136th Legislative Day

June 20. 1984

Speaker McPike: "House will come to order. The House will come to order. Members will be in their seats. To lead us in prayer today, we will have two chaplains, Father James Hill, Pastor of St. Ambrose Catholic Church in Godfrey. Father Hill is a guest of Speaker Madigan. And Reverend Tyrone Henderson, Pastor of First Baptist Church in Centralia. Reverend Henderson is a guest of Representative Dwight Friedrich. Will the guests in the balcony please rise and join us in the invocation?"

Pather Hill: "In the name of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit, Amen. Beavenly Father, we know that unless You a house, we labor in wain without Your help. stand today before You, asking You to come into our and fill our presence because we dedicate ourselves to You. We offer You to our ... We offer service to You. We ask that in our deliberations today that You enter our minds and give us wisdom, and counsel and understanding so that we can work for the common good of the people of this great state of ours. Яe ask this through Christ, our Lord. Amen. In the name of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit, Amen."

Reverend Henderson: "Our God, it is good that Your presence power is here with us today. There are times that we enter into a relationship with You burriedly. with expectations of our own. Today, Father, we come praying that we will be sensitive to Your presence and Your that we will seek Your will to be done here, that we will be coming to You and honoring You with the gratefulness of our heart for our life and love and literty, that we will be coming to You to honor You with a contrite realizing that we are not perfect and that we have need of You at all times. And we come to You, yes, thankful for

136th Legislative Day

June 20, 1984

Your continued grace and mercy upon our lives, upon our nation, upon the people that honor You. And so we just come, praising You this morning, and, yes, we come seeking Your kingdom, Your power, to give You glory in the name of Jesus. Amen."

- Speaker McPike: "Be led in the Pledge of Allegiance by Bepresentative Ropp."
- Ropp et al: "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the Republic for which it stands, one Nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."
- Speaker McPike: "Boll Call for Attendance. 115 Members answering the Boll Call, a quorum is present. Representative Piel."
- Piel: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, would the record show that Representative Neff is excused on account of illness, please?"
- Speaker McPike: "Yes, thank you. Representative Greiman, do you have any? Thank you. Message from the Senate."
- Clerk O'Brien: "A Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. 'Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has concurred with the House in passage of Bills, together with the attached Amendments, in the adoption of which I am instructed to ask concurrence of the House of Representatives, to wit; House Eills #243, 876, 1302, 2296, 2332, 2339, 2345, 2388, 2400, 2428, 2430, 2454, 2466, 2516, 2569, 2570, 2576, 2684, 2693, 2751, 2775 and 2783, passed by the Senate as amended June 17, 1984. Kenneth Wright, Secretary."

Speaker McFike: "Agreed Resolutions."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 1058, Madigan; 1059, Hensel - Karpiel; 1061, Breslin - et al; 1062, McNamara; 1063, Panayotovich; 1064, Topinka; 1065, Matijevich; 1066, Terzich; 1067, Vitek - et al; 1069, Stuffle - Johnson;

136th Legislative Day

June 20, 1984

1070, Ropp; 1071, Keane; and 1072, Krska."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Matijevich."

matijevich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have my aid helping me here while 1 do these. House Resolution 1058, expresses our appreciation to our former Member, Wolbank, who is making a 1870 lithograph presentation to us today: House Resolution 1059, Hensel - Karpiel, celebrates the 150th anniversary of St. Charles, Illinois: 1061, Breslin, honors a respected jurist, Leonard Hoffman, on his retirement; 1062, McNamara, an Eagle Scout award by Mark Hacker; 1063, Fanayotovich, honors the 7th Annual Serbian Orthodox Tennis Tournament; Topinka, 1064, honors the Lutheran ... Concordia Lutheran Church αn its anniversary; 1065, Matijevich, the 50th anniversary of Happy Day Nursery School; 1066, Terzich, golden wedding anniversary of Adolf and Margaret Schwarz: 1067, Vitek, golden wedding anniversary of Peter and Louis (sic -Louise) Paserpsky: 1069, Stuffle - Johnson, on the... the Naval Weather Service Association, its 10th Annual Reunion: 1070, Ropp, retirement of Bex Miller; 1071, Keane, the 90th birthday of Arthur Burns; and 1072, the 50th wedding anniversary of Mr. and Mrs. Pasqual Hernandez. Speaker, I move the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions."

Speaker McPike: "Gentleman has moved for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it, and the Resolutions are adopted. General Resolutions."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Joint Besolution 163, by Representative
Mautino - et al; and Bouse Resolution 1060, by
Representatives Shaw and Rice."

Speaker McPike: "Committee on Assignment. Leath Resolution."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 1068, by Balph Dunn and Richmond, with respect to the memory of Vincent Robert

136th Legislative Day

June 20, 1984

Erickson of Murphysboro."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Matijevich moves for the adoption of the Death Besolution. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'nc'. The 'ayes' have it. The Resolution is adopted. Reading of the Journal."

Clerk O'Erien: "Journal of ..."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, I move the approval of Journals 114 of
May 4, 1984, all the Journals through Journal 130 of June
6, 1984. This has been cleared with the other side of the
aisle too, so I move the approval of those Journals."

Speaker McPike: "The Gentleman has moved the approval of Journals
114 through 130. On that, Representative Piel."

Piel: "Question. I didn't catch the last statement. Did he say that has been cleared with Representative Vinson?"

Matijevich: "Your head Journal man is Dwight Friedrich."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Dwight Friedrich."

Piel: "Fine, thank you very much."

Friedrich: "We have gone over these Journals, Mr. Speaker, and have been... have approved them."

Speaker McPike: "The Gentleman moves for the approval of House Journals 114 through 130 as read. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Motion carries. Page 11 of the Calendar, Speaker's Table, Short Debate, appears House Resolution 288, Representative Gut of Rea. the record. Bouse Resolution 952, Page 11 of the Calendar, House Representative Brookins. Resolution 952, Representative Brookins."

Brookins: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Assembly, last year, we passed Bouse Fill 751 for voters registration where it allowed young folks in high school of voting age to graduate with a diploma in one hand and a voters registration in the other, allowing principals of

136th Legislative Day

June 20. 1984

high schools to become registrars, deputy registrars for the voters registration. In conjunction with that, the Chicago Board of Education signed up 63 principals out of a total of 66 in May of last year. Euring that registration drive of May, over 5,000 young people was first time voters and first time registrars in the Chicago area. For that, I'd like to have a Resolution to the General Superintendent of the Chicago Schools, Dr. Ruth Icve, the Chicago Coalition for Voters Registration and the Mayor of the City of Chicago, for their efforts in this tremendous drive. With that, I would like your favorable vote from you."

- Speaker McPike: "Gentleman has moved for the adoption of House Resolution 952. Is there any discussion? Being none, the question is, 'Shall House Besolution 952 be adopted?' All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Besolution is adopted. Page two of the Calendar, Senate Bills Third Reading, Short Detate, appears Senate Bill 1374, Representative Curran. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1374, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Vehicle Code. Third Beading of the Bill."
- Speaker McPike: "Gentleman from Sangamon, Representative Curran."

  Curran: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, 1374 simply amends the Vehicle Code to exempt vehicles registered as and displaying Illinois recreational vehicle plates from the safety inspection requirement. A Bill that did a lot more than that, but also encompassed that idea, passed this House 106 to mothing a couple weeks ago. It also passed the Senate 47 to 5 yesterday. I ask for a favorable Boll Call."
- Speaker McPike: "The Gentleman moves for passage of Senate Bill 1374. Is there any discussion? Feing none, the question

136th Legislative Day

June 20, 1984

is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1374 pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed vote "nc"\_ Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this Bill there are 108 'ayes', no 'nays', none voting \*present\*. Senate Bill 1374, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Bill 1797, Representative Currie. Is the Lady on the floor? Out of the record. Senate 1879, Bill Representative Vinson. Representative Vinson, do you to have your Bill called? Out of the record. Senate Bill 1881, Representative Hensel. Read the Eill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1881, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Purchasing Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Hensel." Hensel: "Thank you, Br. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 1881 amends the Illinois Purchasing Act to provide three things; that any purchase of natural gas by a state agency, when the price is less than that offered public utility, shall be exempt from bidding requirements; two, that specifications for the testing and balancing of heating and air conditioning systems and for general contract work shall be prepared for independent bidding; and three, that if total construction costs of plumbing, electric, heating, air conditioning and general contract work are less than \$100,000, independent bidding is not required. It also amends the Steel Products Procurement Act to provide; one, clarification that Act applies to a structural steel products, rather than the more general steel products; that all bids and negotiations are based on U.S. steel products, unless the contractor can certify a savings of ten percent or more through the use of foreign steel; that the burden of proof is placed on

136th Legislative Day

- June 20, 1984
- the lowest bid contractor, rather than the executive head of the public agency, to certify savings through the use of foreign steel. I know of no opposition to the Bill, and I ask for a favorable vote."
- Speaker McPike: "The Gentleman moves for passage of Senate Bill 1881. Is there any discussion? Gentleman from Cook, Representative Cullerton."
- Cullerton: "Yes, would the Sponsor yield for a question?"
- Speaker McPike: "Indicates he will."
- Cullerton: "With regard to the independent specifications in bidding not being required if the total cost of the work is less than \$100,000, is that a change from current law?"
- Hensel: "Yes, it was originally \$50,000. They tried to get it up to \$200,000, and it was amended down to \$100,000."
- Cullerton: "So, the existing law is \$50,000?"
- Hensel: "It is at present, yes. It's being increased up to \$100,000."
- Cullerton: "Okay, and what is the reason for that?"
- Hensel: "Well, as you know, the... you don't get too much for \$50,000 anymore these days, and they did try to get it up to \$200,000, but negotiated down to a hundred."
- Cullerton: "But why is independent bidding not a good idea, even if it's a project that's less than 100,000? What is the... What is the reason for not having independent bidding in these lower cost contracts?"
- Hensel: "Let me just check bere? Well, there... there should be a cost savings in it, and I really don't have an answer to that one, Representative, but I'm sure that it was an agreed..."
- Cullerton: "Well, the theory behind independent bidding, as I understand it, is to save money for the state because there is competition from potential bidders. Now, if I understand the Bill, what is the alternative to independent

136th Legislative Day

- June 20, 1984
- bidding? Negotiated bids or what? They can just give it to whomever... the agency chooses to give it to without having to have bids on it?"
- Hensel: "The... Actually, the... just a minute. We still have to have bids, but not separate bids for the individual categories, and the different categories are plumbing, heating, ventillation and electrical."
- Cullerton: "Well, as a result of this change in the law, what would the effect be on smaller contractors as opposed to larger contractors?"
- Hensel: "It should provide more work for the subcontractors at this point."
- Cullerton: "And why is that?"
- Hensel: "Well, there should be a greater pool of jobs available through the... this type of bidding."
- Cullerton: "Okay. I really question the logic behind that argument. I understand that there are parts of the Bill which are worthwhile. I just have reservations about this one change, and I can't see how it would necessarily save the state money. It may, indeed, cost the state money. So, I'm, at this point, somewhat leery of the purposes behind that particular Amendment. It was put on in the Senate. I understand that the rest of the Eill has some value though."
- Speaker McPike: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Levin."
- Levin: "Yeah, can I have the support to remove this from the Short Debate Calendar?"
- Speaker McPike: "Well, it doesn't look like you have the support.

