136th Legislative Day

- May 1, 1992
- Speaker Madigan: "The House shall come to order. Members shall be in their chairs. We shall be led in prayer today by the Reverend Nelson Rice."
- Reverend Rice: "Let's bow our heads. Dear Father, give us strength and courage and let us understand the turmoil, the problems that we have in this great country, that we can come to an agreement, that we can come to the table for compromise. And let that spill over into this Assembly, that it won't be something we'll be ashamed of, but we can say that we are an American, we are Illinoisians. And we ask You to watch over us and give us strength to understand this simple prayer. In His name, Amen."
- Speaker Madigan: "We shall be led in the Pledge of Allegiance by Representative Ropp."
- Ropp 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 Madigan: "Roll Call for Attendance. Mr. Matijevich, do you have any excused absences?"
- Matijevich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. On this side of the aisle the excused absences are Representative Mulcahey, McNamara and Granberg."
- Speaker Madigan: "Let the record show those excused absences.

 Mr. Black, are there any excused absences? Mr. Kubik."
- Kubik: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Let the record reflect that Representatives Klemm, Doederlein and McCracken are excused today."
- Speaker Madigan: "Let the record reflect those excused absences.

 Mr. Clerk, take the record. Mr. Clerk, would you record

 Mr. McPike as present? Mr. Clerk, are we prepared to take
 the record? Okay. Take the Attendance Roll Call, Mr.

136th Legislative Day

May 1, 1992

Clerk. There being 112 Members responding to the Attendance Roll Call, there is a quorum present. Mr. Clerk, do you have any business? Committee Reports."

Clerk O'Brien: "Representative White, Chairman of the Committee on Human Services, to which the following Bills were referred, action taken May 1, 1991 (sic-1992) reported the same back with the following recommendations: 'do pass' House Bill 3593; 'do pass Short Debate Status' House Bill 3212, tabled in committee by Rule 26(d). House Bill 2386, Representative McNamara, Chairman of the Committee on Education Finance, to which the following Bills were referred, action taken April 30, 1992, reported the back with the following recommendations: 'do pass' House Bills 3463, 3799 and 3801; 'do pass as amended Short Debate Status' Senate Bill 642. Representative Rice, Chairman of the Committee on Insurance, to which the following Bills were referred, action taken May 1, 1992, reported the back with the following recommendations: 'do pass Short Debate Status' House Bill 3743, tabled pursuant to Rule 26(d), House Bill 3121, Representative Saltsman, Chairman of the Committee on Executive, to which the following Bills were referred, action taken May 1, 1992, reported the same back with the following recommendations: 'do pass' House Bills 3741, 2862 and 3821; tabled in committee, House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment #15. Representative Turner, Chairman of the Committee on Higher Education, which the following Bills were referred, action taken May 1, 1992, reported the same back with the following recommendations: 'do pass' House Bills 3504, 3888; 'do pass Short Debate Status' House Bills 4156, 3739 and 1077; 'do pass Consent Calendar' House Bills 3555, 4196. Representative Levin, Chairman of the Committee on Public

136th Legislative Day

May 1, 1992

Utilities, to which the following Bills were referred, action taken May 1, 1992, reported the same back with the following recommendations: 'do pass Short Debate Status' House Bills 3329 and 3659; 'do pass as amended Short Debate Status' House Bills 3168 and 4026. Representative Steczo, Chairman of the Committee on Registration and Regulation, to which the following Bills were referred, action taken May 1, 1992, reported the same back with the following recommendations: 'do pass' House Bills 3941; 'do pass as amended' House Bills 3155, 3434 and 3573; 'do pass Short Debate Status' House Bills 3519, 3326, 3518, 3520, 3911, 3815, 3787, 3673, 3622, 3360, and 4076, and Senate Bill 689; 'do pass as amended Short Debate Status' House Bills 2768, 3590 and 748, and Senate Bill 963; 'do pass Consent Calendar' House Bill 3904."

Speaker Madigan: "We shall now proceed to the matter of Motions on page 41 of the Calendar. These would be Motions discharge committee from further consideration of Bills. And the first Bill would be House Bill 1264 by Mr. Farley." Farley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 1264 is a Bill that would increase the Homestead Exemption for seniors from \$2,000 to This Bill has been introduced in the last three years, and it's never seen the light of day coming out of the Revenue Committee, and for what reason, I don't know, Ladies and Gentlemen, because as we talk here this Session about billion in health care costs, and we talk about, for instance, a possible increase in taxes due to our action last night on Senate Joint Resolution 130, I think it's only fair and just that we talk about benefits for senior citizens. I think in the scheme of things, when we talk about casino gambling and these other issues as riverboat

136th Legislative Day

May 1, 1992

gambling and the others that I've mentioned, I think in the scheme of the things it's only just that we bring forth some of things that are of a concern to senior citizens. To the Motion to discharge: Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, the Bill was heard in a Revenue sub-committee of which three people voted 'present', and one person had to leave the room for some other action. I don't necessarily if there were any negative votes on that committee, but, from what I saw I didn't see any. So. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I only think it just that we bring out House Bill 1264 for the senior citizens of the State of Illinois and have that considered along with all the other revenue matters that this House and this Body and the Senate will be considering So with that, Mr. Speaker, I would move that House Bill 1264 be discharged from the Revenue Committee."

Speaker Madigan: "The Chair recognizes Mr. Farley."

Farley: "Mr. Speaker, after saying all of that and checking with, checking with the Chairman of the Revenue Committee, I have been assured that there is some kind of big plan in the works as there has been for the last three years. And, as I have in the last three years, Mr. Speaker, I would like to be a part of this big plan. So at this time I'd like to take this out of the record."

Speaker Madigan: "House Bill 1331. Mr. Weller."

Weller: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am making a Motion regarding House Bill 1331, which extends the same ethics requirement that affects all Legislators, and only Legislators, to all other elected officials in Illinois. Currently in Illinois there is a prohibition against Legislators' accepting gifts of \$100 or more from Members of the General Assembly, and I would like to extend that to all elected officials in the

136th Legislative Day

May 1, 1992

It's an issue of fairness. It's an issue of state. ethics. It's certainly an issue that the people of Illinois need to be heard. This Bill was heard in the Judiciary Committee. It fell one vote short of passing committee. There was...6 votes that were in favor 'present' votes. I feel it deserves a fair hearing before the full House because it certainly is in interest, only of the Legislators of Illinois, but also in the interest of the taxpayers and citizens who want ethics reform. So, Mr. Speaker, I move pursuant to Rule 77(a) I move discharge Committee on Judiciary I, further consideration advance to the order of Second Reading. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Madigan: "Is the Chairman of the Judiciary I Committee, Mr. Dunn, in the chamber? Mr. John Dunn? Mr. Dunn, there is a Motion to discharge the Judiciary I Committee from further consideration of House Bill 1331. The Motion is filed by Mr. Weller. The Bill relates to the Illinois Governmental Ethics Act. Mr. Dunn."

Dunn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in opposition to the Motion. As everyone in the chamber knows, the purpose of a committee hearing is to enable a Sponsor to present his or her Bill and enable those who wish to testify to come forward and speak out, and then to have the committee take action on the legislation. Each of those things happened with regard to this legislation. The legislation, if it's the Bill I'm thinking of, was called and, to the best of my knowledge, voted upon, or not called, I really don't remember, to be honest with you, but I know that there was no refusal to call the Bill. The committee did adjourn with some Bills not called, but at noon on the final day of hearings,

136th Legislative Day

May 1, 1992

Members had not come forward, and matter of fact now...I think this is a case where the Member did not come forward and ask his Bill to be called. And we checked with the Minority spokesperson and we checked on the Majority side to see if we had indications from any Members not around of whether they wanted their Bills called and it was the sense of the committee that it was time to adjourn and so we did. So, I think I'm wrong at first, I think a different Bill was called. This one I don't believe was called, but the Sponsor didn't come forward and didn't request that it be called. So I would urge defeat of this Motion."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Weller has moved to discharge the committee from further consideration. The Chairman of the Committee, Mr. Dunn, has spoken in opposition to the Motion. 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? Have all voted who Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 45 'ayes', 45 'noes'. The Motion fails. Next matter be House Bill 1852 by Mr. Matijevich. would Mr. House Bill 1852. Matijevich. Mr. Matijevich. Mr. Matijevich, you have filed a Motion to discharge...rather you have filed a Motion to take from the table House Bill 1852. The Bill is concerned with lead poisoning"

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, could you leave that on the Calendar because that Motion is because a Bill has been in the Senate. That Motion has been...was there since the fall Veto Session, and I think they're still working on that Bill. They may need it for a Conference Committee and they may not, so could you just hold that Motion?"

Speaker Madigan: "Yes, Sir. House Bill 2811, by Mr. Capparelli." Capparelli: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Pursuant to Rule 77, I move

136th Legislative Day

May 1, 1992

to discharge Committee on Public Utilities and place House Bill 2811 on First Day, Second Reading, First Day. And the reason I'm asking for it, I just...it's not the ommittee's fault, I just never got around over there. I was too busy, and this on the fifteen cent surcharge for a refund for that link-up program that was adopted last year, and we passed legislation to do away with it. We're trying to get the refund for those people that paid into it. I would ask for a discharge Motion."

- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Capparelli has moved to discharge the Public Utilities Committee from further consideration of the Bill. The Chair recognizes the Chairman of the Committee, Mr. Levin, Mr. Levin, Chairman of the Committee."
- Levin: "Mr. Chairman, despite the fact that this is an excellent Sponsor, the Sponsor never did call his Bill in committee. The committee met several times, including having a recess Session today, and he did not come to ask to have the Bill heard. Accordingly, without getting the merits in all of the Bill, I would urge a 'no' vote, with respect to Mr. Capparelli."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Capparelli has moved to discharge the Committee from further consideration of the Bill. The Chairman of the committee has spoken in opposition to the Motion. 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? The Clerk shall...would you record Mr. McPike as 'no'. The Clerk shall take the record. On this question there are 32 'ayes', 71 'noes', the Motion fails. House Bill 2875, Mr. Homer. Take this matter out of the record. House Bill 2943, Mr. Homer."

136th Legislative Day

May 1, 1992

Homer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to discharge the Executive Committee with respect to this Bill. This is the credit reporting Bill, major initiative of the Attorney General. It would provide consumer protection and rights with regard to credit reports, and I think it's extremely important to our constituents, and I would urge that the Body discharge the Executive Committee and allow this Bill to be heard."

Speaker Madigan: "The Chairman of the committee, Mr. Saltsman."

Saltsman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As you know, we had testimony at great length, probably in our Committee for the last two years. We had more testimony on this piece of legislation than we had in any other legislation before us. I did vote for it. I did vote 'yes', but I just want to let the Members know that it was a very fair hearing, the testimony was extensive, it was given a fair hearing, and, like I said, I voted for it there, but I don't know why the committee has to be discharged."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Homer has moved to discharge the committee from further consideration of the Bill. The Chairman of the Committee has spoken in opposition to the Motion. Those in favor of the Motion signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question there are 51 'ayes', 47 'noes', the Motion fails. House Bill 3033, Mr. Phelps."

Phelps: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move to discharge the Committee on Environment and Energy from further consideration and advance to the Order of Second Reading the First Legislative Day. My intent in this action is not to question the fairness from

136th Legislative Day

May 1, 1992

the Chairman of the Committee. I was chairing the Health Care Committee, had to leave just for a few moments, and I'm sure that as of most committees, because of the lateness of the day that Session drove us in, there was about half the people hereand this is the Alternative Fuel Bill, and I think that those that would like to have a chance to vote on it would need to discharge the committee, and I move to do that."

- Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves to discharge the committee from further consideration. The Chair recognizes the Chairman of the Committee, Mr. Kulas."
- Kulas: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise to oppose the Gentleman's Motion to discharge. The Gentleman had a fair hearing on House Bill 3033. I think it's a Bill which is not necessary at the present time, it's not a Bill that we have to deal with. It's a Bill that's going to cost the state money at a time when the state doesn't have that money, and I would ask for a 'no' vote on this Motion."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Phelps has moved to discharge the committee from further consideration of the Bill. The Chairman of the Committee has spoken in opposition to the Motion. 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 take the record. On this question there are 52 'ayes', 52 'noes'. The Motion fails. House Bill 3254, Representative Satterthwaite."
- Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I move to discharge House Bill 3254 from the Pensions Committee.

 This was a Bill that was requested to be posted, but inadvertently missed the posting notification. I believe

136th Legislative Day

- May 1, 1992
- that the chairman will agree with me and ask for him to join with me in the discharge Motion."
- Speaker Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the Chairman of the Committee, Mr. Wolf."
- Wolf: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I rise in support of the Lady's Motion. She's absolutely correct.

 There was an error made, and the Bill was not posted for a hearing. This Bill does not impact the pension system, but impacts the Personnel Code, and I would urge your support of her Motion."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Wolf, did you agree with the Motion? Did you agree with the Motion, Mr. Wolf? The Lady has moved to discharge the committee from further consideration. The Chair of the Committee is in support of the Motion. Those in favor of the Motion say 'aye', those opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Motion is adopted. We shall use the Attendance Roll Call for purposes of the Motion. House Bill 3329. Mr. Ackerman. Mr. Ackerman."
- Ackerman: "Withdraw the Motion, please."
- Speaker Madigan: "Withdraw the Motion. House Bill 3456, Mr. Keane."
- Keane: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to suspend Rules 35(a) and 77(c) to place House Bill 3456 on the Order of Second Reading."
- Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves to discharge the Committee on Revenue from further consideration of the Bill. The Chair recognizes the Chair of the Committee, Representative Currie."
- Currie: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I support the Gentleman's Motion. The Bill inadvertently was not posted, and, for that reason, I think that we should grant his request."
- Speaker Madigan: "All right, the Chair of the Committee rises in

136th Legislative Day

- May 1, 1992
- support of the Motion. Those in favor say 'aye', those opposed say 'no'. The Chair recognizes Mr. Black."
- Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I certainly, I would defer to a Committee Chair in most instances, but this is a vehicle Bill. Nobody knows what it's going to be used for. There are plenty of Revenue vehicles out there, and I really would urge Members to vote 'no'. We have enough to do without dealing with dozens and dozens of vehicle Bills."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Black rises in opposition to the Motion.

 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? On this question there are63...64 'ayes', 45 'noes'. The Motion is adopted.

 The Bill shall be placed on the Order of Second Reading, First Legislative Day. Mr. Keane."
- Keane: "I move to suspend Rules 35(a) and 77(c) to put the Bill 3456 on the Order of Second Reading."
- Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman has moved that the Bill shall be taken from the Order of Second Reading, First Legislative Day to Second Reading, Second Legislative Day. This Motion requires 60 votes. On that question, the Chair recognizes Mr. Kubik."
- Kubik: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I recognize we are in a bit of a rush here, but I would object to this Motion. The Gentleman has not indicated what he plans to do with this particular Bill. We just discharged committee on this Bill. We have no idea what the contents of this legislation will be, and I think this is, you know, a bad move for us to make. I would hope that the Members would oppose this Motion, so that at least we can know what the heck is going to come into this Bill. The Sponsor has made

136th Legislative Day

May 1, 1992

no effort to come to our side of the aisle and indicate what he wishes to put into this legislation, and I would oppose this Motion vigorously, and I would hope that other Members would as well. God knows in a time when we're talking about tax increases, et cetera. we ought to know what's going into this legislation. So I would oppose this Motion and would hope that all my colleagues would do likewise."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Keane has moved that the Bill be placed on the Order of Second Reading, Second Legislative Day. Mr. Kubik has risen in opposition to the Motion. Those in favor of the Motion signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question there are 64 'ayes', 44 'noes'. The Motion is adopted. The Bill shall be placed on the Order of Second Reading, Second Legislative Day. Mr. Clerk, do you have any Amendments? Mr. Kubik."

Kubik: "Mr. Speaker, I would, once the Clerk gets to his Order of Business, I would like to ask whether this potential Amendment has been printed and distributed and placed on the Members' desks."

Speaker Madigan: "That is being done right now. Mr. Clerk, has the Amendment been distributed?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Amendment is distributed."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr...who was the Sponsor of the Amendment?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Obrzut."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Obrzut, to explain the Amendment."

Obrzut: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Amendment #1 to House Bill 3456 increases senior citizen homestead exemption from \$2,000 to \$2,500 in Cook County. It

136th Legislative Day

May 1, 1992

increases the general homestead exemption from \$3,500 to \$4,500 in Cook County. It holds school districts harmless under the School Aid Formula. It requires the Department of Revenue to add to the taxable value of property of a school district in Cook an amount equal to the number of exemptions in these school districts multiplied by the difference in dollar amount between exemptions in Cook County and the exemptions for homeowners outside Cook County. This is designed to hold school districts outside Cook County harmless under the School Aid Formula. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Clerk, read the Bill for a second time."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3456, a Bill for an Act to amend the Revenue Act. Second Reading of the Bill. We're on Floor Amendment #1."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Kubik."

Kubik: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Madigan: "The Sponsor yields."

Kubik: "Representative, seeing how we have just moments ago received this Amendment, perhaps you might respond to a couple of questions. What, would you please explain to me, what you plan to do with the homestead exemption here? What is the provision on the homestead exemption?"

Obrzut: "Representative Kubik, what we plan on doing is increasing the senior citizen homestead exemption from \$2000 to \$2500 in Cook County, and we also increase the general homestead exemption from \$3500 to \$4500 in Cook County."

Kubik: "It would affect only Cook County, and it would increase the general homestead exemption from \$2500 to \$3500, or, excuse me, \$3500 to \$4500. Now you mentioned to me that, you mentioned in your explanation that there is a hold

136th Legislative Day

May 1, 1992

- harmless clause here. What is this hold harmless clause?"

