74th Legislative Day

June 27, 1991

- Speaker Matijevich: "The hour of 10:30 having arrived, the House will be in Session. The Chaplain for today is Reverend Patty Johannesen of the First United Methodist Church in Blue Mound. She is the guest of Reverend (sic Representative) Noland. Our guests in the gallery may wish to rise for the invocation."
- Reverend Johannesen: "Let us turn our hearts and minds to God in God of love and peace, we offer You thanks and prayer. praise for this Body of men and women, and willingness to undertake such an awesome responsibility for state and our people. Grant that they may be focused and centered in their task, that they may sense presence of Your Spirit, which is moving in this place. Open their minds to see the needs of the people, to work toward opportunities for education, for equality, justice for all our people. Bless their work here this day which they offer up to You, as an expression of love for You, and all You do for us. Amen."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Join us in the Pledge of Allegiance which we are led today by Representative Granberg."
- Granberg 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 Matijevich: "Roll Call for Attendance. On the Democratic side, Representative Flowers is excused, and we all know why. Is Representative Kubik here? There he is. Representative Kubik."
- Kubik: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, let the record reflect that Representative Klemm is excused today."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Clerk will take the record of attendance.

 The quorum being present, we're ready for business. Agreed

74th Legislative Day

June 27, 1991

Resolutions."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Joint Resolution 43, offered by Representative Kubik. Senate Joint Resolution #6, bv Anthony Young. House Resolution 790. offered by Representative Giglio; 791, Tenhouse; 792, Leitch; 793, Weller; 794, Currie; 795, Tenhouse; 796, Tenhouse; 797, Tenhouse; 801, White; 803, Black; 804, Hensel; Hensel."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Homer."

Homer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. With Agreed Resolutions, House Resolution 790 by Giglio, House Resolution 791 by Tenhouse; House Resolution 792 by Representative Leitch; House Resolution 793, Representative Weller; Resolution 794, Representative Currie; Resolution 795, Representative Tenhouse; Resolution 796, Representative Tenhouse; House Resolution 797, Tenhouse; Resolution 801, White; Resolution 803, Burke; House Resolution 804, Hensel; House Resolution 805, Hensel. I would, Mr. Speaker, move for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions."

- Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Homer has moved for the adoption of Agreed Resolutions. All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no', and Agreed Resolutions are adopted. General Resolutions."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 767, offered by Representative

 Currie. House Resolution 802, offered by Representative

 Turner."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Speakers table. Death Resolutions."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 798, offered by Representative McAfee with respect to the memory of Ralph Smith, House Resolution 799, offered by Representative Johnson, with respect to the memory of Mary Alice Klagon. House Resolution 800, offered by Representative Johnson, with respect to the memory of Dorothy M. Baum...Bowman. House

74th Legislative Day

June 27, 1991

Resolution 806, offered by Representative Morrow, with respect to the memory of Freddie B. Bailey Sr. House Resolution 807, offered by Representative Morrow, with respect to the memory of Charlotte Downs."

- Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Homer has moved for the adoption of the Death Resolutions. All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no', and the Death Resolutions are adopted. Page 23 of the Calendar on the Order of Consent Calendar, fourth day, is HJR 41, Woolard. The question is, 'Shall HJR 41 be adopted?' Those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and HJR 41 is adopted. So that the Members know what First Order will be, those Members who are considering nonconcurrence so that we can get Bills in the shape to go into Conference Committee and messages can go over to the Senate on that. Start preparing so that you can notify the Chair that you're going to nonconcur on Senate Amendments to House Bills. Representative McPike on House Bill 1183."
- McPike: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move to nonconcur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1183."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Gentleman moves to nonconcur with Senate
 Amendment 1 to House Bill 1183. All in favor say 'aye',
 opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it, and the House does
 nonconcur on Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1183.
 Representative McPike on page 6 of the Regular Calendar on
 House Bill 175."
- McPike: "Mr. Speaker, I move to nonconcur on Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 175."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Gentleman moves to nonconcur on Senate
 Amendment #1 to House Bill 175. Is there any discussion?

 Seeing none, all in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no', and the
 House does concur with Senate Amendment #1...does nonconcur

74th Legislative Day

- June 27, 1991
- to Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 175. On House Bill 176, Representative McPike."
- McPike: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to nonconcur in Senate
 Amendment #1 to House Bill 176."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Gentleman moves nonconcur on Senate
 Amendment #1 to House Bill 176. All in favor say 'aye',
 opposed 'no', and the House does nonconcur with Senate
 Amendment #1 to House Bill 176. House Bill 177,
 Representative McPike."
- McPike: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I move to nonconcur with Senate
 Amendment #1 to House Bill 177."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Gentleman moves to nonconcur with Senate
 Amendment 1 to House Bill 177. All in favor say 'aye',
 opposed 'no', and the...'ayes' have it and the House does
 nonconcur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 177. 178,
 Representative McPike."
- McPike: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I move to nonconcur with Senate

 Amendment #1 to House Bill 178."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Gentleman moves to nonconcur with Senate
 Amendment #1 to House Bill 178. All in favor say 'aye',
 opposed 'no', and the House does nonconcur with Senate
 Amendment #1 to House Bill 178. House Bill 179,
 Representative McPike."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Gentleman moves to nonconcur with Senate

 Amendment #1 to House Bill 179. All in favor say 'aye',
 opposed 'no', and the House does nonconcur with Senate

 Amendment #1 to House Bill 179. House Bill 180,
 Representative McPike."
- McPike: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I move to nonconcur with Senate

 Amendment #1 to House Bill 180."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Gentleman moves to nonconcur with Senate

74th Legislative Day

June 27, 1991

Amendment #180 to House Bill 180. All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no', and the House does nonconcur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 180. House Bill 186, Representative McPike."

McPike: "Mr. Speaker, I move to nonconcur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 186."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative McPike moves to nonconcur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 186. All in say 'aye', opposed 'no', and the House does nonconcur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 186. Could I have your The Order of Business is that we are going to attention? go down the Order on the Special Orders nonconcurrences. Only those Members who are nonconcur will move. We're not going to call concurrences. Only nonconcurrences on the Special Order. So, we are going to begin with House...On the Order of Concurrence, Government Operations, appears House Bill 2, Novak. Gentleman in the Chamber? Out of the record. On House Bill 57, Santiago. Out of the record. House Bill Brunsvold. Out of the record. 86, Martinez. Out of the record. House Bill 118, Steczo. Out of the record. Novak, are you going to nonconcur? Alright, on House Bill 2, Representative Novak is going to move to nonconcur. Representative Novak."

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

I move to nonconcur in Senate Amendment #1 and request a

Conference Committee."

Speaker Matijevich: "Well, you can't do that yet. The Gentleman moves to nonconcur on Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2.

All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no', and the 'ayes' have it, and the House does nonconcur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2. House Bill 284, Steczo. Out of the record. House Bill 313, Currie. Out of the record. House

74th Legislative Day

- June 27, 1991
- Bill 452, Curran. Out of the record. 493, Curran. Gentleman...Representative Curran."
- Curran: "I move to nonconcur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 493."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Gentleman moves to nonconcur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill...got the wrong number up there 493. All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no', and the House does nonconcur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 493. House Bill 526, Mautino. Out of the record. House Bill 551, Currie. 551, Currie. Out. House Bill 679, Capparelli. Gentleman from Cook, Representative Capparelli on House Bill 679.
- Capparelli: "Mr. Speaker, I move to nonconcur with Senate

 Amendment #1 on House Bill 679."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Capparelli moves to nonconcur to Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 679. All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no', and the House does nonconcur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 679. House Bill 700. Hannig. Nonconcurrences only. House Bill 738, Edley. Out of the record. House Bill 743, Parke. House Bill Representative Burke. Out of the...is it nonconcurrence? You gonna nonconcur Dan? No. Out of the record. Wyvetter Younge. Are you going to nonconcur? Out of the record. 894, Steczo. Out οf the record. Representative Wolf. Representative Wolf on House Bill 968. Are you nonconcurring, Sam?"

Wolf: "Nonconcur."

- Speaker Matijevich: "Alright. Representative Wolf."
- Wolf: "Mr. Speaker, I nonconcur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 968."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Wolf moves to nonconcur in Senate Amendment #1 on 968. All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no', and the House does nonconcur with Senate

74th Legislative Day

June 27, 1991

Amendment #1 to House Bill 968. 970. Representative Wolf moves to nonconcur on the Senate Amendments to 970. All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no', and the House does nonconcur with the Senate Amendment to 970. 971. Representative Wolf moves to nonconcur with Senate Amendment to 971. All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no', and the House does nonconcur with the Senate Amendment to 971. 1109 Giorgi. Out of the record. 1123, Hasara. Out of the record. Representative...1149, Mautino. Out of the record. Mautino. Out of the record. 1364, Mautino. Out of the record. 1365, Schoenberg. Out of the record. Wennlund. Out of the record. 1430, Ropp. Out of the record. 1466, Representative Mautino."

Mautino: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Members of the House. I move to nonconcur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1466."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Mautino moves to nonconcur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1466. All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no', and the House does nonconcur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1466. 1487, Capparelli. Out of the record. 1506, Representative Pullen. Out of record...are you going to nonconcur? Representative Pullen on House Bill 1506. Nonconcurrence. Representative Pullen moves to nonconcur with Amendment #1 to House Bill 1506. All in favor say opposed 'no', and the House does nonconcur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 506 (sic 1506). Be at ease for a moment. We are joined today by Emil Jones who is the Senate Sponsor of that Bill that had the Amendment that got no votes. Give me a better Bill next time, Emil. General Resolutions."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Joint Resolution 6."

Speaker Matijevich: "Speaker's table. That last Resolution is

74th Legislative Day

June 27, 1991

Committee on Assignment. HR6. Let us return back to House Bill 738, Representative Edley."

Edley: "I would move to nonconcur on Senate Amendments #1 and 3."

Speaker Matijevich: "Gentleman moves to nonconcur with Senate

Amendment #1 and 3 to House Bill 738. All in favor say

'aye', opposed 'no'...how 'bout..."

Edley: "And 2..."

Speaker Matijevich: "And 2."

Edley: "Well, I'd move to concur on 2, but..."

Speaker Matijevich: "You might as well nonconcur on all of them."

Edley: "Okay."

Speaker Matijevich: "He moves to nonconcur on Senate Amendments 1, 2, and 3 to House Bill 738. All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no', and the House does nonconcur on Senate Amendments 1, 2, and 3 to House Bill 738. We are going to continue down the list, Government Operations. House Bill 1528, Curran. Out of the record. House Bill 1533, Ronan. Oh, Curran. I'm sorry. Mike Curran on House Bill 1528."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Curran moves to nonconcur on Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1528. All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no', and the House does nonconcur on Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1528. Representative Noland, did you...your light is on. Did you want recognition, or...okay. House Bill 1533, Ronan. Out of the record. 1604, Mautino. Out of the record. House Bill 1644, Shirley Jones. Do you want to nonconcur, or concur? If it's nonconcur, we can call it. Representative Shirley Jones."

Jones, S.: "I would like to nonconcur with Senate Amendment #1."

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Jones moves to nonconcur on

Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1644. All in favor say

74th Legislative Day

June 27, 1991

'aye', opposed 'no', and the House does nonconcur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1644. House Bill 1699, Santiago. Out of the record. 1853, Ronan. Out of the record. 1854, Granberg. Out of the record. 1856, Wojcik. Out of the record. 1864, Ryder. Out of the record. 1934, Steczo. Out of the record. 1949, Jim Keane.Is that nonconcurrence, Jim? Alright. Representative Keane."

Keane: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I move to nonconcur with Senate Amendments to House Bill 1949."

Speaker Matijevich: "Gentleman moves to nonconcur with Senate Amendments to House Bill 1949. All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no', and the House does nonconcur with Amendments to House Bill 1949. House Bill 1970, Steczo. Out of the record. House Bill 2005, Edley. Out of the record. 2015. Brunsvold. Out of the record. 2017. Trotter. If you're nonconcurring, we can call it. Nope. Out of the record. 2100, Representative McGuire. the record. 2110, McAfee. Out of the record. 2416. Keane. Representative Keane."

Keane: "Mr. Speaker, did you pass up 2147 and 2148?"

Speaker Matijevich: "They're not on this Special Order. We're going down the Order, the Special Order, Jim."

Keane: "I apologize. I'll get one of those."

Speaker Matijevich: "How 'bout 2416, do you want that one? No.

How 'bout 2418? Representative Keane on 2418."

Keane: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I move to nonconcur on Senate
Amendment #1 to 21..."

Speaker Matijevich: "Gentleman moves to nonconcur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2418. All in favor say 'aye'...2418. That's Amendment #2 on House Bill 2418. All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no', and the House does nonconcur with Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 2418. Representative Mautino on 2421. Out of the record. House

74th Legislative Day

June 27, 1991

Bill 2488, Levin. Are you going to non? Put Representative Levin on. He's trying to tell us something. Representative Levin."

Levin: "Mr. Speaker, this one I'm going to want to concur in.

You passed over 1929, I wanted you to nonconcur in that
one. I think..."

Speaker Matijevich: "19 what?"

Levin: "I think it was 1929."

Speaker Matijevich: "We didn't pass over it. It's not on the Special Order. We're only on the Special Order Government Operations. 2494, Williams. Out of the record. Representative Giorgi on House Bill 1109."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, I move to nonconcur to Senate Amendment #1
to 1109, and..."

Speaker Matijevich: "Gentleman moves to nonconcur with Senate
Amendment #1 to House Bill 1109. All in favor say 'aye',
opposed 'no', and the House does nonconcur with Senate
Amendment #1 to House Bill 1109.

Giorgi: "And now, Mr. Speaker, I move to concur to House Bill 2417, as amended from the Senate."

Speaker Matijevich: "House Bill 2417..."

Giorgi: "I move to concur."

Speaker Matijevich: "On what Amendment, Zeke?"

Giorgi: "Amendment #2."

Speaker Matijevich: "Alright. So the Members know, this is...Representative Giorgi's got some work to do, so this is going to be final action. The Gentleman moves to concur with Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 2417.

Representative Black."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. An inquiry of the Chair. I believe the Chair said when we started that we were only going to do nonconcurrences. Now, if we're going to flip back and forth and do concurrences, I think a lot

- 74th Legislative Day

 of people who can hear our voices had best come to the floor."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Black, you have a good Point of Order, I've been informed that there's a Special Order, Dean of the House, and being second in command, I respect that Special Order."
- Black: "I respect that Order as well, and...oh, absolutely I respect that Order, but just so that anybody listening to the box, if we're going to do some concurrences they might want to come to the floor."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Representative McNamara."
- McNamara: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. I would like to know from the Sponsor as to what we are concurring in."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Giorgi...and in the future, any concurrences, because it is final vote on the Bill, explain the concurrence."
- Giorgi: "Representative McNamara, this is...pay close attention, because this is a technical thing we're concurring to, and I'm going from the memo to you. Is that alright?"
- McNamara: "I'm sorry. If you could talk into the microphone instead of to me..."
- Giorgi: "As amended, House Bill 2417 addresses two problems resulting from a class action court ruling, concerning the local telephone company practice of recovering municipal utility taxes associated with pay phone revenues. 1955, Illinois Bell for example, had recovered the municipal utility tax associated with pay-phone coin revenues through an additional charge billed to customers located in the municipality levying the tax. The tax is recovered in this manner because there is no practical method of collecting pennies in coin phone slots. recovered under tariff, and was based on the understanding the telephone companies and Illinois Commerce

74th Legislative Day

June 27, 1991

Commission on the intent of the law. Now, as a result of the court action, the Amendment validates the collection method the the telephone company has utilized in the past for a period until December 31, 1993. It also directs the Illinois Commerce Commission to conduct an investigation of other alternative methods of collecting the tax, and report its recommendation to the General Assembly by December 31, 1992. This will allow the tax to continue to be collected, and remanded to the municipalities in an orderly manner while new methods of collection are considered. Is that fair enough for you, Mr. McNamara?"

McNamara: "I understand a little bit more, now, and the question is, is that, this is a court action that was brought against Illinois Bell, if I understand correctly. Illinois Bell was told to pay those fees back to the consumers for miscollected taxes. So, rather than pay those fees, they have come down to the General Assembly to allow the General Assembly to raise the rates for 5 years on telephone fees in order to take care of what they were supposed to do in the courts. Mr. Speaker, to this Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "Proceed."

McNamara: "This particular measure really slaps in the face of the court action. This is a case where the court against a telephone company and ordered the telephone company to return those fees to the consumers. telephone company decides not to return those, but to amateurize (sic amortize) over the next five years in higher rates and changes on pay phone booths to collect those dollars so they can pay off the debt that collected illegally during the first time. This is a very bad concept, where we would authorize the telephone company to come in after an ad for a suit, when they collected money in the wrong way, and I would urge that everyone take

74th Legislative Day

June 27, 1991

a strong look at this and oppose this legislation."

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

McCracken: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill, as the previous speaker said, seeks to reverse a court decision construing the Public Utilities Act that we passed in 1985. That Act prohibited the cross-subsidization of any of the telephone company's business. Ιn this case, it cross-subsidize its pay telephone business at the expense of its commercial and residential customers. The court decision is construed the '85 Act, a comprehensive, well designed, well thought out Act, and seeks to take this knee-jerk reaction to a court decision which properly and correctly construed the underlying Act. I also rise in opposition."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Levin."

Levin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of We have voted several times this Session to raise utility rates. If you voted for any of those Bills, you should be voting against this. This Bill will raise your constituents utility Bills, whether they consumers or business by voting for this Amendment, they will pay higher rates in the neighborhood of \$2,000,000 in higher rates because of your vote for this particular Amendment today. This authorizes the cross-subsidization of coin telephone taxes. This authorizes the residential customer and the business customer to pay the taxes for the coin telephone user. This is something which we have earlier this year strongly opposed. When we had a 15¢ surcharge imposed, to help the poor, you heard from your constituents, that that was not fair, that we should not have one class of customers, even if it's for a

74th Legislative Day

June 27, 1991

purpose, paying to subsidize another class of customers, but that's what this Amendment does. This puts into the statute that the residential and business customer who are not using coin telephones, will nevertheless have to pick up the cost of the taxes. It also imposes a formula which maximizes the cost to the consumers and business. The court specifically said in overturning the practice that was being used, that our formula was the improper formula to use, that the amount of money that it brought in was greater than should have been brought in. So, if you cast any vote at all this year against your consumers, and you want to be able to point to a good vote, vote against this Amendment, you can go back and say you have not voted, at least in this instance, to raise the telephone rates of your consumers and businesses."

- Speaker Matijevich: "The Dean of the House, Representative Giorgi, to close."
- Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, this permits the telephone company to amortize the amount it must now refund individual customers over a period not to exceed five years by way of a temporary surcharge on coin phones in a manner approved by the ICC. This would be applicable in the communities that levy the municipal tax now, and I urge the support of this fair Amendment."
- Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman has moved for the concurrence of Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 2417. Those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. This is final action. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? There are 34 'ayes', 76 'nos', and the Motion fails. Now, Representative Giorgi, are you going to move to...Representative Harris. Representative Harris. 'Aye'. Turner. 'Aye'. Representative Giorgi, are you going to move...Representative Shaw. 'Aye'. Representative Giorgi.

74th Legislative Day

- June 27, 1991
- The Motion failed. You did take the record, didn't you? Tony...yeah."
- Giorgi: "Just take it out of the record for a minute."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Just a moment, Zeke. He took the record, and it's 37 'ayes', 73 'nays', and the Motion fails. Now, Representative Giorgi."
- Giorgi: "Okay. I move that we nonconcur to Senate Amendment #2
 to House Bill 2417."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Giorgi moves to nonconcur with Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 2417. All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no', and the House does nonconcur with Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 2417. We're going to continue on Special Order, concurrences. Representative Keane."
- Keane: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. With the infirmity of age, I made a mistake. I nonconcurred on 2418, when I meant to nonconcur on 2148. I would like to ask the Parliamentarian if I can in some way undo the damage I have done."
- Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman moves, with leave of the House, to reconsider the vote by which the House nonconcurred to the Senate Amendments to House Bill 2418.

 Does he have leave? He has leave, and the House does reconsider the vote by which it nonconcurred with Senate Amendments to House Bill 2418, and now it's in its proper..."
- Keane: "Thank you."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Alright. Now we will continue on Agriculture and Environment, only calling those who are nonconcurring. House Bill 70, Representative Brunsvold."
- Brunsvold: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd move to nonconcur on Senate Amendments 1 and 2."
- Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman moves to nonconcur with Senate

74th Legislative Day

June 27, 1991

Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 70. All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no', and the House does nonconcur in Senate . Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 70. 114, Novak. House Bill 114. Out of the record. 204, Jay Hoffman. Out of the record. 314, Hartke. Out of the record. 477, McAfee. Out of the record. 687, Hicks. Out of the record. 742, Granberg. Out of the record. 796, House...committee. of the record. House Bill 18, Kulas. Out of the record. House Bill 1207, Hartke. Out of the record. 1433, Brunsvold. Out of the record. 1601, John Dunn. Out of 1695, Richmond. John Dunn, are you going to the record. nonconcur, John? Out of the record. 1695, Richmond. the record. House Bill 1750, Deuchler. Out of the record. 1850, Hicks. Out of the record. Alright. Representative Hartke, we didn't call 799. Hartke, your Bills we called were 314 and 1207. Neither one of those? Alright. House Bill 2250, Kulas. Out of the record. 2462, Jay Hoffman. Out of the record. On the Order of Concurrence, Revenue and Banking, Special Order. Only calling Noncurrences. 67, Currie. Out of the record. 342. Davis. Out of the record. House Bill 406, Steczo. Representative Steczo."

- Steczo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to nonconcur with Senate
 Amendment #1 on House Bill 406."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Steczo moves to nonconcur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 406. All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no', and the House does nonconcur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 406. House Bill 516, Representative Steczo."
- Steczo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I also move to nonconcur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 516."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Steczo moves to nonconcur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 516. All in favor

74th Legislative Day

June 27, 1991

say 'aye', opposed 'no', and the House does nonconcur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 516. Representative Keane. Representative Keane in the Chair."

- Speaker Keane: "Representative Currie on 1085, on concurrence...non...1256, Rep...1615, Representative Davis on nonconcurr...we're only going to take nonconcurrences.

 Representative Steczo on House Bill 406. Representative Steczo."
- Steczo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Having voted on the prevailing side, I move to reconsider the vote by which we nonconcurred in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 406."
- Speaker Keane: "Gentlemen, you've heard the Motion. favor, say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, House reconsiders the vote, and by which we nonconcurred on 406. Thank you. Okay, we're on the Special Order of Nonconcurrence. I'm just going to read the Bills. If you light up your light as we read the Bills, we will stop, we will only take nonconcurrence. you're going to nonconcur on one Amendment, but concur one or more other Amendments, that is not considered a nonconcurrence. Okay. On concurrence, Revenue 1085, Currie. 1256. Churchill, 1615, Davis, 1911, Capparelli. Mr. Clerk, put 1911 on. Representative Capparelli."
- Capparelli: "Mr. Speaker, I move to nonconcur to Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1911."
- Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman moves nonconcurrance to Senate Amendment #1. All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no', the 'ayes' have it, and the House does nonconcur in Senate Amendment #1 to 1911. Senate Bill 1912, Preston. Is this a nonconcurrance? Senate Bill 1982, Representative Bugielski. House Bill 2106, Representative Sieben. House Bill 2190, Representative Currie. House Bill 2586,

74th Legislative Day

June 27, 1991

Representative Harris. We now οp to concurrence-nonconcurrence on Education. House Bill 94, Representative LeFlore. House Bill 97, Representative Kulas. House Bill 104, Representative Homer. House Bill 240, Representative Ropp. House Bill 266, Representative Hannig. House Bill 455, Representative Ropp. House Bill 525, Representative Mautino. nonconcur. You want to nonconcur? House Bill 599, Steczo. House Bill Representative Richmond. House Bill 816. Representative House Bill 844, Representative Cowlishaw. Representative Cowlishaw."

- Cowlishaw: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I want to concur in Senate Amendment #1."
- Speaker Keane: "No...all we're taking is nonconcurrence. We're going to go through the Calendar, if I pass over a Bill...we're going to move fairly rapidly."

Cowlishaw: "Fine."

- Speaker Keane: "If I pass over a Bill and you're not sure whether you want to concur or not, and then you decide you want to nonconcur, come up and tell the Parliamentarian and we'll get back to you."
- Cowlishaw: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker Keane: "Today is just nonconcurrences. House Bill 885,
 Representative Steczo. House Bill 1014, Representative
 Dunn. House Bill 1024, Representative Obrzut. House Bill
 1078, Representative Madigan. Representative Lang. Excuse
 me.
- Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Move to nonconcur in Senate
 Amendments to House Bill 1078."
- Speaker Matijevich: "You've heard the Gentleman's Motion. All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no', the 'ayes' have it, and the House does nonconcur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1078. Senate Bill...or House Bill 1079,

74th Legislative Day

June 27, 1991

- Representative Lang."
- Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to nonconcur on Senate

 Amendments to House Bill 1079."
- Speaker Keane: "You've heard the Gentleman's Motion. All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the House nonconcurs in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1079. Representative McNamara."
- McNamara: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wish to nonconcur in Senate

 Amendment #1 to House Bill 1097."
- Speaker Keane: "Alright. You've heard the Gentleman's Motion.

 All those in favor say 'aye', all opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the House does nonconcur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1097. House Bill 1752, Stern. House Bill 1815, Steczo. House Bill 1891, Phelps. House Bill 2012, Daniels. House Bill 2423, Currie. House Bill 2642, McNamara. We now are on nonconcurrence, Transportation. House Bill 46, Santiago. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill...or, put the Bill on the board."
- Santiago: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to nonconcur to Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 46."
- Speaker Keane: "You've heard the Gentleman's Motion. All those in favor say 'aye', all opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the House does nonconcur with Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 46. House Bill 718, Ronan. House Bill 81...I'm sorry, House Bill 1183, McPike. House Bill 1431, Sieben. House Bill 1446, Ryder. House Bill 1749, Laurino. House Bill 2067, Capparelli. House Bill 2536, Curran. We now go to the Order of State...Representative Bugielski for an introduction."
- Bugielski: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House.

 It gives me great pleasure today to make an introduction to
 you. Last year, when President Lech Walesa was here in
 Illinois, Governor Edgar met with Lech Walesa, and as a

74th Legislative Day

June 27, 1991

to Lech Walesa, the President of Poland, he established a fellowship program with Poland, and bestowed upon Lech Walesa a fellowship program to...for Poland to send a person over here to work with the Governor's office and learn the Democracy that we have here in Illinois. person I'm going to introduce was appointed by the President of Poland, Lech Walesa himself. He's here on a is a journalist for the Gdansk two-month program. He Weekly. He is a historian. He has worked with the Solidarity movement for nine years in Poland. It gives me great honor and pleasure to introduce to you, Mr. Wojtek Turek."