  I don't see any hands, Ellis, so it stays on Short Debate."
- Levin: "Okay, alright. Then let me then speak against it in its current form. I notice there is an Amendment that was put on in the Senate that exempts from the formal bidding requirement natural gas contracts if the cost is less than

136th Legislative Day

June 20. 1984

that offered by a public utility. I can't understand... no rationale. If we can get the price cheaper than ... for the State of Illinois than a residential customer it through competitive bidding. I think we ought to be able This seems to me that it's going to cost us money. We are trying to save money. We're cutting budgets. We're concerned about saving every penny we can, and then we get a Bill like this, which... which I can understand... no rationale for good parts of this Bill. You know, it's going to cost us more money. You know. think parts of it are okay, but there are a number of parts that I can't see any reason for, and until we can get some of those parts removed from the Bill. I would urge a vcte."

- Speaker McPike: "Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Hensel, to close."
- Hensel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In regards to the natural gas Amendment, it provides that any contract for the purchase of natural gas when the cost is less than offered by a public utility. And we feel that there could be a savings and the state could have saved \$250,000 in the 83-84 heating season if this Bill would have been implemented last year. So, I believe that it is a good Bill, and I ask for a favorable vote."
- Speaker McPike: "The Gentleman moves for passage of Senate Bill The question is, \*Shall Senate Eill 1881 pass?\* 1881. A11 those in favor signify by voting \*aye\*, opposed vote \*no\*. Bave all voted? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this Bill, there are 74 "ayes", 18 13 voting \*present\*. Senate Eill 1861, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Bill 1887, Representative Nash. Representative Nash on the floor? Out of the record. Senate Bill 1957.

- 136th Legislative Day

  Bepresentative Friedrich. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1957, a Bill for an Act in relation to obselete and duplicative provisions in the statutes.

  Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker McPike: "The Gentleman from Maricn, Representative Friedrich."
- Priedrich: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the Bouse, this is the revisionary Bill of the Reference Fureau. One of the duties of the Reference Bureau is to go through the statutes and take out obselete material or conflicting or duplicative material. This is the tiggest Bill you're going to be voting on this Session. It's about 2,100 pages, and I will tell you upfront I haven't read it. But the Democrat Staff has gone through it and told me they find no fault, and there's no substantive material in it.
- Speaker McPike: "The Gentleman moves for passage of Senate Bill 1957. Is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Terzich."
- Terzich: "Bepresentative Friedrich, did the staff that goes through the Law Bevision Bills go through this Bill?"
- Priedrich: "Well, Representative Cullerton has had somebody on the Democrat Staff go through it and incidentally it takes about two or three weeks, and they ve just completed their work and have said that they have cleared everything with the Reference Bureau."
- Terzich: "Well, I'd just like to mention that the Executive

  Committee took good care of this Fill for you."
- Priedrich: "We appreciate that, and I hope you read all of it."

  Terzich: "I did last night. Thank you."
- Speaker McPike: "Further discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1957 pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed vote 'nc'. Have all

136th Legislative Day

June 20, 1984

voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this Bill there are 112 'ayes', no 'nays', none voting 'present'. Senate Bill 1957, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Speaker Madigan in the Chair."

Speaker Madigan: "Farly... It's too early. Mr. Clerk, do you have a Resolution? Mr. Clerk, do you have a Resolution to be read? Please read the Resolution."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 1039, offered by Representatives Madigan - McGann - Keane. Whereas, the Members of this House welcome the opportunity to recognizes important occasions in the lives of citizens of this great state; and July 1, 1984, Margaret Halpin Hill of whereas, on Gillespie, Illinois, will be joined by her family and numerous friends in the celebration of her 90th birthday: and whereas, Margaret, was born in the heart of Illinois on July 1, 1894, spent her early years on the central Illinois farm and later moved to the town of Gillespie where she still lives today; and whereas, after receiving training as a teacher, Margaret returned home and became an elementary school teacher in Benld, Illinois; and whereas. on September 19, 1919, Margaret was married to Bugh Hill and subsequently they built a home, which is today still occupied by Margaret, next door to the family home of Margaretas parents on South Second Street in Gillespie; and whereas, Margaret Halpin Hill and Hugh Hill were blessed with 4 wonderful children: William, Mary, Bugh, Jr. and James; and whereas, the Hill home has always been a place where the Hill family has been able to enjoy the peace. warmth, love, care and mutual concern of a full and family life. Therefore, be it resolved, by the House of Representatives of the 83rd General Assembly of the of Illinois, that we congratulate Margaret Halpin Hill on

136th Legislative Day

June 20, 1984

the occasion of her 90th birthday and we wish her many more years of the full and wonderful rich life which she has always enjoyed. And be it further resolved, that a suitable copy and Freamble of this Resolution he presented to Margaret Halpin Hill as a token of cur esteem for this fine woman."

- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Clerk, has that Resolution already been adopted by previous action of the Bouse? And at this time the Chair would recognize at the podium Representative McGann, who is one of the principal Co~Sponsors of the Resolution."
- McGann: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Hembers of this Assembly. This is truly a pleasant day for all of us here in Springfield when we can honor a gracious lady a proud woman such as Mrs. Margaret Hill. Her ninety years have been spent in our great state. She is truly deserving of this recognition, and I am so proud to have been able to play a small part in this beautiful occasion."
- Unknown: "I think she wants to say a few words to her friends out there."
- Margaret Hill: "Me... I want to thank the Legislature of this one great State of Illinois to make this the bappiest day of my life. I thank you very, very much."
- Speaker Madigan: "Before we proceed to further speeches, the Clerk has the Proclamation from the Governor's Office that he will now read, and then I have the actual Proclamation hand which I will give to Margaret Hill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Whereas, Margaret Halpin Bill is a thoroughbred product of the soil of Illinois, born of the heart of the state on July 1, 1894, where she has remained leading a full, typical midwestern life focused on farm, family and friends; and whereas, trained as a teacher in Normal she returned to her home to teach grade school in Benld in

136th Legislative Day

June 20, 1984

1916; and whereas, married in 1919 to Hugh Hill whose family settled the farm adjoining the Balpins outside of Gillespie, she raised a family of four children and became an active member of the community which she remains to this day; and whereas, in her lifetime she has seen her home state evolve from a sparce settled prairie to a prospering emalgam of agriculture, industry, technology and education, while her beloved Gillespie remains the warm atmosphere she and her contemporaries established there. Therefore, I, James R. Thompson, Governor of the State of Illinois, proclaim July 1, 1984, as Margaret Balpin Fill Day in Illinois on the occasion of her 90th birthday."

- Speaker Madigan: "And now we'll hear from the Hill family. We have with us on the podium two sons of Margaret Hill, we have Hugh Hill, we have Pather James Hill, and we have Jackie Hill who is the wife of Hugh Hill. And at this time, Hugh Hill."
- Hugh Hill: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, and I like the attendance you have here. I have teen covering this Legislature for 25 years and outside of coming up and bugging the Speaker about something or other, this is the first time I've ever been on the podium to do something like this. And on behalf of my family and my mother, I certainly want to thank all of you and particularly Andy McGann, who dreamed all this up to tell you the truth, and, of course, the Speaker, Mike Madigan, an old pal who has arranged it, and you who have sat there and listened. Thank you very, very, very much."
- Pather James Hill: "Well I want to thank you for the attention.

  I get more attention here today than I do on Sunday, but

  I... I... we do... As I was driving up this morning I was
  thinking of something, I... of the marvelous work that is
  done here in this Legislature for really and truly a great

136th Legislative Day

June 20, 1984

state. I concur with my mother on that. I wouldn't want to change it for anything. Thank you very much."

Speaker Madigan: "I failed to acknowledge that Bugh Hill's Steve Hill, is with him. He's off to the side. And on behalf of the Assembly in addition to the Resolution. wish to offer our heartful congratulations to you upon your 90th birthday, and to thank all the members of the Hill family for joining us today in this celebration in House chambers. Thank you very much. Gentlemen. we now have another old friend αf the Legislature, everybody's friend, former Representative, Pete Miller."

Pete Miller: "Thank you. It's the most difficult to follow this marvelous celebration this morning. I just want to say this is where you and I part friends. I'm here issue the usual challenge for tonight's game and to... also to thank the Speaker for this opportunity of pushing the ticket sale. I have a daughter out here on the rotunda, third floor, selling tickets. She's got a table there, and this goes for the Boys' Club of Springfield. We built that marvelous stadium out here, but we neglected to put a flagpole up there. And the money that's raised tonight provide that flagpole. And I'm scrry... I... I think we can win tonight because I see Sam limping there. not going to play. But I do want to thank Balph Capparelli for keeping this game alive in the House and for the interest and also the Speaker, and tonight we part company. Tonight we're out to knock your blocks off, but I know the score will be, you know ... but let's just remember when we lose the kids of Springfield win. That's the way the Senate feels about this. And they re all coming out tonight, and I want you to know after tomorrow heart will be on my sleeve for the House where it's always

136th Legislative Day

June 20, 1984

- been all these years. Thank you."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Capparelli."
- Capparelli: "I would just like to accept Mr. Miller's challenge tonight, and ask everyone of you to participate and come out, and I would like to give Pete a check here for \$310 that the House raised here."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Breslin in the Chair."
- Speaker Breslin: "Ladies and Gentlemen, on the Order of Senate
  Bills Third Reading, page two on your Calendar, appears
  Senate Bill 450, Representative Giorgi. Clerk, read the
  Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 450, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Optometric Practice Act. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Giorgi."
- Giorgi: "Madam Chairman, I ask leave of the House to move this Bill back to the Order of Second Reading for the purpose of an Amendment."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentlemen asks leave to return Senate Bill 450 to the Order of Second Reading for the purposes of an Amendment. All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the Gentleman has leave. Clerk, read the Amendment."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #1, Vinson, amends Senate Bill 450 in the House on page one by deleting line 14 and so forth."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Vinson."
- Vinson: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 450 is an Amendment agreed by the Illinois State Medical Society, the Illinois Ophthalmological Association and the Illinois Ophthalmological Society. It is an Amendment which substantially addresses the concerns that the Medical

136th Legislative Day

June 20. 1984

Society and the Ophthalmological Association bave had regard to Senate Bill 450. What the Amendment does, number one, it creates a new joint board composed of three optometrists, three ophthalmologists and a pharmacologist the purposes of certifying optometrists for the administration of diagnostic pharmaceutical agents. That same new joint board will have the authority to approve any new drugs added to the statutory formulary in the Bill. The therapeutic use of any drug by an optometrist is prohibited and should an optometrist use any drug for a therapeutic purpose, he is delicensed as an optometrist. high risk groups are established by statute; number one, implant patients; and number two, very young children under two years of age. It was felt that in the case of those very young children and of those implant patients substantially higher guarantees of protection, should thev be administered drugs, were required. specifically what is required is that any patient who has had an intra-ocular lens implant may not be administered a diagnostic pharmaceutical agent by an optometrist with the exception of two particular drugs for the purpose of reducing intra-ocular pressure. In addition, in the case of very young children, those under two years of age, there is a flat prohibition. The concern there is that the dosage necessary to achieve the necessary effect ín examination is much greater in proportion to the weight of a very young child and, therefore, the risk of reaction is substantially greater. There is also requirement in the Amendment that the Director of Public Bealth on notice from the Director of B and E circularize pharmacists in the State of Illinois on the legal list of drugs which optometrists may utilize for examining purposes. I believe that this Amendment, which is an

136th Legislative Day

June 20, 1984

agreed Amendment, substantially strengthens the Fill. I believe that it creates the opportunity for these two professions to engage in a process of constructive cooperation, and I believe that it will remove this continual and repetitive fight that has raged over this issue in recent years. I commend it to your attention. I would request your 'aye' vote on the Amendment, and I am prepared to answer any questions."

- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has noved for the adoption of Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 450, and on that guestion, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Preston."
- Preston: "Thank you, Madam Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I am not going to belabor the discussion on the Amendment except to say that the Fill without the Amendment is a horrendous creation of this Body. The Bill with the Amendment is very little better. It makes it simply a terrible Bill, but a slight inch better than without the Amendment. I'm going to be voting for the Amendment, but I hope people will, thereafter, join me in defeating this horrendous Bill."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Champaign, Representative  ${\tt Jchnson."}$
- Johnson: "If the Sponsor would respond, I have a couple of questions that I'd like to ask, primarily to ascertain legislative intent."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman will yield to a question."
- Johnson: "My first question, Representative Vinson, is this: If one optometrist would administer a drug, and subsequent to that, the patient, for whatever reason, have an adverse reaction, does the Director, with the consent of the board, have the ability to decertify any other optometrist other than the one that administers the particular drug?"
- Vinson: "Representative, the answer to your question, in short,

136th Legislative Day

June 20, 1984

is no. At some length I would say this. The board is authorized to discipline, to suspend, to decertify for The purpose of the Bill is to create cause. authority for optometrists, under proper conditions, to use optometric drugs... to use diagnostic pharmaceutical agents for examining purposes. It would be impermissible and a violation of the purpose of the Act for the board to denv certification or revoke certification from one ... from one optometrist in the event that some other optometrist had made a mistake or had acted illegally."

Johnson: "Thank you. My second question is this. Let's assume that you have a currently practicing oftometrist who has taken a course in instruction from a properly accredited institution. Would it be possible, or would it be permissible for the Director, again, with the consent of the board, to adopt rules and regulations which would make it more difficult for that optometrist to be certified than it would be for a new graduate optometrist to be certified?"

Vinson: "No. that would be impermissible. There is no grandfathering under the Bill or under the Amendment, or under the Bill as amended. However, because we are creating joint board where both optometrists a and ophthalmologists will be involved in the certification optometrists for the use of diagnostic pharmaceutical agents, we are concerned to make it absolutely clear that a consistent set of standards will be applied to both new optometric graduates and to currently practicing optometrists. In both cases, the key provision is that they receive pharmacological training and certification from a properly accredited institution of higher education. The... It would be a violation of the intent of the Act and the purpose of the Act for the board to adopt testing or

136th Legislative Day

- June 20, 1984
- certification procedures which made it impossible for an optometrist who had achieved such training and education, even though currently practicing, to be so certified.
- Johnson: "Thank you. I appreciate the responses, and I support the Amendment."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Cook, Berresentative Vitek."
- Vitek: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Will the Gentleman answer a few questions?"
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman will yield to a question."
- Vitek: "Br. Representative, how many hours of training does an optometrist need before he qualifies under this Bill?"
- Vinson: "Representative, we have, in the Amendment, granted the authority to make those determinations to a joint board equally composed of optometrists and cphthalmologists and they will make those determinations."
- Vitek: "And they are going to determine how many hours. Now, how many hours does a physician have to have before he can use any of these drugs? Is it going to be comparable to what a physician has to have?"
- Vinson: "A physician may be able to use these drugs with absolutely no experience in administering them to the eye."
- Vitek: "Well, see this is what bothers me, that the board is going to decide. Why isn't the fact that these optometrists should have the same amount of training before they can administer drugs to the eye because the eyedropper is just as dangerous as the pill... I mean the needle when you have people that are not trained. This is what I am worried about."
- Vinson: "The point is that medical doctors will be involved in the determination of the necessary training for this... for an optometrist to be able to use these drugs."
- Vitek: "Well, right... I don't want to carry this dialogue on back and forth. Bight now they have no training whatsoever

136th Legislative Day

June 20, 1984

- to administer these drugs."
- Vinson: "No, that's not correct. That's not correct."
- Vitek: "Well, what education have the optometrists had? They only can administer two different drugs."
- Vinson: "Extensive pharmacological training in these drugs in optometric school."
- Vitek: "But they only administer two drugs right now. Hight now you have got a list here of almost ten of them that they are going to use in your Amendment."
- Vinson: "The point is that in an optometric school, they receive... they currently receive pharmacological training in those drugs, Representative."
- Vitek: "Only as to two various things..."
- Vinson: "No, that's not correct. That's not correct. You are wrong in that point."
- Vitek: "Well, where am I wrong? How many different drugs can they administer now, an optometrist?"
- Vinson: "Currently, an optometrist cannot. The point that I was making was they do receive pharmacological training in an optometric school for all of those drugs."
- Vitek: "I still think it's a bad Amendment. I'm sorry, Sam."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Peoria, Representative Tuerk."
- Tuerk: "Would the Sponsor yield to a couple..."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman will yield for a question."
- Tuerk: "There's been a great deal of controversy surrounding this

  Bill for a number of years. Does this Amendment remove all

  the controversy prevalent with the proposal?"
- Vinson: "Yes, Sir."
- Tuerk: "It removes all the controversy among the ophthalmologists throughout the state?"
- Vinson: "Well, there may be... and there certainly are, individual ophthalmologists and individual optcmetrists who

136th Legislative Day

June 20, 1984

do not like this Amendment. There are individual ophthalmologists who will believe forever that no ortometrist should ever administer these drugs, and there are individual optometrists who will believe forever that it's inappropriate for a medical doctor to be part of licensing apparatus for an individual optometrist. the things necessary to arrive at a reasonable outcome this issue was that both sides had to compromise. And in process, both sides had to give something un\_ if this Amendment goes on the Bill, the State Medical Society and the Illincis Ophthalmological Association remove their opposition to Senate Fill 450."

Tuerk: "To what extent has the compromise been able to speak to the controversy to the extent of satisfying most of the ophthalmologists in the state?"

Vinson: "Well. the key point that repeatedly was made in this controversy by ophthalmologists was that they are concerned that the optometrist would be ... was not adequately trained in the administration of these drugs... inadequate pharmacological training. They have recognized that with the creation of this joint board which will certify optometrists to use these drugs, a board on which they participate and which will control the disciplinary process for optometrists who use these drugs, that that addresses very substantially their concern in training. Secondly. they have raised criticism of the Bill in that certain patients are more susceptible to reaction to these drugs than other patients. And for those high risk classes of patients, we have set out particular protections so that only ophthalmologists will be able to administer drugs those high risk classes. So I believe in particularly those respects the controversy has been addressed, those were the things that their representatives said that

136th Legislative Day

June 20, 1984

they wanted corrected in the... in the Eill. And the key point is that if this Amendment goes on, they have pledged to remove their opposition to the Eill."

Tuerk: "One last question. Say an optometrist is 50 years old and practicing for 20 years, he would have to return to school to get the proper training in order to meet the provisions of this Amendment?"

Vinson: "Yes, Sir. There is no provision for grandfathering anywhere in the Amendment or in the Bill after it is amended. It is necessary that a practicing optometrist return to school and get the pharmacological training from a properly accredited institution."

Tuerk: "How would that be controlled?"

Vinson: "Ey this joint board composed of medical doctors and optometrists."

Tuerk: "He would have to be certified then at the proper time."

Vinson: "Yes, Sir."

Tuerk: "Thank you."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Ccok, Representative O'Connell."

O'Connell: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Members of the General Assembly. I rise in opposition to the Amendment. As a preface, however, to my remarks in opposition, I would like to say that generally I am a proponent of compromise. I think that politics is the art of compromise and I would commend the... both sides of this issue for their endeavors in arriving at a fair and equitable compromise. I would, however, indicate that I think that this measure, this compromise measure, should be opposed on a three-fold basis. First of all, the issue is the determination and the definition of two existing professions. It is my opinion and my belief that the administering of drugs is in the province of a trained medical physician, period,

136th Legislative Day

June 20. 1984

without any elements of moderation to that issue. I think that the purest form of a matter so vitally integral to the health and safety of our citizenry we should maintain that In that regard, I would suggest that whatever the modifications to the definition of physician, to definition of optometrist, it should not include the administering of drugs, whatever those drugs Secondly, I would suggest that the controversy will not be ended with this compromise. I would submit that this been a hard fought issue for years and that the issue will continue to be fought in further modifications of compromise if adopted today. Therefore, I think that in the years to come, we will be again debating the issue of whether this Amendment should be further modified, further amended. And thirdly, I think that what we we adopt this Amendment, is to set up a further bureaucratic entity in the development of a formulary be administered system ta Łу various people of professions... the medical profession, the pharmacological profession, optometry profession. th€ ¥е are another layer of bureaucracy to an already overlavered State Government of bureaucracy. I don't think that we will be able to effectively administer this Amendment even it is adopted. So, with my respects to both sides of the issue, I would submit that the Amendment should opposed because if we do amend the Bill, we will be making a bad Bill better, and I would suggest that it be opposed. Thank you."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Stuffle."

Stuffle: "Madam Speaker, Members of the House, the Amendment, I think, is as good as we are going to see at this time.

This Bill, particularly, has been before us in one form or

136th Legislative Day

June 20. 1984

another for the last several years. Representative Vinson and Representative Giorgi and others are to he commended for putting this together at the eleventh hour, if you will. This issue will only serve to return here time and time again, if it's not resolved now. Both sides have given a great deal in putting together this compromise. Both sides have advanced their arguments to the point, I think, that we have cleaned this Bill up, and both sides have protected the public interest that so many talk about. There will be always some people who don't want anyone in their domain, whether or not there is logic and reasoning behind the optometrists argument, and I believe there is. There will always be someone who opposes any encroachments, any advancements and any efforts to help the public. need to accept the compromise, and pass the Bill and put the issue behind us."

Speaker Breslin: "There being no further discussion,

Representative Vinson is recognized to close."

Vinson: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Assembly. First of all, I want to thank Representative O'Connell. I understand that he is in opposition to the Amendment, but no one has done so much to make this Amendment possible as he has, and I want to thank him for that. Number two, I want to state that the Amendment is reasonable compromise, and the Amendment is supported by the Medical Society, the Ophthalmological Association and the Optometric Society. Number three, what the Amendment does is to create a constructive engagement of the professions bу involving both medical doctors and optometrists in determining which oftcmetrist should certified, where the proper training should be and in the disciplinary process for the administration of these pharmaceutical agents. Finally, I want to make this

136th Legislative Day

June 20, 1984

observation which really underlines the reason why this is such an important issue and why it has been attended by so much controversy. There are really two fundamentally different patterns of primary vision care in Illinois. Vision care... Primary care is one thing if you are in the Cook County area where there are a great many ophthalmologists and optometrists. There the individual has the ability, very quickly if he wants to, to resort to ophthalmological care. However, if you are downstate in Illinois, it is very difficult to get ophthalmological care. You have to drive, in many cases, very many miles to get to an ophthalmologist. What this Bill does is to provide an optometrist a modern mechanism, under careful and strict supervision, a modern mechanism administration of modern primary vision care. For those reasons, I would urge the adoption of Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 450."

Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall the House adopt Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 450?\* All those in favor vote \*aye\*, all those opposed vote \*no\*. Voting is open. all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. this Motion, there are 105 voting 'aye' ... Representative Madigan asks to be voted 'aye'. There are 106 voting \*aye\*, 5 voting \*no\*, and 1 voting \*present\*. This Amendment is adopted. Representative Giorgi now asks for immediate consideration... There are no further Amendments. Representative Giorgi now asks for immediate consideration of Senate Bill 450. There are objections, Representative Giorgi. Representative Giorgi, therefore, moves that Senate Bill 450 be heard immediately on the Order of Third Reading. Excuse me. Mr. Clerk, are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

136th Legislative Day

June 20, 1984

- Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. The Bill is now on the Order of Third Reading, and Representative Giorgi's Motion is timely for immediate consideration of House... of Senate Bill 450. All those in favor vote "aye", all those opposed vote "no". Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Motion there are 95 voting "aye", 7 voting "no", and 1 voting "present". Representative Giorgi, on Senate Bill 450. Read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 450, a Eill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Optometric Fractice Act. Third Reading of the Eill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Giorgi."