 Obrzut: "That is for downstate school districts."
- Kubik: "And why don't you explain it to me? Why don't you explain to the Membership what in practical terms that means? I mean, what you're talking about is a shift in money in the formula. Is that what we're talking about here?"
- Obrzut: "No. What we're doing is holding them harmless. We're making sure there is no shift, Representative."
- Kubik: "But in order to hold somebody harmless, you have to add money somewhere and take money from somewhere else. So, if you're going to take money out of the base, you've got to add it somewhere else. So, my question is, 'Who are the winners and losers here?' If you're taking money away from suburban school districts and the City of Chicago, where is the corresponding change in dollars, and where is it coming from?"
- Obrzut: "We're not taking anything away, Representative. What we're doing is making sure that nothing gets taken away from downstate."
- Kubik: "So in other words, the amount of money that will go to local suburban school districts due to homestead exemptions will be reduced under this legislation."
- Obrzut: "In Cook County, that is correct."
- Kubik: "So that the amount of money that is in the form of property taxes by increasing the homestead and senior citizen exemption will be reduced only in local school districts?"
- Obrzut: "True, only in Cook County. Pardon me? To answer your question, Representative, it would only be a small amount that would be taking away of a greatly increased value."
- Kubik: "A small amount being taken from local suburban school

136th Legislative Day

May 1, 1992

districts. So, in other words, you, a suburban Legislator, have no problem with reducing the amount of property taxes that go to your local school district due to the fact that these you're going to increase exemptions. essentially what you're doing, is reducing the amount of money that is going to local school districts. Now, talk a little bit about the hold harmless clause. increasing the exemptions, we're reducing the equalized assessed valuation, which has an impact on the formula. in other words, and this hold harmless is designed to, as you point out, protect downstate."

Obrzut: "That's correct."

Kubik: "Okay. And, Representative, while I certainly appreciate your work on this issue, don't you think that we ought to know what the shift in dollars should be before we vote on this Amendment? I mean, we're talking about, literally, hundreds of school districts in Cook County that are going to be affected by this, and it's got to have a massive shift in dollars, that it's going to have a major impact on the School Aid Formula."

Obrzut: "Representative, we would disagree. We don't feel there's going to be a major shift. Or no shift at all."

Kubik: "Well, I think that..."

Obrzuit: "The whole reason for the hold harmless agreement is to keep it from, to keep a shift from happening."

Kubik: "So, what you're saying to me is, that there's a shift, but you're saying that there is no shift, and now you've just said that we're trying to make sure that we have this hold harmless clause because when the shift occurs, we don't want downstate to be affected. So, I'm not quite sure what your answer is here. Is there going to be a shift in dollars, and these dollars are, you know, is there

136th Legislative Day

- May 1, 1992
- going to be a shift in the funds?"
- Obrzut: "Representative, can you repeat the question? There's some confusion over here as far as what you were asking."
- Kubik: "The question is: 'By increasing the homestead exemption and the senior citizen exemption, is there not going to be a shift?' And including a hold harmless clause, by virtue of having a hold harmless clause you're acknowledging that there will be a shift in revenue."
- Obrzut: "No, no, Representative, there will be less money for Cook County, but no shift at all for downstate."
- Kubik: "But there will be a shift in money, income tax money, and, or state funds, I should say 'state funds,' let's leave it at that, from Cook County."
- Obrzut: "No."
- Kubik: "Well, if you're having a hold harmless clause, Representative, by its definition there's a shift. Why have a hold harmless clause if there isn't a shift?"
- Obrzut: "There is a finite amount of money in Cook County. What this is basically doing is protecting downstate. There is no money being taken away from downstate."
- Kubik: "Representative, what...because of the increase in both the homestead and the senior citizens, exemptions, what, can you tell me what, what impact this will have on local school districts in Cook County? How much fewer tax dollars they will have to meet their obligation under the property tax because of this reduction in the amount of money that they would receive from the property
- Obrzut: "Representative, I don't have a number for all the different districts, but for the Chicago Board of Education what is projected for 1991, projected property tax increase without the exemption increases would be \$151 million. With the exemption increases it's \$136 million. So you're

136th Legislative Day

May 1, 1992

talking roughly \$15 million."

Kubik: "That's for Chicago alone?"

Obrzut: "Yeah, that's for Chicago."

Kubik: "For the Board of Education of Chicago? For the Board of Education in the City of Chicago? So there's a \$15 million reduction in the amount of property tax revenue that...increased property tax revenue...that they would receive?"

Obrzut: "The answer is yes."

Kubik: "And does this include the change in the assessed valuation that occurs this year? In other words, the increase in assessed valuation?"

Obrzut: "Yes, it's effective this year."

Kubik: "Okay, so, basically you're shifting \$15 million away from the State Board of Education for their use this year by this exemption."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Kubik..."

Obrzut: "What we're doing is reducing \$15 million from Chicago Board of Education property taxes."

Kubik: "One final question..."

Oberzut: "Of \$151 million in new dollars."

Kubik: "Representative, what, we talked about the increase in the homestead and the senior citizen exemption. What else does this Amendment do?"

Obrzut: "I..I"

Kubik: "I said, we spoke about the increase in the homestead exemption and the senior citizen exemption and the hold harmless clause for downstate, even though there won't be a shift of money. What else did this Amendment do?"

Obrzut: "That's it."

Kubik: "To the Amendment, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I...we're kind of out of order here. I think we

136th Legislative Day

May 1, 1992

should be doing discharge Motions. Instead, we're talking about an Amendment to the Real Estate Tax Law, in Cook County, which will increase both the homestead exemption and the senior citizens' exemption. Now, no matter how you feel about this issue, I think that it's pretty tough to vote on this kind of an issue without having the figures in front of us. For years we have been told by local school districts that the increase in the homestead and senior citizen exemption reduces the amount of property tax that they can utilize for local schools. I am a great advocate of property tax relief, and, as a matter of fact, I may even want to eventually sponsor, or to approve of this Bill. But what I am uncomfortable about, is that the Sponsor has presented an Amendment and the only thing we know is that it will reduce the amount of money that the City of Chicago in the Board of Education for their use for this year of \$15 million. It reduces their budget by \$15 million- money that we will have to make up somewhere. we'll probably have to make it up in state taxes, so that's another \$15 million that will be shifted from the state to the City of Chicago. We know that it will reduce the City of Chicago's property tax by \$15 million. We don't know how much it's going to affect any of the suburban areas of So, my suggestion to you is to look at this Cook County. Amendment very carefully. The other point the Sponsor makes is that he has a hold harmless clause for downstate. He acknowledges that there is no shift, but by the very nature of having a hold harmless clause, there has to be a shift, they've got to believe that there is a shift. where this money is going to be shifted, and how much it will be is something that I think we ought to have the answer to before we vote on this Amendment. And would ask

136th Legislative Day

May 1, 1992

that the Sponsor come up with that information so that we can make an intelligent vote on this Amendment. At this point in time, we don't have that information. We don't know how it's going to affect municipalities and park districts and all of those people. So, I am not saying that this is a bad Amendment, I'm saying the timing on this Amendment is horrendous, because we cannot, we do not have the proper information to make a vote on this Amendment. So I would urge the defeat of this Amendment, and let's come back with a subsequent Amendment. When all of the information is put before us, we can make an intelligent decision on this issue, and we can perhaps even support this Amendment. But right now I think the timing is bad, and I think we ought to defeat this Amendment."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Black."

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

Speaker Madigan: "The Sponsor yields."

Black: "Thank you. Representative, can you tell me where in this

Amendment you set up this formula to do what you purport

you're trying to do?"

Obrzut: "Page 11."

Black: "Uh-huh. Would it start on line 5 at the left and go down through line 14?"

Obrzut: "Was there a question, Representative?"

Black: "Yeah, I'm still waiting. That's the formula, right?

line 5 through line 14, page 11?"

Obrzut: "That's correct."

Black: "You read that very carefully?"

Obrzut: "Yes."

Black: "Explain that to me. Plain simple language, in a minute and a half. Explain this formula that you've thrown out

136th Legislative Day

May 1. 1992

here in the last five..."

Obrzut: "This is the hold harmless agreement."

Black: "No, no, explain the formula to me. No, no it isn't.

Explain this formula to me. You're gonna have to go back

and explain it to the voters. If you can't explain it to

me, I suggest you may be in trouble."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Black."

Black: "Yes, Sir."

Speaker Madigan: "You have posed a question. The Gentleman is attempting to answer your question."

Black: "I trust he will, if he can."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Black. Mr. Obrzut, do you have an answer?"

Obrzut: "I already answered him, I believe."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Black."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. That was no answer at all. Ladies and Gentlemen, to the Amendment. You know it may be good political strategy to throw an Amendment out here, totally unaware that you hide in the well and don't let anybody see, but I'll tell you something. We've read the Amendment. This formula on page 11 is flawed. Seriously flawed. He doesn't know what it does, and yet he's going to ask you to vote on it. Is it hold harmless? You better read it and make sure. I'm not sure it holds anybody harmless. Now, I'll tell you, it might be good political strategy to pull these things out of the hat, but it isn't good government strategy, because somebody's going to have to go home and explain this, and, as near as we can determine, it does not do what the Gentleman says it does. I would suggest you vote 'no' or 'present' and let's get on with the business at hand. We've had enough political strategy in the last 24 hours to last the next 8 weeks."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Pullen."

136th Legislative Day

May 1, 1992

Pullen: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to ask the Gentleman a question, please."

Speaker Madigan: "The Sponsor yields."

Pullen: "First, Sir, you were reading from a document, it appeared, concerning the impact on the Chicago public school budget, and I wonder whether you could tell me was that a document from the State Board of Education?"

Obrzut: "No, it is not."

Pullen: "Was it from the Chicago Board of Education?"

Obrzut: "These are staff calculations."

Pullen: "Do you know where the staff got those figures, Sir?"