- Speaker Keane: "Thank you, Representative Bugielski If staff would clear the aisle...if staff would clear the aisle, retire to the back of the gallery."
- Turek: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. It is an honor to be here addressing this Body. I'm very happy that Governor Jim Edgar created the Lech Walesa fellowship program. I'm here for two months, working in the Governor's office and learning about the American Democracy first hand. The fellowship is very important for Poland, because my country is a fledgling Democracy, and the experiences of Illinois Government that I bring back to my country will be very helpful. Again, it is an honor, and thank you, very much."
- Speaker Keane: "We will now go to nonconcurrences on State and
 Local Government. House Bill 16, Representative Currie.
 House Bill 38, Representative Kirkland. Representative
 Kirkland on House Bill 38. Representative Kirkland."
- Kirkland: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, my light doesn't work. I move to nonconcur Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 38."

 Speaker Keane: "You've heard the Gentleman's Motion. All those in favor say 'aye', all opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the House nonconcurs in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to

74th Legislative Day

June 27, 1991

House Bill 38. House Bill 129, Representative Mautino. House Bill 367, Representative Black. House Bill 518, Representative Steczo. House Bill 714, Representative Steczo. House Bill 762, Representative Lang. House Bill 763, Representative Lang. House Bill 764, Representative Lang. Representative Lang. Representative Lang.

- Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Move to nonconcur on Senate

 Amendments to House Bill 764."
- Speaker Keane: "You've heard the Gentleman's Motion. All those in favor say 'aye', all opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the House nonconcurs on Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 764. House Bill 794...out of the record. 799. 856, Curran. We're calling nonconcurrences again, only nonconcurrences. 945, Capparelli. 1006, Mautino. 945, Representative Capparelli."
- Capparelli: "Mr. Speaker, I move to nonconcur to Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 945."
- Speaker Keane: "You heard the Gentleman's Motion. All those in favor say 'aye', all opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the House does not concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 945. Representative Hartke, which Bill did you wish? Senate...House Bill 799. Representative Hartke."
- Hartke: "Mr. Speaker, I move to nonconcur with Senate Amendments
 #1 and 2 to House Bill 799."
- Speaker Keane: "You've heard the Gentleman's Motion. All in favor say 'aye', all opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the House does nonconcur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 799. House Bill 1006, Representative Mautino. 996, Representative Klemm. 2139, Representative Phelan. House...Representative Kirkland. Oh. You're just testing the light. House Bill 2174, Representative Persico. 2309, Representative Steczo. 2349, Representative McGuire. We will now go to nonconcurrences, Human Services. Going back

74th Legislative Day

June 27, 1991

- on nonconcurrence, State and Local Governments, 518. House Bill 518. Representative Steczo."
- Steczo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I move to Noncur on Senate
 Amendment #1 to House Bill 518."
- Speaker Keane: "You've heard the Gentleman's Motion. All those in favor say 'aye', all opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the House does nonconcur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 518. House Bill 714, Representative Steczo."
- Steczo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I move to nonconcur with Senate

 Amendment #1 to House Bill 714."
- Speaker Keane: "You've heard the Gentleman's Motion. All favor say 'aye', all opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the House does nonconcur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 714. We will now go to the nonconcurrence on those Bills listed on Human Services. House Bill 137, Flowers. House Bill 274, Representative White. House Bill 318, Representative Currie. House Bill 426, Representative White. House Bill 489, Representative Currie. House Bill 555, Representative Regan. House Bill 606, Representative Woolard. House Bill 677, Representative Black. House Bill 678, Representative Black. House Bill 69,1 Representative House Bill 735, Representative Phelps. House Bill 739, Representative White. House Bill 751, Representative Burke. Do you wish to nonconcur on either of the two Bills? This is just nonconcurrence. House Bill House Bill 1162. Representative DeJaegher. House Bill 1171, Representative Currie. Representative DeJaegher, do you wish to nonconcur? House Bill 1218, Representative Phelps. House Bill 1230, Representative DeJaegher. Representative Currie."
- Currie: "On Senate Bill 1171 (sic House Bill 1171), I would move not to concur with Senate Amendment 1."
- Speaker Keane: "You've heard the Lady's Motion on House Bill

74th Legislative Day

June 27, 1991

1171. All those in favor say 'aye', all opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the House does nonconcur to Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1171. House Bill 1268, Representative White. House Bill 1270, Representative White. House Bill 1353, Representative Noland. Representative Noland, do you wish to nonconcur?"

Noland: "I wish to nonconcur."

Speaker Keane: "State your Motion. Representative Noland moves to nonconcur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill All those in favor say 'aye', all opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the House nonconcurs in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1353. House Bill 1545, Representative Preston. Representative Preston. Representative Preston moves to nonconcur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1545. A11 those in favor...you've heard the Gentleman's Motion. A11 in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the House nonconcurs in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1545. House Bill 1629, Representative Hasara. House Bill 2010, Representative Granberg. House Bill 20...Representative Granberg on 2010. Representative Granberg moves to nonconcur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2010. All those in favor say 'aye', all opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the House nonconcurs with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2010. House Bill 2021, Representative Parcells. House Bill 2040, Representative Bugielski. Mr. Clerk...Representative Bugielski."

Bugielski: "Mr. Speaker, and Members of the House. I wish to nonconcur on Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2040."

Speaker Keane: "The Gentleman moves for nonconcurrence to Senate Amendment #1. All those in favor say 'aye', all opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the House nonconcurs with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2040. House Bill 2177, Representative Hasara. House Bill 2234, Representative

74th Legislative Day

- June 27, 1991
- Giglio. House Bill 2446, Representative Satterthwaite.
 Mr. Clerk..."
- Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker, I move to nonconcur in Senate

 Amendment #1 to House Bill 2446."
- Speaker Keane: "You've heard the Lady's Motion. All those in favor say 'aye', all opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the House nonconcurs with Senate Amendment #1 to 2446.

 House Bill 2510, Representative Currie. Representative Currie."
- Currie: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I move the House not concur in

 Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 2510 (sic House Bill 2510."
- Speaker Keane: "You've heard the Lady's Motion. All those in favor say 'aye', all opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the House nonconcurs in Senate Amendments 1 to House Bill 2510. Wе will now go to the Order ٥f Concurrence...Nonconcurrence, Civil and Criminal Law. House Bill 56, Representative Santiago. Representative Santiago."
- Santiago: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I move to nonconcur on Senate

 Amendment 1 and 2 to House Bill 56."
- Speaker Keane: "You've heard the Gentleman's Motion. All those in favor say 'aye', all opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the House nonconcurs in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 56. House Bill 65, Representative Santiago. House Bill 316, Representative Homer. House Bill 331, Representative Homer. House Bill 358, Representative McCracken. Mr...Representative McCracken."
- McCracken: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I move to concur in Senate Amendment #1. This is a track-leasing Bill. We passed the identical legislation and it is now on the Governor's desk, in Senate Bill 104. This is being held just to make sure there's no loose ends connected with this particular article of the Uniform Commercial Code."

74th Legislative Day

June 27, 1991

Speaker Keane: "You've heard the Gentleman's Motion, that the House nonconcur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill All in favor say 'aye', all opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the House does nonconcur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 358. 431, Representative McCracken. 434, 515, Representative Steczo. Representative Homer. Representative Frederick. Virginia Frederick. House 624. Representative Hicks. House Bill 772, Representative House Bill 786, Representative Satterthwaite. Turner. House Bill 840...Representative Turner, did you wish to nonconcur on 772? Okay. This is just the nonconcurrences. Bill 840, House Jay Hoffman. House House Bill 1007, Representative Representative Walsh. House Bill 1101, Representative DeJaegher. House Bill 1321, Representative Stepan. Representative Wennlund on House Bill 1007. The gentleman moves to nonconcur on Senate Amendment #2. You've heard the Gentleman's Motion. All in favor say 'aye', all opposed The 'ayes' have it, and the House does nonconcur in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 1007. Representative Stepan, do you wish to nonconcur?

Stepan: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I wish to nonconcur."

Speaker Keane: "House Bill 1321."

Stepan: "Mr. Speaker, I wish to nonconcur on House Bill 1321,

Senate Amendment #1."

Speaker Keane: "You've heard the Lady's Motion. All in favor say 'aye', all opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the House nonconcurs with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill House Bill 1340, Representative McCracken. House Bill 1415. Representative Homer. House Bill Representative Regan. House Bill 1498. Representative Richmond. House Bill 1499, Representative Curran. Bill 1564, Representative Preston. House Bill 1608.

74th Legislative Day

June 27, 1991

- Representative Currie. Let's go back to House Bill 1564, Representative Preston. Representative Preston.
- Preston: "Mr. Speaker, I move to nonconcur in Senate Amendment
 #1."
- Speaker Keane: "You've heard the Gentleman's Motion. All those in favor say 'aye', all opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the House does nonconcur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1564. House Bill 1608, Representative Currie. House Bill 1609, Representative Currie. House Bill 1811, Representative Saltsman. Representative Saltsman."
- Saltsman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I move to nonconcur with Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1811."
- Speaker Keane: "You've heard the Gentleman's Motion. All those in favor say 'aye', all opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the House nonconcurs in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1811. House Bill 1850...I'm sorry. House Bill 1950, Homer. House Bill 1955, Weller. House Bill 2075, Currie. House Bill 2208, Lang. House Bill 2306, Jay Hoffman. House Bill 2307, Jay Hoffman. We have now completed the Calendar for nonconcurrences. If anyone has a Bill that they wish to nonconcur with the Senate Amendments, please bring them up to the podium. They have to be on this Special Order. House Bill 57, Representative Santiago."
- Santiago: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I move to nonconcur on Senate

 Amendment #1 to House Bill 57."
- Speaker Keane: "You've heard the Gentleman's Motion. All in favor say 'aye', all opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the House does not concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 57. House Bill 1073, Representative Stern."
- Stern: "Mr. Speaker, I would like not to concur in the Senate

 Amendment on House Bill 1073, Senate Amendment #1."
- Speaker Keane: "You've heard the Lady's Motion. All those in favor say 'aye', all opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and

74th Legislative Day

June 27, 1991

the House nonconcurs in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill House Bill 2139, Representative Phelan. Representative Phelan moves to nonconcur on Senate Amendments #1 and 3 to House Bill 2139. All those in favor say 'aye', all opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the House nonconcurs in Senate Amendments #1 and 3 to House Bill 2139. Is there any further...anyone wishing to have a nonconcurrence on the Special Order called? I want to take an opportunity to recognize an old friend, former Representative Fred Tuerk, is in the back speaking with Lance Murphy and Representative Saltsman. Springfield, as always. We will now begin concurrences, Government Operations, and we'll start...we will start from the top and go Bill by Bill. On concurrences, Government Operations appears House Bill 69, Representative Brunsvold. Out of the record. House Bill 86, Representative Martinez. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 86 on the Order of Concurrence, Motion to concur with Senate Amendment #1."

Speaker Keane: "Representative Martinez ."

Martinez: "Yes. I wish to concur with Senate Amendment #1."

Speaker Keane: "Is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall the House concur on Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 86?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. This is final action. Representative Pullen.

Pullen: "Inasmuch as this is final passage of this Bill, I was wondering whether we could perhaps ask Sponsors to tell us...including on this one, what the Amendment does, and what the underlying Bill does, please?"

Speaker Keane: "Very good point."

Pullen: "Thank you."

Speaker Keane: "Representative Martinez, would you explain the

74th Legislative Day

June 27, 1991

Senate Amendment?"

Martinez: "I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, but I don't have any paperwork with me at this moment. Be glad to furnish that later on."

Speaker Keane: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, 104 voting 'aye', 4 voting 'no', none voting 'present'. The House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 86, and this Bill having received the required Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 69, Representative Brunsvold. We'll ask everybody to explain the Amendments that they're concurring in."

Brunsvold: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I would move to concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 69. Senate Amendment #1 clarifies the privacy dealing with the 911 calls. Right now, the person lists the numbers...has the number listed as unlisted, this simply says that no one can have access to those numbers outside of a 911 call, like people...automatic dialers, and I would think this is good as far as the privacy section of 911. The person will still be allowed, however, when they dial 911 the number and address will come up on the screen."

Speaker Keane: "Any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On this Bill, there are 105 voting 'aye', none voting 'no', and none voting 'present', and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 69, and this Bill, having received the required Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 118, Representative Steczo. Out of the record. House Bill 284, Representative Steczo.

74th Legislative Day

June 27, 1991

Representative Steczo. Representative Steczo. House Bill 313, Representative Currie. Out of the record. House Bill 452, Representative Curran. Out of the record. House Bill 526, Representative Mautino. Representative Mautino."

Mautino: "Thank you very much. Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move to concur with Senate Amendment #1 Bill to House 526. The original proposal...the Senate Amendment deletes the Department of Commerce and Community Affairs from the list of agencies that can enter into a trust agreement with a person or group of individuals. The original Bill provided for Department of Agriculture, the Historic Preservation, and the Department of Conservation, to accept moneys individual groups established in a trust for the purposes that the group raises the money. We've had a lot of individual volunteer groups whether it's for Preservation. Agriculture, or Conservation that want to assistance to those Departments, and they had no way to do This provides them with a trust where that money goes and uses it for those betterment purposes, and I move for concurrence on Senate Amendment #1, because DCCA wanted to be taken out of the Bill. That's exactly what it and moves for concurrence."

Speaker Keane: "Is there any discussion? The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. The question is, 'Shall the House concur on Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 526?' Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 112 voting 'aye', none voting 'no', none voting 'present', and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 526, and this Bill, having received the required Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House

74th Legislative Day

June 27, 1991

Bill 551 Representative Currie. Out of the record. House Bill 700 Representative Hannig. Mr. Clerk...Representative Hannig."

Hannig: "Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House.

This is a Bill which we passed earlier in this chamber by near unanimous vote. It would allow the State's Attorney's Appellate Prosecutors to increase from 8 to 12 the number of investigators that they have, and this is so that they can cap your federal money, because they have a grant for this program. The Senate Amendment simply put an effective date on the Bill, and so I would move that we do concur in the Senate Amendment."

Speaker Keane: "Any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 700?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 112 voting 'aye', none voting 'no', none voting 'present', and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 700, and this Bill having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill...we'll go back to Senate Bill 248...House Bill 248...284, I'm sorry. House Bill 284, Representative Steczo."

Steczo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I move to concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 284. This Amendment adds language that excludes employees or agents of a church or religious organizations and provides other exclusions which makes the Bill more palatable. And, in addition, we plan to go to conference with another Bill and make a few more changes that will take away the objections of many people. So, Mr. Speaker, on this one I would concur with Amendment #1 to House Bill 284."

Speaker Keane: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in

74th Legislative Day

June 27, 1991

Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 284?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 97 voting 'aye', 9 voting 'no', 8 voting 'present', and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 284. and this Bill having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 743, House Bill 847, Representative Representative Parke. It's concurrence. Dο you wish to Representative Burke. This is concurrence, if you would make that Motion and explain Amendment #1 and 2."

Burke: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, on House Bill 847, it is my intention to concur with the Senate action on Amendments 1 and 2. The Amendments would provide for the opportunity: (1) for taxpayers in the State of Illinois to contribute a dollar to the funding of this compensation Act for returning Persian Gulf veterans. Amendment #2 deals with life insurance, and it would permit terminally ill patients to withdraw up to the face—value of their policies to pay for their medical care. These policyholders pay state and federal income taxes on the amount they collect. This Amendment would provide that they would not be responsible for the income tax on that amount, and I would ask for a favorable consideration."

Speaker Keane: "Representative Ropp."

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

Speaker Keane: "He indicates he will."

Ropp: "On this...on this last Amendment, does this attempt to take care of all of the paid premium or all of the amount of insurance that...explain that last Amendment, would you please a little more clear?"

Burke: "Yes, Representative, it's the face-value of the life

74th Legislative Day

June 27, 1991

insurance policy that one would be entitled to having participated in that, in particular."

Ropp: "Okay, it's that amount of money that you can use to pay off some hospital care. Is that what it was?"

Burke: "That is correct."

Ropp: "Okay, so, it would not, in effect, it would attempt to eventually reduce the ultimate face-value, if you have used a portion of your cash value...up until you may need the full life insurance pay-off."

Burke: "Well, I would suggest with the elimination of the income tax on that particular amount, they would, indeed, benefit.

They would receive substantially more just by virtue of the elimination of tax."

Ropp: "Okay, I think this is a very good idea. I think there are a number of states that have this provision already in the law which allows those people who may be financially strapped to take advantage of their life insurance while they're still living, rather than to only use it for those who may be a beneficiary. Thanks."

Speaker Keane: "Representative Homer."

Homer: "Thank you. Will the ...will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Keane: "He indicates he will."

Homer: "Representative Burke, that same Amendment would...would that Amendment require a taxpayer to include in income funds that he had received as a result of the acceleration of a life policy where he has a terminal illness?"

Burke: "Representative, are you asking with respect to the state income tax?"

Homer: "Yes."

Burke: "Would they be responsible for including it in their declaration of income?"

Homer: "Yes."

Burke: "Yes, I believe they would be, but that portion that would

74th Legislative Day

June 27, 1991

be derived from the cash value of the life insurance policy would be exempt from state tax."

Homer: "Now, what would be exempt?"

Burke: "The cash value when an individual, in the example cited who is ill and must cash in their life insurance policy, there's always a cash value to that life insurance. If they were to find themselves in difficult medical condition, they would be eligible to avoid that state income tax on that cash value of the life insurance policy."

Homer: "Well, if someone dies and they receive a pay-out on their life insurance...their beneficiaries receive a pay-out, there is no income tax to be paid. It's not subject to income tax."

Burke: "Representative, I'm not certain, but I think that might be a matter for probate to decide, depending on the amount."

Homer: "No, I...I don't think so, Representative Burke. Ι mean...you know. it's my clear understanding that when...when life insurance is not considered income, I'm not sure that you would be for this provision, you know...unless I don't understand it, because what it seems is say that if someone is terminally ill and takes advantage of one of those policies where they offer...offer someone payment on an accelerated basis so that they can use those proceeds during their last illness or with the expenses of their last illness and somebody decides to take care of that, this Amendment would seem to say that would have to pay income tax on those monies, but, if they wait until they died, their beneficiaries would not pay any income tax. Life insurance proceeds are not subject to income tax in Illinois, but this would seem to make them subject to income tax if they're taken out before

74th Legislative Day

June 27, 1991

dies."

Burke: "What you've just cited is certainly not the intention of this Amendment..."

Homer: "Well, maybe...maybe you should do this...maybe I could ask you to do this, we have a lot of time. Maybe you would want to take the Bill from the record and double check with...with staff to make sure of what that does. Would you do that? I'm sure they'll get back to your Bill, but, if you would, take it from the record. I think it would be a good idea."

Burke: "Mr. Speaker..."

Speaker Keane: "The Sponsor asks to take the Bill from record, and we will get back to it. House Bill 879. Representative Wyvetter Younge. House Bill 894. Representative Steczo. House Bill...House Bill 1109, Representative Giorgi, on concurrence. We've already nonconcurred it, sorry. Representative Steczo, on Mr. Clerk, 894. Representative Steczo."

Steczo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I would move to concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill This Amendment was prepared in consultation with the Department of Professional Regulation. It replaces terms like designed professional unit with designed professional and dedicated...dedicated employee for various would permit payment from the fund to the department for certain expenses used to support license and enforcement activities, and it enumerates that the dedicated employees, in terms of job function rather than payroll title, as has been the case for some employees in the original Bill. I'd move, Mr. Speaker, for concurrence in the Senate Amendment."

Speaker Keane: "Any discussion? Being none, the question is,

'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House

74th Legislative Day

June 27, 1991

Bill 894?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 107 voting 'aye', none voting 'no', none voting 'present', and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 894, and this Bill, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. We will now go back to...one Bill back to House Bill 879, Representative Wyvetter Younge. Representative Younge."

Younge: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to concur in Senate

Amendments #1 and 2 in House Bill 879."

Speaker Keane: "Would you explain Amendments 1 and 2?"

Younge: "Senate Amendment #1 makes ongoing the funding of incubators in cities that fall under the distressed areas legislation."

Speaker Keane: "And Amendment #2?"

Younge: "Amendment #2 makes the funding for incubators, generally, extended to five years."

Speaker Keane: "The question is...the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 879?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 110 voting 'aye', none voting 'no', 1 voting 'present', and the House does concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 879, and this Bill, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1149, Representative Mautino. Mr. Clerk...1179 (sic 1149). Representative Mautino."

Mautino: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move to concur in Senate Amendments 1 and

74th Legislative Day

June 27, 1991

Amendments #1 and 2 provide 2 to House Bill 1149. that...#1 provides that any person employed by a state licensed health care facility who engages in the practice of environmental health whose job responsibilities include ensuring that the environment in the health care facility is healthy and safe, and that visitors are not required to be registered under the Act. That's an agreed Amendment, as is number two, which allows home units to regulate but license environmental health practitioners. underlying Bill provided for the licensure of environmental health practitioners who were licensed in this state until 1983 and fell through the crack...cracks under the Sunset Provision. This legislation reinstates them under the current...the provisions that were intact at the time that they were licensed under this state. Both the Bills. in the House and the Senate, were overwhelmingly supported, and I ask for the concurrence to Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 1149."

Speaker Keane: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 1149?' All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 112 voting 'aye', none voting 'no', none voting 'present', and the House does concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 1149, and this Bill, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill...House Bill 1204. Representative Mautino."

Mautino: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I move to concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1204.

Amendment #1 is specifically the Bill now. It provides that every insurance company issuing, renewing, or amending dental insurance coverage must disclose the following: the

74th Legislative Day

June 27, 1991

frequency of the determination of the usual and customary fee, the general description of the methodology used to determine usual and customary fees and by how much a fee can exceed the average fee for a dental procedure and still be eligible for full reimbursement. The underlying Bill was a Bill to provide this same knowledge to the insured. The Amendment is an agreed Amendment by members of the industry as well as the dental profession, and I move for its concurrence and the passage of House Bill 1204."

Speaker Keane: "Any discussion? The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1204?'

All those in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 110 voting 'aye', none voting 'no', none voting 'present', and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1204, and this Bill, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1364, Representative Mautino."

Mautino: "Mr. Speaker, I apologize. This should have been under the prior call of yours for nonconcurrence. May I do so now?"

Speaker Keane: "Proceed."

Mautino: "I'd like to nonconcur in Senate Amendment #1 to House
Bill 1364, which basically gutted the Bill, and what the
intentions are is to...submit this Bill to a Conference
Committee, in case the Department of Professional
Regulation needs a Bill to correct anything that occurs in
this House."

Speaker Keane: "You've heard the Gentleman's Motion. All in favor say 'aye', all opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the House nonconcurs in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1364. We'll now go back to House Bill 847, Representative

74th Legislative Day

June 27, 1991

Burke."

Burke: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To follow-up on the discussion to House Bill 847, I believe, that my colleagues concerns have been addressed, with respect to Amendment #2...asking that life insurance companies, being that they often allow terminally ill patients to withdraw up to the face value of their policies to pay for medical care, in Illinois, these policyholders pay state and federal income taxes on the amount they collect. We're asking that this particular money be exempted from state income tax."

Speaker Keane: "Representative Wennlund."

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

Speaker Keane: "Indicates he will."

Wennlund: "Does this...Bill still provide for a one dollar surtax on automobile rentals in Illinois?"

Burke: "No, Sir, it does not."

Wennlund: "That was removed by the Senate Amendments?"

Burke: "That is correct."

Wennlund: "Thank you."

Speaker Keane: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur with Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 847?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 114 voting 'aye', none voting 'no', none voting 'present', and the House does concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 847, and this Bill, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1365, Representative Schoenberg. House Bill...Representative Schoenberg on 1365."

Schoenberg: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 1365 as we'd...merely sets standards for

74th Legislative Day

June 27, 1991

appraisals...for appraisers and licensers...so that the State of Illinois can comply with the federal regulations established in the S&L bailout Bill. Amendment #1 to merely makes some minor changes in terms of the number of members of the Real Estate Appraisal Committee, constitution of that committee. It expands the definition for proven experience to include mass appraisal .and does...makes a number of other minor technical changes. The overriding...point about Amendment #1 and Amendment which expands from nine to ten the number of members on the Appraisal Committee, is that these are all in compliance with the federal regulations, and I would urge my colleagues to concur on this. This has been negotiated, after all, through both parties and all parties involved, and I urge your favorable vote."

Speaker Keane: "Representative Parke."

Parke: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to know from the Sponsor, is the Real Estate Commission signed off on this legislation? Is it agreed by all parties, now?"

Schoenberg: "Yes, they have."

Parke: "Thank you."

Speaker Keane: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in All Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 1365?' in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 115 voting 'aye', none voting 'no', none voting 'present', and the House does concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 1365, and this Bill, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1405, Representative Wennlund. Representative Wennlund, 1405."

Wennlund: "Thank...thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to concur in

74th Legislative Day

June 27, 1991

Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 1405. What they basically, two minor clean-up Amendments to the statewide one-call system, and what the Amendments did is it exempted land surveyors out from underneath the provisions of the JULIE Bill, so they wouldn't have to call before they went out and surveyed some premises, and Senate Amendment #2 is the agreed language that the Department of Transportation has...has agreed to and...it...it makes it clear that if you're doing work in the City of Chicago, you call digger, which is the one-call system that they have, and not JULIE. They're just a technical clarification, and...happy to answer any questions. I ask passage."

Speaker Keane: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 1405?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk, take the record. On this Bill...on this Bill, there are 111 voting 'aye', 1 voting 'no', 'present', and the House does concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 1405, and this Bill, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1430, Representative Representative Ropp."

Ropp: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 1430 retains original Bill which...attempted to repeal the Policing Act but added a provision which states that in the Department of Agriculture the standard-bred and thoroughbred horses in Illinois that are foaled are registered currently, if they're a day late from the designated time they're just denied that registration. This sets up a...financial reimbursement to the state for that delinguent pay...delinquent filing period so that they will be able to

74th Legislative Day

June 27, 1991

race in Illinois or out-of-state, and I move for the acceptance to...to concur with Senate Amendment #1."

Speaker Keane: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 1430?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 112 voting 'aye', none voting 'no', none voting 'present', and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 1430, and this Bill, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1487, Representative Capparelli. House Bill 1533, Representative Ronan. Bill 1604, Representative Mautino. House Bill 1699. Representative Santiago. House Bill 1853, Representative House Bill 1854, Representative Granberg. House Bill 1856, Representative Wojcik. Do you wish to call it for concurrence? Representative Wojcik."