- Giorgi: "Madam Speaker, I think the Bill has been fully debated, fully lobbied and everyone's informed fully as to what the Bill's contents are, so I now move that Senate Bill 450 be supported by this House."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman moves for the cassage of Senate
  Bill 450, and on that question, the Gentleman from Cook,
  Bepresentative Vitek."
- Vitek: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Ladies and Gentleman of the Honse-Beautiful. beautiful. beautiful. Death is: beautiful. Death is beautiful. When you read this and read this Bill, even with the Amendment, here is a report, a medical rebuttal. During the hearings held on in the House Human Services Committee, Illinois physicians presented several cases of drug reactions, which resulted in blindness, one of which required heroic resuscitation in the physician's office to prevent the death of a healthy 40 year old male over a... Cuiet. don't know when we get such important Bills down here that people can't sit and keep quiet for two minutes. might affect your own family, even with this Amendment of Sam Vinson's, an honorable man, could cause some child or some member of your family blindness, or a shock or

136th Legislative Day

June 20, 1984

I don't know how many people read The Fen articles of the association, but they couldnot publish it unless it was true, and I'm quoting from part of that, 'Over a two year period, 28 South Carolina ophthalmologists reported separate drug induced side effects, including one death, three heart attacks, five convulsions, two attacks, 29 cases of acute glaucoma all from the use of very safe topical diagnostic drugs. Fut these drugs in the hands of men who have had no experience whatsoever. Sam says they have had experience in the school of optometry, but not in the school of medicine. When you put eye drops with an eye dropper in the eyes and a man who does not know what he is doing, it's just as dangerous as a doctor who gives the needle and doesn't know what the hell he's doing. This is the danger of this kind of a Eill. Gc ahead. Vote for it, but I m not going to have it on my conscience when some optometrist turns around and puts some drops in the eyes and causes either the blindness of some poor innocent little kid or some male. Go ahead, vote for I'm going to vote 'present'."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Cook, Bepresentative Preston."

Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of Preston: "Thank you, Madam House. Really. just echoing the remarks Representative Vitek. We shouldn't feel that this Bill is agreed to by the physicians. Yes, the Medical Society, because they were constrained to by the fact that the Motion to take from the Table succeeded last week, they facing losing the whole loaf and so they were forced to lose only a portion of the loaf and to agree to the Bill with some modifications. if Eut you talk ophthalmologists, as I have, during this past week. ophthalmologists are not in agreement on this Bill. They

136th Legislative Day

June 20. 1984

are not against it because of a turf battle, and this has nothing to do with the battle between the Medical Society the Optometrists Society because they don't matter one But what does matter is the eyesight of the children of this state and the adults of this state. If you talk to Ron 'May', who is the past president of the Illinois Ophthalmology Association, or to Dr. Steven 'Vial', who president of the Illinois Cphthalmology the present Association, or to Dr. Lisa 'Wall', or to Dr. 'Cxana', who's last name is more difficult to pronounce than opthalmologist, these people will tell you. Representative Vitek has told you, that putting drops in the eye can cause cardiac arrest. Futting drops in the eye can cause the immediate onslaught of glaucoma and immediate blindness. To permit people who don't have medical training to deal with the emergencies that come up, as well as not having medical training to deal with a simple knowledge of what each of the many drugs that they going to be able to put into your eyes are, what the consequences can be, makes absolutely no sense. ø€ also tell you about a conflict of interest. In my other life, I'm an attorney. I represent some of the largest optical houses in the United States. I represent many optometrists. Yes, I have a conflict of interest, and I'm voting against that interest that I have by voting an absolute 'no' on this terrible Fill. Optometrists simply not trained in the practice of medicine, and they are not trained in enough of the practice of medicine to allow them to put drops in your eyes, various types of drops, anesth... various types of anesthetics, various types of topical appliances which do not belong... being done by someone not properly trained. It is very important that we look at the real issue. It is not a turf battle

136th Legislative Day

June 20, 1984

between associations. It's a turf battle between what is safe to use and what is not safe to use, and that battle has to be resolved on the side of what makes sense. Let doctors practice medicine. Let physicians practice medicine, and let optometrists continue refracting eyes the way they have. This is a terrible Fill that's dangerous to eyesight. I urge you to vote "no"."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Ccck, Representative Marzuki. Please refrain from demonstrations. The rules provide that there shall be no demonstrations in this House. Representative Marzuki."

Marzuki: "Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'm not certain that it makes a whole lot of difference as to who administers the eye drops at this moment. I think what we ought to be considering is the safe dispensing of drugs by all individuals who are allowed to administer drugs. I think there is ample evidence that even those who are thoroughly trained sometimes dо not take the proper precautions in administering drugs that includes and the medical profession. For us to extend, without proper safeguards, the dispensing of more drugs would be, in my opinion, mistake. I think that we need to look hard at what is qoing on in all of the medical practices in the state make doctors more aware that they should be very careful before administering drugs. I, myself, have been a victim of poor administration of drugs. I think many people in this House have had similar experiences. To extend this would be a mistake regardless of how many other states have I think we need to look at the total problem done it. before we extend this particular ability to utilize drugs by anyone. I would urge a "no" vote on this Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Ccck, Representative

136th Legislative Day

June 20. 1984

Terzich."

Terzich: "Fefore I turn in my Visine, I'd like to move the previous question."

Speaker Breslin: "That's unnecessary, Bepresentative Terzich.

There is no further discussion. Representative Vinson is recognized to close."

Vinson: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. First of all. I want tc recconize that Representative Vitek is clearly an honorable man who is acting on what he perceives to be the best possible advice. I have no doubt of that. But I also want to say to him that I read the articles regularly, in The Fen. that you were referring to long before this legislation was brought to шÀ attention. And I investigated those articles. I investigated them very carefully. And I tell you, in all sincerity, that if you were to investigate those articles in The Fen and the background data that they attempt to report, you would find that that is a malicious and unfounded publication that you cannot rely on and that no one here should rely on and that no one here would rely on if they made a deep background check on that particular publication. I can assure you you would come conclusion bad you the benefit of the background investigation I had on that. Representative. Manv are sold without prescription, over the counter, that are far more dangerous than the drugs we talk about in this Bill. Many professionals are authorized to administer far more dangerous drugs with less pharmacological training. That is true of dentists. That is true of podiatrists. That is true in some cases of medical doctors who do not understand certain parts of the body as well as some other professions and yet are authorized to administer specialty drugs to those particular parts of the body. Forty-three

136th Legislative Day

June 20, 1984

other states have adopted this legislation, and in the course of that process of modernizing the practice of vision care, what has resulted in the form of ortometric malpractice premiums, optometric malpractice premiums have actually dropped. If there were some great risk in letting optometrists utilize these drugs. Representatives, then the trial lawyers would have certainly jumped on it, and there certainly would have been an increase in malpractice Finally, I would make the point that the premiums. Ophthalmological Association and the Medical Society do not oppose this Bill, and they do not oppose this Bill because now we have created a constructive engagement of the professions. Under the terms of this Bill as amended, there is a strong process jointly surgresised by medical doctors and optometrists for the certification optometrists to use these drugs, and there is a process of discipline established. I believe that one of the results of this Bill will not only be better vision care for the people of the State of Illinois, but I also believe that in the long run this Bill will result in a much better relationship among the professions of this state for delivery of care. I would solicit your "aye" wote on Senate Bill 450."

Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 450 pass?"

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

Voting is open. Representative Vitek, you spoke in debate and, therefore, may not explain your vote. For what reason do you rise."

Vitek: "My name was mentioned in debate... I mean in talk with Mr. Vinson, and I just want to correct one thing he mentioned about malpractice insurance. So, since my name was mentioned, a point of personal privilege that I want to get straightened out and maybe help some of these trial

136th Legislative Day

June 20, 1984

lawyers and make them an extra buck. Fetween 1974 to 1982, AETNA Insurance reported a 500 percent nationwide increase in premiums for optometric malpractice insurance. That's a fact. A decrease in 18 percent in any one year is certainly an exception to a long term trend. So, Sam, the trial lawyers love this Bill."

- Speaker Breslin: "Have all voted who wish? Eave all voted who The Clerk will take the record. On this Eill there wish? are 93 voting \*aye\*, 14 voting \*nc\*, and 5 This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1223. Representative Hoffman. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1375, Representative Tate. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1420, Bepresentative Reane. Out of the record. Representative LeFlore. Out of the record. 1481. Senate Bill 1484, Representative Greiman - Nash. the record. Senate Bill 1538, Representative Giorgi. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1538, a Bill for an Act in relationship to interest rates on special assessments and certain sanitary districts. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Breslin: "Bepresentative Giorgi."
- Giorgi: "Madam Speaker, I request leave of the House to move this

  Bill back to the Order of Second Reading for the purpose of
  an Amendment."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman asks leave to return this Fill to
  the Order of Second Reading for the purposes of an
  Amendment. Are there any objections? Hearing no
  objections, the Gentleman has leave. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "Amendment #4, Giorgi, amends Senate Bill 1538 as amended."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Giorgi."
- Giorgi: "Madam Speaker, this is at the request of the

136th Legislative Day

June 20, 1984

Metropolitan Sanitary District of Chicago. This Amendment will authorize the Metropolitan Sanitary District to issue demand notes in lieu of long term capital improvement bonds. There's no change in the district's borrowing capacity, and the Amendment merely provides an alternative financing mechanism which will result in the savings in interest costs. Both the City of Chicago and the Cook County have been using this type of financing with great success, and I urge support of the Amendment."

- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #4 to Senate Bill 1538, and on that guestion, is there any discussion? Hearing no discussion, the guestion, is "Shall Amendment #4 to Senate Eill 1538 be adopted?" All those in favor say "aye", all those opposed say "nay". In the opinion of the Chair, the "ayes" have it and the Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?" Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. Representative Gicrgi now asks
  leave for immediate consideration of Senate Bill 1538.
  Hearing no objections, the Gentleman has leave. Read the
  Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1538, a Bill for an Act in relationship to an interest rate on special assessments in certain sanitary districts. Third Beading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Madam Speaker, this is the... this is curing all the problems for the sanitary districts of the State of Illinois. They have been debated guite at length in the General Assembly, but I'll... give you a brief rundown on them. The first one has to do with special assessments allowing the interest rate to reach the public acceptance rate. The other is it allows sanitary districts who have to comply with the... the national energy requirements that

136th Legislative Day

June 20. 1984

these... Because this is the only vehicle available for sanitary district problems, the staff has asked that it be held for short time so that they can study the further Amendments, but I d like to move it to Third Reading in the meantime."

Speaker Breslin: "The Bill is on Third Reading. We will take it out of the record at this time, Representative Giorgi. On page five on your Calendar appears Senate Bill 1692. Representative Cullerton. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1841. Representative Keane. Representative Keane. the record. Senate Bill 1850. Representative Daniels -Madigan. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1859. Representative O'Connell. Representative O'Connell. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1864, Representative Vinson. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1883, Representative Out of the record. Senate Bill 1889. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1935, Representative Madigan - Currie. the record. Senate Bill 1941. Representative Barnes. Senate Bill 1941. Clerk, read the Fill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1941, a Bill for an Act to amend certain Acts in relationship to environmental protection.

Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Ereslin: "Representative Earnes."

Barnes: "Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Senate Bill 1941 is one of the Bills from the hazardous waste task force. The effect of the Bill, it directs the Department to conduct studies for all new facilities storing, treating, or disposing of hazardous waste in land. Amends the Environmental Protection Act to provide that the state geological and water survey shall assess and comment on the applicant's hydrological study for a development permit for a new facility to store, treat, or dispose of hazardous waste in land. Provides that the Department shall consider

136th Legislative Day

June 20, 1984

the assessment in granting the permit for such facilities. Provides that a local government may assess a fee up to \$100,000 for a reasonable independent evaluation of the site location suitability for a new regional pollution control facility. And if there arenot any questions, I would ask a favorable Foll Call."