Obrzut: "The \$151 million figure does come from the Chicago Board of Education. And then our calculations from the Bill, it would be \$136 million."

Pullen: "Sir, would you please tell me what is meant on page 11 by the phrase 'The Department of Revenue shall add to the value of all taxable property of each school district.'"

Obrzut: "It's just a bookkeeping measure."

Pullen: "Did you say, 'It's just a bookkeeping measure?'"

Obrzut: "For the purpose of this Bill, correct."

Pullen: "Well, what is the effect on the taxation of all property, all taxable property, of each school district after this bookkeeping method has been applied by the Department of Revenue that adds to the value of that taxable property?"

Obrzut: "Basically, what it does, it protects the downstate school districts."

Pullen: "Sir, maybe I should read more of this phrase. 'The
Department of Revenue shall add to the value of all taxable
property of each school district situated entirely or
partially within a county with 2 millions or more
inhabitants.' How does that do anything to the downstate

136th Legislative Day

- May 1, 1992
- school districts? It appears that it affects the taxable property in Cook County, Sir."
- Obrzut: "Representative, because we took it away. If we didn't have this in there, more money would move up to Cook County's, and less to downstate."
- Pullen: "Would you repeat that more clearly, please? I'm having difficulty hearing, Mr. Speaker."
- Obrzut: "If we took the money, if this provision wasn't in the Amendment, more money would be going up regarding school districts up until, up to Cook County, and this presents that from happening."
- Pullen: "Does this provision relate to the levying of property taxes?"
- Obrzut: "No, not at all."
- Pullen: "What does the Department of Revenue have to do with state aid to schools?"
- Obrzut: "They set the equalizers and do the calculations."
- Pullen: "What does that have to do with state aid to schools?

 Doesn't that have to do with taxation of property?"
- Obrzut: "It only has...it only has to do with EAV assessed value."
- Pullen: "But the equalized assessed value is the tax base on which school districts and other units of local government apply their rate to produce the tax levy, isn't that correct?"
- Obrzut: "Yes, that's correct."
- Pullen: "Well, if the Department of Revenue adds to the value of all taxable property in each school district in Cook County, does that not increase the tax base in each school district?"
- Obrzut: "No, only for the School Aid Formula, and that's state money."

136th Legislative Day

May 1, 1992

- Pullen: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the Gentleman's responses demonstrate why many people in this House are very nervous about this legislation. Because what he is saying does not appear to be at all reflective of what is in this Amendment. And I would urge the Gentleman to withdraw this Amendment until he can write it in such a way that it says what he says he means. And if he will not do that, then I urge the House to reject this Amendment. Thank you."
- 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 is adopted. Mr. Clerk, is there a request for a fiscal note on this matter?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Request for a fiscal note has been made."
- Speaker Madigan: "On the question of the request for a fiscal note the Chair recognizes Mr. Keane."
- Keane: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move the fiscal note does not apply."
- Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman has moved that the fiscal note does not apply. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Daniels."
- Daniels: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, to explain my vote. First of all, we think that the Amendment that the Speaker ran through without a Roll Call is flawed. But perhaps some of you downstaters might want to consider seeing a fiscal note on this Bill. Our staff estimates that if, in fact, the Amendment were drawn properly and said, assessed value, instead of 'value', and if the language was correct, that the potential fiscal impact could be in the \$100 to \$150 million range. The Gentleman

136th Legislative Day

May 1, 1992

that sponsored the Amendment was intentionally vaque, pretended he didn't know what he was talking about, but apparently the state is supposed to reimburse those in the Cook County area that lose their homestead exemption. it's state money that goes into those homestead exemptions, and the net effect of that, of course, is you're taking away money from downstate schools and downstate dollars. am I right on this? I can't tell you that I positively am. But I'll tell you, before you go along with discharging the fiscal note, you might want to see that so can make a decision on this legislation. that you Otherwise. you're gonna find yourself just like Amendment, being ramrodded through without any vote on it, so that the people couldn't record your 'no' vote. gonna find yourself once again, the subject of chicanery, sponsored by a Legislator that's trying to run this thing through, hood winking you, and closing your eyes before you know what it's all about."

Speaker Madigan: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question there 63 'ayes', 46 'noes'.

The Motion is adopted. House Bill 3456 shall be taken out of the record. House Bill 3693, Representative Schakowsky."

Schakowsky: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 3693 is a Bill in which I am working out language with all the interested parties to put an advisory only referendum on the ballot in November on national health care. And, so, the Bill as it is, just orders that such a referendum will be held, but we're working out the language with all those that have expressed interest in how it would read. Urge that it be discharged from committee."

Speaker Madigan: "The Lady has moved to discharge the Committee

136th Legislative Day

May 1, 1992

on Executive from further consideration of the Bill. The Chair recognizes the Chairman of the Committee, Mr. Saltsman."

- Saltsman: "Yes, this Bill did have a committee hearing. Again, I voted 'yes' for this piece of legislation. I only want people to know it did have a fair hearing. We did have a lot of Bills that day. We probably had 50 Bills in the committee that day. It did have a hearing, and I voted 'yes', and everybody's on their own, but it did have a fair hearing. I want to give the committee credit for it."
- Speaker Madigan: "The Motion is to discharge the committee from further consideration 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 voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question there are 42 'ayes' and 51 'noes'. The Motion fails. House Bill 3846, Mr. Obrzut. Gentleman requests that the matter be taken out of the record. House Bill 3943, Mr. Weller."
- Weller: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. In the bipartisan spirit of the Majority who approved last night's education Constitutional Amendment, I asked that legislation, that House Bill 3943, legislation that would establish a fair base, guarantee a basic level of funding for our public schools, particularly local schools in our own community by earmarking 70% of the net income tax revenues that they be provided to public education (2/3 to elementary and secondary education, and 1/3 to higher education). This plan has been known as the Priority One Plan. It's a plan that we put forward to offer some basic funding for education. And, frankly, from looking at the figures, projections of the State Board of

136th Legislative Day

May 1, 1992

Education, I know from my own district that this would probably increase funding for our local schools by about 10 to 12% without a tax increase. So, Mr. Speaker, I move to discharge the Committee on Revenue from further consideration, and advance to the Order of Second Reading, House Bill 3943. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

- Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves to discharge the Committee on Revenue from further consideration of the Bill. The Chair recognizes the Chair, Representative Currie."
- Currie: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Gentleman's right. The important vote was last night. I think the Bill that he brings to us in this Discharge Motion is not very important after all. The House Revenue Committee did give full consideration to the measure this year, as we did last year, as we did the year before. I oppose the Gentleman's Motion."
- Speaker Madigan: "The question is, 'Shall the Motion be adopted?'

 The Gentleman has moved to discharge the committee. The
 Chair of the Committee has spoken in opposition to the
 Motion. 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 47 'ayes', 52
 'noes'. The Motion fails. We'll go back to House Bill
 3456. The Bill is on the Order of Second Reading. Mr.
 Clerk, do you have any Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3456, Floor Amendment #1 has been adopted. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Homer."
- Homer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Amendment 2 takes care of any concern that may have been raised with regard to whether the implementation of this Bill, as amended with

136th Legislative Day

May 1, 1992

House Amendment #1, would require funding from the state to the local governments affected because of the effect of the State Mandates Act This Amendment would specifically exempt the Bill as amended from the provisions of the State Mandates Act so as to relieve the state of any obligation to fund any loss of revenue to local units...local taxing units within Cook County as a result of the Bill as amended."

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Wennlund."

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

Speaker Madigan: "The Sponsor yields."

Wennlund: "How does this Amendment mesh with the prior Amendment, Representative?"

Homer: "Well, prior Amendment, Representative Wennlund, would, that's House Amendment #1, would have set a different exemption amount for Cook County tax...for Cook County taxpayers. They would get a \$500 increase in their homestead in their senior citizen homestead exemption and a \$1,000 increase in their homestead exemption. And that would result in a lowering of tax revenues into taxing districts in Cook County. They would lose tax revenues, and, so, this Amendment 2 says that the state, through the Mandates Act, would not be obligated to reimburse those local taxing districts for the lost revenue."

Wennlund: "Does, the state currently reimburses for homestead exemptions now, is that correct?"

Homer: "Well, I don't think that they do now, but I am told that back in 1983 that we took some initiative at that time to exempt the State Mandates Act on the issue of these exemptions. But, to make it absolutely clear that the State Mandate Act is, in fact, exempted with respect to

136th Legislative Day

May 1, 1992

this particular Bill, to remove any question of that, this Bill, this Amendment would do that. So that it would absolve the state of any need whatsoever to reimburse the local taxing districts that lost money because of this increased exemption."

Wennlund: "Where does the lost money get made up from?"

Homer: "Well, they'll have to raise their tax rates if they want to make it up, because they're going to lose money as a result of the increased exemptions. So that the only way that Cook County taxing districts could increase their revenues would be to increase their tax rates to offset the lower assessments."

Wennlund: "And those school districts would have to go to a referendum before they could increase their rates, naturally."

Homer: "I don't think in Cook County...I don't think the Chicago school, well in the suburbs, that's correct. Yes. The Chicago school system, I think, has to have rate increases approved by the General Assembly."

Wennlund: "But the suburban, South Suburban and West and Suburban school districts would have to go to referendum before they could make up for the lost money that this Bill would create?"