Wojcik: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I move to concur with...Senate Amendment #1, which deletes the requirements that no person shall be given any parenteral injection except by a physician licensed to practice medicine in all of its branches or a dentist licensed by the state."

Speaker Keane: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1856?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'no'. Representative Hartke."

Hartke: "I was gonna ask a question. What kind of injection?"

Wojcik: "Would you like to explain your vote?"

Speaker Keane: "Why don't you just answer his question."

Wojcik: "Yes, Chuck."

Hartke: "What kind of injection?"

74th Legislative Day

June 27, 1991

Wojcik: "Parenteral. It refers to the intestinal area."

Hartke: "Okay, thank you."

Speaker Keane: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 110 voting 'aye', 1 voting 'no' and none voting 'present, and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1856, and this Bill, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Well, now that we've passed a few Bills up...House Bill 313, Representative Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I move the House do concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 313. This is the Bill that would require agencies of government to provide notice when they are intending to...to...hire people to provide professional and artistic services under the Minority and Female Business Enterprise Act, and the Senate Amendment has the effect of saying that an agency that is already...doing \$5 million or more in business with minority and female proveyors of professional and artistic services will not be covered by the terms of this Bill. I move we do concur."

Speaker Keane: "Representative Black."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. It's not always easy to hear in here, and I'd like to ask the...Sponsor a question on Senate Amendment 2."

Speaker Keane: "Proceed."

Black: "It's...we're providing an exemption to any state agency that awards, if I can read this figure correctly, \$5 million or more in professional artistic service contracts to minority and female owned businesses. I guess, the only question I have is, 'Are you sure that's good public policy?' Given the fact that we've had so much criticism of the so-called pin-stripe patronage and so forth and so

74th Legislative Day

June 27, 1991

on?"

Currie: "Representative Black, I liked the Bill as we sent it to the Senate. I liked the Bill when it covered all state agencies. We had a lot of trouble passing the Bill in the Senate without this...this Amendment. It's my understanding that one agency would basically be covered by this exemption; that agency is the Illinois Department of Transportation. I would prefer, myself, to have that agency included in these provisions, but...at least, the exemption is worded so that an agency has to meet some pretty stiff requirements before it would be permitted to be exempt from this Act."

Black: "Okay, in other words, we have a cake, we just may not have the icing."

Currie: "Pardon me?"

Black: "We...we may have a birthday cake here, but we don't have the icing, but a cake without icing is better than no cake at all. Right?"

Currie: "I think what we're missing here are the wheels. I think we...I think our analogy ought to be some other kind, but I think it's the wheels that are missing from this car."

Black: "Okay, alright, thank you."

Speaker Keane: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 313?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 103 voting 'aye', 6 voting 'no', 3 voting 'present', and the House does concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 313, and this Bill, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 551, Representative Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I move

74th Legislative Day

June 27, 1991

the House do concur in Senate Amendment one to House Bill 551. This is the Bill that would provide some ethical standards in respect to conflict of interest for members of the Illinois Commerce Commission, and the effect of the Senate Amendments is to...lower the time period after which somebody may take action in respect to an issue that the...Commissioner has had some prior involvement with...and, basically, is prospective with respect to...to who would be covered by the Bill."

Speaker Keane: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 551?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this...on this Bill, there are 114 voting 'aye', none voting 'no', none voting 'present', and this Senate...the House...and this House does concur in Senate Amendments...Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 551, and this Bill, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 743, Representative Parke."

Parke: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to concur with Senate Amendment #1. Ιt becomes the Bill. It amends Personnel Code to require that each department develop a plan effects of a work requirements designed to reduce need for employees to need day care. Each department is required to submit the plans to the Department of Central Management Service biannually beginning March 1, 1993, and I ask for a favorable vote on the concurrence Motion."

Speaker Keane: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 743?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 115 voting

74th Legislative Day

June 27, 1991

'aye', none voting 'no', none voting 'present', and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 743...McCracken, 'aye', and this Bill, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1533, Representative Ronan."

Ronan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker...we'll wait for the board..."

Speaker Keane: "Hold...hold on a second. Wait for the board."

Ronan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to concur in Senate
Amendment #1 to House Bill 1533. This is the right to
privacy in the Workplace Act that I passed out of the
House. The only change we made was that we exempted
non-profit organizations on a request from a Member of the
Senate. I'd be glad to answer any questions concerning
either the Senate Amendment or the Bill."

Speaker Keane: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1533?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Dunn, for what purpose do you rise?"

Dunn: "Well, I...I rise to explain my...my vote, Mr. Speaker.

Just for purposes of brief discussion...on this Bill...on
this Bill, a green vote is with the tobacco industry and a
red vote is with the...with the organizations which have
fought for clean air, like the Lung Association, the Cancer
Society, the Heart Association and those groups, so, if you
want to vote with the Tobacco Society, vote green on this
Bill, if you don't, vote 'present' or 'no'."

Speaker Keane: "Representative McCracken, to explain your vote."

McCracken: "Could I just get a nod yes or no? Is this the thing

where you can't ask people how they spend their free time

away from work? Is that what this is? Well, how could

anyone be against such a good government Bill?"

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

74th Legislative Day

June 27, 1991

wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 83 voting 'aye', 29 voting 'no', 4 voting 'present', and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1...yes, record Wojcik as 'yes', the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to...record Cronin 'yes'...House Bill...the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1533, and this Bill, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1604, Representative Mautino."

- Mautino: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to nonconcur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1604."
- Speaker Keane: "The Gentleman moves to nonconcur to House Amendment...Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1604. You all heard the Gentleman's Motion. All in favor say 'aye', all opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the House nonconcurs in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1604. House Bill 1853, Representative Ronan. Representative Ronan. Representative
- Ronan: "Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Yes, I'd like to concur in Senate Amendments #1, 2, and 3 to House Bill 1853. Senate Amendment #1 makes various technical corrections to the Bill that the...enrolling and engrossing requested over there. Senate Amendment #2 requires all protective eye gear..."
- Speaker Keane: "Representative...Representative Ronan, we show only one Senate Amendment."
- Ronan: "Oh...you're right. There's three provisions in Senate
 Amendment #1. I got the Bill analysis confused,
 Representative Ronan. Alright, I'd move to concur in
 Senate Amendment #1. Brief analysis: it makes technical
 corrections, requires all protective eye gear to be
 sanitized prior to usage, and it creates the tanning
 facilities permit fund to collect fees deposited in the

74th Legislative Day

· June 27, 1991

fund, and those dollars will go to the department and then out to local government. I'll be glad to answer any questions concerning the legislation."

- Speaker Keane: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1853?' All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 85...86 voting 'aye', 27 voting 'no' and none voting 'present', and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1853, and this Bill, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1487, Representative Capparelli."
- Capparelli: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1487. The Bill originally was the Wholesale Distribution Act that were mandated do by Congress, and the...Amendment had some concerns by the Department of Professional Regulation, and they put the...that added to an Amendment, and now the Bill is...in order for that. Everybody agrees, and I would like to have a favorable Roll Call."
- Speaker Keane: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1487?' All those favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 111 voting 'aye', none voting 'no' and none voting 'present', and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1487, and this Bill, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is declared passed. House Bill 1864, Representative Ryder. House Bill 1934, Representative Steczo. House Bill Representative Steczo. House Bill 2005, Representative

74th Legislative Day

June 27, 1991

Edley. Representative Edley. Representative Edley. House Bill 2015, Representative Brunsvold. Representative Brunsvold."

- Brunsvold: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would move to concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2. Actually, Senate Amendment 2 includes Amendment 1. This...this Amendment would provide that the...seller or holder may collect delinquency charges up to 5%. I don't know of any opposition. Would ask for the concurrence in Senate Amendments 1 and 2."
- Speaker "We only have Senate Amendment #2, so the Gentleman...the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 2015?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'no'. The voting Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 100 'aye', 4 voting 'no', 4 voting 'present', and the House does concur. Representative DeJaegher, Representative...Phelps and Representative McGuire, vote 'em 'aye'. This Bill, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House 2017, Representative Trotter. House Bill 2100. Representative McGuire. Representative McGuire."
- McGuire: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm looking up the information here; it's not in here. I have the Amendment...I have the Amendment to House Bill 2100, and I'd like to concur in the Senate Amendment."
- Speaker Keane: "Would you explain the Amendment, the Senate Amendment?"
- McGuire: "Okay, the Amendment...the Bill creates a Workplace
 Literacy Act, and Senate Amendment #1 provides that the
 Prairie State 2000 authority rather than the Department of
 Labor shall administer the program, and it provides that
 the authority may use the Prairie State 2000 fund to fund

74th Legislative Day

June 27, 1991

workplace literacy and basic skills education programs, and Amendment #2 repeals language in the School Code requiring the State Board of Education to provide support for local educational agencies to conduct high impact training services to meet the needs of business and dislocated workers. Those are the two Amendments."

Speaker Keane: "Representative Parke."

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

Speaker Keane: "He indicates he will."

Parke: "Mr. Sponsor...what will be...if this is gonna be under the two...Prairie State 2000 authority to fund the literacy program, what are we taking out of Prairie State 2000 that won't get funded?"

McGuire: "Nothing. Nothing."

Parke: "Nothing?"

McGuire: "Nothing."

Parke: "Well, have we appropriated that additional money there?"

McGuire: "Prairie State...Authority has \$5 million in the budget for the program."

Parke: "They have already...they do have an appropriation for it?"

McGuire: "Pardon me?"

Parke: "They do have an appropriation for it?"

McGuire: "Yes. Yes."

Parke: "Thank you very much."

McGuire: "Thank you."

Speaker Keane: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 2100?' All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 116 voting 'aye', none voting 'no' and none voting 'present',

74th Legislative Day

June 27, 1991

and the House does concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 2100, and this Bill, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2110, Representative McAfee."

McAfee: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to concur in Senate
Amendments #1 and #2. Senate Amendment #1 basically
deletes the Criminal Investigation Division and clears up
and only makes it for the Department of State Police, and
Amendment #2 deletes the criminal penalties in the Whistle
Blower Act."

Speaker Keane: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 2110?' All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 113 voting 'aye', none voting 'no' and none voting 'present', and the House does concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 2110, and this Bill, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2421, Representative Mautino."

Mautino: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Amendments one and two add reference, they basically became the Bill. It amends the State Mandates Act to repeal the provisions governing the Board of Appeals on January 1, 1992, and creates a new State Mandates Board of Review to begin January 1, 1992, based upon legislation we passed earlier in the House, and Amendment #2 requires that the members of the board are to be chosen with the advice and consent of the Senate, and I move for concurrence in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 2421."

Speaker Keane: "Representative Weaver."

Weaver: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor

74th Legislative Day

June 27, 1991

yield? Representative, does this give the newly created State Mandate Board of Appeals any teeth to enforce prohibition against mandates?"

Mautino: "I believe it does, yes. I've been informed that it does, yes."

Weaver: "I'm sorry, I couldn't hear you."

Mautino: "I said...they can distribute money that's appropriated by this General Assembly, if that's what you call teeth."

Weaver: "Well, I...I would just...I was wondering, we already have a States Mandates Act that doesn't seem to be doing much of a job, and was wondering whether this was going to actually do anything at all?"

Mautino: "They can make recommendations to us here in the General

Assembly, and...it's created to replace the Board of

Appeals."

Weaver: "Well, if this...this fund or this reimbursement to local units of government...is dependent upon appropriations, if no appropriations are made then they won't be making any reimbursements. Is that correct?"

Mautino: "That's correct."

Weaver: "So, are we better off with this than we are with the Mandates Act?"

Mautino: "I would think so. Yes, we'd be better off with this than the Mandates Act. You are correct."

Weaver: "Thank you very much."

Mautino: "That's quite alright."

Speaker Keane: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 2421?' All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 112 voting 'aye', none voting 'no' and none voting 'present', and the House does concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to

74th Legislative Day

June 27, 1991

House Bill 2421, and this Bill, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2005, Representative Edley."

Edley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Amendment #1 adds a fifth Regional Tourism Council in the Tri-County area around Peoria, and I'd ask for a favorable...I would ask for a concurrence."

Speaker Keane: "Representative Weller."

Weller: "Question for the Sponsor. Thank you. My understanding is that in creating this fifth tourism council that the...there would be no increase in funding for the...tourism councils, rather than just having four tourism councils vying for the same pool of dollars, you would now have five. Is that the case?"

Edley: "That's my understanding."

Weller: "So, then, everyone here who is represented by a tourism council that's currently receiving funding by voting for this would see the funds cut for their own tourism councils. Is that true?"

Edley: "In effect, I...that probably would be the result of it."

Weller: "Thank you, Representative. Ladies and Gentlemen of the

House, by voting to concur with this Senate Amendment, if

you're currently concerned about tourism and the ability of

your community to bring tourism dollars into your district

and in your communities to boost your local economy, by

voting to concur with the Senate Amendment, you're reducing

the amount of state funds that the current existing tourism

council that serves your area will be able to receive. I

urge you to vote 'no'. Thank you."

Speaker Keane: "Representative Myron Olson. Ladies and Gentlemen, the noise level is getting high in here. Take your conversation..."

Olson, M.: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and

74th Legislative Day

June 27, 1991

rise in opposition to Gentlemen οf the House. Ι as offered bу Representative Representative Weller said it quite well, by initiating still another tourism council which is already being served, you are diverting some monies that would go in equal amounts to the various other units and as consequence would not serve as well. It's well for all of us to know that in the year when the Department Commerence and Community Affairs is going to have some deep and significant cuts, they oppose this concurrence as well. Therefore, I think it should be defeated." **(Rest of tape #2 inaudible - continue with tape #3.)**

Speaker Keane: "Question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 1228?' All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 109 voting 'aye', 2 voting 'no'. none voting 'present', and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 1228. Representative Mautino on 673. Representative Mautino on Representative Mautino moves to nonconcurr in Amendment #1. All those in favor say 'aye', all opposed The 'ayes' have it, and the House does not concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 673. House Bill 508. Representative Deering. Representative Deering moves to nonconcur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 508. All those in favor say 'aye', all opposed 'no'. have it, and the House nonconcurs in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 508. House Bill 1123, Representative Hasara. moves to nonconcur to Representative Hasara Senate Amendment #1. All those in favor say 'aye', all opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the House does not concur in Senate Amendment #1 in House Bill 1123. House Bill 2489.

74th Legislative Day

June 27, 1991

- Representative Weller."
- Weller: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to nonconcur with Senate

 Amendment #1."
- Speaker Keane: "The Gentleman moves to nonconcur. All in favor say 'aye', all opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the House nonconcurs in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2489.

 House Bill 1929, Representative Levin."
- Levin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to nonconcur in Senate

 Amendment #1 to House Bill 1929."
- Speaker Keane: "You've heard the Gentleman's Motion. All in favor say 'aye', all opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the House nonconcurs in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1929. House Bill 2149. House Bill 2149. Representative McGann moves to nonconcur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2149. All those in favor say 'aye', all opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the House nonconcurs in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2149. House Bill 2169, Representative McGann."
- McGann: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of Assembly. I move to nonconcur in Amendment #1 on House Bill 2169."
- Speaker Keane: "You've heard the Gentleman's Motion. All in favor say 'aye', all opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the House does not concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2169. House Bill 2385, Representative Hensel."
- Hensel: "Mr. Speaker. Could we take this out of the record for about two minutes?"
- Speaker Keane: "Out of the record."
- Hensel: "Thank you."
- Speaker Keane: "On the Order of Concurrence, Agriculture and Environment, House Bill 204, Representative Hoffman."
- Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 204 was originally the Voluntary

74th Legislative Day

June 27, 1991

Mediation; Farm Debt Mediation Bill. In addition to that, it had an Illinois Farms Legal Assistance Foundation which is presently in existence at the State Bar Association and is funded through grant funds. The provision creating the Illinois Farm Legal Assistance Foundation is going to sunset. What has happened is the Senate amended the Bill because of some opposition in the Senate to the Voluntary Mediation, which still remains on the Bill is extending the Illinois Farm Legal Assistance Foundation and keeping the grant money that it previously received. I ask that we concur with the Senate's Amendment."

Speaker Keane: "Representative Parke."

Parke: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question about the legislation. Being that I'm not from an agricultural area in this state, how is the Farm Bureau on this legislation?"

Hoffman: "They're in favor of it."

Parke: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Keane: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 204?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 113 voting 'aye', none voting 'no', 1 voting 'present', and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 204, and this Bill having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 114, Representative Novak. Representative Novak."

Novak: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move to concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 114."

Speaker Keane: "Explain the Amendment."

Novak: "Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 114 is the maintenance

74th Legislative Day

June 27, 1991

of the tipping fee that is scheduled to drop to 45¢ at the end of this year. The Amendment maintains the tipping fee at 60¢. This is a very important piece of environmental legislation, because I think all of you Representatives received a letter from the Department of Energy and Natural Resources, and you may have received communication from the Department of Environmental Protection Agency. This very important piece of legislation in that it enables that collected to be returned back to monies the governments. Cities, villages, counties, private industry Small businesses, corporations, those people that are involved in developing new markets for recycling, developing new ways to handle our solid waste management problem. It's a very important piece of legislation. and you're interested in pursuing resolutions to our environmental problems in our state, especially our problems with solid waste crises, we need to keep this tipping fee at 60¢."

Speaker Keane: "Representative Wennlund."

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

Speaker Keane: "He indicates he will."

Wennlund: "Representative Novak. Wasn't the tipping fee scheduled to drop on January 1, 1992, from 60¢ down to 45¢?"

Novak: "Correct."

Wennlund: "And, what this really amounts to is an increase in the tipping fee from \$1.05 to \$1.20 for cubic yard. Is that correct?"

Novak: "Correct."

Wennlund: "And, ultimately, the consumer and home owners could end up paying an increased garbage fee because of this fee increase, because nobody's going to absorb it themselves, none of the waste haulers are going to absorb it, are

74th Legislative Day

June 27, 1991

they?"

Novak: "Pardon me, Representative Wennlund, I could not hear you."

Wennlund: "I say, ultimately, the home owner and the consumer's going to pay an increased cost for garbage collection because, certainly the waste haulers and the industry is not going to absorb that 15¢ per cubic yard bump."

Novak: "There are only 16 counties that utilize the local tipping I mean, there's a possibility it could be passed off to the consumer. I think it was calculated at only \$2.18 per year, per year, now, per household. If we want to put our money where our mouth is, and start working on environmental problems, we need to maintain this tipping fee at 60¢ if we want to get these dollars back to community, back to Romeoville, for example, for a recycling program. The County of DuPage gets a vast amount of money, the City of Chicago gets a vast amount of money. Many, many local communities get these needed dollars recycling programs. If this thing drops back to 45¢ we're going to lose \$4 or \$5 million that is needed to keep these recycling programs going to help solve this solid waste management problem."

Wennlund: "Thank you, to the Amendment, just so the Members of the House understand that that's what this Bill does and if that's what you're doing and if you're not concerned about the folks back home, or called on the folks back home about the increased cost of garbage collection, then, you should vote yes."

Speaker Keane: "Representative Parke."

Parke: "You know...thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative Novak, it seems pretty simple from the way you describe it, but, on my analysis it says that the Illinois Manufacturer's is against this and the Illinois Chamber of Commerce is

74th Legislative Day

June 27, 1991

against this, as well as many of the companies that take care of waste hauling. Can you explain to me why these major business groups would be against this legislation?"

Novak: "Representative Parke, you asked the question, can I explain to you why the IMA and the Chamber is against it?"

Parke: "Right."

Novak: "They're against it because it's going to cost them money. I mean, we're all down here talking about problems that we're trying to solve. This tipping fee was implemented in 1987 and went to court. The court adjudicated the problem. They made the correct decisions, and now this money is split between the Department of Energy and Resources and the Department of Environmental Protection Agency for much needed environmental protection programs. Now, if we're going to let this tipping fee go back to 45¢, we are going to lose the substantial dollars that go to just about every county and community in the State of Illinois. Such as, where you live, Representative Parke. and where Representative Daniels lives and where I live and many other Representatives. It's really going to help our Yes, I understand why they're against it, communities. because it's going to cost them money."

Parke: "Well, I understand that, but, have we tried to work out some kind of a compromise on this? I mean, shouldn't we beat this and say 'no' and come up with a way of developing a compromise on this legislation that both parties can live with?"

Novak: "I feel that the need and the desire to maintain this tipping fee at the current level overrides the concern for some type of accommodation because the importance of our environmental...to solve our environmental problems, should be at the fore part of our concerns about governmental solutions to problems that we have caused in our society."

74th Legislative Day

June 27, 1991

Parke: "Thank you, Representative. To the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, and I am going to rise in opposition to this, and I think that we all appreciate the need for environmental and sound environment, and that we ought to work to that but, we also have to have the ability to operate and maintain jobs in this state with this legislation. So, I would ask the Body to defeat this and work on finding a compromise that everybody can live with; the business community, the local state and local governments, and the consumer who ultimately will foot the Bill. So, I would ask the Body to defeat this Bill."

Speaker Keane: "Representative McNamara."

McNamara: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in opposition to this Bill. One of the main things that we are doing is, is this is another case where we have automatically said, some years ago, that we would take off a fee off the tipping fee. We are now turning around to extend that up again. I think that this is a horrendous proposition. I think it deserves a defeat and send it back to the Conference Committee for some type of a conference that all parties can live with. I urge the defeat of this Bill."

Speaker Keane: "Representative Robert Olson."

Olson, R.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Representative yield?"

Speaker Keane: "He indicates he will."

Olson, R.: "Representative Novak. The state tipping fee of 60¢ was to go down the first of January."

Novak: "Correct."

Olson, R.: "The local fee, currently 45¢, was to go up the first of January. Does that still take effect?"

Novak: "Yes. It does not affect the local fee at all. As a matter of fact, Representative Olson, only about 16 counties utilize this local fee out of the entire state,

74th Legislative Day

June 27, 1991

and some of them aren't even at 45¢. They're lower than that."

Olson, R.: "Okay, to the Bill, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of the Gentleman's Motion. I have two landfills currently getting out-of-state waste. One of the issues involved that promotes the out-of-state waste coming in is that tipping fees in this state are a bargain. They are a bargain. They can spend around \$3,000 per semitruckload bringing out-of-state waste from New Jersey into our area and still make money on the deal. Our fees are not excessive. The producers of the waste should be the ones to be feed, or taxed, if you will, and I think this is a good Bill, a good concurrence Motion, and I support it."

Speaker Keane: "Representative Kulas."

Kulas: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I, reluctantly, rise to oppose the Gentleman's Motion for concurrence on Senate Amendment #1. This is a fact that money is needed for the different programs that we mandate on locals and so on. I agree, and I agree that that money is needed and we should keep the tipping fee at where it is right now. But, we should have put a cap on this fee or extended the surcharge for just a couple of years to see where these programs are going. What are we, as a state, going to do about the whole solid waste issue. This just gives carte blanche to the Department of Energy and Natural Resources and to the EPA to dole out money where they think it's politically fit, and I urgently oppose all my colleagues to vote against the concur."

Speaker Keane: "Question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate
Amendment #1 to House Bill 114?' All those in favor vote
'aye', all those opposed vote...oh, I'm sorry,
Representative Novak, you can explain your vote."

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

74th Legislative Day

June 27, 1991

House. Since this program has been in effect, the state has collected around \$28 million and \$19 million has been paid out to projects. The other balance is still in the Environmental Protection Agency to be used. But, I have a list here of all of the communities, all the programs that have been given recycling grants, the counties, local government, cities, villages, private industry, and we certainly need a little more green votes up there."

- Speaker Keane: "Representative Bugielski. One minute to explain your vote."
- Bugielski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Just to explain my 'no' vote that the City of Chicago is..."
- Speaker Keane: "Representative Bugielski, that may be overkill.

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

 Mulcahey votes 'aye'. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk,
 take the record. Representative Novak."
- Novak: "Mr. Speaker, I move..."
- Speaker Keane: "Representative Novak. Representative Novak...on
 this Bill there are 32 voting 'aye', 70 voting 'no', 7
 voting 'present', and the House does not concur in Senate
 Amendment...the House does not concur in...the Motion
 fails. The Motion fails. Thank you. House Bill 314.
 Representative Hartke."
- Hartke: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House.

 I move to concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 314.

 The Amendment makes a technical correction. It clarifies the Natural Area Gardens Bill, which passed here in the House. What the underlying Bill does, it names the Salt Water Conservation Districts to be the Natural Area Gardens Preservation Group in the State of Illinois. I would appreciate your support for this concurrence."
- Speaker Keane: "Question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate

 Amendment #1 to House Bill 314?' All in favor vote 'aye',

74th Legislative Day

June 27, 1991

all opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 112 voting 'aye', none voting 'no', none voting 'present', and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 314, and this Bill having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 477, Representative McAfee. Out of the record. House Bill 687, Representative Hicks. Out of the record. House Bill 742, Representative Granberg. Out of the record. Representative Steczo on 796. Representative Steczo."

Steczo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd move to concur with Senate Amendments #1 and #2 to House Bill 796. Senate Amendment #1 deletes the section of the Bill which allows park district boards to grant free lifetime privileges to the former members and deletes the section making technical changes. Amendment #2 deletes the language in the Bill that will mandate the Department of Public Works access, parking, landscaping, and maintain for the Veterans Memorial that would be planned for Rockcut State Park, and it also provides that Veterans Memorial... Vietnam Veterans Memorial plus be of an agreed design rather than simply the design of the Vietnam Veterans Honor Society. Mr. Speaker, I would move to concur in Senate Amendment's #1 and #2."

Speaker Keane: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment's #1 and #2 to House Bill 796?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 112 voting 'aye', none voting 'no', none voting 'present', and the House does concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 796, and this Bill having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House

74th Legislative Day

June 27, 1991

Bill 1818, Representative Kulas. 818. I'm sorry. 818, Representative Kulas."

- Kulas: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would move to concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 818. Senate Amendment #1 becomes the Bill and it adds a new section to the EPA Act which establishes that state air permits will be federally enforceable. This is to comply with the New Federal Clean Air Act Amendment, and I would move for passage of this Bill."
- Speaker Keane: "Question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 818?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill there are 115 voting 'aye', none voting 'no', none voting 'present', and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 818, and this Bill having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1207, Representative Hartke. 1207,; Representative Hartke."

Hartke: "I move to concur with Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 1207."

Speaker Keane: "You want to explain Amendments #1 and 2?"

Hartke: "Amendment #...Amendment #2 is the only Amendment."