Speaker Breslin: "The Lady has moved for the passage of Senate
Bill 1941. And on that question, is there any discussion?
The Gentleman from Peoria, Representative Tuerk."

Tuerk: "Would the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Breslin: "The Lady will yield for a question."

Tuerk: "Are these regulations more stringent than the federal requiation?"

Barnes: "No."

Tuerk: "They are not?"

Barnes: "No."

Tuerk: "Thank you."

Speaker Breslin: "There being no further discussion, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1941 pass?" All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 110 voting 'aye', none voting 'no', and none voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. With leave of the Assembly, I would like to go back to Senate Bill 1939 which was skipped. Representative Barnes, would you like to do 1939? Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1939, a Bill for an Act tc... to amend an Act creating the Illinois Realth and Hazardous Substances Registry Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Barnes."

Barnes: "Madam Speaker, the Democratic staff informs me that the new Amendment has not been filed on this Bill. Again I

136th Legislative Day

June 20, 1984

would like to take it out of the record."

Speaker Breslin: "Quite alright, Representative. Out of the record. On the Order of Senate Bills Second Reading Short Debate Calendar, on page five on your Calendar, appears Senate Bill 1384, Representative Hastert. Out of the record. We are now on Senate Bills Second Beading, Short Debate Calendar, on page six, appears Senate Bill 1425, Representative Steczo. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1425, a Eill for an Act in relationship
to the sale of liquid fuel portable space heaters. Second
Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in
Connittee."

Speaker Breslin: "Are there any Motions filed?"

Clerk Leone: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Breslin: "Are there any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #2, Cullerton, amends Senate Bill 1425 as amended."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Steczo."

Steczo: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Representative Cullerton is not here, but an agreement has been worked out on Amendments prior to that. So, I will just move to table Amendment #2."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman asks to table Amendment #2. All those in favor say 'aye', all those... Ch, the Gentleman...

The Gentleman..."

Steczo: "Representative Cullerton is the Spensor of Amendment #2, and I'm moving to table."

Speaker Breslin: "Has it been adopted yet, Representative Steczo?"

Steczo: "No, it has not."

Speaker Breslin: "Then the Gentleman is... since you are not the Sponsor, that is correct. All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'nay'. In the crimion of the Chair,

136th Legislative Day

June 20, 1984

- the dayes have it, and the Amendment is tabled. Are there any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #3, Steczo Virginia Frederick, amends Senate Bill 1425 as amended."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Steczo."
- Steczo: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Leave to withdraw Amendment #3."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman asks leave to withdraw Amendment #3. Hearing no objection, the Amendment is withdrawn. Are there any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #4, Cullerton, amends Senate Bill 1425 as amended."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Steczo."
- Steczo: "Madam Speaker, I move to table Amendment #4."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Steczo asks... moves to table Amendment #4 to Senate Bill 1425. And on that question, is there any discussion? Seeing no discussion, the question is, 'Shall Amendment #4 be tabled?' All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say "nay". In the crinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment is tabled. Are there any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #5, Steczo Virginia Frederick, amends Senate Bill 1425 as amended."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Steczo."
- Steczo: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Members of the House. We have finally gotten to the... to the Amendment that has been agreed upon by most parties after extensive discussions have taken place with myself, Representative Frederick, the Governor's Office, our staffs and representatives from Great America. I would like to detail for the House the changes that have been made to the Great America Bill which was adopted as Amendment #1 to Senate Eill 1425. Among the things we have done is delete the definition of amusement

136th Legislative Day

June 20, 1984

device substituted and the definition of amusement attraction. We have deleted the definition of concession booth-We've also deleted the definition of related electrical equipment, however, that definition has been included in the definition of amusement rides and amusement attractions. In addition to that, Madam Speaker, we have, in Amendment #5... we have indicated that the members of the board who are appointed by the Governor shall receive compensation for services of \$36 per day. That's a change under the original Bill. The director of the Department of Labor would also receive that per diem which he cannot, and the Amendment reflects that change. In addition, Madam Speaker, we have deleted inspection fees and have... have placed in the Bill permit fees not to exceed \$50 for each amusement rider attraction and have also indicated that the director, instead of the board. may hire inspections to inspect amusement rides. Re bave in Amendment #5... we have made the director or inspectors able to stop rides at various places and can be resumed upon the ckay of those ... of the director or the particular We have deleted the definition of nonmechanized inspector. playground equipment, et cetera, because the definition of amusement rides and attractions suggests mechanized. have made a change with regard to not-for-profit religious or educational and charitable institutions who either or operate as opposed to owned and operated, as was brought up when this Bill passed the House. We have also, Madam Speaker, provided that ... I made an affirmative statement of... regarding local regulation and have deleted the Section regarding home rule, because the City of Chicago at the present time does license and... these attractions. And finally , Madam Speaker, we have provided that the owner or operators of amusement rides and attractions may

136th Legislative Day

June 20, 1984

deny entrance to those amusement rides and attractions if the owners of such devices feel that in their opinion entry may jeopardize the safety, but we have also indicated that they cannot stop an inspector in the course of his inspection duties. And I would move for the adoption of Amendment #5 to Senate Eill 1425."

- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #5 to Senate Bill 1425. And on that question, is there any discussion? Seeing no discussion, the question is, "Shall Amendment #5 to Senate Eill 1425 be adopted?" All those in favor say "aye", all those opposed say "nay". In the opinion of the Chair, the "ayes" have it, and the Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?" Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #6, Steczo, amends Senate Eill 1425
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Steczo."

as amended."

- Steczo: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Amendment #6 makes a change, and it's something that we did not catch when we drafted Amendment #5. All this does is changes the word 'board' to 'director' in terms of implementing the various kinds of rules and regulations that the board would promulgate, and I would move for the adoption of Amendment #6."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #6. Mr. Clerk, this is Amendment #6. The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #6 to Senate Bill 1425. And on that question, the Gentleman from Will, Representative Van Duyne."
- Van Duyne: "Yes, Representative Steczo, I was over on the other side and I heard you mention the fact that you were talking about all kinds of mechanized, unmechanized and all the other stuff that went into this general category. Then you said, and we have taken out fraternal, nonprofit, religious, et cetera, et cetera. Foes that take out about

- 136th Legislative Day

  ninety-nine and nine percent... nine tenths percent of the
  - people?"
    zo: "No, Representative Van Duyne, the... that's Amendment
- Steczo: "No, Representative Van Duyne, the... that's Amendment #5, and I would be glad to speak with you after that...
  Amendment #6."
- Van Duyne: "No, I don't want to speak with you privately about it. I want everybody here to know that what you're really doing is putting out an anemic enforcement. You sure... If Van Duyne Amusement Incorporation has an amusement park and I have to govern myself according to all the regimentation that you've got incorporated in this, then immediately after that you go into a real quick dissertation about how you're going to let everybody, in other words, out of it. It goes hand in glove with my philosophy that, you know, we really put the private entrepreneur right to the wall, and then we let all the VFW's, all the holy name societies and everybody right off the hook."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Fiel, for what reason do you rise?"
- Piel: "Yes, Madam Speaker, we're on Amendment #6. If he wants to argue the Bill have him argue it on Third Reading or argue Amendment #5 when it was on the floor, but I think the man is completely out of order at the present time."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Piel is correct, Representative Van Duyne. Do you have any further questions on Amendment #6? There being no further discussion, the question is 'Shall Amendment #6 to Senate Bill 1425 be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. Does the Gentleman have leave to keep this Bill on the Order of Short Debate? Hearing no

136th Legislative Day

June 20. 1984

objections, the Gentleman has leave. Senate Bill 1457, Bepresentative Keane. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1457, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act in relationship to state monies. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Are there any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Ploor Amendment #1, Keane, amends Senate Bill 1457 on page one and so forth."

Speaker Breslin: "Bepresentative Keane."

Keane: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1457
takes care of a problem that has just been developed in the
Treasurer's Office. There's been a great deal of requests
for wire or electronic transfers of funds where there is a
warrant payable from the State Treasury, and all this
Amendment does is say that the State Treasurer may impose a
fee. Whatever the wiring... the wire or the cost of
electronic transfer of funds would be, he can collect that
fee. The Treasurer can collect that fee from the person
requesting that wire or electronic transfer. I'd be happy
to answer any questions. Ask for adoption of Amendment
#1."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1457. And on that question, is, there any discussion? Seeing no discussion, the question is, 'Shall Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1457 he adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. Senate Eill 1607. Excuse me.

On Senate Bill 1457, does the Gentleran have leave to keep that Bill on the Order of Short Debate? Hearing no

136th Legislative Day

June 20, 1984

objection, the Gentleman has leave. Senate Bill 1607, Representative Matijevich. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1659, Representative Capparelli - White. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1735, Representative Nash. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1735, a Fill for an Act to amend the School Code. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Breslin: "Are there any Motions filed?"

Clerk Leone: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Breslin: "Are there any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #2, Hoffman, amends Senate Bill 1735 as amended."

Speaker Breslin: "Bepresentative Hoffman. Representative Nash.

Excuse me. Representative Vinson, for what reason do you rise?"

Vinson: "Madam Speaker, I wonder if the Gentleman might take the
Bill out of the record for a couple of minutes until we can
get Representative Hoffman to the floor."

Speaker Breslin: "Very good. We will take it out of the record until the end of the Calendar and come back to it. Senate Bill 1876, Representative Vinson. Gut of the record. Senate Bill 1943, out of the record. Representative Capparelli, did you want to call Senate Bill 1659? Out of the record. On the Order of Senate Bills Second Reading, page six on your Calendar, appears Senate Bill 495, Representative Braun. Out of the record. Senate Fill 626, Representative Currie. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1179, Representative Jaffe - White. Representative Jaffe. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1179, a Bill for an Act in relationship to parentage. Second Reading of the Eill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

136th Legislative Day

Jun∈ 20. 1984

Speaker Breslin: "Are there any Motions filed?"

Clerk Leone: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Breslin: "Are there any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #2, McCracken - Johnson, amends
Senate Eill 1179 as amended."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative McCracken and Representative Johnson. Representative McCracken asks leave to withdraw Amendment #2. Hearing no objection, the Amendment is withdrawn. Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #3, Jaffe - Levin, amends Senate
Bill 1179 as amended."

Speaker Breslin: "Bepresentative Jaffe."

Jaffe: "Madam Speaker and Members of the Ecuse, Amendment #3

basically is a tightening up Amendment which tightens up

the language with regard to the effective date and also

tightens up the language with regard to the statute of

limitations relative to an agency. I know of no opposition

to Amendment #3, and I would urge its adoption."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 1179. And on that guestion, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Yes, will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman will yield for a question."

Cullerton: "Representative, you indicated this tightens up some language. I see that the Amendment has something to do with the crimes of formication and adultery. Could you be more specific as to..."

Jaffe: "Yeah. Yeah, if you remember in the original Amendment that we had we wanted to... The language was actually faulty. What we... What we're saying in this Amendment, and I think it reflects the views of what the Committee wanted, it says that the evidence derived from the proceeding under this Section shall be inadmissable against

136th Legislative Day

June 20. 1984

the defendant in a criminal proceeding, you know, involving those crimes where a defendant comes in and admits that he is, in fact, the father."

Cullerton: "Fine. Thank you very much."

Speaker Breslin: "Is there any further discussion? There being no further discussion, the question is, "Shall Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 1179 be adopted?" All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #4, EcCracken, amends Senate Bill 1179 as amended."

Speaker Breslin: "Bepresentative McCracken."