Homer: "That's true, and as you know from the discussion of Amendment 1 is that there is a hold harmless provision designed there for the purpose of the School Aid Formula. So that in the School Aid Formula, for the purpose of determining the amount the school district would receive, the amount of the lowered assessments would be put back in. So that there would be no resulting loss of state revenues through the formula either. So this is the final piece of the puzzle that makes sure that the state is fully

136th Legislative Day

May 1, 1992

protected."

Wennlund: "So that...it won't affect the amount they receive under the state aid formula, but it will affect the amount they receive from local property tax?"

Homer: "In Cook County, yes. The implementation of this Bill, with Amendment 1 and 2, would mean that Cook County taxing districts, be it schools or other taxing districts, would receive less tax revenue than they would have without the Bill. And in order to make that up, they would have to increase their rates. If they're not able to do that without referendum, then they would have to go to referendum to do that."

Wennlund: "Are there any figures available as to exactly how much money this would cost suburban Cook County school districts and other, presumably other taxing districts, cities and villages, park districts?"

Homer: "There may be, and I don't...I don't have that information, if there is. It's pointed out to me that with respect to home rule municipalities, that they would be able simply to increase their rates without resorting to referendum."

Wennlund: "Does this apply to all taxing bodies?"

Homer: "In Cook County."

Wennlund: "In Cook County?"

Homer: "Yes."

Wennlund: "Okay. Thank you. To the Amendment, Mr. Speaker.

Here we go again, creating an unfunded mandate on every
taxing body: school, park district, city and village in
Cook County, by reducing the amount by which they can raise
their revenues to provide services and to provide schools.

And the state's saying, 'We're not going to pay you to make
up the difference. You're going to have to go out to the

136th Legislative Day

May 1, 1992

voters in most instances, in the instances of all school districts in suburban Cook, and ask them for a rate increase. And everybody here knows what the success of tax referendums have been over the past several particularly those in high property tax portions of Cook County. So it's something you ought to consider when you're voting on this. And we're here again singling out one county in the state and every taxing district in that county is going to have a negative impact which has got to be in the millions of dollars. With no figures available, we can't tell these school districts how much they're going to lose as a result of this. It's just that we know they're going to lose 'cause when you decrease the amount of assessed valuation at their current rates, they're going to lose money. There's no question about it. Mr. Speaker, request a record vote on this matter, and if it achieves a requisite number of votes, I request a verification."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Black."

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

Speaker Madigan: "The Sponsor yields."

Black: "Thank you. Representative Homer, my memory not being what it was a few years ago, sometime this week didn't we pass out of the House a House Constitutional Amendment that said any mandates that we put on local units of government will be accompanied by the requisite dollars?"

Homer: "We passed it. It's now pending in the Senate. Yes, I. don't know what the Senate has done."

Black: "I don't know what the Senate did either. I don't know whether it passed today or not. But then, even though we passed that out, I think unanimously, as best I can recall, then we're coming back in here and exempting ourselves from a mandate. I mean, that doesn't seem logical to me."

136th Legislative Day

May 1, 1992

Homer: "Let me tell you what should seem logical to everyone that is not a suburban Cook Legislator is that the Bill is already on Second Reading and it has an Amendment on it that would increase the homestead exemption for Cook County taxpayers. I am offering this Amendment to protect the rest of us because...and I don't understand why you would want to oppose my Amendment. My Amendment says the state would be held harmless. I don't want the people of my district to have to pay for the provisions of House Amendment 1. So, all of us who aren't Cook County suburban Legislators ought to at least support my Amendment because if we don't, and the Bill passes with Amendment 1, then the state would have to perhaps reimburse Cook County taxing districts out of our General Fund as a result of the effect of the State Mandates Act. Now the Amendment that's over in the Senate that passed the House is, would not kick in in any event until the voters approved it in November, and I'm saying that in the meantime we should do all that can to protect our constituents, and this Bill clearly protects mine and yours. So I hope we would support this Amendment."

Black: "Thank you very much, Representative. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I really think what we have here, is a...the proverbial freight train that's on the track and obviously hurtling toward wherever the engineer decides it's going to go. There are many of us who in all honesty, cannot fathom the formula that was in Amendment 1. Now we're exempting the state from what obviously will be some portion of local governments, an expensive mandate exemption, and I...Ireally think that we are rushing to judgement on this. I would simply join with my colleague, Representative Wennlund, in asking for a

136th Legislative Day

May 1, 1992

recorded Roll Call Vote on Amendment #2 and again reiterate, that should it get the requisite number of votes, we will seek a verification."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Kubik."

Kubik: "Would the Sponsor yield for a question or two?"

Speaker Madigan: "The Sponsor yields."

Kubik: "Representative Homer, I just wanted to walk ...I think I understand your hold harmless provision...to walk through this, just briefly, so that I understand this completely. What you're saying is that we are going to increase the senior citizen exemption and the homestead exemption in all units in Cook County? Okay. For purposes of calculating the school aid formula, we are literally going to add back the loss of those exemptions, the money that...the assessed valuation of those exemptions so that everything remains the same."

Kubik: "Okay. Now, we are increasing the general homestead exemption to \$4,500?"

Homer: "Yes."

Kubik: "And we are increasing the senior citizen exemption to \$2,500?"

Homer: "Yes."

Kubik: "Okay. Now my question is, that you mentioned earlier that this will affect all units, including home rule units."

Homer: "Yes."

Kubik: "Okay. So, although we're adding back for purposes of the School Aid Formula, we're not adding back in municipalities and park districts..." Kubik: "Okay. So there...the amount of revenue that, the amount of revenue that they would receive via the property tax would be reduced?"

Homer: "Yes."

136th Legislative Day

May 1, 1992

Kubik: "Okay."

Homer: "School districts may be reduced, also. The school districts may also be reduced. They won't lose state aid, but they will be losing property taxes. Yes."

Kubik: "Okay. And, in the case of the Chicago school district, as Representative Obrzut pointed out, they would be reduced by \$15 million?"

Homer: "Yes."

Kubik: "Okay. Mr. Speaker, a short comment to the Bill, if I may. I would...that explanation I think is a very good explanation. And I think that what we ought to keep in mind here is, as you weigh voting on this Amendment is that this Amendment is going to hold harmless the school portion of this property tax."

Homer: "No, this is not a hold harmless, Representative Kubik.

This exempts, this Amendment 2, exempts the Mandates Act,
the State Mandates Act."

Kubik: "So it defines the fact that we are holding harmless the school aid formula."

Homer: "No, it really doesn't deal so much with the school aid formula as such. Without this Amendment, there would be a concern that since we are passing a Bill that reduces the revenues of local units, taxing units in Cook County, that they could then come to us and say 'Well, since you passed a Bill taking away some of our revenue, under the Mandates Act you have to reimburse us for what you've taken away. This Amendment would say, 'no', the State Mandates Act is exempt, so don't come to us go to your voters."

Kubik: "Okay, well, Ladies and Gentlemen, I think Representative Wennlund has hit the nail on the head. This is an unfunded mandate that we're going to pass. Now whether you're for property tax relief or not, you know, that's a question you

136th Legislative Day

May 1, 1992

have to determine, but the bottom line is, that we are again placing an unfunded mandate on local units of government at the same time that we're talking about capping them, et cetera. We're going to place another unfunded mandate on local government and, to me, you know, this is pure hypocrisy. We passed a Constitutional Amendment less than a week ago on this subject, and here we are just cavalierly blowing along and going to pass another major, major unfunded mandate on local government. It just, it just boggles my mind. I would hope that we would oppose this Amendment and bring some reason to this whole process."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Flinn"

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

Speaker Madigan: "Those in favor say 'aye', those opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The previous question is moved.

The question is on the adoption of the Amendment. Those in favor of Mr. Homer's Amendment vote 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. Mr. Homer, to explain his vote."

- Homer: "Very briefly, if you don't live in suburban Cook, and you don't represent suburban Cook constituents, you better be voting 'yes', because if you don't vote 'yes', you're putting an obligation on your citizenry to fund this tax reduction in Cook County. So, it looks like it's getting the votes."
- Speaker Madigan: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question there are 65 'ayes', 32 'noes'. The Amendment is adopted. Arethere any further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative Pullen."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Keane."

136th Legislative Day

May 1, 1992

Keane: "Mr. Speaker, I believe Amendment #3 is out of order."

Speaker Madigan: "The Parliamentarian will respond."

Parliamentarian: "On behalf of the Speaker, Amendment #3 is out of order. When Amendment #2 was adopted, it renumbered Section 1, so that when Amendment #3 is considered it refers to Paragraphs 19, 23-a, and Section 111.1. None of those are considered in Amendment #1."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Pullen. Representative Pullen." Pullen: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. You and the Sponsor of the Bill have now completed approximately the 422nd time that you have denied the Sponsors of this Amendment the opportunity to even have the people of Illinois know that we are attempting to get equity for property taxpayers in Cook County by simply giving us the same access to the state property tax appeal board that the taxpayers in the other 101 counties of Illinois have enjoyed since 1968. time this Amendment is introduced, you either find aruse to rule it out of order, or you just don't call the Bill. Well, you had to call this Bill because it's your pet Bill with your targets on it. So you had to call it, Mr. Speaker. So you had to find something else. But one day, Mr. Speaker, the people of Illinois and the people of Cook County will someday, when you are no longer in that Chair, have the opportunity for relief from the state Property Tax

Speaker Madigan: "The Parliamentarian has ruled the Lady's
 Amendment not in order. Mr. Clerk, is there a request for
 a fiscal note?"