Speaker Keane: "Do you want to check this and come back to it in a few minutes?"

Hartke: "Yes, I will."

- Speaker Keane: "Out οf the record. 1433, House Bill Representative Brunsvold. House Bill 1601, Representative John Dunn. Out of the record. House Bill 1695, Representative Richmond. 1695."
- Richmond: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move to concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1695. It changes the Bill by broadening the

74th Legislative Day

June 27, 1991

eligibility requirements to include farmers who have had \$40,000 in sales in any one of 5 preceeding years, instead of just in the last year, and who may have leased the land instead of just owning it. The Amendment also adds farm workers who have been laid off to those eligible for assistance and makes subsequent changes in language to accommodate the changes. I move the concurrence of Amendment #1."

Speaker Keane: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1695?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Representative Giglio in the Chair. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 113 voting 'aye', none voting 'no', 2 voting 'present', and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 in House Bill 1695, and this Bill having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Giglio in the Chair."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Dunn on 1601? Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Dunn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to concur with Senate
Amendment #1 to House Bill 1601. Actually, the Amendment
is really a technical Amendment, and I ask for a favorable
passage of this Bill."

Speaker Giglio: "Any discussion on the Gentleman's Motion?

Hearing none the question is, 'Shall the House concur in

Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1601?' All those in

favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open.

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

the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question, 112 voting

'yes', none voting 'no', and the House does concur in

Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1601, and this Bill

74th Legislative Day

June 27, 1991

having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Hartke on 1207."

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

Senate Amendment 1 and 2 of House Bill 1207, I move concurrence of these two Amendments. The original Bill of 1207 set forth the Soil Amendment Act, and as it left the House, we knew that there were going to be some various requirements, and so forth, set up for the Soil Amendments Labeling Act, and Amendment #2 establishes the inspection procedure for that Act."

Speaker Giglio: "Any discussion? Representative Ropp."

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

Speaker Giglio: "He indicates he will."

Ropp: "Can you give me a definition of what a soil amendment is?"

Hartke: "A soil amendment is something that is added to fertilizers or water or chemicals to do various things to enhance the ability of the soil to take up fertility. It is not a fertility replacement and that is why we want this labeling done on these soil additives. Something to make water wetter, for example, something like that."

Speaker Giglio: "Are there a lot of different amendments that are now being applied to our soils in Illinois?"

Hartke: "There are several companies that do add soil additives or soil amendments to enhance things, but it's not a fertilizer replacement. Therefore, what this Act does is require the labeling of what these amendments are."

Ropp: "Okay, but, isn't the idea of a soil amendment to have some kind of attempt for water holding capacity or attaching the, let's say, the chemicals or herbicides either to the seed or to the plant that we're trying to enhance? Isn't that one of the purposes?"

Hartke: "Yes, those could be, and what this does is set up the labeling affect, to let the farmer know that it is what it

74th Legislative Day

June 27, 1991

is. It's a truth..."

Ropp: "Thank you."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Wennlund. Representative Wennlund."

Wennlund: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield? Does either the original Bill itself or Senate Amendment 1 or Senate Amendment 2 name a State Soil?"

Wennlund: "How does the Illinois Farm Bureau feel about the amendments?"

Hartke: "The Illinois Farm Bureau, I think, is in support of
 this, I think as well as the Illinois Fertilizer and
 Chemical Association."

Wennlund: "Thank you."

Speaker Giglio: "Question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate
Amendment #1 to House Bill 1207?' 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?
Have all voted who wish? Representative Hartke."

Hartke: "I think in your explanation of the outcome, did you say

Amendment #1 and 2? I just heard you say Amendment #1."

Speaker Giglio: "He's correct. One and two."

Hartke: "Thank you."

Speaker Giglio: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 1207?' Take the record Mr. Clerk. On this question, there are 116 voting 'yes', none voting 'no', and the House does concur in Senate Amendments #1 and #2 to House Bill 1207, and this Bill having received the required Constitutional Majority, is declared passed. Representative Brunsvold on 1433? Out of the record. Representative Deuchler, 1750. Proceed."

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

74th Legislative Day

June 27, 1991

move to concur with Senate Amendment 1. This Amendment adds the authority for the Commerce Commission to require the utilities to promote the use of energy efficient lightbulbs and motors as part of the utilities required energy plan for its service territory. This Bill went over to the Senate on unanimous vote with one voting 'present'." Speaker Giglio: "Any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1750?' All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question, 113 voting 'yes', none voting 'no', and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1750, and this Bill having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Hicks, 1850? Representative Hicks in the chamber? Out of the record. Representative Kulas on 2250. Out of the record. Representative J. Hoffman, 2462. Proceed."

Hoffman, J.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 2462 amends the Environmental Protection Act to provide that in cases where a person is convicted of illegal dumping of waste on a person's own property, the Attorney General of the agency may require notice of that fact to be recorded on the title of the property. I ask that we concur with Senate Amendment #1 which indicates it would permit the hazardous waste fund to be used for blood tests performed within one year of effective date of the Act of a person who worked for one year or more in an industrial facility contaminated with polychlorinated biphenylis, PCB's."

Speaker Giglio: "Any discussion? Representative Wennlund."
Wennlund: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, thank you. Will the Sponsor yield?"

74th Legislative Day

June 27, 1991

Speaker Giglio: "He indicates he will."

Wennlund: "Has the Department of Public Health taken a position with respect to Senate Amendment #1?"

- Hoffman, J.: "I'm trying to remember if I talked to them. I'm not sure. If they did it's probably against...I don't want to say 'yes' or 'no', and they may have talked to me, but I can't recall. I told the Senator Sponsor that I would attempt to carry this Senate Amendment through the House and that's why I'm doing it."
- "Well, it's my understanding it's going to cost at Wennlund: least \$30,000 to do these tests because you're putting a burden on the Department of Public Health to perform blood screenings within one year of the effective date of Bill for anybody who worked for a year or more in an industrial facility that may have had PCB contamination. And what you're doing is, you're taking money out of the hazardous waste fund for other tests, and it's mу understanding that the Department of Public Health is opposed to these new tests, because you're going to take about \$30,000 out of the hazard waste fund that is needed for other tests. And in addition to that, do you know whether or not there are any new monies appropriated for the hazardous waste fund?"
- Hoffman, J.: "This isn't an appropriation, this just gives the authority. This is not an appropriation. If this were to be carried out, it's my understanding, in talking to the Senate Sponsor, he would have to get some type of appropriations specific for this. This is addressing an issue, and we're only talking about facilities that are on the national priority list, we're not talking about every facility."
- Wennlund: "Thank you. To the Amendments; as the result of this, and the depletion of the hazardous waste fund and the

74th Legislative Day

June 27, 1991

Illinois Manufacturer's Association and the Associated Employers of Illinois are both opposed to this legislation, and the Department of Public Health is concerned about raiding the Hazardous Waste Fund for the purpose of providing these new blood screening tests which they do not feel are necessary even though a person may have worked for a year or more in a building containing...or contamination by PCB's. So, the 'no' vote is a proper vote. It's not the year to be spending additional money."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Hoffman, to close."

- Hoffman, J.: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I
 think that we have had a thorough discussion of the Bill.
 I think that the Bill is very important. The Senate
 Amendment, will carry it for the Senator who carried my
 Bill in the Senate, and I ask for a favorable vote."
- Speaker Giglio: "Question is, 'Shall the House concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2462?' All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question, there are 67 voting 'yes', 44 voting 'no', and the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2462, and this Bill having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Currie, on House Bill 67. You want to call your Bill? 1850? On House Bill 687, Representative Hicks. Representative Hicks."
- Hicks: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would move to concur with Senate Amendment #1 and #2 to House Bill 687. Senate Amendment 1 is the clarifying Amendment that clarifies the intent of the Bill by adding language requiring that the financial institution be liable for costs and damages. Senate Amendment #2 adds

74th Legislative Day

June 27, 1991

that the Illinois Housing Development Authority as one of the financial institutions who would be available under this liability Bill."

Speaker Giglio: "Any discussion? Hearing none, the guestion is 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 and 2 to House Bill 687?' All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Parke. Representative Parke? Okay. Representative Mautino 'aye', Mr. Clerk. Have all voted Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question, there are 108 voting 'yes', none voting 'no', and the House does concur with Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House 687, and this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Hicks on 1850. House Bill 1850?"

Hicks: "I'm nonconcurring...nonconcur."

Speaker Giglio: "You want to nonconcur? The Gentleman moves to nonconcur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1850. All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. Motion carries. Alright, on the Order of Concurrence under Revenue and Banking...Revenue and Banking, we have Currie, Davis, Steczo, Churchill, Davis, Preston, Bugielski, Sieben, and Harris. Representative Currie. Representative Davis. Monique Davis on House Bill 342. Do you wish to proceed?"

Davis: "Yes. I wish to concur with the Senate Amendment."

Speaker Giglio: "Lady moves to concur with Senate Amendment to House Bill 342. Any discussion? Senate Amendments #1, 2, and 3."

Davis: "These are Amendments that help to make this legislation more amendable to the desires of the Department of Public Aid, and they are in agreement to all of them."

74th Legislative Day

June 27, 1991

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Wennlund."

Wennlund: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If I could have an explanation of the Amendments. Representative, could you tell us what these Amendments do?"

Davis: "Okay, Amendment #1 amends the Comptroller and State

Treasurers Act and the Department of Public Aid Code to
authorize the use of electronic fund transfer systems for
the direct deposits of Public Aid Financial and Food Stamp
Benefits, effective July 1, 1991. That's Amendment #1."

Wennlund: "Thank you, and Amendment #2?"

Davis: "Okay, we're getting Amendment #2."

Wennlund: "Oh, it does the same thing, or a similar thing with a..."

Davis: "Amendment #2, oh, it requires that electronic funds transfer, the purposes have to be conducted in compliance with the Electronic Fund Transfer Transmission Facilities Act."

Wennlund: "Thank you very..."

Davis: "And, it also requires the convenient density of distribution points so that the recipients will have adequate options to access benefits held in electronic transfer accounts."

Wennlund: "Thank you very much. To the Amendments, I want to compliment the Sponsor for finding an alternate way to provide help for those who have to cash public aid checks without incurring the expense of going through a private place where they can cash these checks and get a charge for it. I think it's an excellent idea, and it's my understanding the Department of Public Aid is on board and in favor of your Bill. I want to compliment you, because after all the hassle of trying to find another way to save money for public aid recipients, this is an excellent alternative and everybody should vote 'yes'."

74th Legislative Day

June 27, 1991

Speaker Giglio: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments #1, 2, and 3 to House Bill 342?' All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. On this question, there are 112 voting 'yes', none voting 'no', and the House does concur with Senate Amendments #1, 2, and 3 to House Bill 342, and this Bill having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Churchill, 1256. Representative Churchill? Out of the record. Representative Davis on 1615? Representative Davis? 1615? 1615."

Davis: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. We concur with Senate Amendment #1. It takes the required date of residency from the Persian Gulf out of the Bill to make it Consitutional. There was some question in reference to the constitutionality of only allowing those who had served certain dates to benefit from given a priority on those mortgages. So, we concur on Amendment #1."

Speaker Giglio: "Any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1615?' All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who Take...Representative Cowlishaw? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question, there are voting 'yes', none are voting 'no', and the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1615. this Bill having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Preston, House Bill 1912? Proceed."

74th Legislative Day

June 27, 1991

Preston: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move to concur in Senate Amendment #1. This Amendment has been agreed to by the community bankers in the Illinois Banking Association. It permits banks to go and offer banking services at nursing homes. What the Senate Amendment does is, it says that the banks that offer those services can't go out of the area where they are currently permitted by law to do branch banking. I know of no opposition to this good Bill. It helps nursing home residents."

Speaker Giglio: "Any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall the House concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1912?' All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Clerk. On this question, 111 voting 'yes', none voting 'no', and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1912, and this Bill having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Bugielski, House Bill 1982? Out record. Representative Sieben, House Bill 2106. Proceed."

Sieben: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would move to concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2106. Senate Amendment #1 makes a technical change by stating that, 'with respect to the sale of any uninsured Certificate of Deposit, every dealer shall notify the purchaser in writing of that lack of insurance.' And I would move to concur."

Speaker Giglio: "Any discussion? Hearing none, the question is,

'Shall the House concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House
Bill 2106?' All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed 'no'.

The voting's open. Have all voted who wish? Have all

voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record,

74th Legislative Day

June 27, 1991

Mr. Clerk. On this question, there are 115 voting 'yes', none voting 'no', and the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2106, and this Bill having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Currie? Out of the record. Representative Harris, 2562. Proceed."

Harris: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of move to concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2562. The underlying Bill allows for the establishment of additional ATM's, or automatic teller machines at community events like fairs, neighborhood events, or the State Fair. Due to some questions that were asked here in the House, we put a clarifying Amendment on in the Senate which is Senate Amendment #1 which has effect of doing two things: (1) It specifies that these ATM's are in addition to the already authorized ATM's that, (2) They can only be established during the time of the temporary event, such as the fair or the neighborhood festival. So, I ask your support of ... "

Speaker Giglio: "Any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall the House concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House All in favor vote 'aye', opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. Mr. Clerk. On this question, there are 103 voting 'yes', none voting 'no', and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2562 and this Bill having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2494. Representative Williams. Representative Paul Williams. Proceed."

Williams: "Yes, I'd like to move to concur on 2494 Amendment #1.

It was a technical Amendment to the Condo Act and Amendment
#1 provides that when the purchaser pays for common

74th Legislative Day

June 27, 1991

expense, it clears up the priority of liens in that particular situation. As far as I know, it's no opposition to the Amendment."

- Speaker Giglio: "Any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2494?' And on that question all in favor vote 'aye', The voting is open. This is final action. opposed 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question, there are 112 voting 'yes', none voting 'no', and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill this Bill having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Education. Representative LeFlore, Kulas, Homer, Ropp, Hannig, Mautino, Steczo, Richmond, J. Hoffman, Cowlishaw, John Dunn, Obrzut, Stern, Phelps, Daniels, Currie, and Education concurrence, and on that Order, Representative LeFlore. House Bill 94. Proceed, Sir."
- LeFlore: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 94, Amendment #1.

 Amendment #1 to House Bill 34 adds, 'the Board of Higher

 Education shall monitor the budget and evaluate programs to
 improve human relation at public institution of higher
 learning. Each institution shall forward to the local
 state's attorney any report received by campus security or
 universally alleged commission of hate crimes. I will ask
 for a favorable vote on the concurrence."
- Speaker Giglio: "Any discussion? Hearing none, the question is,

 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House
 Bill 94?' All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote
 'no'. The voting is open. Representative Black."
- Black: "I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker. Maybe he could nod his head. I think, in this Amendment, it deleted all the requirements from each university to add course work in this, did it

74th Legislative Day

June 27, 1991

not?"

LeFlore: "You're right, Representative."

Black: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Giglio: "Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question, there are 106 voting 'yes', 5 voting 'no', and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 94, and this Bill having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Kulas on House Bill 97. Proceed, Sir."

Kulas: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would move to concur with Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 97. House Bill 97 was the Bill which would require all schools to use recycled paper products by the year of '93. Senate Amendment #1 just clarifies the fact that only when economically and practically and feasible, the school board shall determine to purchase recycled paper, and Senate Amendment #2, by Senator Karpiel, also clarifies the intent of this legislation that school districts have the primary responsibility to carry out the recycled paper products program. And I would move for concurrence."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Black."

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

Speaker Giglio: "He indicates he will."

Black: "Representative, in the underlying Bill, the phrase,
 'whenever the Board determines it is feasible to do so.'

For purposes of your intent, does that makes this
 legislation permissive? If the board determines it isn't
 feasible to do so, would they then not...would they be 'off
 the hook' so to speak, or not get in trouble cause they
 didn't do this?"

74th Legislative Day

June 27, 1991

- Kulas: "That's correct. If the board decides that it's economically or practically infeasible, it wouldn't have to comply. But, at the same time, they would have to answer to the voters in their districts."
- Black: "Okay, so, basically it's a permissive action that the board can take, but if their citizenry doesn't like that then they certainly can go and fuss with them a little bit.

 Alright. Thank you."
- Speaker Giglio: "Further discussion? Representative Ewing."
- Ewing: "Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Sponsor would yield?"
- Speaker Giglio: "He indicates he will."
- Ewing: "I don't think I heard for sure, but are we mandating this on the schools, that they have to use these recycled papers?"
- Kulas: "We're saying that beginning in July 1, 1993, we'd require all paper or paper products that are purchased or used by any school board, public school or attendance center, or sold in any school supply store within such schools would have to contain recycled materials. Yes. Again, in the Amendment, we clarify, 'that the school board determines if it's economically feasible and practical. If it's not economically feasible and practical, then they do not have to comply."
- Ewing: "Well, I'm sure that that's a laudible goal, to use recycled paper, but I question whether this isn't a mandate and one that is going to cost the schools additional administrative problems as well as expense, and I'm not sure that that's what we ought to be doing right now, Representative."
- Kulas: "All the school boards signed off on this legislation, so, I would move for concurrence, Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker Giglio: "Question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate

 Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 97?' All those in favor

74th Legislative Day

June 27, 1991

vote 'aye', opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question, there are 110 voting 'yes' and 1 voting 'no', and the House does concur with Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 97, and this Bill having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Homer; House Bill 104. Representative Homer on House Bill 104."

- Homer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move that we nonconcur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2."
- Speaker Giglio: "The Gentlemen moves to nonconcur in Senate Amendments 2 (sic 1). Any discussion? All in favor say 'aye'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the House nonconcurs with Senate Amendments #1 and #2 to House Bill 104. Representative Homer."
- Homer: "I think the board was wrong and therefore, my Motion was wrong. There was only one Senate Amendment. It was Senate Amendment #1. So, my Motion...let me verify that with the Clerk. Is that not correct? That is correct, now, Mr. Speaker. So, let me if I may, now, there's only one Senate Amendment. My Motion is to nonconcur in Senate Amendment #1."
- Speaker Giglio: "You heard the Gentleman's Motion. He wants to nonconcur with the Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 104.

 Any discussion? Hearing none, all those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The motion carries. The House nonconcurs with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 104. Representative Ropp. House Bill 240. Proceed."
- Ropp: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 240 has an Amendment #1 by the Senate which requires the Illinois Commission on

74th Legislative Day

June 27. 1991

Intergovernmental Cooperation to report annually on the advisability of the continued participation of the Midwest Higher Education Compact which is the basic subject matter of the Bill. I move for its concurrence."

- Speaker Giglio: "Any discussion on the Gentleman's Motion?

 Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall the House concur with

 Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 240?' All in favor vote
 'aye', opposed 'no'. The voting's open. Have all voted

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

 wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question, there

 are 111 voting 'yes', none voting 'no', and the House does

 concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 240, and this

 Bill having received the required Constitutional Majority,
 is hereby declared passed. Representative Hannig on House

 Bill 266. Are you ready, Sir? Proceed."
- Hannig: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. It's the present practice of the State Board of Education to conduct annual salary and benefit surveys for certified educational support people. What the underlying Bill did was, it codified this requirement and put it into law, that the state board would collect this data, and we passed that over, obviously, to the Senate. And all the Senate Amendment does is move the reporting date from February 1, to April 30. So, I would move that we concur in Senate Amendment #1 on House Bill 266."
- Speaker Giglio: "Any discussion? The Lady from DuPage,
 Representative Cowlishaw."
- Cowlishaw: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise very reluctantly to oppose this Motion. House Bill 266, first of all, the information that is called for in this Bill to be compiled by the State Board of Education is already available at local school districts throughout the state, and any information that is

74th Legislative Day

June 27, 1991

desired to be acquired, to be put together in some kind of report form, any organization including employee organizations can go out and get that information for themselves. What this Bill does is require the State Board of Education, at taxpayer expense, to accumulate the information that employee organizations want to have for their own purposes. That is not a good use of taxpayer dollars, and this is not a good Bill, amended or otherwise, and I stand in opposition to this Motion."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Wennlund."

Wennlund: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in support of the Amendment. I think it's important that public school districts who live and survive on local taxpayers money and on the people of Illinois' tax money should publish those lists of salaries and benefits so the teachers throughout Illinois can know exactly where they stand. It's a good Amendment, a good basic Bill and it deserves an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Satterthwaite."

Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House this, again, appears to be a Bill that only deals with the needs of people who are worried about collective bargaining, and while I suppose that collecting this information at the local level would not be a major problem, it does seem to me that it is increasing the responsibilities of the State Board of Education to have to have them compile it and make it available to people who are interested in looking over those surveys. Is there any kind of projection of cost to the State of Illinois for the implementation of this Bill? Representative Hannig."

Hannig: "Yes, thank you, Representative. We had the Bill in committee and the State Board had no problem with it. They said that basically, they already do this and that it would

74th Legislative Day

June 27, 1991

cost...I couldn't see where it would cost any additional moneys for them to simply make this available to anyone who had this desire to see this information."

- Satterthwaite: "They currently do this at the state level for both certified and noncertified personnel?"
- Hannig: "They do it for the certified, Representative. I suppose that it would require them to put an additional page on the request that they send to these schools. The idea though is that, obviously, this is something they do of their own initiative, and they could just quit doing it if they so chose. By putting in law, I think that we make sure that whoever is the superintendent, in years to come, continue what is a good policy."
- Satterthwaite: "If they're already collecting this, then why does the Bill call for the development of a survey form that will be furnished to each school district? It would seem to me that that survey form would already be in existence."
- Hannig: "Apparently, it is in existence for the certified personnel. It would add the support personnel but, as I said, that that is not obviously a big problem. It may just simply be the way the Bill is written, Representative. I don't think that we're creating anything that was a problem. Dave Carey was in committee. He said there was really no problem on the Bill. He didn't testify against it, and we really passed this thing 91 to 6 earlier, so I don't know why there's this big debate on it today."
- Satterthwaite: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, as you recognize, sometimes we don't have sufficient time to fully explore all of the pieces of legislation before us, and I would simply suggest to Members that they may want to be careful on this vote because it does appear to be making an additional mandate on the State Board of Education for collecting information and then, the responsibility for

74th Legislative Day

June 27, 1991

distributing that to anyone who wants to have it. With that, I would simply say, be cautious of your vote."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Ropp."

Ropp: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would just propose a scenario as we all have been faced throughout this Session that, well, Illinois ranks so-and-so in terms of national ranking in support of education. I don't see that this particular Bill will really add to the support of education at all. What it will do, ultimately, is to say to some 'okay, we rank 15th hundreth out of the school districts in the State of Illinois and, therefore, we need to get more money' when, in fact, they may but certain districts because of limited resources may not be position to add to the salaries as some would so desire. So, it would seem to me like what is best is to allow the local school boards to make those decisions based on the negotiating contracts they have with the available resources and with the kinds of talents they have within that school system. It seems to me like this is a program, if it already is in place, certainly does not need to added to, and is one that would begin to place priorities. status, and strata of employees who are in the teaching field where you can have one area compete against another and is certainly subject to potential strikes, we're at the bottom of a list and we need more and in fact, we may be imposing this on school districts when frankly, they may not have the dollars to implement what some people want, and I urge a very strong consideration if you vote on this, as to the potential implication that will arise from it."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Hannig, to close."

Hannig: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. First of all, as I already said, the state board collects

74th Legislative Day

June 27, 1991

most of this data already on their own. They have no objections to doing this, in fact, I don't believe that they felt it would cost them any additional money. does, is simply collects this data so that we can put all the school districts, indeed, on a level playing field. That, when someone comes to me and says, 'why do the teachers in a neighboring district do this or that, or why are they paid like that, or why is someone given these benefits', then we can look and have a fair and impartial person to determine exactly what are the benefits from these other districts. So, that way we don't have a strike in one school district because of a mistaken idea that the folks in the next district are getting paid more money than them when, indeed they are not. They can simply go to the book and look and see what everything is. Quite frankly, in my opinion, it adds more light to the subject of government and running the school districts. It provides more information. It provides more knowledge. I don't see why it's so controversial. And In fact, this is simply a concurrence that the state board asked us to change this date on and that's the only reason this Bill has to come back, and I would ask all Members simply to...all 91 of you who voted for this Bill last time to join me in supporting it and sending it on to the Governor. So, I ask for your 'yes' vote."

- Speaker Giglio: "Question is, 'Shall the House concur with Senate
 Amendment #1 to House Bill 266?' And on that question, all
 in favor vote 'aye', opposed 'no'. The voting is open.
 Representative Robert Olson, one minute to explain your
 vote."
- Olson, R.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is a neutral Amendment.

 It practically does nothing, but it's an Amendment on a bad

 Bill, and I would like to see a message up there in red

74th Legislative Day

June 27, 1991

votes that this is just bad, unneeded legislation."

Speaker Giglio: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question, there are 48 voting 'yes', 35 voting 'no', and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 266, and this Bill having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1587, Representative Lou Jones. Lou Jones, on House Bill 1587? Proceed."

Jones: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I move to concur on Amendment #1 and 2 of House Bill 1587. Amendment #1 changes how the three tenants on the Housing Commission Board will be selected. Originally, my Bill said they would be elected but because of the funds and the cost of an election, it was changed, they would be selected by the Mayor. He would select three of the seven member board. Amendment #2 merely changes the Bill to Chicago only, and I ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Giglio: "Any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 1587?' All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. this question, there are 105 voting 'yes'...Representative Balanoff votes 'no'. On this question, there are 105 voting 'yes', 6 voting 'no', and the House does concur with Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 1587, and this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Frederick. Representative Frederick in the chamber? House Bill 1254. Proceed."

Frederick: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I move that the House nonconcur with Senate Amendments 1 and 2 on

74th Legislative Day

June 27, 1991

House Bill 1254."

- Speaker Giglio: "You heard the Lady's Motion. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the House nonconcurs with Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 1254.

 Representative Jones, Lou Jones. House Bill 2118?

 Proceed."
- Jones: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I move to concur on Senate Bill (sic-Amendment) #2 of House Bill 2118. That was a Amendment, Agreed Amendment between the bankers, the Sponsor, and myself that did not get put on in the House, and I agreed that when it went to the Senate they would put the Amendment on it. It's an Agreed Amendment, There's no problem with it, and I ask for a favorable vote."
- Speaker Giglio: "Any discussion on the Lady's Motion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall the House concur with Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 2118?' All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed 'no'. The voting's open. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. question, there are 105 voting 'yes', none voting 'no', and the House does concur with Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 2118, and this Bill having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Ropp. Representative Gordie Ropp on 455, House Bill 455. Proceed, Sir."
- Ropp: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Amendment 1 adds the word 'certified' to all secondary school teachers to make them all eligible for the summer employment programs, and I move to concur with Senate Amendment #1."
- Speaker Giglio: "Any discussion? Question is, 'Shall the House concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 455?' All

74th Legislative Day

June 27, 1991

those in favor vote 'aye', opposed 'no'. The voting's open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question, there are 113 voting 'yes' and none voting 'no', and the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 455, and this Bill having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Mautino. Representative Mautino in the chamber? Out of the record. Representative Steczo, 599. Proceed."