\*\*RCCracken: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Bouse. Senate Amendment #4 is... Amendment #4 is an agreed Amendment between myself and the Sponsor of the Bill. And it would delete those provisions from the original Bill which allowed for the use of essentially a business record as proof of the blood test result. This is a big change from current law relative to the foundation requirements and in-person testimony of an expert when rendering an opinion of this type. It was agreed in Committee that this should be deleted and all implications thereof as well. So, this Amendment would delete Subsections (d) and (e) from the Bill. I move for its adortion."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #4 to Senate Bill 1179. And on that question, is there any discussion? Seeing no discussion, the question is, "Shall Amendment #4 to Senate Fill 1179 he adopted?" All those in favor say "aye", all those opposed say "nay". In the opinion of the Chair, the "ayes" have it, and the Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?" Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

136th Legislative Day

June 20, 1984

- Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. With leave of the Assembly, I would like to go back to Bepresentative Nash's Bill which is on the Order of Senate Bills Second Beading, Short Debate, page six on your Calendar. Senate Bill 11... or, excuse me, Senate Bill 1735. Senate Bill 1735. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1735 has been read a second time previously. Amendment #2, Hoffman, amends Senate Fill 1735 as amended."
- Speaker Breslin: "Bepresentative Hoffman."
- Hoffman: "Thank you very much, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. These changes were suggested by the attorneys who drafted House Amendment #1 in conjunction with the Senate staff. The attorneys represented the Chicago School Finance Authority and the Chicago Board and clarified the difference between the construction and the rebab... I move for the adoption of Amendment #2."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 1735. And on that guestion, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Cullerton."
- Cullerton: "I simply did not hear a word he said."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Hoffman, could you speak a little louder, and would the Assembly give the Gentleman your attention so that Members can hear the delate?"
- Hoffman: "Thank you very much, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #2 are changes that were suggested by attorneys who drafted the Ecuse Amendment #1. These attorneys represented the Chicago School Finance Authority and the Chicago Board of Education. This werely cleans up the language in Amendment #1, and I... makes no changes in the substantive provisions of the Eill. And I would move for the adoption of Amendment #2."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of

136th Legislative Day

June 20, 1984

Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 1735. And on that question, is there any discussion? Hearing no discussion, the question is, 'Shall Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 1735 he adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?" Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #3, Berrics, amends Senate Bill 1735 as amended."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Berrios."

Berrios: "Okay. What the Amendment does is it increases the bonding authority by 37,000,000 from 658 to 695, and it also provides... it also expands the purpose of which the bond proceeds can be used for school construction. It includes it, and I would ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage... the adoption of Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 1735. And on that question, the Gentleman from DuFage, Representative Boffman."

Hoffman: "Question of the Sponsor of the Amendment."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman will yield to a question."

Hoffman: "As the definition for the utilization of these bond funds stands in your Amendment, it is possible that all 95,000,000 could be used by the board for construction purposes?"

Berrios: "Yes.

Hoffman: "Is it also true that previously only 30,000,000 were authorized for that purpose?"

Berrios: "Yes."

Hoffman: "Is it possible under this Amendment, Representative, that none of the 95,000,000 would be used for rehabilitation purposes?"

Berrios: "Ropefully not."

Hoffman: "Thank you. Ladies and Gentlemen of the Assembly, I

136th Legislative Day

June 20, 1984

point out to you that as this Amendment is previously... as this Amendment has been explained by the author of the Amendment, quite correctly, that there is no limitation on the amount of funds that can be used for new construction; whereas before, there was a limitation. I bring this to the attention of the people, who represent the City of Chicago, that this Amendment opens up the utilization of the entire amount for new construction. And you need to keep this in mind, not only as you support this Amendment but as you... as you vote for the Eill. Obviously, it's your taxes. It's your... It's your decision. Eut I think it's important that you understand the contents of this particular Amendment. Thank you very much.

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 1735. All those in favor say "aye", all those opposed say "nay". In the opinion of the Chair, the "ayes" have it, and the Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. Does the Gentleman have leave to keep this Bill on the Order of Short Debate? Bearing no objection, this Bill remains on the Order of Short Debate. Returning to Senate Bills Second Beading, page six on your Calendar, appears Senate Bill 1395, Representative McGann. McGann - Satterthwaite. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1478, Representative Wojcík. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1522, Representative Greiman. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1524, Representative Stuffle. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1524, a Eill for an Act relating to motor vehicles and motor fuel tax. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Are there any Floor Amendments?"

136th Legislative Day

June 20, 1984

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #1, Stuffle, amends Senate Bill 1524 on page one and so forth."

Speaker Breslin: "Bepresentative Stuffle, do you want this Bill taken out of the record? Yes. The Gentleman asks that the Bill be taken out of the record. Senate Bill 1612, Bepresentative Hoffman. Representative Hoffman. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1625, Bepresentative Hopp. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1629, Bepresentative Giorgi. Representative Giorgi. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1629..."

Speaker Breslin: "Cut of the record. Excuse me. Senate Bill 1631, Representative Giorgi. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1631, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Are there any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #1 lost in Committee, and Amendment #2

was withdrawn in Committee. Floor Amendment #3, Friedrich,

amends Senate Bill 1631 on page one and so forth."

Speaker Breslin: "Bepresentative Friedrich."

Priedrich: "Madam Speaker, this merely does what we attempt to do on another Bill, and that's permit the building fund money of schools to be used for... to rent a parochial school instead of taking it out of their operating fund. There are several parochial schools been abandoned in the district... in the area, and that would take care of that."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #3 to 1631, and on that question, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Yes, Representative Friedrich, could... could you perhaps elaborate a little bit? I wasn't able to hear too well what your explanation was."

Friedrich: "Pardon me?"

136th Legislative Day

June 20. 1984

Cullerton: "I didn't hear ... "

Friedrich: "Well, at the present time, there are a number of parochial schools have been abandoned being used as public schools, and they re being rented to the public schools. But at the present time, they have to take the money out of their operating account instead of their building fund account. This lets them use the building fund money to pay their rental as opposed to the operating money."

Cullerton: "Okay."

Speaker Breslin: "Is there any further discussion?

Bepresentative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Madam Speaker, I've spoken guite often with the Sponsor of this Amendment. His Amendment is already on Senate Bill 1811. It's in the Senate. It's ready for concurrence, and the Senate Sponsor of this Fill, Senator Holmberg, would rather not have this Amendment on this Bill. And I'd like to ask Representative Friedrich to withdraw the Amendment."

Friedrich: "Well, I guess we all play a game of chance around here, and I would hope that I certainly would, if the other is concurred in, I would have no problem with that. I'm waiting to see if that happens, and I was hoping that we could do this in the meantime."

Giorgi: "Well, let me say this to the Representative. If you withdraw your Amendment now, and I get this Bill onto Third, and you need it for the next year or two, I\*11 pull it back and fully debate it with you. Fow's that?"

Priedrich: "I have no problem with that."

Giorgi: "Would you withdraw your Amendment then?"

Priedrich: "I appreciate your willingness to do that. So in that case, I would..."

Speaker Breslin: "The Sponsor asks leave to withdraw Amendment #3

to Senate Bill 1631. Does the Gentleman have leave?

Hearing no objection, the Amendment is withdrawn. Are

136th Legislative Day

June 20. 1984

there any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #4, Giorgi, amends Senate Eill 1631 on page five and so forth."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Amendment #4, as drafted, provides that if the voters of a school district approve the proposed change in the election of school board members, then no other proposition on the method of elect the members may be submitted to the voters for ten years. Senate Bill 1631 and the Amendment also provides that if such a referendum fails, then neither the same proposition or any other proposition regarding the election of school board members may again be submitted to the voters of that district for two years. What this is doing is attempting by school board resolution to allow school boards to elect members from district and at large. And this just provides that in the event that change takes place that the change must proceed for ten years. So I urge the adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #4 to Senate Bill 1631. And on that guestion, the Gentleman from Effingham, Representative Erunmer."

Brummer: "Yes, will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman will yield for a question."

Brummer: "Representative Giorgi, I'm sorry, but I don't have the Amendment in front of me, and my ears don't hear as fast as you speak sometimes. I know you speak very clearly and slowly, but sometimes I don't understand. Could you slowly go through this again?"

Speaker Breslin: "Expresentative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "The original Bill allows school boards to be elected other than at large, elected by districts, and also allows school board members to be elected by district and at large simultaneously, in other words, four from a district and

136th Legislative Day

June 20, 1984

maybe two or three at large. Now this Amendment provides that... that if the election does take place and there is a new method of selecting school board members that cannot be submitted to the voters for ten years. In the event that fails, it can be submitted every two years."

Brummer: "Who's in favor of the Amendment, and who's opposed to it?"

Giorgi: "The Amendment was given to me by either the IE, or the IFT or one of the school... the association of school boards. I forget which. It's not my personal Amendment. It was given to me by the school district people. I think the people represent consolidated districts."

Brummer: "Thank you."

Speaker Breslin: "Is there any further discussion? There being no further discussion, Representative Gicrgi to close."

Giorgi: "I urge the adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #4 to Senate
Bill 1631 be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye', all
those opposed say 'nay'. In the crimion of the Chair, the
'ayes' have it, and the Amendment is adopted. Are there
any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #5, Berrios, amends Senate Eill 1631 on page one and so forth."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Ferrios."

Berrios: "I want to withdraw that Amendment."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman withdraws Amendment #5. Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #6, Homer, amends Senate Eill 1631 as amended."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Homer."

Homer: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen.

Amendment #6 would amend the provisions regarding the school calendar. Currently, as you may know, a school

136th Legislative Day

June 20. 1984

required to establish a minimum term of 185 days board is sc as to ensure 176 days of actual attendance. Out of that there are four days allotted for teacher institute. which 1eaves five additional days which basically can be used at the discretion o.f the superintendent or the school board in order to close the school without being penalized in the form of school aid. A situation arises where a school district wishes to close the school because of the death of a teacher or other individual who is of some importance to the school district. And the situation occurs where if that individual should die in the fall of the year, then the school district would be allowed to use that as one its discretionary days. And if, in fact, the school then were required to close because of additional acts thereafter, they would not be renalized in the form of school aid. If on the other hand a school board closed its schools because, for example, there were five snow days and then the death occurred in the springtime, after the five days had been used, then in order to close in recognition of that event, the school district would be penalized state statute in the form of school aid. Sc, in effect. vou would have two school districts with situations being treated differently for the purpose of aid by the fortuitous event of death or unfortuitous event. So what this Amendment would do is say that the school board could in addition to closing for acts of God close also in the case of a death where the superintendent has authorized the same, and in no event should the number of those days exceed two in any school year. And I would ask for your approval."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #6 to Senate Bill 1631. And on that question,

136th Legislative Day

June 20, 1984

the Lady from DuPage, Representative Nelson."

Nelson: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I have a question of the Sponsor."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman will yield for a question."

Nelson: "Okay. Representative Homer, I did hear you explanation, but I am not sure, even after hearing it, that I really understand the reason for this. It seems to me that in the case where, let us say, more than two deaths might occur in a year that were important to residents of that school district that you would then be discriminating against the third individual who died who would not get a day closed in his honor while the other two would. What explanation do you have for picking the two day limitation?"

Homer: "It was just an attempt, Representative Nelson, to put a reasonable limit as to the number of deaths. Actually in the situation that you point out, if in fact there were three deaths in the fall, and the school closed for all three of those and then had five snow days after that, actually they would be allowed in that case to go ahead and close those five days because they would acts of God and would not be renalized. So that you still would have an equitable situation. I agree with you. Whereas, if the days came first followed by the three deaths, that school district would be penalized for the three days closed. So that it... I agree, it's still somewhat inequitable but what we're doing is attempting to reasonable number of days in which we decided arbitrarily is two in order to protect against at least the majority of situations that might arise."