Appeal Board."

- Clerk O'Brien: "There's request...the fiscal note has been voted 'not applicable'. There is a request for a state mandate note."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Clerk, I'm advised there is now a second

136th Legislative Day

May 1, 1992

request for a fiscal note relative to the Bill as amended. I'm now corrected that there is not a request for a fiscal note, but there are apparently, there is apparently a request for a mandate note. So, Mr. Clerk, what is on file with the Clerk? Mr. Clerk, what is on file with the Clerk? What is on file with you? Read to the Members what is on file."

Clerk O'Brien: "The requests I have are: 'I hereby request a state mandate fiscal note be supplied to House Bill 3456 as amended, and additionally, I request a state mandates fiscal note be supplied on House Bill 3456 as amended by Amendment #2."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Keane."

Keane: "Mr. Speaker, I move that neither of those apply."

Speaker Madigan: "The question is, 'Should Mr. Keane's Motion be adopted, which would render those requests for notes 'not applicable'? Those in favor of Mr. Keane's Motion vote 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question there are 69 'ayes', 39 'noes'. The Motion is adopted. There is now on file a fiscal note request. Mr. Keane."

Keane: "Mr. Speaker, I move the fiscal note request does not
apply."

Speaker Madigan: "You've all heard the Gentleman's Motion. Those in favor of Mr. Keane's Motion vote 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. Mr. Black to explain his vote."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I would request a verification of the roll on this Motion, and I will stand to ask for a verification on every Motion before us from now until we adjourn. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who

136th Legislative Day

May 1, 1992

wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question there are 65 'ayes', 37 'noes'. The Motion is adopted. Mr. Black, relative to your request for a verification, the Chair rules that request dilatory, Sir. You might wish to read the transcript. You might conclude it's dilatory, the Bill shall be placed on the Order of Third Reading. On page 43 of the Calendar there appears House Bill 3996. Mr. Obrzut. Mr. Obrzut. Take it out of the record. House Bill 3999, Mr. Wennlund. Mr. Wennlund. Out of the record. House Bill 4153, Mr. Homer. Out of the We will now go to the Supplemental Calendar. the order of Motions there appears House Bill 2907, Mr. Hartke. Mr. Hartke."

Hartke: "Thank you, very much, Mr. Speaker. I move to discharge from the Committee on Insurance for further consideration and advance to the Order of Second Reading, First Legislative Day House Bill 2907. House Bill 2907 is a, an issue that deals with the windshield replacement business, and the small businesses of the State of Illinois. I presented a Bill before the Insurance Committee but failed to receive the number of votes to pass it out of committee; however I feel that it's a very important issue for many of the small businesses in the State of Illinois, and I intend to pursue this and possibly put it as Amendments on other Bills, but rather than, to go through that paperwork, I would appreciate it having this Bill, under my sponsorship, 2907...this Motion be requested"

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman has moved to discharge the
Committee on Insurance from further consideration of the
Bill. The Chair recognizes the Chairman of the Insurance
Committee, Representative Rice."

Rice: "Mr. Speaker, this Body, we heard that...we heard the Bill,

136th Legislative Day

May 1, 1992

we gave it fair review, and I think, at this particular time, I would have to vote no. Oppose it, no. Oppose it."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Rice."

Rice: "I oppose it...something."

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman opposes the Motion. So, Mr. Hartke has moved to discharge the committee from further consideration of the Bill. The Chairman of the Committee rises in opposition to the Motion. 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? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question there are 29 'ayes', 71 'noes'. The Motion fails. The Membership should be advised that on all of these Motions they require 71 votes. House Bill 2911, Mr. Balanoff. Out of the record. House Bill 3131, Representative Parcells."

Parcells: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to discharge the Committee on Insurance on House Bill 3131 and advance to the Order of Second Reading. This, there was not a quorum present to take the vote on this Bill, and I think the Chairman of the Committee will ascertain that. So, we were unable to vote on it, and I would like the issue to be voted on; and I would ask that it be advanced to the Order of Second Reading."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Rice, the Chairman of the Committee."

Rice: "Mr. Speaker, at the time this Bill came before us, we did not have a quorum."

Speaker Madigan: "You did not have a quorum."

Rice: "We did not have a quorum."

Speaker Madigan: "I see. And did you wish to state a position on the Motion?"

Rice: "We would consider that...give her a good chance today."

136th Legislative Day

May 1, 1992

- Speaker Madigan: "Okay. So, the Lady has moved to discharge the committee from further consideration. The Chairman of the Committee appears to support the Motion. Those in favor say 'aye', those opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Motion is adopted, using the Attendance Roll Call. House Bill 3781, Mr. Turner. Mr. Turner."
- Turner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Assembly. I move to discharge from committee House Bill 3781. When I appeared before the Elementary & Secondary Education Committee, I had a conflicting committee at the same time. When I appeared in the committee room this morning to hear that Bill, I was told that the committee was adjourning, and I could not...it could not be heard. The Chairman of the Committee said that she would agree to support the Discharge Motion."
- Speaker Madigan: "The Chair recognizes the Acting Chairman of the Elementary and Secondary Education Committee, Representative Monique Davis."
- Davis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker Ladies and Gentlemen of the House.

 We had a one-hour meeting today, and the agenda was very full; and while we were hearing the last Bill, Representative Turner did enter, and we did not have time to hear his legislation today; and I do support his Discharge Motion."
- Speaker Madigan: "Those in favor of the Motion say 'aye', those opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Motion is adopted, using the Attendance Roll Call. House Bill 3877, Mr. Rice."

Rice: "We did not have a quorum at this particular time."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Chairman."

Rice: "I support the Motion."

Speaker Madigan: "Gentleman moves to discharge the committee.

136th Legislative Day

May 1, 1992

The Chair recognizes Mr. Black."

Black: "I have an inquiry of the Chair, Mr. Speaker. Did you say
a few moments ago that all of these Motions require 71
votes?"

Speaker Madigan: "I did."

Black: "Then I would request a vertification on this should it get the requisite number of votes. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "I see. Did you wish to oppose the Motion?"

Black: "Yes, I stand in opposition and ask for a roll call."

- Speaker Madigan: "Those in favor of the Motion vote 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Chair recognizes Representative Parcells."
- Parcells: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. I wanted to say on this particular Bill that I am the vice...or the Minority spokesman on that committee, and there were not, I was the one that pointed out there were not enough people in the room to vote on this; and therefore I would ask my colleagues to let him have a fair hearing and vote 'aye'."
- Speaker Madigan: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Chair...Have all voted who wish? Mr. Black, did you wish to change your vote? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question there are 95 'ayes', 8 'noes'. The Motion is adopted. House Bill 4192, Mr. Lang. Mr Lang. On Supplemental Calendar #3, House Bill 3937, a Motion by Mr. Daniels. Mr. Daniels."
- Daniels: "Yes, we would like to discharge the committee on House Bill 3937."
- Speaker Madigan: "Gentleman moves to discharge the Committee on Elementary and Secondary Education from further consideration. The acting Chair of the Committee supports

136th Legislative Day

May 1, 1992

the Motion. Those in favor say 'aye', those opposed say 'no', the 'ayes' have it. The Motion is adopted using the Attendance Roll Call. On the Supplemental #2, House Bill 3932, by Representative Wyvetter Younge, the Lady moves to discharge the Elementary and Secondary Education Committee from further consider of the Bill. The Acting Chair and the Minority spokesperson agree to the Motion. Those in favor say 'aye', those opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Motion is adopted, using the Attendance Roll Call. Page 43 of the Calendar, there appears Senate Bill 911 by Representative Manny Hoffman. Mr. Hoffman."

- Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Pursuant to Rule 74, I move to take from the table and discharge the Committee on Counties & Townships. What this is, is a Bill, it's an old park district Bill, and what it will do is it will give some needed revenue from OTBs to some of the park districts that have an OTB in their location. It's been agreed to by the Chairman, and I...there is no opposition that I know of, and it will bring the date of this Bill to September 15th."
- Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman moves to take from the table.

 The Motion is supported by Mr. Hartke, the Chair of the

 Committee on Counties and Townships, and those in favor of

 the Motion will signify by saying 'aye', those opposed say

 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Motion is adopted, using

 the Attendance Roll Call. The Chair recognizes Mr. Keane

 for a Motion."
- Keane: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend Rule 35(a) to place the following Bills on the Order of House Bills Second Reading. House Bills 1084, 2947, 2954, 3120, 3130, 3580, 3670 and 4066."
- Speaker Madigan: "You've all heard the Motion. Those in favor say 'aye', those opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it.

136th Legislative Day

May 1, 1992

The Motion is adopted using the Attendance Roll Call. The Chair recognizes Representative Monique Davis for the purpose of a Motion on a Resolution."

Davis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I move that we have immediate consideration for House Senate Joint Resolution 127."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Clerk I believe you have a Resolution on your table, HJR 127. Would you read the Resolution, Mr. Clerk? Mr. Clerk, take this matter out of the record, and let's go to Supplemental Calendar #4. Mr. Clerk, on Supplemental Calendar #4, there appears House Bill 1084 by Representative Currie. Read the Bill a second time."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1084, a Bill for an Act to amend the Revenue Act. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Madigan: "Are there any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Madigan: "Third Reading. House Bill 2947. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Madigan: "House Bill 2947, a Bill for an act to amend the Revenue Act. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee."