Steczo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move that we concur with Senate Amendments 1, 2, 3, and 4 to House Bill 599. The Bill deals with school district consolidation, and the 4 Amendments are clarifying Amendments that deal with the proposition of electing new school board members in cases where there are consolidations. On those consolidation ballots, to authorize separate ballots which indicate the issuance of bonds, and lastly deals with the terms for those candidates for school board on those ballots. I... Mr. Speaker, would move that we concur with Senate Amendments 1, 2, 3, and #4."

Speaker Giglio: "Any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall the House concur with Senate Amendments #1, 2, 3, and 4 to House Bill 599?' And on that, all those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. is final action. Representative Marinaro 'aye'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question who wish? 111 voting 'yes', none voting 'no', and the House does concur in Senate Amendments #1, 2, 3, and 4 to House Bill 599. This Bill having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Mautino, 525. Proceed, Sir. Representative Mautino."

74th Legislative Day

June 27, 1991

- Mautino: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move to concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 525. The Amendments include the Educational Service Centers as recipients of DCCA Grants Telecommunication Systems to provide distance learning services. And Senate Amendment #2 provides that the communication systems that provide distance learning be obtained through DCMS rather than DCCA and that was the agreement between the two departments. Specifically, that is the Bill. It allows for telecommunications distance learnings, and I move for concurrence on Senate Amendments 1 and 2 on House Bill 525."
- Speaker Giglio: "Any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 House Bill 525?' All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed 'no'. The voting's open. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question, there are 114 voting 'yes', none voting 'no', and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 525, this Bill having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Richmond, House Bill 734. Bruce Richmond? House Bill 734. Proceed."
- Richmond: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move to concur with the...Amendment #1 to House Bill 734."
- Speaker Giglio: "Any discussion on the Gentleman's Motion?

 Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in

 Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 734?' All those in favor

 vote 'aye', opposed 'no'. The voting's open. This is

 final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who

 wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. Mr.

74th Legislative Day

June 27, 1991

Clerk. On this question, there are 113 voting 'yes', none voting 'no', and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 734, and this Bill having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative J. Hoffman, House Bill 816. Proceed."

Hoffman, J.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 816 is a Bill that would pay difference in salary between a reservist who went to the Persian Gulf and worked as a teacher or in an educational institution or as municipal employee, the difference in what they made when they went to the Persian Gulf and what they would've made. I think it's a fair Bill for the veteran's that served us so well in the Persian Gulf. Senate Amendment essentially limits the Bill in that it says that any unit of local government has more than 20% of its employees called up for active duty that, then these provisions wouldn't apply. Ι ask for favorable consideration and concurrence."

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

Representative Cowlishaw."

Cowlishaw: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield for a quick question?"

Speaker Giglio: "He indicates he will."

Cowlishaw: "Thank you very much. Representative Hoffman, I would just like to get an understanding on the record as to the legislative intent because of a certain amount of confusion with the language. So, if you could just respond to this question, I would really appreciate it. This Bill provides that if an individual is called to active duty as a result of an order of the President, he shall continue to receive the same compensation that was being received before, for the duration of his active military service. Those are the

74th Legislative Day

June 27, 1991

words in the legislation. What happens if an individual is called to duty by order of the President and then decides to remain on active duty for another 20 or 30 years? I assume that your intent is that this Bill should apply only to that period for the duration of the emergency that led to the person being called to active duty. Now, is that the correct interpretation of this Bill?"

Hoffman, J.: "That's exactly correct."

Cowlishaw: "Very good. Thank you very much."

Speaker Giglio: "Further discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1...excuse me, Representative Weaver?"

Weaver: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I've got a brief question of the Sponsor. The effects of Senate Amendment #1. If you can explain those to me. As I understand it, it says that if 20% or more of the employees of that local unit of government, or school, are called away then, this doesn't apply?"

Hoffman, J.: "I don't know. Not to schools, local governments."

Weaver: "Does this mean that if 25% of the workers at our

Weaver: "Does this mean that if 25% of the workers at our municipal garage are called to active duty, they don't get the benefits?"

Hoffman: "That's my understanding."

Weaver: "Why would we wanna do that? Why would we give them the benefit if there's less than 20%, and if there's more than 20%, take everything away from them?"

Hoffman: "Well, I think the Senate sponsor had a concern about the drastic impact it could have on some units of local government. In their ability to maintain services, and could possibly hurt their budget. You know, if you have a police force, or you have five employees, and what happens is all five of them go and you're a small town, I think that was the Senate Sponsor's problem with it. It's my

74th Legislative Day

June 27, 1991

understanding that AFSCME does not object to that."

- Weaver: "Well, Mr. Speaker, to the Motion. I think either we're in favor of helping the veterans or we're not. Whether there's 20% of them going or 25% or 30% going, I think they all ought to get the same benefits. For that reason, I would advise a 'no' vote, particularly on Senate Amendment #1, but on the concurrence Motion."
- Speaker Giglio: "Representative Hoffman, to Close.

 Representative Hoffman, to close."
- Hoffman, J.: "Well, I think this is a good Bill. It shows that we care about the people who went and fought for us in the Persian Gulf. You know, many of these people had a hard time when they went, financially, with their families, leaving them behind, they're leaving their job and they're called up to reserve duty. I ask that we adopt the Senate Amendment, although it's not a perfect world, I think it is to address the concerns of some units of local government. I, personally, like my original Bill, however, that's not what we're looking at today. I ask that you concur..."
- Speaker Giglio: "Question is, 'Shall the House concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 816?' And all those in favor will vote 'aye', opposed 'no'. The voting's open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question, there are 93 voting 'yes' and 11 voting 'no', and the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 816, and this Bill having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Ladies and Gentlemen, I would like to welcome to Springfield the this area, Representative Durbin. Congressman from Representative Durbin in the center aisle next to Zeke Giorgi. Give him a nice hand. Congressman Durbin. Supplemental Calendar announcements. Mr. Clerk."

74th Legislative Day

June 27, 1991

Clerk O'Brien: "Supplemental Calendar #1 is being distributed."

Speaker Giglio: "Another guest here in the chamber talking to
Representative Marinaro, is former Representative Woody
Bowman, Financial Director, now, of the biggest county of
the State, County of Cook. Welcome back, Woods. You're
not lobbying, are you? Oh, okay. Representative Cowlishaw
on House Bill 844? Proceed."

Cowlishaw: "Thank you[.] very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move to concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 844. The underlying Bill simply calls for an annual report from the State Board of Education to the General Assembly as to the approximate cost the curricular mandates and οf any curricular requirements that have been added since the prior year. The effect of the Senate Amendment, which was suggested by Senator Berman, and I think was an excellent suggestion, is that there should be a way to distinguish between those requirements that are established by the Federal Government and those that are established by the State Government and, therefore, I rise to make the Motion to concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 844."

Speaker Giglio: "Any discussion? You heard the Lady's Motion. those...The question is. 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 844?' And on that question, all those in favor vote 'aye', opposed, 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question, 112 voting 'yes', none voting 'no', and the House does concur in Amendment #1 to House Bill 844, and this Bill, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Steczo. House Bill 885. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Steczo. Proceed." Steczo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House.

74th Legislative Day

June 27, 1991

move to concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 885. House Bill 885 is the School Improvement and Educational Accountability Act. The Senate added one Amendment made a number of changes, which answered a lot of the problems that had arisen when this Bill was before House. Among the things that the Senate did...was to change language to allow...to reward schools, as well as to just recognize schools, to strengthen the authority to establish an academic watch list, to permit the Chicago Board of Education to submit school improvement plans required by law for the purposes of revised school improvement plans. This Bill...this Amendment clarifies that a school improvement panel will be appointed for each school on the watch list. It deletes the possibility for a district-wide school improvement panel for Chicago, and clarifies that a school improvement panel for Chicago...for a school must include representation from both the school's school council and the subdistrict council. It local limits waivers to programatic issues and permits the State Board of Education to identify applicable issues by rule and requires that districts and independent authorities notify collective bargaining agents...of educators about the various waivers, and it permits those agents to attend those meetings. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I believe, that this Amendment was worked out in detail with all the participants, and, I believe, there is little or no opposition. I would answer any questions, if not, would ask for your 'yes' votes in the concurrence Motion."

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

Cowlishaw: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I stand in strong support of Representative Steczo's Motion to concur in the Senate

74th Legislative Day

June 27, 1991

Amendments for House Bill 885, which may indeed be one of the most important, if not the most important, education initiative that we will have adopted for, at least, last three years and, perhaps, three years into the future, but I have been asked, as one of the Sponsors of this Bill, to please read into the record a statement so that there might not be any confusion later about the intent contained in the language in Senate Bill...Senate Amendment #1: therefore, if I 'The requirement that a school may: district notify the exclusive bargaining representative of its intent to seek a waiver will have no effect on the bargaining status of any subject matter, because bargaining status is exclusively determined by the Illinois Educational Relations Board Act.' The notice Labor requirement is simply that, a notice requirement. It will allow the exclusive bargaining representative to be informed and to attend meetings during which a proposed waiver will be discussed. The notification provision does not require the school district or the State Board of Education to receive input from or confer with that exclusive representative. The negotiation is between the school district and the State Board of Education, while the bargaining agent is no more than an observer; and, with that understanding, I stand in strong support of House Bill 885, as amended."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Curran."

Curran: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of legislative intent, I wish to ask a couple of questions of the Sponsor. Will the Sponsor yield for those questions?

Mr. Speaker?"

Steczo: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'll yield."

Speaker Giglio: "Further discussion?"

Curran: "Yes, there is further discussion. I was... I was very

74th Legislative Day

June 27, 1991

glad to see that the Senate included...included provisions for the participation of the exclusive bargaining agents in House Bill 885, as it returned from the Senate. entire regulatory Bill certainly will best function with the cooperation and, in fact, cannot function well without the cooperation of the involved parties. Bargaining on all significant issues is the best way to proceed. Let me call your attention to what the Senate added to House Bill and I quote: 'The school district or independent authority notify, in writing, the affected exclusive bargaining...the affected exclusive collective bargaining agent of the districts or authorities intent to seek approval of a waiver and of any meetings to be held with educators to discuss the waiver. The affected exclusive collective bargaining agents shall be allowed to attend such meetings.' I have concluded, with the insertion of this language, that the bargaining rights of the exclusive bargaining units are in no way impaired by this Act and, in fact, the bargaining unit is encouraged to bargain these items as desired. Is that true, Mr. Sponsor?"

- Steczo: "Representative Curran, absolutely your interpretation is correct."
- Curran: "And, Representative Steczo, if a local teacher or school employee exclusive bargaining unit seeks to bargain items within the waivers, they can certainly make the appropriate claims according to the Illinois Education Labor Relations Act. Is that correct?"
- Steczo: "Again, Representative Curran, your interpretation is most definitely correct."
- Curran: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. No further questions."
- Speaker Giglio: "Further discussion? Representative Davis."
- Davis: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. For the purpose of clarity,

 Representative Steczo, on Amendment #4, there are some

74th Legislative Day

June 27, 1991

provisions in which Chicago have been excluded. Would you explain those, please? Amendment #4 excludes Chicago from certain provisions. Which provisions are they?"

Steczo: "Representative, there is no Amendment #4, but, I believe, that you are speaking of the...the way the Bill permits the Chicago Board of Education to submit its own school improvement plans for the purposes of the revised school improvement plan, and, I believe that, perhaps, is one of those. I believe, too, that...in terms of the...deletion of the possibility for a district—wide school improvement panel for Chicago, and the improvement panels are for each school, rather than for the district. I believe, those may be what you're speaking of."

Davis: "And they will, also, be invited to certain meetings, I understand that..."

Steczo: "That is correct. That's what we just discussed."

Davis: "Under those circumstances, I would like to say that I think it's an excellent piece of legislation, and we do need greater regulations from a body, whose duty it is to help improve the schools in the State of Illinois. I commend you for this piece of legislation, and I do support you."

Speaker Giglio: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 885?' And, on that question, all those in favor vote 'aye', opposed, 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question, there are 116...113 voting 'yes' and 1 voting 'no', and the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 885, and this Bill, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative John Dunn on House Bill 1014. Representative Dunn. We'll come back when he comes down from the balcony. Representative Obrzut on

74th Legislative Day

June 27, 1991

House Bill 1024. Jeffrey Obrzut. Representative Obrzut. Representative Steczo. Representative Steczo. Representative...Helen, would you ask Representative Obrzut if he wants to call his Bill? Take it out of the record. Representative Stern on House Bill 1752. Representative Stern in the chamber? Alright, Representative Stern, we'll do yours, and then we'll go back to John Dunn. House Bill 1752. Proceed."

Stern: "Mr. Speaker, I move to concur in the Senate Amendment #1 on House Bill 1752. Seventeen fifty—two dealt with a particular local situation which involves the proposed merging of three school districts in Highland Park, and Senate Amendment #1 deletes language which would require them to use only one of the particular three tax rates listed, so that now they can select their rates from the myriad options that present themselves. I ask your 'aye' vote on the concurrence Motion."

Speaker Giglio: "The question is...any discussion on the Lady's Motion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1752?' those in favor vote 'aye', opposed, 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. this question, there are 106 voting 'yes', 4 voting 'no'...Representative Daniels, 'aye'. Representative Kubik, 'aye'. On this question, there are 107 4 voting 'no'. Representative Morrow. Representative Weaver. Representative Weaver, do you wish to speak, George, Representative Weaver?"

Weaver: "Yes, thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Just to explain my vote. If I read our analysis correctly, this removes the limit of the maximum tax rate that can be listed for education. So, potentially it provides for a

- 74th Legislative Day June 27, 1991 non-referendum tax increase without notification."
- Speaker Giglio: "Representative Hultgren votes 'no'.

 Representative Cronin votes 'no', Mr. Clerk.

 Representative Black."
- Black: "I was just going to explain my vote, but Representative Weaver pretty much did it. It's a pretty good Bill, except with the Senate Amendment #1 that simply removes the limit on a maximum tax rate, so forth and so forth and so forth. This one may need a little...a little more thought."
- Speaker Giglio: "The...the voting is still open. You can change your...change your switches. The voting is still open.

 All those that wanna change...if you wanna change, please do so. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Stern."
- Stern: "I turned my back for a minute. It was all green. What happened?"
- Speaker Giglio: "Somebody...somebody made a...somebody made a couple of statements. So, while you were talking Representative Black and Representative Weaver..."
- Stern: "And it's not a tax increase. May I hear what the question was? I thought it was all done. I'm sorry. I didn't mean to..."
- Speaker Giglio: "Representative...Representative, maybe...ask

 Representative Black if he'd like to repeat what he said.

 Maybe, he'd be kind enough to."
- Stern: "Im' sorry, Representative Black. I didn't mean to disregard your question. I didn't hear it. I thought it was..."
- Speaker Giglio: "What was your question?"
- Black: "I'm sorry. I wasn't recognized in time to even ask you a question, and I know you wouldn't ignore anyone on this floor, Representative. It's...Senate Amendment #1, according to our analysis, says it removes the limit on the

74th Legislative Day

June 27, 1991

maximum tax rate that can be listed for education and for operation and maintenance purposes in the petition to form a combination school district, and I think, given that explanation, many of us feel like that then becomes an open—ended tax rate."

Stern: "May I explain what the situation is and what this Amendment does, in my view?"

Black: "I would welcome your explanation."

Stern: "...In fact, this is a situation in which three districts would merge, and my understanding of the way the law read, prior to this Amendment, was that in the case of such a, what is the word, consolidation they were obliged to use the lowest of the three tax rates of the consolidating districts. The removal...adding this Amendment would, in my understanding, simply remove that obligation and say that they could use any one of the up to the maximum, does not, in fact, remove the maximum on the whole tax rate issue, simply does not require them to use the minimum tax rate, which is what they would have had to do prior to this Amendment."

Speaker Giglio: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question, there are 40 voting 'yes' and 56 voting 'no', and the Motion fails. Representative John Dunn, House Bill 1014. Representative Dunn. Proceed."

Dunn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker...thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move to concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill...House Bill 1014. What this Amendment does is it...it moves the effective date back to January 1, 1994. This puts this Bill out in the future. It's a low cost Bill for inventors and residents, and I ask for your...concurrence in this Motion."

Speaker Giglio: "Any...any discussion? Hearing none, the

74th Legislative Day

June 27, 1991

question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1014?' All those in favor vote opposed, 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this guestion, there are 79 voting 'yes', 31 voting 'no', 2 voting 'present', and the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill Bill, having received the required 1014, and this Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared Representative Steczo, on House Bill 1815. Steczo. Representative Steczo. Out of the record. Representative Phelps, House Bill 1891. Proceed."

Phelps: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of House. I move to concur with Senate Bill 1 to House Bill 1891. It...Amendment #1 clarifies Representative Santiago's Amendment that a full-time teacher in the Chicago public schools who has taught at the same school for two consecutive years and has received a satisfactory evaluation shall be awarded a permanent full-time teaching assignment, if a vacancy exists for which the person is qualified, and then I move to nonconcur with Senate Bill 2, which provides the circumstances under which asbestos or asbestos containing material is to be removed. Appreciate your support."

Speaker Giglio: "The Chair would like to ask the Gentleman, you...you move to concur with Senate Amendment #1 and nonconcur with Senate Amendment #2?"

Phelps: "Yes, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Giglio: "Alright, the question now is, 'Shall the House concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House...House Bill 1891?' And, on that question, the Gentleman from Winnebago, Representative Mulcahey."

Mulcahey: "Question of the Sponsor, Mr. Speaker."

74th Legislative Day

June 27, 1991

Speaker Giglio: "Proceed."

Mulcahey: "Representative Phelps, isn't...Amendment #2 identical to a House Bill that failed in the..."

Phelps: "I can't hear, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Giglio: "He's going to nonconcur with Senate Amendment #2. He wants to concur..."

Mulcahey: "But that's the one. That's #2, is that correct?"

Phelps: "I'm going to concur with one, Dick, and nonconcur with two, but we're talking about one right now."

Mulcahey: "Okay, but what I'm saying right now is...is Senate

Amendment #2 the same as...as Senate Bill 946?"

Phelps: "Nine forty-six. Yes, Dick, it is."

Mulcahey: "Okay, alright, got it, thanks."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Cowlishaw."

Cowlishaw: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies...would the Sponsor yield for a quick question?"

Speaker Giglio: "Indicates he will."

Cowlishaw: "Representative Phelps, at first you wanted to concur in both Amendments and then you changed your mind, apparently, and decided to only concur in Amendment #1."

Phelps: "No, I haven't changed my mind, Representative Cowlishaw.

I concur with one, nonconcur with two. That's what I've always said."

Speaker Giglio: "He wants to divide the question, Representative Cowlishaw."

Cowlishaw: "I see, alright, I think he had just changed his mind in the middle there."

Speaker Giglio: "We're on Amendment #1."

Cowlishaw: "Thank you."

Speaker Giglio: "So, the question is, 'Shall the House concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1891?' And on that, all those in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed, 'no'.

The voting is open. This is final action. Have all voted

74th Legislative Day

me."

June 27, 1991

who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question, there are 90 voting 'yes' and 17 voting 'no', and the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1891. Now, the Gentleman moves to nonconcur with Senate Amendment #2. Any discussion? Hearing none, all those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed, 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the House nonconcurs with Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 1891. Representative Cowlishaw, on House Bill 2012. Cowlishaw. Proceed."

"Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 2012 simply requires districts school to consider...to consider supported employment as part of existing transition planning for special education students who are 16 years of age and over. The Senate Amendment, in which I rise to move to concur, limits that transition planning to those eliqible children when the individual education plan determines that to be a part of the need. It modifies the Illinois State Board οf Education's mandate consultation with others in developing plans for supported employment programs to programs such as the one called Project Choices, which is not to be confused with Project Choice, but rather has to do with job training and supported employment for people with developmental disabilities. That is all that the Senate Amendment does and...and, basically, all that the Bill does, and I rise in strong support of this Bill as amended and ask my colleagues to concur in Senate Amendment #1."

Speaker Giglio: "Further discussion? Representative Hannig."
Hannig: "Yes, will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Giglio: "Indicates he will...indicates she will, excu

74th Legislative Day

- June 27, 1991
- Hannig: "When I look on the Fiscal Mandates Note, it said that the costs could be as high as \$72 million. Would the state pay that or would the local governments have to do that, the school...school boards?"
- Cowlishaw: "There is no mandate involved in this Bill,
 Representative Hannig. I think, perhaps, that might have
 been a...a man...or a fiscal note that was filed prior to
 the fact that this Bill no longer requires schools to do
 this, it requires them to consider doing this."
- Hannig: "Okay, so the Amendments, basically, would nullify the state...or the cost. Thank you."
- Cowlishaw: "They're not required to do anything by this Bill,

 Representative, but we ask them to consider supported

 employment as a element in the program that they plan for

 16-year-olds..."
- Hannig: "Why, then, do we need a Bill if we're not really doing anything?"
- Cowlishaw: "Well, apparently, from what the Chief Sponsor,
 Representative Daniels, has told me, and he is kind of a
 expert in this field, apparently, from what he has told me,
 there are some school districts that have given very
 little, if any, attention to the supported employment
 factor in making these kinds of plans for developmentally
 disabled young people."

Hannig: "Thank you."

Cowlishaw: "You're welcome."

- Speaker Giglio: "Further discussion? Representative Cowlishaw, to close."
- Cowlishaw: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I move to concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2012."
- Speaker Giglio: "You heard the Lady's Motion. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed, 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?

74th Legislative Day

June 27, 1991

Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question, there are 112 voting 'yes', none voting 'no', and the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2012, and this Bill, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared Representative Currie. Out of the record. Representative McNamara. Representative McNamara. Representative Balthis. Representative McNamara, 2642. Do you wish to have that Bill called? You want to concur or nonconcur, 2642? Out of the record. Alright, on the Order of Concurrence on Transportation, appears House Bill 718. Representative Ronan. Is Representative Ronan in the chamber? Al Ronan. Do you want to hear Representative Al Ronan on House Bill 718. Proceed."

Ronan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to...concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 718. What it did...it removed one of the provisions from the Omnibus Bill. In fact, the provision that this Amendment removed was the Bill that the...Speaker had put on during the...during the process. So, Representative Giglio, this is a little treat from the Senate. They knocked out your Bill that you had put into the Omnibus Bill."

Speaker Giglio: "And you're not gonna fight for me?"

Ronan: "Mr. Speaker, if you'd like me to nonconcur, I'd be more than willing to do this. My advice, though, is that we can put that on one of the other Omnibus Bills, 'cause I guarantee you we'll have some Conference Committee Reports before we're done this Session. So, I still move to concur."

Speaker Giglio: "Any discussion? You heard the Gentleman's Motion. 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 718?' And, on that, on those in favor vote 'aye', opposed, 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted

74th Legislative Day

June 27, 1991

who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question, there are 115 voting 'yes', none voting 'no', and the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 718, and this Bill, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative McPike. Out of the record. Representative Sieben on House Bill 1431. Proceed."

- Sieben: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move to concur with Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 1431. Senate Amendment #1 would remove the provision...for 12 year...people under 12 to obtain a boating safety certification. Amendment #2 would deal with...approximate cause for alcohol driving for injuries and would make blood alcohol tests admissible as evidence following an accident, and I would move for...to concur in these Amendments."
- Speaker Giglio: "Any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 1431?' All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed, 'no'. The voting is open. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Schoenberg, 'aye', Mr. Clerk. Have all voted who wish? Representative Wennlund. Take the record. On this question, there are 114 voting 'yes', none voting 'no', and the House does concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 1431, and this Bill. having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Black. Representative Black."
- Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. After further conversation with Representative Stern, it appears that House Bill 1752 is

74th Legislative Day

June 27, 1991

not exactly as I thought it was, and I think in order to give the Representative a full and fair hearing on her Bill, having voted in the prevailing side by which House Bill 1752 was defeated, I would ask the Body and make the Motion to...for a reconsideration of House Bill 1752."

Stern: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I... I tried to avoid telling you more than you would want to know about this situation before, and...we got into trouble. don't I tell you a lot about it. This district...this school district is in the Fort Sheridan area, and because of military impact aid, is having a terrible time and is \$7 million in debt. It has been suggested that it consolidate with the two other Park school districts, and we are making an effort to bring that to pass. On the ballot, at the time of the vote to consolidate or not to consolidate, will be a tax rate. The Amendment that was put on in the Senate does not take away the right of the voters to decide on what that tax rate will be. It simply says that they do not have to select lowest tax rate. We urge your 'aye' vote on this concurrence to Senate...to House Bill 1752."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Peterson."

Peterson: "Mr. Speaker, I'm a Co-Sponsor of this Bill, and it's an important Bill for our area, and we'd like to have some order in the House. There was some misinformation before on the Bill. We would like you to listen attentively to Representative Stern, so you can vote 'aye'."

Speaker Giglio: "The...Chair's been informed that we can't vote on this twice in one day without getting leave. So, Representative Black is correct when he asks leave voting on a prevailing...Representative Black asks leave to reconsider the vote by which the...by which House Bill 1752 to concur lost and by the Attendance Roll Call. Does the

74th Legislative Day

June 27, 1991

Gentleman have leave? Hearing none, leave is granted. Mr. Clerk, House Bill 1752. Representative Stern."

Stern: "I think I have explained it thoroughly. Bill Peterson is my Co-Sponsor on this. We ask your 'aye' vote on the concurrence Motion. I will..."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Black."

Black: "...very much, Speaker. think Mr. Ι what the...Representative Stern might want to do...the confusion that I had was caused by any lack of reference to referenda on our analysis. It's been explained to me by our analyst and others, the I.E.A. and the Illinois Association of School Boards, are in complete agreement with this Bill. Now, that might be a first, I'm not sure, but the and the school boards are in complete agreement and, Representative, correct me if I'm wrong, this requires a front-door referendum, and I think, if anybody else in this chamber has any questions, now is the time to ask them and vote accordingly, and apologize then Ι Representative for disrupting her vote late in the process. but we just didn't hear anything about a referendum."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative McNamara."

McNamara: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I, also, having misunderstood the explanation the first time, rise now in support of the Bill. What the Bill really does is that it allows if three school districts wish to merge they would vote, not only on the merging of those school districts, but each individual school district would merge...would, also, vote on the tax rate which one of those school districts had. It is a very clear, up—front method of school districts merging together, and it, also, allows the people to decide as to what tax rate whether or not it was acceptable to them. I urge everybody's approval of this Bill."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Hartke."