Nelson: "Representative Homer, if you see the need for some limitation of this concept, wouldn't it make better sense to begin at the beginning and simply say that there really is no need for schools to close to honor someone this way.

136th Legislative Day

June 20, 1984

Kids actually don't think of a day off of school the way we do and do not think of Memorial Day in the same sense that adults do and, I think, are more likely to rejoice in a day off rather than honor the memory of a school hoard member or someone else who's passed on. That's why I don't understand your Fill."

Homer: "Well, I... I would hope that... that that is not applicable to all the students in our public schools. I... I offered this as a result of ... of an individual situation that occurred where a... a physical education teacher and guidance counselor for 30 years at a who was intimate and had helfed and assisted so many students, passed away in an untimely fashion. school board and, in fact, the entire community felt that it would be appropriate to close the school in order to honor that individual's death. Unfortunately for the school, they had already used up their... they had had five snow days and, therefore, were... did so even though they would be penalized for school aid. And although it's not a frequent occurrence. 1 think it does bappen under exceptional circumstances, and I think that it would be unfair to penalize that school just because that individual died in the spring as a result... the fall. Representative Nelson, as we indicated, if the individual dies in the fall, then the school district is permitted to close without penalty in any event. And what we're trying to do is standardize it without respect to the unfortuitous timing of the death."

Nelson: "Representative Homer, is it your belief that there are some parents for whom a closing of the school imposes a hardship because they then have to find other means of care for their children if these children are in the rather early primary grades? Working parents, for example."

136th Legislative Day

June 20. 1984

Homer: "Okay. Well, I'm not... I'm not even prepared to get into the merits of whether a school should close because of a death. That decision should be made by the school board and the district superintendent, and perhaps those arguments should be weighed very carefully by those individuals. All that I'm trying to do is put on an equitable basis, an equal footing, situations that occur from school district to school district based simply on the timing of the death which I... I see making no sense whatsoever in terms of whether that school district should receive school aid."

Nelson: "To the Amendment, Madam Sponsor (sic - Speaker).

It's... It's my belief that this type of legislation is entirely unnecessary. Representative Homer has said himself that the school district did realize that because they had used up their snow days and because they wished to honor the person, who had given long years of service to the school district, at the same time they realized that they would be losing school aid, and yet they chose to close for a day in this person's memory. I think that to add this kind of legislation to a School Code that is already overburdened with mandates and exemptions is a very poor idea, and I would urge 'no' votes. And I would ask for a Boll Call.

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

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. (sic - Madam) Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. With all due respect to the Sponsor and his situation that he brings to your attention, I would only make two points. Number one, I am not certain that a local school district superintendent has the authority to close the school. It would appear to me that that would be a responsibility of the... of the school

136th Legislative Day

June 20, 1984

board, not one of their employees. Number two. I would point out to you that all the ... the national studies that are being... that are coming out, many of them are encouraging a longer school year, longer school days, more time on task, if you will, for the students. I concur with the previous opponent to this Amendment that in my judgment this is not the way to address these issues. The fact the matter is that the law, when I came to the Legislature 18 years ago, provided that if you didn't hold the number of minimum school days you didn't get any state aid at all, You either held school every day or you didn't. Then... Then we backed off and eventually got to the point where we are now, fractionalizing it on a daily basis. seems to me that ... that the way the law stands now reasonable. The fact of the matter is that we allow those days. Most schools will keep three of those davs right at the end of the year and will dismiss the school early, and to include this into the statutes would only confuse the issue rather than clarify it in terms of providing for excellence in education in this state. again, with all due respect to the fine Sponsor, whom I'm sure will put on a fine performance tonight on the baseball field, I ... I must rise in opposition to this Amendment."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from McBenry, Representative Klenn."

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

Speaker Breslin: "The Sponsor will yield for a question. The
Membership should be reminded that the TV lights are on and
photographs may be taken at this time. Froceed,
Representative Klemm."

Klemm: "Alright. Thank you. Representative Homer, maybe you have answered this, and I just didn't hear it. Why is there a limit to two such closings in case of a death in

136th Legislative Day

June 20, 1984

the district?"

Homer: "It was simply an attempt, Representative Rlemm, to put some sort of reasonable limitation upon the number of days that a school could close as a result of the death of a faculty member or school board member. There really is no magic in the number two. It was just... just sensed as a reasonable limitation."

Klemm: "Alright, but you're trying to, I assume, close a school district in deference to somebody's long service, their contributions, whether it he a school loard member or a member of the faculty. But then you limit it saying that the first two we'll honor, but the next three too had."

Homer: "Well, what we're attempting to do, Representative is to ... Actually, the number of cases that we're talking about even without limitation is very minute. suspect not more than a handful in any given school year. The number that would exceed two in any given school year where those two days would follow ... you know, this is only going to be important where the ... where the deaths follow the ... the utilization or the using up of the ... of the acts of God days. Those number of situations in the State of Illinois is probably so small that it's hardly worth addressing. So I don't really think we're really in effect discriminating against any real, viable. possible situations."

Klemm: "Alright. Thank you. To the Amendment, Madam Speaker.

It just really seems, having been a president of a board of education for a number of years, that it just seems that if you're sincere of saying that we want to pay tribute to these deceased members who have contributed so much, and we want to close the school and not penalize them, fine. I really don't have a problem with that. I do have a problem saying that we're going to limit how many people we're

136th Legislative Day

June 20, 1984

going to honor by that. And it would seem to me that you'd be better off in allowing the local board to determine that rather than this approach. So as much as I support what you're trying to do, I don't think this is the proper way of limiting it... just as that. So I think I really have to stand in opposition to the Amendment."

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

Homer: "Alright. Hell, thank you, Madam Speaker and Members. I appreciate your input. I ... I'm disappointed that ... that Representative Hoffman, who was fortuitously born Canton, Illinois, was not endowed with the ... with wisdom that so many individuals born there were in this situation. But I do respect the ... I do respect the ... the indepent of all of the Members who spoke on the Bill in all seriousness. I would only say that... that in summing here that... that what we're dealing with is best illustrated by an example. If under current law the school closes when someone dies in September and then after that there are five snow days, so that the school really has closed six days, then under existing law that school district receives full school aid without penalty. Now. if ... if school district B has the five snow days that it closes for and then the individual dies in April and they elect to close, so that they too have six days where they re close, five because of snow and one because of death, then we penalize under existing law that school district under current law. What this Amendment would do is put both of those school districts on the same footing. And if anybody in this Assembly knows of some reason why we should in any stretch of logic treat those two situations differently, then I certainly would be glad to listen. But all of the discussion about whether we ought to close for

136th Legislative Day

June 20, 1984

the death of someone, or whether we shouldn't or whether the school boards should make that decision or not are largely irrelevant to the discussion of this Bill. What we're simply trying to do by this Amendment is put identical situations on identical basis where the state treats them in the same equitable way — nothing more and nothing less. So I think that the discussion has gone afield of the concept which just attempts to make equitable what is currently an inequity in the law, and I would ask for your support."

Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #6 to Senate

Bill 1631 be adopted?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all

those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is cren. Have all voted

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

the record. On this question, there are 50 voting 'aye',

46 voting 'no' and 2 voting 'present', and the Amendment is

adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #6, Eerrics - Ecnan, amends Senate

Bill 1631... Amendment #7 amends Senate Bill 1631 on page

one and so forth."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Berrios."

Berrios: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. What this Amendment does, it adds a provision to expand a class of persons eligible for special education services in local school districts to include those from birth to age 21, rather than the current ages three to 21. It provides that beginning in the school year 1985 - \*86, the class of persons eligible for special education services in local school districts may include eligible children from birth to age three. Provides that beginning in school years 1987 and \*88... and, therefore, the classes of persons eligible for special educational services in local school districts shall include eligible children from birth to age three. You know, we should help

136th Legislative Day

June 20, 1984

the handicapped children when they re born. If we get in there a little earlier maybe we can save some money in the long run, and I would ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #7 to Senate Bill 1631, and on that question, the Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Ecffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. A question of the Sponsor of this Amendment."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman will yield for a question."

Hoffman: "If every school district took advantage of this, how much would it cost the state in additional money?"

Berrios: "Approximately 30,000,000."

Hoffman: "Approximately 30,000,000 dollars."

Berrios: "Bight."

Hoffman: "Thank you. Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I don't question the motives of the Sponsor or the laudability of considering extending the ... the years of eligibility for state aid for special education from three to 21 back to 0 to 21. There are a lot of problems with doing this which aren't related to the money. But let me just zero in on ... on the money, because the matter of the fact is that we have considered similar legislation to this in the past and have rejected it for one... for one reason - well, maybe more than one - but for one of the reasons are now fractionalizing paying for special education and other programs which are presently in place. Here's another program which would eventually cost 30,000,000 dollars additional, and we aren't even paying for the program on the formula basis that we say that we're going to pay for it under the law now. We're going to pass a state aid Bill this Session where we're fractionalize a number of payments. And it's for that reason, Ladies and Gentlemen, that I believe we should

136th Legislative Day

June 20, 1984

oppose this Amendment, because this kind of legislation... appropriations. And we have to recognize that that's what we're really talking about. And for that reason, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Ecuse, I believe that this Amendment should be opposed."

Speaker Breslin: "There being no further discussion,

Representative Ferrios to close."

Berrios: "You know, we spend a lot of money on a lot of things down here in Springfield, and you know, we're talking about helping the handicapped children. And if you really look at the whole program in the long run, we're going to end up saving money. Instead of starting at age three, we start them when they're younger. We give them a chance in life. That's what I'm after, and I would hope for a favorable vote."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #7 to Senate Bill 1631. All those in favor vote "aye", all those opposed vote "no". Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this guestion, there are 57 voting "aye", 36 voting "nc" and 5 voting "present". This Bill... This Amendment, having received the necessary Majority, is declared passed. Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #8, Keane, amends Senate Bill 1631 on page one and so forth."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Keane."

Keane: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Amendment #8 to Senate Bill
1631 just puts common practice in the Chicago School System
into the statutory. I believe it's necessary that this
does become statutory so that in the administration, or I
should say the management of the physical plant, that there
is no doubt as to the final word. And basically, what the

136th Legislative Day

June 20, 1984

Amendment says is that the engineer custodian shall at all times be responsible for the physical condition of any building containing 30,000 square feet or more. The 30,000 square feet is the way it exists now without... any building in the Chicago Public School System under that does not have to have an engineer custodian. Be happy to answer any questions and ask for a favorable Boll Call."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #8 to Senate Bill 1631. And on that question, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Fiel."

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

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman will yield for a question."

Piel: "Representative, first of all, could you explain to me why this Amendment is needed?"

Keane: "Yes. If you're familiar with the Angel Guardian Fire, we had a situation where the doors were chained. understand that that was due to a principal or someone who is not familiar with the physical maintenance, the proper maintenance of a physical plant issuing orders to go ahead and do something that, in fact, ended up killing a of children. We do have instances in the Chicago Public School System where the principals who are not familiar with safe operations of a physical plant indicate their preference for something. Presently, this is the ... is presently the guidelines in the Fublic School System, and all we want to do is make sure that they stay that way."

Piel: "Okay. Well, wait a minute. Let me back up just a little bit. First of all you used the explanation of Angel Guardian, which is a parochial school. I've got a... Is this covering parochial schools?"

Keane: "No, it's not."

136th Legislative Day

June 20. 1984

Piel: "Okay."