Speaker Madigan: "Is there any Motion?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Madigan: "Are there any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Madigan: "Third Reading. House Bill 2954, Read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2954, a Bill for an Act to amend the Revenue Act. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Madigan: "Are there any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

136th Legislative Day

May 1, 1992

- Speaker Madigan: "Third Reading. House Bill 3120. Read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3120, a Bill for an Act concerning newspaper publication of notices and resolutions. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Madigan: "Are there any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

- Speaker Madigan: "Third Reading. House Bill 3130. Read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3130, a Bill for an Act to amend the Revenue Code. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Madigan: "Are there any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

- Speaker Madigan: "Third Reading. House Bill 3580. Read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Bill 3580, A Bill for an Act to amend the Revenue

 Act. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee

 Amendments."

Speaker Madigan: "Are there any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

- Speaker Madigan: "Third Reading. House Bill 3670. Read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3670, a Bill for an Act to amend the Revenue Act. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Madigan: "Are there any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

- Speaker Madigan: "Third Reading. House Bill 4066. Read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 4066 a Bill for an Act to amend the Revenue Act. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee

136th Legislative Day

May 1, 1992

Amendments."

Speaker Madigan: "Are there any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Madigan: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, would you read HJR 127. Representative Davis."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Joint Resolution 127, offered by Representaive Davis. WHEREAS, Four Los Angeles police officers were acquitted of assault against Rodney G. King and numerous other charges in a verdict that stunned the nation; and WHEREAS. Television viewers nationwide have seen a videotape of the beating inflicted on the fleeing motorist, with its 56 baton swings and repeated kicks to the prone figure of Mr. King as he lay surrounded by police officers, but the jury failed to convict the officers on any of the charges, which included assault with a deadly weapon, excessive use of force as a police officer, false report, and acting as an accessory after the fact; and WHEREAS, For millions of Americans, the video demonstrates police brutality and racism, and the acquittal of the officers constitutes a severe miscarriage of justice; and WHEREAS, During the incident that led to the Mr. King was stopped after a 15-minute high-speed chase, beaten and clubbed, bound, thrown into an ambulance, and sent to a hospital with multiple cuts and fractures; and WHEREAS, The beating, which has been condemned by the U.S. public as the worst form of police brutality, is said by civil rights groups and African-American community leaders to be unusual only in that it was captured on film; and WHEREAS, Some two dozen police officers were present at the beating of the unarmed Mr. King, and ten of them were later punished by the police department, which evidently considered them to have acted improperly; and 136th Legislative Day

May 1, 1992

The jury, however, concluded that the policemen WHEREAS. had not broken any laws when they clubbed and kicked Rodney G. King in the process of arresting him; and WHEREAS, Bill of Rights of the U.S. Constitution guarantees to all citizens the right to "be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures," and a violation of this stricture is a violation of a person's civil rights; and WHEREAS, In response to the outrage of angry Americans who feel that Mr. King's civil rights have been violated by the police and ignored in this verdict, we feel that further action is necessary to restore the faith of the people in the our enforcement officials and our American justice system; therefore, be it RESOLVED, BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE EIGHTY-SEVENTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, THE SENATE CONCURRING HEREIN, that we strongly urge the U.S. Attorney General and the Department Justice to pursue an investigation to determine whether any further action should be taken against the four police officers involved in the beating of Rodney G. King, and to examine whether the methods used by and taught to law enforcement personnel encourage the use of unnecessary force; and be it further RESOLVED, That suitable copies of this preamble and resolution be transmitted to President George Bush and to the U.S. Attorney General."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Davis."

Davis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, as you can see, this Resolution is necessary in order to show the United States government and the people of the State of Illinois that we here in the General Assembly do believe in justice, we believe in the jury system, and we don't support anyone making a mockery of

136th Legislative Day

May 1, 1992

that system. We recognize that the jury trial that occurred, with all the testimony, the video tapes that were evident, a mockery is being made of the justice system. We have, and we do appreciate, about 40 or 50 additional Sponsors from the House of Representatives, and we simply would urge an 'aye' vote, and hope that all the Representatives in this General Assembly will become Co-Sponsors of this legislation. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Clerk, have we taken the Motion for immediate consideration? All right, fine. So first there was a Motion for immediate consideration. Those in favor say 'aye'. Those opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Motion is adopted. And now the Lady has moved for the adoption of the Resolution, and on that question is there any discussion? There being no discussion, the question is...Mr. Petka."

Petka: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. The verdict in California was a very tragic shocking verdict, but in some ways a very predictable verdict. Mr. Speaker, I have never quarreled with a and their verdict in my whole life, and I'm sure not going to start here today. I would just like to offer a observations that I think are very pertinent. Five years ago, when I came into the House of Representatives, I had just left the Will County State's Attorney's office and had just left the trial of a case involving two white defendants from Georgia who were accused of murdering a black gentleman in Will County. During the jury selection of that case, the defense attorneys systematically excluded every single black juror from the venire, in some instances without even asking a single question. I introduced a House Bill, when I first came down to the General Assembly

136th Legislative Day

May 1, 1992

to basically extend the protections of Batson vs Kentucky to both sides of the aisle and predicted, and predicted. that unless we extended to both sides, in other words to...not only to require the prosecution to explain why they're excluding black jurors, who in my opinion have a Constitutional right to serve, but also defense attorneys in cases that they should be required to explain why they are excluding black jurors. I do believe if that California had legislation on the books that would have permitted an explanation, and if black jurors indeed, served on this jury, we may have had an outcome that was markedly different than was produced. My observation is this, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, that Bill was introduced and was never called for a vote. The time that it was introduced by myself, it never got out of committee. There is a very, very powerful clique of people seek to advance their representing careers by criminals, who sometimes do things which are not in the best interests of the people of this entire state of all races. And I... Perhaps this is empty rhetoric, your honor, Speaker, but it is a matter that somewhere in a Conference Committee Report or some legislation should appear that perhaps we can take a first step to prevent the very ugly situation that has arisen in the State of California, and I do believe that if minority members were that jury, we would not have had the problems that we have there today. I really do not have anything further to say, but it is simply an observation and I believe that it could have cut off some very serious problems.

Speaker Madigan: "The question is, 'Shall the Resolution be adopted?' Those in favor of the adoption of the Resolution say 'aye'. Those opposed say 'no'. Mr. McPike could you

136th Legislative Day

May 1, 1992

come to the podium?"

Speaker McPike: "Representative McPike, in the Chair. Mr. Clerk,
Consent Calendar, Second Reading."

Clerk O'Brien: "Consent Calendar, Second Reading, Second Day. House Bill 1132, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code together with Committee Amendment #1. House Bill 1504, a Bill for an Act to amend the Housing Authorities Act, together with Committee Amendment #1. House Bill 6...2678 a Bill for an Act to amend the Vehicle Code. House Bill 2737. a Bill for an Act in relation to habitual child sex fffenders. House Bill 2748, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Lottery Law. House Bill 2784, a Bill for an Act amend certain Acts in relation to child support witholding. House 2818, a Bill for an Act to amend the Civil Administrative Code of Illinois. House Bill 2824. a an Act to amend the Professional Boxing & Wrestling Act. House Bill 2905, a Bill for an concerning funding of the sustainable agriculture programs together Committee Amendment #1. House Bill 2919, a Bill for an Act concerning municipal officers, recodifying certain portions of the Illinois Municipal Code. House Bill 2921, a Bill for an Act to amend the Township Annexation Act. House Bill 2940, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. House Bill 2946, a Bill for an Act to amend the Animal Control Act. House Bill 2962, a Bill for an Act to amend the Police Search Cost Recovery Act. House Bill 2968, a Bill for an Act to amend the Township Law. 2969, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Highway Code. House Bill 3037, a Bill for an Act to amend the Fire Protection District Act. House Bill 3047, a Bill for an Act to amend the Nursing Home Care Act, together with Committee Amendment #1. House Bill 3054, a Bill for an Act

136th Legislative Day

May 1, 1992

to amend the Metropolitan Water Reclamation District Act. Bill 3055, a Bill for an Act to amend the Metropolitan Water Water Reclamation District Act. House 3056, a Bill for an Act to amend the Metropolitan Water Reclamation District Act. House Bill 3057, a Bill for an Act to amend the Township Law. House Bill 3100, a Bill for an Act to amend the Metropolitan Water Reclamation District Act. House Bill 3119, a Bill for an Act to amend the Nursing Home Care Act together with Committee Amendment #1. House Bill 3183, a Bill for an Act to amend the Unified Code of Corrections. House Bill 3202, a Bill for an Act to amend the Health Services Education Act. House Bill 3208, a Bill for an Act to amend the Counties Code. House Bill 3230, a Bill for an Act to provide for the continuing appropriation for State Pensions Funds, together with Committee Amendment #1. House Bill 3248, a Bill for an Act relating to the disabled. House Bill 3269, a Bill for an Act to amend the Metropolitan Pier and Exposition Authority Act. House Bill 3323, a Bill for an Act to amend Illinois Insurance Code, together with Committee the Amendment House Bill 3331, a Bill for an #1. concerning dissolution of marriage. House Bill 3344. Act to amend the Lawn Care Applications and Notice Act. House Bill 3427, a Bill for an Act to amend the Township Law. House Bill 3436, a Bill for an Act to amend the Uniform Commercial Code. Bill 3437 has been removed from the Consent Calendar. House 3454, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Vehicle Code. House Bill 3461, a Bill for an Act to amend the Criminal Code. House Bill 3506, a Bill for an Act to amend the Park District Code. House Bill 3569, a Bill for an Act to amend the Public Officer Prohibited Activities Act.