74th Legislative Day

June 27, 1991

Hartke: "Yes, will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Giglio: "She indicates she will."

Hartke: "...I'm a little confused to start with, too, but I think
John partially explained this. You have three taxing
districts wanting to merge, school districts, they have a
rate of four, five and six dollars, all three rates would
be put on the ballot and then...no just one. You're saying
that all school...there was just one..."

Stern: "When the...ballot is prepared, a tax rate will be selected by the school districts involved and put on the ballot, but it'll be either four, five or six or in between. It won't be seven or eight."

Hartke: "Right. Well, they would determine a tax rate. It would not be the old tax rates, it would be, say, the new district formed by referendum of the people will be called the tri-county or tri-whatever school district and that the tax rates shall be such."

Stern: "That is correct."

Hartke: "And it would be a front-door referendum by the people."

Stern: "That is correct..."

Hartke: "And do all three districts have to pass this, in order
to consolidate?"

Stern: "I don't think so."

Hartke: "Alright, so what you have then is the possibility of two
very small districts being out voted by a large district.
Is that correct?"

Stern: "Representative McNamara believes he can answer this question..."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative McNamara."

McNamara: "Yes...in answer to your question, if two of the school districts decided that they accepted the rate and the provisions, those two school districts could accept that.

The third school district would not be forced into it. If

74th Legislative Day

June 27, 1991

the third school district...the referendum in that district, as I understand it now, alone, if they voted no, then they would not be consolidated within it. Example: if a five, six, seven dollar rate were there and there were a hundred people from school district with the five dollar rate and those people decided that they themselves did not want to accept an eight dollar rate that was required by the highest school district within that area, they could vote 'no' and be exempt out of that school district. That is my understanding of it. Each individual community has the right to vote for the consolidation and all must be there to consolidate."

Hartke: "Second question: Would this be a consolidation
 question, as well as, the rate in the same question on the
 ballot?"

McNamara: "It would be a consolidation, as well as, the rate.

They must agree to the taxing rate, and they must agree to the consolidation, if I'm understanding you."

Hartke: "So, the referendum said then would have to carry both
 questions on the ballot: (1) do you want to consolidate
 this way (2) at what rate?"

McNamara: "That's correct."

Hartke: "If it fails on the consolidation question, it fails. If it fails on the rate issue, it fails. Any one district opting out, the system still fails."

McNamara: "That is correct."

Hartke: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Cowlishaw."

Cowlishaw: "Thank you...thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Just to clarify this discussion that...that was just now concluded, if you look at the experience out in Byron, Illinois, where there have been repeated attempts to consolidate school districts, you will discover that, in

74th Legislative Day

June 27, 1991

fact, in order for one of these proposals to pass, every school district that is voting upon it has to approve it by a majority of the voters taking part in the election, in those...each and every one of those participating school districts, and each proposal is separate unto itself, so that if one of them...if there are three school districts involved and one of them turns it down, the other two don't automatically get to do anything. That proposal has failed, and so then the two school districts that did...did want to do this could put forth a separate proposal later and vote on it, including a tax rate, but you can't vote on a proposal and then accept only part of it. You'd have to have a vote all over again."

- Speaker Giglio: "Anybody else? Representative Stern, to close."

 Stern: "Just to conclude an already complicated and murky explanation. The underlying Bill, 1752, requires that the debts generated by District 111 remain on that district so it doesn't lie over all the citizens of the new district, and I think this is important legislation for situations like ours, and I ask your 'aye' vote on the concurrence."

 Speaker Giglio: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in
- Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1752?' All those vote 'aye', opposed, 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Black, are you voting? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Schoenberg."
- Schoenberg: "Mr. Speaker, to explain my vote. I have a conflict of interest, and, therefore, I will vote 'present'."
- Speaker Giglio: "Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. Oh, I'm sorry. Take the record. On this question, there are 109 voting 'yes', 3 voting 'no', and the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1752, and this Bill, having received the required Constitutional

74th Legislative Day

- June 27, 1991
- Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Wojcik."
- Wojcik: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, when I was out of the room, the vote was taken on House Bill 885, and, inadvertently, I was voted 'no'. Had I had been here I would have voted 'yes', and I, certainly, would like to be recorded that way."
- Speaker Giglio: "Mr. Clerk, record Representative Wojcik's request. Let the record show. Representative Mautino."
- Mautino: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Before we got into this dissertation about House Bill 1752, I had my light on to discuss 1431, and, having voting on the prevailing side, I now move for reconsideration of House Bill 1431, and I'd like to explain my position and the rationale for that Motion. When I looked at the analysis on Senate Amendment #2 to 1431, the Amendment analaysis says the Amendment #2 makes a technical change. When, in fact, I looked at the Amendment, the technical change that has been considered makes a D.U.I. felony on a watercraft a Class...a Class IV felony, which is one to three years in jail. For that reason, I would like to have 14...House Bill 1431 reconsidered so that the Gentleman can explain the Amendment without mumbling through it so everybody knows what that Amendment does."
- Speaker Giglio: "Alright, does the Gentleman have Motion...does the Gentleman have leave to reconsider the vote by which House Bill 1431 passed? Hearing none, leave is granted by the Attendance Roll Call. Representative Sieben on House Bill 1431."
- Sieben: "Yes, I would object to the Gentleman's Motion. The Bill
 was presented. The people have had the analysis on their
 desk for some period of time, and if...if he wanted to
 discuss the...intent of this Amendment, we should have done
 it at that time, so I would object to his Motion to

74th Legislative Day

June 27, 1991

reconsider."

- Speaker Giglio: "Well, the Motion...the Motion...Representative Sieben, the Motion was just passed. That's when...when I recognized Representative Mautino and then I asked leave, and there was no...no 'nos', no negatives, that Motion carried by the Attendance Roll Call. Now, the Bill is reconsidered, so we're right back to where it was. So you...it's your Bill now...he wants you to proceed to explain Senate Amendments #1 and 2, so that the Body can understand exactly what they do."
- Sieben: "Mr. Speaker, then I would take this Bill out of the record at this time. We can discuss this, and we'll talk with the Senate Sponsor and clear up what Senator Hawkinson's intent was with this Amendment."
- Speaker Giglio: "Alright, take...take it out of the record, Mr. Clerk. The Bill was reconsidered, and the...the Bill is back on the Calendar, sitting on the Calendar under concurrence. The next Order of business is Representative Ryder on 1446. Representative Ryder in the chamber? Out of the record. Representative Laurino on House Bill 1749. Representative Laurino. Representative Laurino in the chamber? Out of the record. Representative Capparelli on House Bill 2067. Capparelli. Capparelli, 2067. Do you wish to proceed with this, Sir?"
- Capparelli: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to concur with...Senate Amendment #1. Originally, the Bill provided for maximum size where a trailer be moved on the highways. Amendment #1, from the Senate that put the permit fees in, is agreed by the D.O.T. and the Home Association. I would ask for a favorable Roll Call."
- Speaker Giglio: "You heard the Gentleman's Motion. Any discussion? Hearing none, all those in...the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House

74th Legislative Day

June 27, 1991

Bill 2067?' And, on that Motion, all those in favor vote 'aye', opposed, 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Punch it. Don't work? Turn your switch, turn your Try it. It's okay? It's alright? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question, 112 voting 'yes', none voting 'no', and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2067, and this Bill, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Curran on House Bill 2536. Out of the record. Alright, we're going to go back and...and pick Bills up some Representative...Currie and Representative Novak has...has a Motion to nonconcur on... House Bill 114. House Bill 114, Mr. Clerk. Representative Novak."

- Novak: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I now move to nonconcur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 114."
- Speaker Giglio: "Heard the Gentleman's Motion. All those by saying 'aye', opposed, 'no'. signify opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the House nonconcurs with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 114. Representative Currie, before we move off Transportation, Representative Ryder was in a meeting, also. Would...he'd like to have House Bill 1446 heard. The Gentleman from Morgan, Representative Ryder, on House Bill 1446, Mr. Clerk."
- Ryder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would move to concur with Amendment Senate #1. Senate Amendment #1 deleted provisions that were added as an Amendment in the friendly as Amendment in the House, the...Department of Transportation objected to that The underlying Bill remains the same. Amendment. I am

74th Legislative Day

June 27, 1991

happy to move to concur with the Senate Amendments."

Speaker Giglio: "Any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall the House concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1446?' All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed, 'no'. The voting is open. This will be final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question, there are 113 voting 'yes', none voting 'no', and the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill and this Bill, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Alright, now we're going to return to Representative Currie's Bills, and, on that Order, House Bill 67, Representative Sixty-seven. Out of the record. House Bill 1085. House Bill 1085, Representative Currie. Proceed."

Currie: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I move the House do concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1085. The underlying Bill clarifies that the telecommunications tax does not...does not apply...I'm sorry, the Illinois Invested Capital Tax is not applicable to commercial office buildings, and, at the Department of Revenue's suggestion, the Bill was amended in the Senate to clarify that neither does it apply to hotels which act as retailers of...telephone services. So, I'd appreciate your support for the concurrence Motion."

Speaker Giglio: "Speak a little louder, Representative Currie.

Representative McNamara."

McNamara: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I couldn't hear a word you said. If you could explain it again. There wasn't a word that I could hear over here. I'd appreciate your explaining it again."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Currie."

Currie: "The underlying Bill clarifies that the Illinois..."

74th Legislative Day

June 27, 1991

- McNamara: "Mr. Speaker, could we have some quiet in the House, please?"
- Speaker Giglio: "All those people not entitled to the House floor, would you kindly leave? All those persons not entitled to the House floor, please leave the chamber. Proceed."
- Currie: "The Bill, as it passed this chamber, clarified that the Illinois Invested Capital Tax does not apply to commercial office buildings. At the suggestion of the Department of Revenue, the Bill was amended in the Senate to clarify that the Illinois Invested Capital Tax does not apply to hotels either since they, like commercial office building owners, are only acting as retailers, rather than as another kind of thing. So, that's the Amendment, and I'd appreciate your support for the concurrence Motion."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative McNamara."

- McNamara: "No, now that I understand the Bill, I have no problem with that concept. Thank you."
- Speaker Giglio: "...Calendar announcement."
- Clerk Leone: "Supplemental #2 to the House Calendar is now being distributed."
- Speaker Giglio: "Further discussion on the...Motion to concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1085? Hearing none, all those in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed, 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Giorgi, 'aye'. Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question, there are 115 voting 'yes', none voting 'no', and the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1085, and this Bill, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On this same Order, appears House Bill 2190, Representative Currie. Proceed."

74th Legislative Day

June 27, 1991

Currie: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. This Bill as amended in the Senate would provide for five new check-off programs on the Illinois State Income Tax: one for domestic violence shelters, one for victims of aids, one for the U.S. Olympics Committee, one for system technologies for the disabled, and a Youth, Alcohol and Substance Abuse Prevention Fund. We worked on this with...in a bi-partisan fashion, in and out of the House Revenue Committee, and I'd appreciate your support for my Motion to concur."

Speaker Giglio: "Any discussion on the Lady's Motion? The question is, 'Shall the House concur with Senate Amendments 2 to House Bill 2190?' And, on that question, all those in favor vote 'aye', opposed, 'no'. The voting is Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question, there are 113 voting 'yes', none voting 'no', and the House does concur with Senate Amendments and 2 to House Bill 2190, and this Bill, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared House Bill 2423, Representative Representative Currie on House Bill 2423. Proceed."

Currie: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I move the House do concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill As amended, the Bill has the approval of the 2423. Illinois State...Student Assistance Commission. provides two alternate ways for Illinois high school seniors to be designated as state scholars: the in which youngsters are ranked, and the traditional way formula provides for, both the effect of their rank in class and their performance on the A.C.T. or a similar test. In addition, the Bill provides that schools designate...those youngsters who perform at or above the

74th Legislative Day

June 27, 1991

95% level on the A.C.T. or comparable kind of exam. So, I'd appreciate your support for the Motion to concur. The Bill will provide parity for all high schools in the state, public and private, for those high schools that rank as well as those that do not."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Black. Representative Black. Representative Cowlishaw."

Cowlishaw: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I want to commend Representative Currie for this Bill. This issue has been of concern to Representative Satterthwaite and to me and to a lot of other people here for a long time, and...and we kept trying to figure out a way to solve this problem, and...and we didn't have very much...success with it, and Representative Currie has really done an exemplary job of resolving this whole thing, and I stand in strong support of House Bill 2423."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Davis."

Davis: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Giglio: "She indicates she will."

Davis: "Representative Currie, the Senate Amendment, does it increase the number of people getting scholarships if they have high A.C.T. scores?"

Currie: "This program, Representative, does not carry with it any cash money. Not a single dollar. All the program does is designate youngsters as state scholars, the top 10% of high school graduating seniors. So..."

Davis: "Will they get scholarships?"

Currie: "No."

Davis: "Okay. Thank you very much."

Speaker Giglio: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2423?' And, on that question, all those in favor vote 'aye', opposed 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted

74th Legislative Day

June 27, 1991

Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. who wish? Clerk. On this question, 110 voting 'yes', none voting 'no', and the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2423, and this Bill, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared Representative Laurino, we passed 1749 when you were...were in...not in the chamber. Do you wish to have that Bill called? Representative Laurino. Representative William Laurino. William Laurino, do you wish to have House Bill 1749 called? Representative Laurino."

Laurino: "Concur in that. Mr. Speaker, I concur in Amendment #1

to House Bill 1749. All it is, is a
clarification...concerning the...repairs and rebuilders.

Secretary of State and...the...other Sponsors are all in
favor."

Speaker Giglio: "Any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall the House concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1749?' All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed 'no'. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question, 106 voting 'yes', 4 voting 'no', and the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill...McCracken, 'aye'...there now 107 voting 'yes' and 4 voting 'no', and the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1749. this Bill, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative you were in the back in a meeting. House Bill 2536, do you wish to have this Bill called, 2526 (sic 2536)? The Gentleman from Sangamon, Representative Curran."

Curran: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to concur with Senate

Amendment #1 to House Bill 2536, an Act in relation to

74th Legislative Day

June 27, 1991

ethanol fuel. It promotes the use of ethanol fuels in busses in areas like the Springfield Mass Transit District. Glad to answer any questions and ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Giglio: "Any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall the House concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2536?' All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed 'no'. The voting is open. This is final action. This Bill passed the House there was an extra Majority, extraordinary votes of 71, so it needs 71 which it has. Okay, have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question, there are 105...105 voting 'yes', 8 voting 'no', and the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2536, and this Bill, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Currie, on State and Local Government, appears House Bill 16. Representative Barbara Currie. House Bill 16."

Currie: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I move that the House do concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 16. This is the Bill that was a response to the Sun Times series on slumlords in the City of Chicago. This measure applies only in the County of Cook, and the penalty provisions in the Bill were modified in line with the agreement that I made with Members of the House Judiciary I Committee, so the Amendments that we did on a comparable Bill, in this chamber, were done on this Bill in the Senate, and I would appreciate your support for the concurrence Motion."

Speaker Giglio: "Any discussion? Hearing none, the question is,

'Shall the House concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House
Bill 16?' All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed 'no'.

The voting is open. This is final action. Have all voted

74th Legislative Day

June 27, 1991

who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question, there are 109 voting 'yes', none voting 'no', and the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 16, and this Bill, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Laurino in the Chair."

Speaker Laurino: "On the concurrence with state and local government, the following Representatives should be prepared to handle their concurrences: Representatives Black, Lang, Curran, Keane, and Persico. Representative Mautino on House Bill 129. Representative Mautino. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk. Representative Mautino, proceed."

Mautino: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I move that we concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 129. Senate Amendment #1 provides that the...the coverage under the State Employee's Group Insurance Act also include those individuals who work in domestic violence shelters or service employees thereof. The underlying Bill was an agreed Bill between CMS and local governments that allowed for other units of local government to join with the state employee's group health insurance local health plan. provided for the Illinois Association of Park Districts and any non-for-profit association, which included the township officials of Illinois, as well as reducing the 100% level to an 85% provision that allowed for a spouse of individual employed by one of these agencies didn't have to join the program, if they had other coverage, and I move for the concurrence in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 129. Happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Laurino: "Further discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House

74th Legislative Day

June 27, 1991

Bill 129?' All those in favor indicate by...vote 'aye', opposed 'nay'. The board is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. This Amendment, having received 110 'ayes', 0 voting 'nay'...'no', and 0 voting 'present', the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 129, and this Bill, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 367, Representative Black. Representative Black.

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I would move to concur with Senate Amendment #1. All that Amendment does is to change a reference, we had the wrong reference. It makes reference to the Cemetery Protection Act, rather than the Cemetery Care Act. The Bill, as it left the House, went out on Consent Calendar and it simply increased some penalties for tampering and vandalizing cemeteries and gravestones."

Speaker Laurino: "Further discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 367?' All...all in favor will vote 'aye', opposed, 'nay'. The board is open. Have all voted who wish? all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. This Amendment, having received 113 'ayes', 0 voting 'nay', and 0 voting 'present', the House does concur in Amendment #1 to House Bill 367, and this Bill, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 762, Representative Lang. Out of the record. House Bill 763, Representative Proceed, Lang. Representative. Representative Lang, proceed."

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Move to concur with Senate
Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 763. The key Amendment
here is Amendment 2 provides that on August 7, 1995, the

74th Legislative Day

June 27, 1991

office of Regional Superintendent of Schools in Cook County is abolished. It vests all powers and responsibilities of the State Superintendent, in the State Superintendent after that time. Move to concur."

Speaker Laurino: "Any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 763?' All those in favor, indicate by voting 'aye', those opposed vote 'nay'. The board is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted Take the record, Mr. Clerk. This Amendment, having received 96 'ayes', 13 'nay', 0 voting 'present', the House does concur in Amendment #1 to House Bill 763, and this Bill, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 794. Representative Brunsvold. Representative Munizzi, would you indicate to Brunsvold that there's a Bill up that he has to handle? Out of the record. House Bill 857, Representative Curran. Proceed, Representative."

Curran: "I move to concur on Senate Amendment #1. House Bill 857
restores park board members authority as conservators of
the peace with power to make arrests on Park Board District
property, however, the park board members can't possess
firearms when exercising their authority."

Speaker Laurino: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 857?' All those in favor will indicate by voting 'aye', opposed 'nay'. The board is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. This Bill...this Amendment, having received 115 'ayes', 0 voting 'nay', and 0 voting 'present', the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 857, and this Bill, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 942, Representative

74th Legislative Day

June 27, 1991

Keane. Representative Keane in the chamber?

Representative Keane in the chamber? Out of the record.

House Bill 1006, Representative Mautino. Proceed,

Representative Mautino."

Mautino: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I move that we concur in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 1006. Amendment #2 provided that the unit of local government paying for coverage for its employees under a HMO shall be based upon the age, sex, and other demographic variables of the employer, rather than on the analysis of its employees currently enrolled in the HMO. This provision is an Agreed Amendment in the Senate, by the HMO's, as well as the industry, and it...the relationship to the original Bill is that...it provides that...employees of any...of a unit of local government that choose to participate in a local health care and program, or the state program can, also, enroll in a HMO, and that's what it does. I move for the concurrence in Amendment #2 to House Bill 1006."

Speaker Laurino: "The Gentleman moves for the concurrence in...to Amendment #1 to House Bill 1006. Any discussion? none, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1006?' All those in indicate by voting 'aye', opposed, 'nay'. The board is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. This Amendment, having received 107 'ayes', 3 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present', the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1006, and this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Keane. Representative Keane, you've got two House Bill 942, do you wish to have that called? Bills, Okay, ...well, hold on right now, we'll Representative Bugielski and then you'll be next.

74th Legislative Day

June 27, 1991

Representative Cowlishaw, for what reason do you rise?"

Cowlishaw: "Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry, I hit my yes button twice and that turned it off. May I please be recorded as voting 'yes' on House Bill 1006?"

Speaker Laurino: "The record...the record will indicate that you decided to vote that way."

Cowlishaw: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Laurino: "Representative Bugielski, on House Bill 1996."

Bugielski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I wish to concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1996. The Amendment...Amendment #1 just makes technical changes in the amount per capita from \$1.55 to \$1.558 and from \$55 to \$55.10 per square mile. These numbers were adjusted to reflect actual population figures which were only estimated when the Bill was originally drafted, so I ask for a favorable Roll Call on this."

Speaker Laurino: "Further discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1996?' All those in favor indicate by voting 'aye'. opposed 'nav'. The board is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? record. Mr. Clerk. This Bill. having received...this Amendment, having received 115 'ayes', 'no', 1 voting 'present', the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1996, and this Bill, received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2147, Representative Keane."

Keane: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to nonconcur with Senate

Amendment #1 to House Bill 2147. Move to nonconcur."

Speaker Laurino: "Nonconcur?"

Keane: "Right."

Speaker Laurino: "All those in favor indicate by saying 'aye', opposed, 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. The House does

74th Legislative Day

June 27, 1991

nonconcur in House Bill 2147. We'll go back to...House Bill 794, Representative Brunsvold, now that you're off the telephone, Sir."

Brunsvold: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would move to concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2. Senate Amendment #1 would...the states attorney of any county, except Cook, has exclusive rights representing the Forest Preserve, and Senate Amendment #2 limits that to under \$500,000, which would take Cook, DuPage, and Lake out of that and would ask for the concurrence on Senate Amendments 1 and 2."

Speaker Laurino: "Further discussion? Seeing none, ...I'm sorry.

Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Would the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Laurino: "Indicates he will."

Matijevich: "Joel, that last portion, did you say Lake is out of it?"

Brunsvold: "Yeah, Lake would be out of it. Cook's out of it.

With \$500,000 under, Cook, Lake and DuPage are out."

Matijevich: "It's under \$500,000."

Brunsvold: "Under \$500,000."

Matijevich: "Let me say for those who...might be under \$500,000, and that's why I have the concern about Lake, what this Amendment does in my county, the Forest Preserve District can...the members, can hire their own counsel, and I think that's a proper way to go. If...if you pass this Amendment, that means the states attorney shall exeficio be the attorney for the Forest Preserve District, unless he doesn't want to. I don't think that's good law. I guess I shouldn't complain about it if my county's out of it, but if those who are under \$500,000, I think I ought to alert you, at least, to the fact that, that would be the law."

Brunsvold: "In response, in Kendall County, for example, there's a...states attorney that does represent the county board

74th Legislative Day

June 27, 1991

and the Forest Preserve and is doing both jobs."

Speaker Laurino: "Further discussion? Seeing none, the Gentleman moves for the adoption of Amendments 1 and 2 to House The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 794?' All those in favor indicate by voting 'aye', opposed 'nay'. The board is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. These Amendments, having received 107 'aye', 4 voting 'no', and 4 voting 'present', the House does concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 794, and this Bill, having received the required Constitutional Majority, hereby declared passed. House Bill 2148, Representative Keane. Is Representative Keane in the chamber? Out of the record. House Bill 2174, Representative Persico. Is it Persico or Persico? Persico, okay. Proceed, Representative."

Persico: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the General Assembly. I move to concur with Senate Amendments 1, 2, 3, and 4. This is the Department of Transportation Land Bill. Amendments 1, 2, and 3 restores access rights and releases the easements of certain parcels of land. appraisals are on file with the Clerk. Amendment #4 amends the Chicago Sanitary District Enlargement Act that extends the corporate limits...of the Metropolitan Water Reclamation District of the greater Chicago, and I move for its adoption."

Speaker Laurino: "Further discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Amendment #1 to House Bill...to Amendment #1 to House Bill 2174?' All those in favor indicate by voting 'aye', opposed 'nay'. The board is open. Have all...Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record,

74th Legislative Day

June 27, 1991

Mr. Clerk. This Amendment, having received...Representative Capparelli, 'aye'. This Amendment, having received 104 'ayes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present', the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2174, and this Bill, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2309, Representative Steczo."

- Steczo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I would move to concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2309.

 This Amendment puts in affect an agreement between the Illinois Municipal League and the Illinois Library Association, regarding annexation of unincorporated library lands..."
- Speaker Laurino: "Representative...Representative Steczo, we'll take this Bill out of the record for the Representative Giglio is recognized for...Representative Giglio, for Democratic Caucus in Room Representative...Representative Myron Olson is recognized for the purpose of a Republican Conference in Room 118 for approximately one-half hour. We will proceed down to our Caucus rooms and be back here at 5:15. Thank you. Members of the House. Members of the House. We would like caution you that we will be back on the floor at 5:15 promptly, and when we do come back, we will proceeding to reapportionment, so be prompt on your Caucus and be back here on 5:15."
- Speaker McPike: "The House will come to order. Representative McPike in the Chair Page 3 of the Calendar, appears House Bill 1357. Mr. Clerk, has this Bill been read a second time?"

Clerk O'Brien: "This Bill's been read a second time previously."

Speaker McPike: "Are there any Amendments?"

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

74th Legislative Day

June 27, 1991

Churchill and Parcells."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Churchill. Representative Churchill, would...Mr. Churchill."

Churchill: "Withdraw Amendment #1."

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

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

Speaker McPike: "Representative Churchill."

Churchill: "Please withdraw Amendment #2."

Speaker McPike: "The Gentleman withdraws Amendment #2. Further
Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative Churchill and Parcells."

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Churchill."

Churchill: "Please withdraw Amendment #3."

Speaker McPike: "Amendment #3 is withdrawn. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #4, offered by Representative Churchill, Pullen, and Kubik."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Churchill."

Churchill: "Please withdraw Amendment #4."

Speaker McPike: "Amendment #4 is withdrawn. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #5, offered by...Speaker Madigan."

Speaker McPike: "Speaker Madigan, Amendment #5."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, how many Amendments are filed?"

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Six Amendments."

Speaker McPike: "Speaker Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, this Amendment contains the judicial districting Amendment for Cook County, and the next Amendment amends this Amendment, and so I would suggest that I be permitted to adopt this Amendment and the next

74th Legislative Day

June 27, 1991

Amendment, place the Bill on Third Reading and then speak to the Bill, as amended on Third Reading. And so, in that regard, I would now move to adopt this Amendment."

Speaker McPike: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Amendment #5. All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment's adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #6, offered by Speaker Madigan."

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Madigan."

Madigan: "This particular Amendment changes approximately 10,000 people on the map and moves those people from one district to another. I would move for the adoption of the Amendment."

McPike: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Amendment #6.