136th Legislative Day

May 1, 1992

House Bill 3583, a Bill for an Act to amend the Bond Authorization Act. House Bill 3598, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Vehicle Code. House Bill 3599, for an Act to amend the State Finance Act. House Bill 3641, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Job Training Coordinating Council Act. House Bill 3643, a Bill for an Act to amend the Civil Administrative Code of Illinois. Bill 3651, a Bill for an Act concerning a House comprehensive statewide poison control system. House Bill 3674, a Bill for an Act concerning the acquisition of other financial institutions by banks. House Bill 3695, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. House Bill 3711, Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Banking Act. House Bill 3731, a Bill for an Act to amend the Public Utilities House Bill 3773, a Bill for an Act to amend the Abandoned Mined Lands and Water Reclamation Act. 3814. a Bill for an Act to amend the Child Labor Law. House Bill 3823, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Credit Card and Debit Card Act, .together with Committee Amendment #1. House Bill 3902, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Municipal Code. House Bill 3971, a Bill for an Act to amend the Public Utilities Act. House Bill 4008, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Municipal Code. House Bill 4094, a Bill for an Act to amend the Uniform Commercial Code. House Bill 4166, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Public Aid Code, together with Committee Amendment #1. House Bill 4167, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Public Aid Code, and Senate Bill 1039, a Bill for an Act to amend the State Mandates Act. Second Reading of these Bills."

Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. Page 41 on the Calendar, under Motions, Representative McGann."

136th Legislative Day

May 1, 1992

- McGann: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the Assembly. I move to allow the Legislative Audit Commission to convene on May 5th and 6th from the hours of 5:00 p.m. to 9:00 p.m., while the House would possibly be in Session."
- Speaker McPike: "All right, you've heard the Gentleman's Motion, is there any objection? Hearing none, the Attendance Roll Call will be used, and the Motion carries. Agreed Resolutions."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 1863, offered by Representative Churchill; 1865, Hicks; 1866, Matijevich; 1867, Lou Jones; 1868, Parke; 1869, Parke; 1871, Burke; 1872, Burke; 1873, Manny Hoffman; 1876, Saltsman; 1877, Saltsman; 1878, Granberg; 1879, Weller; 1880, Parcells; 1881, Shirley Jones; 1882, Jane Barnes; 1883, Tenhouse. House Joint Resolution 129, Kubik, and House Joint Resolution 130, Lou Jones. Senate Joint Resolution 150, offered Representative Kubik; Senate Joint Resolution 151, Klemm; Senate Joint Resolution 152, Ryder; Senate Joint Resolution 153, Hensel."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Matijevich."
- Matijevich: "Speaker, I move the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions."
- Speaker McPike: "Gentleman moves the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. All in favor say 'aye'. Opposed, 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Agreed Resolutions are adopted. Death Resolutions."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 1864, offered by Representative Mautino, with respect to the memory of Mr. & Mrs. Novitsky.

 House Resolution 1870, offered by Representative McDonough, with respect to the memory of Rose Bacigalupo. House Resolution 1874, offered by Representative Wyvetter Younge, with respect to the memory of Judge Earle McCaskill. House

136th Legislative Day

- May 1, 1992
- Resolution 1875, offered by Representative Balthis, with respect to the memory of Kenneth R. Novak, Jr."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Matijevich moves for the adoption of the Death Resolutions. All in favor say 'aye'.

 Opposed, 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Death Resolutions are adopted. General Resolutions."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Joint Resolution 126, offered by Representative Phelps and House Joint Resolution 127, offered by Representative Davis."
- Speaker McPike: "Committee on Assignment."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Joint Resolution 128, offered by Representative Johnson."
- Speaker McPike: "Speaker's Table. Adjournment Resolution.

 Committee Reports."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Curran, Chairman of the Committee State Government and Administration, to which following Bills were referred, action taken May 1, 1992, reported the same back with the following recommendations: 'do pass' House Bills 3775, 3774, 3834, 2924, 2902, 2889, 4006, 3450, 2573, 4091, 4090, 2985, 2981, 3871 and 4005.; 'do pass Short Debate Status' House Bills 2908 and 3786; 'do pass as amended Short Debate Status' House Bills 3844 & 3591.. Representative Davis, Chairman of the Committee on Elementary and Secondary Education, to which the following Bills were referred, action taken May 1, 1992, reported the same back with the following recommendations: 'do pass' House Bill 3767; 'do pass as amended' House Bills 3881, 3903 and 4136; 'do pass Short Debate Status' House Bill 3856. 'do pass as amended Short Debate Status' House Bill 347; 'do pass as amended Consent Calendar' House Bill 3067. Representative Homer, Chairman of the Committee Judiciary II, to which the following Bills were referred,

136th Legislative Day

May 1, 1992

action taken May 1, 1992, reported the same back with the following recommendations: 'do pass' House Bills 3028, 3494, 3973, 4188, 3633, 3165 and 3291; 'do pass as amended' House Bills 3980, 3986, 3655, 2132 and 2502; 'do pass Short Debate Status' House Bill 2799; 'do pass Consent Calendar' House Bills 1421, 2882, 3089, 3139, 3184, 3185, 3607 and 3848; 'do pass as amended Consent Calendar' House Bill 3921."

Speaker McPike: "Adjournment Resolution."

Clerk O'Brien: "A Message from the Senate by Ms. Hawker, Secretary. 'Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate adopted the following Senate Joint Resolution, the adoption of which I ask concurrence οf instructed to the House of Representatives, to wit: Senate Joint Resolution 155, Resolved by the Senate of the 87th General Assembly, State Illinois, the House of Representatives concurring herein, that when the two Houses adjourn on Friday May 1, 1992, they stand adjourned until Tuesday, May 5, 1992, at 12:00 noon.

Speaker McPike: "Representative Lang moves for the adoption of the Adjournment Resolution. All in favor say 'aye'.

Opposed,'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Adjournment Resolution is adopted. Allowing the Cerk Pernctory time for Committee Rports, Representative Lang now moves that the House stands adjourned until next Tuesday at the hour of 12:00 noon. All in favor say 'aye'. Opposed,'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the House stands adjourned."

REPORT: TIFLDAY PAGE: 001

STATE OF ILLINOIS 87TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES DAILY TRANSCRIPTION OF DEBATE INDEX MAY 01. 1992

92/09/09

11:34:08

HB-1084	SECOND	READING	PAGE	42	
HB-1084	MOTION		PAGE	41	
HB-1264	MOTION		PAGE	3	
HB-1264	OUT OF	RECORD	PAGE	4	
H8-1331	MOITOM		PAGE	4	
HB-2811			PAGE	6	
HB-2907			PAGE	37	
HB-2943			PAGE	8	
		READING	PAGE	42	
HB-2947			PAGE	41	
HB-2954		READING	PAGE	42	
HB-2954			PAGE	41	
H8-3033		0.01.07110	PAGE	8	
		READING	PAGE	43	
HB-3120		0.5.0.5.40	PAGE	41	
		READING	PAGE	43	
HB-3130			PAGE	41	
HB-3131			PAGE	38	
HB-3254			PAGE	9	
HB-3329		0.0000	PAGE	10	
HB-3329	-		PAGE	10	
HB+3456			PAGE	12	
HB-3456 HB-3456		KEAUING	PAGE	26	
HB+3456			PAGE	10	
		RECORD	PAGE	11	
HB-3580			PAGE PAGE	24 43	
HB-3580		REAUTING	PAGE	41	
		READING	PAGE	41	
H8-3670		REAUTING	PAGE	43	
HB-3693			PAGE	24	
HB-3781			PAGE	39	
HB-3877			PAGE	39	
HB-3937			PAGE	40	
. HB-3943			PAGE	25	
		READING	PAGE	43	
HB-4066		KEADING	PAGE	41	
SB-0911			PAGE	41	
HJR-0127		READING	PAGE	44	
HJR-0127			PAGE	47	
				* *	
	SUBJECT	MATTER			
HOUSE TO ORDER - SPI	AKER MA	DIGAN	PAGE	1	
PRAYER - REPRESENTAT			PAGE	i	
PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE		, -	PAGE	i	
ROLL CALL FOR ATTEN			PAGE	i	
COMMITTEE REPORTS			PAGE	2	
REPRESENTATIVE MCPI	KE IN TA	HE CHAIR	PAGE	48	
CONSENT CALENDAR			PAGE	48	
AGREED RESOLUTIONS			PAGE	51	
DEATH RESOLUTIONS			PAGE	51	
GENERAL RESOLUTIONS			PAGE	52	
COMMITTEE REPORTS			PAGE	52	
MESSAGE FROM THE SE	NATE		PAGE	53	
ADJOURNMENT			PAGE	53	