All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it,
and Amendment #6 is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

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

Speaker McPike: "Speaker Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Section 2-F-A of the Circuit Courts Act, Public Act 86-1478, requires the General Assembly to enact legislation on or before July 1, 1991, dividing the Circuit Court of Cook County into 15 subcircuits for the purpose of electing resident judges. The subcircuits must be compact, contiguous and substantially equal in population. The subcircuits must be created utilizing the results of the 1990 Federal Census. The Amendment I offer today satisfies all constitutional and statutory requirements. subcircuits. which comprise the proposed judicial

74th Legislative Day

June 27, 1991

districting plan, meet the compactness standard as this standard has been interpreted by the courts in the context of legislative redistricting. It must, also, be recognized that the compactness requirement of Public Act 86-1478 subservient to the federal constitutional requirement of one-person, one-vote, as well as the requirements of the Voting Rights Act; thus, compactness, in certain instances, sacrificed in order to create four judicial subcircuits with concentrations of African-American persons 65% and two subcircuits consisting of a majority of Hispanic individuals. In all instances, the proposed judicial districting plan meets the contiguity requirement of Public Act 86-1478. Based upon a total Cook County population of 5,105,067 according to the 1990 census, the ideal population of a judicial subcircuit is 340,338. The maximum deviation, under the judicial districting plan, is .07%, and the total range of deviations of the plan is thus, the districting legislation satisfies the substantially equal in population requirement of Public Act 86-1478. Just last week, the United States Supreme Court held that the Voting Rights Act applies to election of Supreme Court Justices in Louisiana and to the election of trial judges in Texas. As I will demonstrate, the judicial subcircuits proposed in this Amendment satisfy the requirements of the Voting Rights Act. Using African-American population figures, subcircuits 1, 2, 5, and 7 contain 69.8%, 69.14%. 86.53%. and 70.14% concentrations οf African-American individuals. The dramatic increase in the Hispanic population in Cook County is, also, reflected in the proposed judicial districting Subcircuit 6 contains an Hispanic population concentration of 57.23%. Subcircuit 14 enhances ability of the Hispanic community to elect a judicial

74th Legislative Day

June 27, 1991

candidate of its choice; it has a Hispanic population concentration of 57.53%. This judicial districting plan is designed to implement the primary reason for enacting legislation requiring Cook County to be divided into 15 subcircuits for the purpose of electing resident judges to enhance minority representation in the Cook County judiciary. I ask for your support on the Amendment and the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "The Gentleman moves for passage of House Bill 1357 and, on that, Representative Churchill."

Churchill: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen οf the I rise to support House Bill 1357. This Bill is the natural conclusion of a process which began over As a result of the efforts of certain ago. Republican Legislators and members of the minority community, with the assistance of their Legislators, a Bill was passed authorizing the creation of 15 subcircuit districts in the Cook County judiciary. I want particular compliments to Senator Roger Keats, Representatives Jack Kubik and Penny Pullen, Representatives Paul Williams, Anthony Young, and Miguel Santiago. It is their leadership on this issue which has brought us to this point in the process. I believe that the map which is being presented to us in House Bill is a fair map. It complies with constitutional and Voting Rights Acts standards. It incorporates the input of testified on this issue before the who have House Reapportionment Committee and before the Republican Task concerns of community groups have Force. The been addressed. Ιt provides configuration а οf four African-American seats and two Hispanic seats. The balance adequately represent suburban, as well as city, communities interest. This meets the original intent of those who

74th Legislative Day

June 27, 1991

have negotiated this issue and the requests of the minority groups. It is a fair political compromise. This is a fair Bill. This is a map which needs to be passed. judicial redistricting provided for by statute or by the Constitution. There is no automatic judicial review provided by statute or the Constitution. Without this map, the status of the judiciary in Cook County will remain the status quo. This is a map which, also, needs to be signed by Governor Edgar, and I want to publicly thank Minority Leader, Lee Daniels for his efforts in communicating with the Governor and ensuring that this will receive a treatment when it reaches his desk. I do believe that a map such as this will be accepted by the Governor, and this is a map which needs to be passed in the Senate. thanks goes to Representative Daniels for his work with Senate Minority Leader, Pate Philip. I believe that a map such as this will be treated favorably by the Republican side of the aisle in the Senate. I encourage my colleagues the other side of the aisle to work with their counterparts in the Senate to get this Bill called and passed in the Senate. This is a major change in the third branch of government in the largest county in this state. I recommend it to you for passage."

Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 1357 pass?'
All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all
voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the
record. On this Bill, there are 116 'ayes' and no 'nays',
and House Bill 1357, having received the Constitutional
Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1354. Mr.
Clerk, has this Bill been read a second time?"

Clerk O'Brien: "This Bill has been read a second time previously."

Speaker McPike: "Are there any Amendments?"

74th Legislative Day

June 27, 1991

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

Speaker McPike: "Representative Churchill."

Churchill: "Please withdraw the Amendment."

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

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

Speaker McPike: "Representative Churchill."

Churchill: "Please withdraw Amendment #2."

Speaker McPike: "Amendment #2 is withdrawn. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative Churchill and Parcells."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Churchill."

Churchill: "Please withdraw Amendment #3."

Speaker McPike: "The Gentleman withdraws Amendment #3. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #4, offered by Speaker Madigan."

Speaker McPike: "Speaker Madigan on Amendment #4."

Madigan: "Okay, Mr. Speaker, how many Amendments are filed?"

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Clerk, how many Amendments are filed?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Five Amendments in total."

Madigan: "So, again, I would suggest that we adopt the Amendments, move the Bill to Third Reading and debate the Bill on Third Reading. This is the basic Amendment. It is followed by another Amendment which amends this Amendment; so, relative to Amendment #4, I move for the adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker McPike: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Amendment #4. All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and Amendment #4 is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #5, offered by Speaker Madigan."

74th Legislative Day

June 27, 1991

Speaker McPike: "Speaker Madigan."

Madigan: "Again, I move for the adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker McPike: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of

Amendment #5. All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'.

The 'ayes' have it. Amendment #5 is adopted. Further

Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

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

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1354, a Bill for an Act to apportion the State of Illinois into legislative and representative districts. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Speaker Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen οf the House. provides a proposal for the redistricting of This Bill legislative and representative district boundaries Illinois. I believe this proposal establishes districts for the next ten years, which are compact and contiquous, politically fair, adheres to the one-person, principle, and provide fair representation for minorities. In the legislative redistricting process, there are three bodies of law which must be followed: the United States Constitution, the Constitution of the State of Illinois, and the Federal Voting Rights Act of 1965, as This proposal adheres to those laws. The Illinois House of Representatives, on several occasions, most notably in our House Rules and in the report of this committee, has emphasized the importance of these three legal precepts in the redistricting process in Illinois. believe this I redistricting proposal fulfills our commitment to fair representation of minorities, as required by the Voting Rights Act, as well as our commitment to create districts in compliance with the United States and Illinois Constitutions. Urban areas in Illinois lost population,

74th Legislative Day

June 27, 1991

and that population loss was particularly apparent in areas with a high concentration of African-Americans. Despite the loss of concentrated African-American population, proposal assures no loss in minority representation. Ιn fact. this proposal increases the number of African-American super-majority seats in the House by two, south suburban Cook and East St. Louis, and increases number of African-American super-majority seats in the Senate by one. Considering the population loss and the acknowledged undercount, I believe this proposal clearly meets the standards of the Federal Voting Rights Act. addition, the overall population of Hispanics increased in the City of Chicago by 42%. In recognition of this, number of Hispanic super-majority districts in the House was increased by two, and the number οf Hispanic super-majority districts in the Senate was increased by I might add, that these proposals are made with the input and participation of organizations representing the Latino community. For African-American and Hispanic populations, upstate and downstate, great care was taken to avoid fracturing minority populations, whether or not these had sufficient voting strength to create communities minority influence or super-majority districts. case possible, this proposal gives African-American and Hispanic-concentrated populations the strongest available, no matter how large or small the population concentration. The one-person, one-vote standard guarantees equal representation for the citizens οf Illinois. Based on the United States Census Bureau's 1990 census, the ideal population for a legislative district is 193,740, and the ideal population for a representative district in Illinois is 96,870 people. This proposal implements the one-person, one-vote principle. The maximum

74th Legislative Day

June 27, 1991

deviation from the ideal population, under this proposal, legislative districts is .23%. The total range of deviations for legislative districts is . 45%. For representative districts the maximum deviation from the ideal population, under this proposal, is .27%. The total range of deviations for representative districts is .51%. This proposal makes every effort to make districts compact and contiguous, with the exceptions of districts which were drawn to comply with the Federal Voting Rights Act and the concept of maximization of minority voting strength. Finally, I believe this proposal is politically fair. population loss in certain areas of the state and the population gain in other areas indicate that many districts will experience significant change. This proposal reflects the population shift with an increase of four suburban collar county districts and a loss of three Chicago districts. In conclusion, this House of Representatives has made it clear from the beginning that the principles in the reapportionment Acts of 1991 would be the standards set bv the Illinois and United States Constitutions and the Federal Voting Rights Act of 1965, as This proposal complies with the Illinois and United States Constitutions and the Federal Voting Rights This proposal provides fair representation minorities, and provides a map which is politically fair. I ask for your support on this Bill."

Speaker McPike: "The Gentleman moves for the passage of House Bill 1354 and, on that, Representative Churchill."

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

Churchill: "Is...Amendment #4 exactly the same as the Bill which
passed out of the Reapportionment Committee two days ago?"
Madigan: "No."

74th Legislative Day

- June 27, 1991
- Churchill: "And how does it differ from the Bill that passed out of the Reapportionment Committee two days ago?"
- Madigan: "Mr. Churchill, let me correct my statement. Amendment #4 is exactly as approved by the committee. Amendment #5 changes Amendment #4."
- Churchill: "Okay, and then would you explain to the Body how Amendment #5 changes the Bill...which we saw two days ago?"
- Madigan: "Amendment #5 makes minor changes in certain districts on the...in the southern part of Chicago and in some of the southwestern suburbs."
- Churchill: "How many districts are changed by Amendment #5?"
- Madigan: "Eighteen."
- Churchill: "Does it change or have any effect on the African-American districts?"
- Madigan: "Three of those districts will change from a 65% majority district to a 66.2% district. All three would change from 65% to 66.3%."
- Churchill: "Do the changes which you've made in Amendment #5 increase the number of African-American districts?"
- Madigan: "No."
- Churchill: "Do the changes which you've made in Amendment #5 have any effect on the Hispanic districts?"
- Madigan: "No."
- Churchill: "Your plan had originally..."
- Madigan: "Mr. Churchill. Mr. Churchill, your question was whether any of these changes affected an Hispanic district?"
- Churchill: "That's correct."
- Madigan: "They do not affect an Hispanic super-majority district."

 They do affect an Hispanic-influence district."
- Churchill: "And how is that effect?"
- Madigan: "There is a shift of 1,900 people."
- Churchill: "And what does that do to...the percentage of...the

74th Legislative Day

June 27, 1991

Hispanic district?"

Madigan: "Alright, Mr. Churchill. We're going to have to go back and correct my statement. So, let's start with your question. Your question, I believe, would be, 'Did any of these changes affect an Hispanic district?' and so my answer would be that there's no effect upon an Hispanic super-majority district and...and this Amendment #5 does not...does not affect even the Hispanic-influence district either.

Churchill: "So, there is no effect on any of the Hispanic districts?"

Madigan: "Yes."

Churchill: "When was Amendment #5 introduced?"

Madigan: "I believe it was introduced today."

Churchill: "Approximately what time?"

Madigan: "I don't know, but we could ask the Clerk."

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Clerk, when was Amendment #5 introduced?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Between 4:00 and 4:30."

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Clerk, do we have a time stamp for Amendments?"

. Clerk O'Brien: "No, Sir."

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Churchill, we can't tell you with any degree of accuracy when it was introduced. It was introduced today."

Churchill: "Thank you. Mr. Speaker, your plan has seven districts with over 75% African-American population and five with over 84% African-American representation. Do you believe that African-American voters need a district with over 75% or 85% to elect a representative of their choice?"

Madigan: "Mr. Churchill, I feel that this map satisfies the requirements of the Federal Voting Rights Act."

Churchill: "But, do you, personally, believe that you need a district with over 75% or 85% African—American voters for

74th Legislative Day

- June 27, 1991
- the people in that district to elect a representative of their choice?"
- Madigan: "My personal belief is that this map satisfies the requirements of the Federal Voting Rights Act."
- Churchill: "Is it not possible to spread the African-American population out more fairly to give them control of a greater number of districts?"
- Madigan: "I believe that this map satisfies the requirements of the Federal Voting Rights Act."
- Churchill: "Is this like pleading the Fifth Amendment? In a public hearing about two weeks ago, yesterday...not yesterday, but two days ago, the committee hearing, Mr. Bruce Crosby introduced a plan which would create 17 majority African—American seats in Cook County. Did you or the committee consider this plan to see if it complied with neutral redistricting criteria?"
- Madigan: "The committee considered several plans, several ideas and several proposals. I'm not a member of the committee and, therefore, I don't know if Mr. Crosby's plan specifically was considered as a plan by the committee."
- Churchill: "Did you personally consider Mr. Crosby's plan?"
- Madigan: "To my knowledge, I've never seen Mr. Crosby's plan."
- Churchill: "Do you know if the Crosby Plan violated any neutral criteria?"
- Madigan: "Well, as I said, Mr. Churchill, to my knowledge, I've never seen the Gentleman's plan, so I'm not in a position to be rendering any opinion relative to his plan."
- Churchill: "Will you or the committee give the Crosby plan serious attention?"
- Madigan: "Speaking for myself and not for the committee, my policy throughout this process is to...has been to consider all plans, all ideas, and all proposals, which I have done, and I wish to repeat again, that in my judgment, this map

74th Legislative Day

- June 27, 1991
- satisfies the requirements of the Federal Voting Rights
- Churchill: "This morning in the Reapportionment Committee, the
 Urban League proposed a plan which produced one more
 African-American seat than the plan which you proposed
 today. Will you incorporate the ideas of the Urban League
 in your eventual map?"
- Madigan: "I'm sorry, Mr. Churchill, I missed your question."
- Churchill: "This morning the Urban League testified in the Reapportionment Committee that they had a plan which comprised districts that include one more African-American district than the plan which you proposed today. Will you incorporate the ideas of the Urban League into your map?"
- Madigan: "I advised Mr. Leon Bradley from the Urban League several weeks ago that I was anxious to work with him and the Urban League in terms of developing ideas, plans and proposals for consideration in...in drafting a reapportionment plan, so that would be my answer to part of your question. Concerning that particular plan that you referenced now, I am advised by my staff that the plan that you have referenced, in fact, fractures the Hispanic community in the seventh and the tenth ward, and I simply enter that in the record as my statement relative to that plan."
- Churchill: "Nine of the districts in your plan have a Hispanic population of between 20% and 30%. Why did you not combine some of these geographically concentrated districts into one district with a majority of Hispanics or, at least, with enough Hispanics to influence the outcome of the elections?"
- Madigan: "In my judgment, this map satisfies the requirements of the Federal Voting Rights Act, and, as I said in my...opening remarks, which seem to have left me, Mr.

74th Legislative Day

June 27, 1991

Churchill..."

- Churchill: "Well, they were fine remarks."
- Madigan: "Did you like them better the second time than the first time?"
- Churchill: "Yeah, I did."
- Madigan: "On page three of those remarks, I said that in each case possible, the proposal gives African—American and Hispanic—concentrated populations the strongest voice available, no matter how large or small the population concentration."
- Churchill: "Well, then, let me call your attention to your districts 6, 7, and 12. They're all contiguous. They all have a Spanish populations in the mid— to high—20s. Couldn't these districts have been combined in this heavily Hispanic area to create another majority Hispanic seat?"
- Madigan: "Mr. Churchill, in my judgment, this map satisfies the requirements of the Federal Voting Rights Act."
- Churchill: "And so, recombining districts 6, 7, and 12 to create
 a district that would have a higher Hispanic population is
 not something which you would do in this map?"
- Madigan: "As I said earlier, Mr. Churchill, in my judgment, this map satisfies the requirements of the Federal Voting Rights Act."
- Churchill: "What neutral criteria forced you to pair Republican incumbents, Hasara and Robert Olson, in oddly shaped House District #100?"
- Madigan: "Mr. Churchill, as I said in my opening remarks, in my judgment, this map is politically fair, and I would hasten to point out to you and to the Members of the House that this map would provide for 43 safe Democratic districts, 22 swing districts, and 53 safe Republican districts."
- Churchill: "I'm curious about the criteria that you used, though, and I would ask you again, what criteria forced you to pair

74th Legislative Day

- June 27, 1991
- Republican incumbents, Hasara and Robert Olson, in oddly shaped House District #100?"
- Madigan: "Again, Mr. Churchill, in my judgment, this map is politically fair. For a variety of reasons, one of which would be the statistics which I just read into the record."
- Churchill: "Perhaps, you could tell me what neutral criteria forced you to pair Republican incumbents, Hoffman and Balthis, in oddly shaped House District #78?"
- Madigan: "Again, Mr. Churchill, in my judgment, this map satisfies the requirements of the Federal Voting Rights

 Act, and again, in my judgment, is a politically fair map."
- Churchill: "In determining the political makeup of the districts, did you use the University of Illinois trustee race?"

Madigan: "Yes."

- Churchill: "And can you define to me which of the trustees you used?"
- Madigan: "The middle trustee."
- Churchill: "And is that the middle Republican trustee or the middle Democrat trustee?"

Madigan: "Both."

- Churchill: "So you averaged the middle Republican and Democrat trustee, and that is the number which you're using as the basis for your political analysis?"
- Madigan: "Mr. Churchill, we'll have to get back with you, in terms of the methodology that we used."
- Churchill: "Is using the middle University of Illinois trustee basis, is that a measure of political support that has ever been used by political scientists or others in the State of Illinois?"
- Madigan: "Again, we'll have to get back with you with the exact methodology that was used."
- Churchill: "Perhaps you could tell me if there's been some published article or other report that has relied on this

74th Legislative Day

June 27, 1991

measure?"

- Madigan: "I think we'd all be better served if we were to...respond to you after we've had an opportunity to develop a good response."
- Churchill: "Okay, and do you...do you know, did Senator Rock use the same basis in the map which Senator Rock proposed?"
- Madigan: "I think you might want to address that question to Senator Rock."
- Churchill: "Did the...did the numbers which you used come out of your computer program?"
- Madigan: "Again, Mr. Churchill, I think that we'd all be better served if we could prepare a...a response for you."
- Churchill: "I assume then that you'll delay the vote on this Bill until we are able to get that response?"

Madigan: "No."

Churchill: "I had a 50-50 chance, and that was the guess I figured you'd say. To the Bill, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker McPike: "Proceed."

Churchill: "The Minority Party does not agree with the assessment made by the Majority Party of its own proposed legislative maps. There was testimony offered in the committee that this map did not comply with the Voting Rights Act, and I do not believe that the map Amendments significantly change the minority population, as we see it. There was testimony offered that more African-American districts could be drawn, which would meet constitutional and Voting Rights Acts standards. Testimony was offered, and there were a number of examples where an improperly high percentage of blacks were packed into districts, and testimony was offered that more Hispanic districts could be drawn which would meet constitutional and Voting Rights Act standards. We believe that the Majority Party's methodology of identifying the political makeup of the proposal is flawed,

74th Legislative Day

June 27, 1991

and I guess, it's obvious now, that we have no answer on the floor of how this whole thing came about, but I don't think that the use of the second-place, Republican and Democratic University of Illinois candidates, particularly from just the 1988 election, is a reasonable indicator of whether a proposed district can be expected to elect a Republican or a Democrat Legislator. The University of trustee Illinois results do not reflect incumbency advantages; they do not reflect historic support Legislator. This map does not respect communities of interest, as requested during committee hearings. It splits municipalities, townships, and other communities with common interests, and although I'm very happy to say that we've had some time to analyze the basic Bill, unfortunately, we have had no time to analyze the last Amendment, as it was just placed on our desk before we went into conference, and I think that's a serious flaw in the processing of this Bill. A few moments ago, Minority Party supported the passage of a judicial map creating 15 subcircuits in Cook County. We supported this map because we believed that the proposal complied with the constitution and Voting Rights Act. It incorporated the testimony which we had received in committee, and it was a fair compromise politically. Unfortunately, the proposal which is currently before us does not meet the same believe that the proper vote on House prerequisites. I Bill 1354 is a 'no' vote. Thank you."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Lou Jones."

Jones: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. My remarks address the issues of the Federal Voting Rights Act and the maximization of minority voting strength, as they relate to the House...to House Bill 1354.

The first principle which must be followed in the

74th Legislative Day

June 27, 1991

redistricting process is that one-person, one-vote. This principle guarantees the rights of all citizens to equal representation and, certainly, protects the rights minority populations from the dilution of their voting The Illinois House of Representatives affirms strength. its commitment to Federal Voting Rights Act in House Resolution 370, which established our rules governing the redistricting process. I believe the Illinois House Representatives also affirms its responsibility to minority communities through its procedures. First. the unprecedented number of apportionment hearings held throughout the state. Second, the public access computer in Springfield provided organizations and individuals. wished to submit or work on actual maps, the ability to utilize current technologies to their efforts. Third, organizations and individuals representing the minority communities had countless meetings in Springfield, with the leadership of the General Assembly and individual Members the General Assembly, as well as each other. process, the Members of the Illinois House Representatives faced some difficult obstacles. There was a shift of Illinois's population. Although the population increased slightly in the State of Illinois, the urban areas in the state experienced the loss in population. This general trend held true in urban areas such as East St. Louis, the Quad Cities, Rockford, Decatur, Joliet, and Peoria. During the course of 22 hearings by the Illinois House Reapportionment Committee, we heard witness after testify to the reality of the undercount witness Illinois and its effect on the minority population. Another issue, which could have been an obstacle redistricting, was the growth in the Hispanic community. In Chicago alone, the Hispanic community experienced an

74th Legislative Day

June 27, 1991

overall 42% population growth. Due to the efforts of the Speaker of the House in bringing these communities together at every juncture and, also, due to the efforts of the Minority Members in the House and Senate, as well efforts the House Reapportionment Committee, οf the Afro-American and the Hispanic communities worked through the redistricting process in a manner whose clear and positive results are reflected in House Bill 1354. House Bill 1354, the number of districts with a majority African-American population is a total of 15, all of which have an Afro-American population concentration of 65% or Thirteen of these are in the City of Chicago, one greater. of these is in the south suburban area of Cook County, these in the East St. Louis area. House Bill 1354 creates seven Afro-American super-majority Senate districts. districts of 65% or greater Afro-American population concentration, and one minority influence district with Afro-American concentration of 52%. There is difference between minority-influence districts and minority controlled districts, and that difference...that difference is very important to the Afro-American and the Hispanic communities. Minority influence districts are those which have a population concentration of specific minority greater than 50%, but less than 65%. Standards usually apply for minority-controlled districts. argue for the creation of a number of minority-influence districts for Afro-American and/or Hispanic representation, at the expense of minority-controlled districts. In fact, both the Hispanic and the Afro-American communities agree that minority controlled districts are more important than the 65% standard should be used to create those districts. House Bill 1354 creates four Hispanic ... Representative Districts; two on the northwest side of Chicago and two on

74th Legislative Day

June 27, 1991

the southwest side of Chicago, with Hispanic population concentrations of 65% or greater, thus, applying the standards of the Federal Voting Rights Act in redistricting minority for the population. Minority population concentrations, both Hispanic and Afro-American, were kept intact with those House districts in Rockford, Kankakee, Waukegan, Joliet, Lockport, Decatur, Springfield, Quincy, Mt. Vernon, Alexander, Pulaski, and Johnson Counties and In addition, Rock Island Hispanic population its African-American population were kept cohesive. Ιn recognition of this, I fully support House Bill 1354. To Democratic and Republican friends in the Illinois House of Representatives, I ask you to join me in my support of this Bill. In doing so, you will add your voice to the commitment to carry out the intent of the Federal Voting Rights Act."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Santiago."

Santiago: "Thank you...Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in support of House I commend the Members, leadership and staff of the House of Representatives, and community groups throughout the State of Illinois, especially Maldef, for their input and support in maximizing the Hispanic vote in the proposed legislative districts. This map creates two additional Hispanic Representative districts and one additional Hispanic Senate district. By maximizing the Hispanic vote, we have guaranteed that the civil rights of the Hispanic community have not been violated in the reapportionment process. This is a map that maximizes the political power of the Hispanic community and upholds the Illinois Constitution of 1970, the U.S. Constitution, and the Voting Rights Act of 1965, as amended. Mr. Speaker, Ladies Gentlemen of the House, I rise in support and urge the

74th Legislative Day

June 27, 1991

adoption of House Bill 1354. Thank you."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Parcells."

Parcells: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the Sponsor would yield for a question or two?"

Speaker McPike: "Yes, he will."

Parcells: "Mr. Speaker, could you tell me how many districts are now...House districts are now in DeKalb County?"

Madigan: "I do not know."

Parcells: "Is there someone there that might answer that?"

Madigan: "They don't know either."

Parcells: "Well, and I'm not sure, but it appears to me that it's five House districts; and it appears to me, if I'm reading the map correctly, that it's five Senate districts that are proposed in this map. I believe there were only two before. In the town of Cicero, we had testimony, if you may remember, I'm not sure you were at that hearing, but many of your Members were, that they asked, 'Please to be kept compact,' and, if I have read the map correctly, and, perhaps, you know the answer to this, do you know how many House districts there are in Cicero?"

. Madigan: "No, I don't."

Parcells: "Well, and once again, if I am reading the map correctly with the guidance of someone from that area, once again we have four House districts, where there used to be three, and three Senate districts. Up in my own area, and this part I can read very well, Wilmette is in...little town of Wilmette, 27,000 people, has three House districts, three Senate districts. New Trier Township, one of the smaller townships, appears, unless you can tell me that I'm wrong, to have four House districts and four Senate districts and, also, the Township of Worth, four House districts and four Senate districts and four Senate districts and four Senate districts and four Senate districts. The reason I bring this up is that...you stated in the beginning that you had

74th Legislative Day

June 27, 1991

to follow four bodies of law: the...Voting Rights Act, the Illinois Constitution, and the Federal Constitution. Voting Rights Act doesn't address what I'm about about this, but the Illinois Constitution surely does and that's the compact and contiquous, and these are not very compact; and, furthermore, we had testimony from, at least, half of those towns that I mentioned asking us, as a matter of fact begging us over and over again, to please put us in one district, at the very most two. It appears we've put them in four and five districts, and they said, 'We have communities of interest to have our town in one area.' They specifically asked for it. They said, 'We want to be compact; we do have communities of interest, and we'd like it if you'd please try to put us in one area.' In each of these areas, we have put them in even more districts than they already are, and, if...for that reason and, if no other reason, but certainly for that reason, I would ask that we take a 'no' vote on this Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Kulas."

Kulas: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to have my remarks and the answers to my questions journalized for the purpose of legislative intent and for any future proceedings. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker McPike: "Yes."

Kulas: "Representative Madigan, in Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act, as amended, Subsection B, which you handed out to us with our maps, what do you consider to be a protected class?"

Madigan: "I'm advised by counsel that protected classes are African-Americans and Hispanics."

Kulas: "Mr. Speaker, on the near westside of Chicago, there's a community known as the Ukrainian Village, which has three churches, a school, a museum, an art institute, youth

74th Legislative Day

June 27, 1991

organizations, senior citizen centers, a credit union, a bank, and numerous other business and civic organizations. Would you consider them to be an ethnic community under the Voting Rights Act that should fall under the protected class?"

- Madigan: "I believe that the lawyer that I consult with on these matters would say that they are not."
- Kulas: "Well, I'm not a lawyer, Mr. Speaker, but I have case law here in...Kovalevsky versus West Publishing Company, you know about West Publishing. In Kovalevsky versus West Publishing Company in Minnesota, the courts ruled that an employee's Ukrainian roots were sufficient to establish her as a member of a protected class, that discriminated against on the basis of national origin. Would you, in that case, reconsider your decision that...that this group should fall under the protected class?"
- Madigan: "Mr. Kulas, I have not read the case that you cited.

 I'm not familiar with it, and, as I said earlier, I'm not rendering my own legal judgment; I'm simply repeating what I've been told by a lawyer, who is quite familiar with this area of the law."
- Kulas: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen, I really wasn't going to get up and speak on this Bill because people would say, 'Ah, it's just sour grapes. He got a lousy district, so he's going to get up and talk against the Bill.' But, I really can't, in good conscience, go back to my community, to my family, my pastor, to my friends and tell them that I didn't at least get up and speak on their behalf, because under this map the Ukrainian community is disenfranchised. My mother, who lives a block and a half away, is in a Hispanic district. My brother, who lives two blocks away, and all of my

74th Legislative Day

June 27, 1991

churches, are in an African-American district, and I'm in a Well...well, maybe the yuppies are a yuppie district. protected class, I don't know. But I'm a realist. Speaker, and I knew that when the census numbers came out the Hispanic community's population had increased a and they deserved two new super-majority seats in this General Assembly. Knowing that, I made concessions. large portion of my district in order to form this super-majority new district. This, I can explain to my community, but how can I go back to them and say, 'Well, listen, the African-American community, they've lost a 120,000 people, but they retain all their seats plus they get one new suburban seat'. This they won't understand, and, lo and behold, the Republicans get up and say, 'Well, the African-Americans should have more seats.' know. I'm from the old school where two and two is four, and I guess with this new math it's three minus one equals So, I can't go back and explain that to my people; five. they won't understand that. This is a political map. know it, and...all I can say is the Ukrainians are hardy people. We survived the purges of the Communists in 1930s, and we'll survive the purges of the political system here in Illinois in the 1990s, but I can't support this map."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Daniels."

Daniels: "Mr. Speaker, listening to the Gentleman's comment kinda made me want to address, shortly, some of the subject matters that are brought up on this map, and I couldn't help but listen carefully to him and think about the fact that relying upon the same people that drafted the maps in 1981, which ultimately were ruled to have discriminated against minorities in the State of Illinois and the Federal Court made them change it, would almost be like asking Al

74th Legislative Day

June 27, 1991

Capone to be your bookkeeper, and I thought to myself, 'There's a parallel here that finds an amazing connection.' listened carefully to the debate, short as it may have been, but the results of the study and the map dealing with the judicial subdistricts of Cook County, a Bill that we passed in this House in order to create the subdistricts, that the Speaker argues complies with the Voting Rights Act, (I happen to agree with that; that's why I voted for the Bill), and the resounding approval of the subdistricts in Cook County by this General Assembly, and then I watched the presentation of the current matter before us, and I listened to the very carefully asked questions by Representative Churchill and the inability to answer those questions, technical questions as they may be, but questions of the person that drew the maps in 1981 and is now drawing them in 1991, and says to us, 'We'll get back to you on that,' sometime, of course, after he hopes this map passes, and then I think on behalf of all of the people of the State of Illinois that are asking us now to make sure that their interests are represented in the General Assembly, that their voice is heard in the General Assembly on matters of importance to their community: the questions of schools, affordable housing, future of our leaders, future of our children, the important decisions that we make here so that every person within this state is represented within this Assembly, as we sit here in the pictures of Stephen Douglas and Abraham Lincoln, in the best traditions of what Illinois has to offer, and I wonder if this map really gives us the best that Illinois can offer, and I wonder to myself if the compliance of Voting Rights Act, that we have before us where we're told that, 'Oh, it's alright, minority groups, you should be satisfied because, after all, you did lose population,' but

74th Legislative Day

June 27, 1991

have we forgotten that in 1981, the map drawn then was ruled to have discriminated against minorities? forgotten that in 1982 the United States Congress passed the Voting Rights Act to protect the minorities of country from the occurrences that took place in 1981 in this Legislative Assembly? And can we forget that recently the United States Supreme Court spoke clearly about judicial one-man, one-vote Voting Rights Act and the application to...of that to the election of judges? I think not, and I think it's important then for us to view the actions of today and the anticipation that this map may be pushed through by the Majority Party, without the participation of the Minority Party, which I strongly violates every premise and every principle of representative government, and I use as a comparison what occurred on the judicial remap and the structure of our judiciary in the largest county in the State of Illinois and how Republican and Democrats, minority individuals worked together with white ethnics to craft a map that we unanimously, without one dissenting vote, approved in this General Assembly, and I say now, 'Is this the process in its best form,' and the answer has to be 'yes', and then I say, 'What's happening now?' It's happening now because you couldn't resist, the Majority Party could not resist, the temptation to take this all into the back room. So, you file an Amendment that's supposed to be an answer to the dreams of the people of Illinois and their future and you give us, not 72 hours to study it as we argued on this floor, you give us less than 72 minutes. A shock, a disgust for all the people that we represent! And, yeah, I come from DuPage County, and I'm darned proud of my county, because we have a lot to be proud of, as I assume every person here is proud of their area that they represent, and

74th Legislative Day

June 27, 1991

I look it and I say, 'Isn't it interesting that we've had one of the fastest-growing counties in the United States of America, and we're reduced in legislative districts?' Clem. that's a fascinating theory, isn't it? It sure is. reduced in the number of districts that we have in the fastest-growing county in the United States of America, and what does it say, 'You didn't follow the population shifts; you didn't follow the trends: you didn't recognize that people have moved in this state from one area to another Does this comply, then, with one-man, one-vote? area.' No, it certainly doesn't. We know that. We have lawyers like you have lawyers, (They're all too expensive by the but I won't criticize ours because I'm going to be relying on ours very heavily as we move this process through the court, which we will, and our lawyers tell us, 'Man, this thing is a mess,' and then, of course, studied very carefully, you know...remember the rule that we had to furnish the diskette when we filed the think you took your diskette and ran it over a magnet before you gave it to us because we had to write a whole new program to input in the system. That's okay. We expected that, so we're prepared for that. We were able to write the program, but you now file a new Eighteen map. changes in Cook County that you give us no diskette, no time to study, no time to debate, no time to analyze and no time for input with people like a man that stands up for minorities in this state by the name of Crosby, who is a man who fought in 1981 for minority representation in state and won...and won in Federal Court where the court 'Yes, you said. are right. The minorities discriminated against.' You don't give him a chance for that input. It's one thing to step on the Minority Party, and we aren't too surprised, but it's another thing to

74th Legislative Day

June 27, 1991

intentionally step on minorities and their rights that are protected under the Voting Rights Act, so I don't believe that your Amendment will stand the light οf review. I don't believe that your Amendment is compact and look at the strange shapes that you have contiquous. Ι created, which to obviously intended me are disenfranchise many of the voters in the southern part of Cook County and to adversely, intentionally adversely, districts impact the οf Representative Balthis, Representative Regan, and Representative Hoffman in such a fashion as to destroy the ability of the people in that area to have a say in governmental operations and study those maps and the strange shapes that you've put together and the doughnut holes that you've created in the State Illinois. in certain areas of this state, in an attempt to maximize Democratic influence. You do not respect community of interest and, yes, in its final and complete analysis, you have politically gerrymandered this state in an effort to retain the majority status as you know it today, as a result of your political gerrymandering I am, in the truest sense of the word, disappointed. disappointed because it is this party, this side of the aisle. that forced the hearings that took place throughout this state, and I am disappointed because I had hoped, maybe idealistically so, for a better result than what we have now, but I will tell you, Republicans will speak up, will have more to say in the future about your actions, and, yes, we will defend the minorities of this state to the fullest extent of the law, to the fullest extent of the protection of our Constitution and our federal laws, to make sure that they are appropriately represented in this state. You do not do that; it is unfortunate. I am personally going to vote 'no'. I'm

74th Legislative Day

June 27, 1991

going to vote 'no' because of the violations that have taken place here, and I'm going to vote 'no' on the part of the people of Illinois and the people who have been disenfranchised and discriminated against by this most unfortunate Amendment."

Speaker McPike: "Speaker Madigan, to close."

Madigan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. First, let me compliment the Majority Members of the Reapportionment Committee because those Members were the ones, who in conjunction with the Minority Members of the committee, attended all of the public hearings which were conducted throughout the State Illinois, but it was the Majority Members of the committee that drafted а map that provides reapportionment of legislative and representative districts State of Illinois. There is only one map under consideration. So, to those who have found reason to criticize this map, and there have been some to my right, I ask, 'Where is your map? Why don't you advance a map?' When the Constitution talks in terms of the responsibility of the General Assembly to reapportion itself every ten years, the Constitution is speaking in terms of all Members of the General Assembly, not just those who happen to be Members of the Majority Party in a given year. So, this is It's a good, solid map. It meets all of the requirements of the United States Constitution, the Constitution of the State of Illinois and the Federal Voting Rights Act. There was some comment regarding community of interest. We do have a record of public testimony taken at the hearings chaired by Representative Lou Jones. That record clearly indicates a mixed opinion on the question of community of interest. Some who have spoken today have argued that all communities in this state have appeared before the committee and said, 'We want to be

74th Legislative Day

June 27, 1991

We don't want to be divided into different districts.' The truth of the matter is that the record is replete with instances where communities have come before the committee and said, 'It has been to our advantage that we are divided in the different districts.' When there's a matter before the General Assembly or where there's a matter before a state agency in Springfield, where our community is divided among different districts, we have the ability to call upon several Members of both the House and the Senate to advocate the interests of our community before the Legislature and before state government. don't want to leave this issue with people thinking that the record of our committee is only in one direction in the area of community of interest. The truth is that the record is mixed, at best. Let me point out that consideration of this map today and before the committee is full compliance with the rules of the House of Representatives. There was some reference to the inability of certain people not being able to read a diskette. That diskette is prepared in complete compliance with standards established by the United States Department of and if there's somebody who's unable to...read a diskette prepared in compliance with the standards of United States Department of Justice, please accept my apologies. In conclusion, as I stated in my remarks, this map is fair, politically fair, it is compact, it is contiguous, it meets the requirements of the one-person, one-vote principle, and i t meets the requirements of the Federal Voting Rights Act, as amended. I request an 'aye' vote."

Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 1354 pass?'

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

Representative Myron Olson, to explain his vote."

74th Legislative Day

June 27, 1991

- Olson, M.: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Just for the record, it should be noted that ten years ago Speaker Madigan, then the Minority Leader, did not file a map, because he didn't think he could pass it. So, when we get to the rhetoric of what we're doing here this...this year, 1991, that should be noted for the record."
- Speaker McPike: "Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this Bill, there are 69 'ayes' and 46 'nos', and House Bill 1354, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1360. Mr. Clerk, has this Bill been read a second time?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "This Bill has been read a second time previously."

Speaker McPike: "Are there any Amendments filed?"

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

Speaker McPike: "Representative Churchill."

Churchill: "Please withdraw Floor Amendment #1."

Speaker McPike: "Amendment #1 is withdrawn. Eurther Amendments?"

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

Speaker McPike: "Representative Churchill, Amendment #2."

Churchill: "Please withdraw Floor Amendment #2."

Speaker McPike: "The Gentleman withdraws Amendment #2. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative
Churchill and Parcells."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Churchill."

Churchill: "Please withdraw Floor Amendment #3."

Speaker McPike: "Amendment #3 is withdrawn. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #4, offered by Representative

74th Legislative Day

June 27, 1991

Santiago and Martinez."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Santiago. Would you give the Gentleman some order? Proceed."

Santiago: "Thank you...Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise to offer Amendment #1...Amendment #4 to House Bill 1360, which creates a Hispanic majority district in the City of Chicago. The Hispanic population in Chicago is over 700,000. Of this population, there are two distinct population centers: one on the northwest side and one on the southwest side. Ву linking these two populations. we can...can establish a Congressional district with a Hispanic majority. Amendment #4 to House Bill 1360 creates just one Congressional district; it is a district with a 63% Hispanic population. This district that provides the protected minority of the district with the opportunity to elect a person of their choice as required by the Voting Rights Act of 1965, as amended. Besides creating a district for the protected Hispanic minority, this map allows for three districts to be drawn with a minimum of 65% black population. proposed districts connects two major Hispanic population centers using Harlem Avenue as the connector. As I previously, the district is 63% Hispanic. There have been proposals that would put the district at 60%, 61%, and even 62%. Many of you may think that two or three percentage points are insignificant, but even one percentage point is significant when it comes to the Hispanic district. Mr. Speaker, can I have some order, please."

Speaker McPike: "Would you give the Gentleman some order?"

Santiago: "One percent of a Congressional district equals 5,700 people. The federal courts have decided that a district with a 65% minority population provides the protected minority with the opportunity to elect a person of their

74th Legislative Day

June 27, 1991

Maldef has proposed a district with 64% Hispanic majority. That is already 5,700 people short of what the courts have ruled. By going down to 63% majority, we are 11,400 people short. Due to the lower Hispanic citizenship and voter turnout, anything less than a 63% Hispanic minority puts in jeopardy the opportunity for the protected minority to elect a person of their choice. I am willing to replace this map with any other map that can be on by all parties interested, but that map must have at least 63% Hispanic population. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, it is our responsibility to draw a Congressional Failure to draw a Congressional map is an affliction of our...of our responsibility. Ву not passing Congressional map, we will be violating the civil rights of 700,000 Hispanics in the City of Chicago. We will, also, violate the U.S. Constitution, the Illinois Constitution, and the Voting Rights Act of 1965, as amended. By not passing this map, we will violate, once again, the U.S. Constitution, the Illinois Constitution, the Voting Rights Act of 1965, as amended, and our own House Rules. We will, also, violate the civil rights of 700,000 Hispanics in the City of Chicago. By adopting this Amendment, we will be able to prove in court that there was legislative intent to create a Hispanic Congressional district. I seek your support for Amendment #4 to House Bill 1360, which creates a 63% Hispanic majority Congressional district. adoption of Amendment #4 to House Bill 1360. Thank you very much."

Speaker McPike: "On the Amendment, Speaker Madigan."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, as an accommodation to a Member, I would accept this Amendment."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Churchill."

74th Legislative Day

June 27, 1991

- Churchill: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Gentleman yield?" Speaker McPike: "Yes."
- Churchill: "Representative Santiago, can you explain to us, does the configuration of this district resemble a 'C'?"
- Santiago: "Yes. We're using the...Harlem Avenue as the connector, so we're going around the...the west end."
- Churchill: "Okay, so you have a...a large part of the population on the north side...or near north side, a large population on the near south side, and you've connected it by running the district west down Harlem Avenue and then coming back.

 Is that correct?"

Santiago: "You are correct."

Churchill: "Does your Amendment only contain one Congressional district?"

Santiago: "You are correct."

Churchill: "So, there are no other Congressional districts that are drawn in your Amendment?"

Santiago: "You are correct."

Churchill: "Okay, thank you very much."

- Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #4 be adopted?' All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #5, offered by Representative
 Anthony Young, Lou Jones, and Shaw."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Anthony Young."

Young: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #5 provides a Congressional redistricting plan for four Congressional districts in Cook County. Three of those districts would be African-American, one of them would be Hispanic. It's an alternative to the plan previously prevented...presented. It would provide three African-American Congressional districts. What is now the

74th Legislative Day

June 27, 1991

lst Congressional District would have а 70% African-American population. What is 2nd now the Congressional District would have an approximately 68% African-American population. What is now the 7th Congressional District would have approximately a 65% African-American population. It also draws a proposed Hispanic district. That district would have a Hispanic population οf approximately 62%. We offer a...alternative plan for the General Assembly to consider. It draws the Hispanic Congressional district by connecting the north and southwest sides around a map that the connecting point goes at Mannheim Road. It's a map that is supported by Congressman Hayes and Congresswoman Collins, and I would move for its adoption."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Churchill."

Churchill: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Gentleman yield?" Speaker McPike: "Yes."

Churchill: "Representative Young, does this Amendment only include four Congressional districts?"

Young: "Yes."

Churchill: "And there are no other Congressional districts throughout this state that are incorporated in this Amendment?"

Young: "No, there are not."

Churchill: "Does this Amendment attempt to work out the previous

Amendment with the Hispanic district?"

Young: "Could you repeat that question?"

Churchill: "Does your Amendment work out between the Hispanic district or are there gaps or are there overlays between the districts that you're proposing and the Hispanic district?"

Young: "The districts are different."

Churchill: "Are they contiguous to the Hispanic district?"

74th Legislative Day

June 27, 1991

Young: "No."

- Churchill: "Are there any conflicts between the districts which you proposed and the Hispanic district?"
- Young: "Yes. This map creates an Hispanic district, but the lines are not the same as the ones in the previous Amendment."
- Churchill: "So, the Hispanic district, which you're creating in this Amendment, supersedes and changes the Hispanic district that we just created with the previous Amendment #4?"
- Young: "No, it does not. It's an alternative plan, but it does not supersede. Both would be on the Bill, but this Amendment does not delete everything that came before it."
- Churchill: "So, there are conflicts between this Amendment and the previous Amendment geographically, is what you're saying."
- Young: "That is correct."
- Churchill: "Could you, briefly, describe each of the districts in terms of Chicago geography, so we have some concept of where the districts lie?"
- Young: "What is called District #2 in the Amendment would be the equivalent of what is now Congressional District #1, represented by Congressman Hayes, which is the near and middle south sides. Congressional District #3 in this Amendment is now what is Congressional District represented by Congressman Savage, which is the far south side and south suburbs. Congressional District #4 in the Amendment is now Congressional District #7, represented by Congresswoman Collins, which is the Loop, the west side and the western suburbs, and Congressional District #5 of is our proposed creation of an Hispanic Congressional district that links the northwest side and the southwest side to the west at approximately Mannheim

74th Legislative Day

June 27, 1991

Road."

Churchill: "According to our reading of your Amendment, your Amendment only contains three districts. You've just described four districts."

Young: "The Amendment contains four. The Amendment contains Congressional districts two, three, four, and five."

Churchill: "Okay, thank you."

Speaker McPike: "Speaker Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, as an accommodation to a Member, I would accept the Amendment."

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

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker McPike: "Speaker Madigan."

Madigan: "Third Reading."

Speaker McPike: "You wish this Bill to go to Third Reading? Representative Daniels, for what reason do you rise?"

Daniels: "Inquiry of the Chair."

Speaker McPike: "Yes."

Daniels: "Does not Amendment #5 have a different 'Hispanic district' than Amendment #4? And, if so, wouldn't that be out of order?"

Speaker McPike: "Well, the Amendments have been adopted, so the Point of Order..."

Daniels: "That may be. I still have the right to inquire of the Chair as to whether or not the Amendments are in order. You want to move this to Third Reading, and the question is first, 'Are the Amendments in order, and doesn't Amendment #5 contain a different Hispanic district than Amendment #4?' Both Amendments have been adopted. The question is, 'What is the intent of the Majority Party?' You want to

74th Legislative Day

June 27, 1991

draw two Hispanic different districts that cross each other? Are they in order?' I think, by the fact you've adopted both, they are out of order and, secondly, my question would be whether or not a district map that only redistricts part of the Congressional area of the State of Illinois, is, in and of itself, in order or out of order? Rule carefully Mike, Jim, whomever..."

Speaker McPike: "On the point, Speaker Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, Mr. Daniels seems to be a little aggravated, and I wouldn't want to aggravate him at this late hour because he's such a fine fellow, so, if we could leave the Bill on Second Reading, and let me simply state that since this Bill, as amended, does not provide for a complete map of the State of Illinois, I do not plan to attempt to move the Bill, and if you could take the Bill out of the record, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker McPike: "Alright, the Bill will be taken out of the record. Representative Matijevich now moves that the House stand Adjourned until tomorrow at the hour of 10:00 a.m. All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have and the House stands Adjourned. First Special Session will come to order, and the Attendance Roll Call for the Regular Session will be used as the Attendance Roll Call for the First Special Session. Attendance Roll Call will used...Regular Session will be used for the First Special Session. Representative Maitjevich now moves that the First Special Session stands Adjourned until tomorrow at the hour of 10:05 a.m. 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

92/09/14 14:38:23

JUNE 27, 1991

HB-0002	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	5
HB-0016	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	118
	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	20
	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	19
	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	24
	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	26
	CONCURRENCE		
		PAGE	28
	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	15
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	27
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	75
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	76
HB-0104	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	78
HB-0114	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	55
HB-0114	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	112
HB-0129	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	119
	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	3
	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	4
	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	4
	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	4
	NON-CONCURRENCE		•
		PAGE	4
	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	4
	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	5
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	78
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	79
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	30
HB-0313	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	42
HB-0314	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	61
HB-0342	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	70
HB-0358	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	24
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	120
	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	16
	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	17
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	85
	NON-CONCURRENCE		
	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	6
		PAGE	53
	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	16
	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	22
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	87
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	29
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	44
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	86
HB-0673	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	53
HB-0679	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	6
HB-0687	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	69
HB-0700	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	30
HB-0714	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	22
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	103
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	87
	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	8
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	44
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	120
	NON-CONCURRENCE		
		PAGE	21
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	124
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	62
	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	21
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	88
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	63
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	91
	DISCUSSED	PAGE	18
HB-0847	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	31
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	38
HB-0847	OUT OF RECORD	PAGE	34
HB-0857	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	121
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	35

REPORT: TIFLDAY PAGE: 002

STATE OF ILLINOIS 87TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES DAILY TRANSCRIPTION OF DEBATE INDEX

92/09/14 14:38:23

JUNE 27, 1991

	3 2 2	-	
HB-0885	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	91
HB-0894	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	34
	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	21
	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	6
	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	7
	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	7
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	122
	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	25
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	98
	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	26
	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	18
	NON-CONCURRENCE CONCURRENCE	PAGE	19
	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE PAGE	113 19
	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	10
	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	53
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	35
	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	22
	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	3
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	36
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	65
	OUT OF RECORD	PAGE	63
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	53
HB-1254	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	84
HB-1321	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	25
HB-1353	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	23
HB-1354	RECALLED	PAGE	131
	RECALLED	PAGE	127
HB-1357	THIRD READING	PAGE	128
	RECALLED	PAGE	157
	OUT OF RECORD	PAGE	164
	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	37
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	38
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	39
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	40
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	104
HB-1431	OUT OF RECORD	PAGE PAGE	110
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	11 112
	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	7
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	47
	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	7
	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	8
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	45
HB-1545	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	23
HB-1564	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	26
HB-1587	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	84
HB-1601	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	64
HB-1604	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	46
HB-1615	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	72
	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	8
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	63
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	117
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	66
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	96
HB-1752		PAGE	105
	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	26
	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	70
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	46
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	41
	CONCURRENCE NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	99
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE PAGE	17
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	73 54
.10 1727	- STOOMNEHOL	FAGE	74

REPORT: TIFLDAY PAGE: 003

STATE OF ILLINOIS 87TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES DAILY TRANSCRIPTION OF DEBATE INDEX

92/09/14 14:38:23

JUNE 27, 1991

	JUNE 214 1991			
HB-1949	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAG	E 9	
HB-1996	CONCURRENCE	PAG	E 123	
HB-2005	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAG	E 52	
HB-2010	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAG	E 23	
	CONCURRENCE	PAG	E 101	
	CONCURRENCE	PAG	E 48	ļ
	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAG		
	CONCURRENCE		E 111	
	CONCURRENCE	PAG		
	CONCURRENCE		E 73	
	CONCURRENCE	PAG		
	CONCURRENCE	PAG		
	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAG		
HB-2169		PAG		
	CONCURRENCE	PAG		
	CONCURRENCE	PAG		
	OUT OF RECORD	PAG		
	CONCURRENCE	PAG		
	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAG		
	OUT OF RECORD	PAG		
	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAG		
	CONCURRENCE		E 50	
	CONCURRENCE		115	
	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGI		
	CONCURRENCE	PAGI		
	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGI		
	CONCURRENCE	PAG		
	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAG		
	CONCURRENCE	PAGI		
	CONCURRENCE	PAGI		
	CONCURRENCE	PAGI		
HJR-0041	RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGI		
NJK-0041	KESOFOLION OFFERED	PAG	3	
	0110 1507 111755			

SUBJECT MATTER		
HOUSE TO ORDER - REPRESENTATIVE MATIJEVICH	PAGE	1
PRAYER - REVEREND JOHANNESEN	PAGE	1
PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE - REP. GRANBERG	PAGE	1
ROLL CALL FOR ATTENDANCE	PAGE	1
AGREED RESOLUTIONS	PAGE	2
GENERAL RESOLUTIONS	PAGE	2
DEATH RESOLUTIONS	PAGE	2
GENERAL RESOLUTION	PAGE	7
REPRESENTATIVE KEANE IN THE CHAIR	PAGE	17
INTRODUCTION - MR. WOJTEK TUREK	PAGE	20
REPRESENTATIVE GIGLIO IN THE CHAIR	PAGE	64
INTRODUCTION - CONGRESSMAN DURBIN	PAGE	91
INTRODUCTION - FORMER REPRESENTATIVE WOODY BOWMAN	PAGE	91
REPRESENTATIVE LAURING IN THE CHAIR	PAGE	119
HOUSE TO ORDER - REPRESENTATIVE MCPIKE	PAGE	127
ADJOURNMENT	PAGE	164
FIRST SPECIAL SESSION	PAGE	164
FIRST SPECIAL SESSION - ADJOURNMENT	PAGE	164