Keane: "I was just giving you an example of ... "

- Piel: "Okay. Well, you said... you said that this is already being covered. Well then.."
- Keane: "I said that this is... that this is in the present policy of the Eoard of Ed, but it may be changed. It may be changed especially if there are cutbacks in the funding of the Chicago Board of Education, and they attempt to do away with engineers or they attempt to have..."
- Piel: "Is this going to help them? Are we... you know, is this going to help the Board of Education, I mean, if we eliminate their options?"
- Keane: "It certainly will. I don't want... What I'm trying to do is close the option of having people who are not qualified in physical plant operation getting into it. That's exactly the point that I made when I said that this is what happened at Angel Guardian."
- Piel: "Eut aren't you... aren't you... But aren't you... sort of,
  what I'm talking about, eliminating... or you know,
  eliminating their options, you're eliminating their options
  to save money, aren't you?"
- Reane: "Oh, not at all. This in no way changes the staffing of custodian engineers. It in no way makes more jobs. It has absolutely nothing to do with creating more joks or locking anybody in. This is strictly a safety."
- Piel: "Alright. When you put the figure in there of 30,000 square feet and putting in also the title of engineer custodian, why do you have to have one engineer custodian? And the second thing would be 30,000 square feet. Couldn't this happen in, let's say, 25,000 square feet?"
- Reane: "No, because in a building of under 25... under 30,000 square feet, presently, they do not have an engineer custodian. The reason that that s in there is is that the

136th Legislative Day

June 20. 1984

present arrangements with the Chicago Board of Education for a building that's under 30,000 square feet you do not have to have an engineer custodian. This would apply to... where they have a park next to a school, and they might have a little field house. They don't want to force the... and I don't want to force the school district to put in a custodian engineer."

Piel: "Just looking at the thing off the top of my head, I'm not exactly sure if the legislation is needed, but, you know, you're saying here..."

Keane: "Well, it's a safety..."

Piel: "Alright. Let me ask you this. Has there been anything...
you know, you were mentioning as an example a parochial
school. Can you give me any examples under the public
school system?"

Keane: "As I said earlier, this does not apply to parochial
schools."

Piel: "No, but you gave that as an example. I'm asking if you can give me an example in the public school system."

Keane: "Yes. I can give you an example. A school... An engineer custodian is licensed on He's licensed on boilers. swimming pool operation. He's licensed in the cafeteria. few years ago we had a ... in Percy - "Julien" School an exterminator came in there and until we got the engineers involved... the exterminator came in and some of the exterminating liquid got associated with the fcod and the children became sick because of it. So what we're having more and more of is the engineers tecoming the professional, and he's getting licensed. We'll probably ask them to go back and get... We're probably going to ask them, plus the cafeteria operators in the public schools, that they have to go and get some certification."

Piel: "No further questions. Thank you."

136th Legislative Day

June 20, 1984

Speaker Breslin: "There being no further discussion, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Keane, to close."

Keane: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. The Amendment does exactly what I said. It doesn't cost any money. It doesn't create any jobs. All ... It's really a safety measure. The schools have become sc complex, especially in the areas of cafeterias, where they hav∈ constantly... exterminating, the handling of those liquids that they use in extermination, the safety in the swimming pools that we have in the schools and what's even more important, the safety that's involved with the engineering where you have high pressure boilers, where you have air conditioners and various other things that can become very, very much a health problem for the kids. We also have had instances where the engineers have specifically denied a principal's request to chain the doors. Frincipals who have experience with... having problems with gangs coming into the schools sometimes might feel that the immediate way to handle the problem is to chain the doors so the people from the outside, the gang members, cannot get in. These... kind of actions can result in disaster. This allows... This Bill allows the engineer to say 'nc'. I'd ask favorable approval."

Speaker Breslin: "The question is, \*Shall Amendment #8 to Senate
Bill 1631 be adopted?" All those in favor say \*aye\*, all
those opposed say \*nay\*. In the crimion of the Chair, the
\*ayes\* have it, and the Amendment is adopted. Are there
any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1644,

Representative Stuffle. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1644, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act to eliminate the health hazards posed by the presence of

136th Legislative Day

2

June 20. 1984

asbestos materials in Illinois schools. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendments #1, 2 and 4 were adopted in Committee."

Speaker Breslin: "Are there any Motions filed?"

Clerk Leone: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Breslin: "Are there any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Ploor Amendment #5, Levin, amends Senate Bill 1644 on page... and so forth."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Levin."

Levin: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #5 was agreed to in Connittee. What it... What the... It replaces Amendment #3, which was technically defective and, therefore, was not offered in Committee. Amendment #5 simply provides that on the council that is established to make recommendations with respect to asbestos in the schools, there shall be four parents added to that council. In my district as well as in others which have asbestos in the schools, the parents are very, very concerned, and this provides an opportunity for them to have some input in the process of coming up with the solution to the asbestos problem."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #5 to Senate Bill 1644. And on that guestion, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Yes, will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman will yield for a question."

Cullerton: "Representative Levin, as I understand the Bill, there will be a council formed, and there's four public members who are appointed by the legislative Leaders. And what this Amendment says is that these public members must be, at the time of their appointment, a parent of at least one child who's a student in a school where the material appears to be present. Is that correct?"

136th Legislative Day

٩

June 20, 1984

- Levin: "Not totally, Representative. The Bill, in its current form, establishes a council, and there are various bureaucrats that are appointed to the council to make recommendations. This Amendment adds four public members to that council in addition to the fureaucrats and says that those four public members must be parents of children who are currently in schools believed to have asbestos."
- Cullerton: "Okay. Now my question to you is, what does it mean to say, 'enrolled in a school in which asbestos materials appear to be present'? What kind of standards do we use to determine whether or not the asbestos appears to be present? I mean, shouldn't there be a requirement that it actually be found in the school?"
- Levin: "Yeah, I think, you know, there have been EPA tests in the various schools which have come up with conclusions as far as the level of asbestos in the various schools... in a number of the schools."
- Cullerton: "But you don't say that in the Amendment. You just say, "where it appears to be present". I just... I just think for the purposes, perhaps, of legislative intent you might want to make it more clear what does qualify... what schools do qualify and how do they qualify."
- Levin: "Yeah, it is my intent that there he an objective measure be it testing having been done by FFA or other agencies that found that there is, in fact, a high level of asbestos in a particular school. The phraseology that I used was because there is a concern that the FFA testing may not be adequate, that there may, in fact, he a higher level of asbestos in a number of these schools than is determined under the... a lot of the standardized tests used by the EPA. And that's one of the things that this Commission is going to look into is better ways to be able to guantify the level of asbestos in the schools."

136th Legislative Day

- June 20, 1984
- Cullerton: "Thank you. Madam Speaker, I have no further questions."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Stuffle, on the Amendment."
- Stuffle: "Madam Speaker, merely to indicate that the Senate

  Sponsor and I have looked at the Amendment. We agree with

  Representative Levin's arguments, and we... willing to

  accept the Amendment."
- Speaker Breslin: "There being no further discussion, the question is, 'Shall Amendment #5 to Senate Fill 1644 he adopted?'

  All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'nay'.

  In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #6, McNamara, amends Senate Bill 1644 as amended."
- Speaker Breslin: "Who was the Sponsor? Representative McNamara.

  Clerk, read the Bill. Excuse me. Representative McNamara."
- McNamara: "Thank you, Madam Chairman (sic Speaker), Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Amendment restores the language originally in Senate Bill 1644 as it arrived in the House. When the Senate Eill came cut of the Senate, the provisions of the Bill applied to both the public schools and nonpublic schools. The Amendment trings Senate Bill 1644 into conformity with the federal ashestos laws which apply equally to all schools, public and nonpublic. The Amendment is important because the danger that Bill addresses is present to all students. To eliminate the nonpublic schools from the Bill unnecessarily endangers the lives of a large number of children in the state. I recommend approval of this Amendment."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Amendment #6 to Senate Bill 1644. And on that question,

136th Legislative Day

June 20, 1984

the Lady from DuFage, Representative Nelson."

Nelson: "Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. I have a question of the Spensor."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman will yield for a question."

Nelson: "Representative McNamara, I certainly agree with you that if asbestos in the schools is a serious problem, it ought to be one that we care about for all the children in the state. I just want to make sure that I understand the effect of your Amendment. As I understand it, inspections will be made of all schools under this Amendment, private and public. Is that correct?"

McNamara: "That's correct."

Nelson: "And who does those inspections?"

McNamara: "The Department of Public Health."

Nelson: "Okay. And what sanctions can be imposed upon either private or public schools if they find that there is a danger to the school children."

McNamara: "Under the Act, the Department can require remedial action to be taken."

Nelson: "Have you received from the Department of Health approval for this Amendment? Do they concur in it? Did you check with them?"

McNamara: "I have not checked."

Nelson: "Okay. Is there a price tag on this Amendment?"

McNamara: "I assume that the price tag under the original Eill of Senate Bill 1644, which was subjected to the Mandates Act, was taken into effect at that time."

Nelson: "Do you have a specific cost factor in mind?"

McNamara: "According to the Mandates Act as filed, the total cost is not able to be estimated at this time."

Nelson: "Thank you."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption. The question is, 'Shall Amendment #6 to Senate Bill 1644 be

136th Legislative Day

June 20, 1984

adopted? All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

- Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. Ladies and Gentlemen, on the Order of House Joint Resolutions, page 13 on your Calendar, appears House Joint Resolution 124, Representative Flinn. Out of the record. House Joint Resolution 138, Representative Barnes. Out of the record. House Joint Resolution 151. Representative Vinson, for what reason do you rise?"
- Vinson: "Madam Speaker, I believe the rules of the Bouse require
  that the Speaker begin at the beginning of an Order of
  Business and go down all the Eills on that Order of
  Business. And how did we get to 124 in the middle of page
  13 rather than beginning at the Order of Business entitled
  the Speaker's Table?"
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Vinson, we began with the business of House Joint Resolutions. We began at the top, and we are now down to House Joint Resolution 151.

  Representative Vinson."
- Vinson: "Madam Speaker, I don't know why these things seem to repeatedly occur when certain people are in the Chair, but I want to tell you that we have been requesting for several days that one of our Members have the opportunity to present a Besclution that they have on this Order of Business. Now you have deliberately done this in such a fashion to deny that Member that opportunity, and you have violated the rules by doing that. And I just want to inform the chamber that I think that every Bepublican ought to be resisting that and ever Member who cares about Members' rights ought to be resisting that. And whatever

136th Legislative Day

June 20, 1984

Resolution it is you're conspiring to try to get to, we ought to defeat so that we send that message."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Vinson, we are trying to do the business of this House in an orderly fashion and take in your requests also that your Members be allowed to go to conference at this very moment. We are trying to do so as quickly as possible. We are on the Order of House Joint Resolution 151. Representative Fullock. Clerk, read the Resolution."

Clerk Leone: "House Joint Resolution 151, by Representative Bullock."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Eullock."

Bullock: "Thank you, Madam Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Joint Resolution 151 addresses a subject of coastal zone management programs. We're asking with this Joint Resolution that the Governor and the Secretary ٥£ Transportation develop internally a coastal zone management program which would, in fact, would allow to consult with various units of government throughout the state, especially in the City of Chicago, to implement a coastal zone management program. In the U.S. Congress the Ocean and Coastal Zone Development Act, 'Block' Grant Act, which would provide funds for the cuter continental ... oil revenues for states such as Illincis who establish a management and enact enhancement of programs for the renewal of ocean and coastal zone resources. This Resolution, I'm led to believe, would be sufficient order to allow this state to participate in that program. And it's merely asking that the... that the Governor, and his Cabinet Bembers and the Secretary of Transportation undertake efforts to develop such a program."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage of House Joint Besolution 151. And on that guestion, the

136th Legislative Cay

June 20, 1984

Gentleman from DeWitt, Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in opposition to the Gentleman's Resolution. for three reasons. First of all, I don't think it's right for the Chair to abuse its authority and to ignore the rules in order to get to ODE particular Resolution or piece of business. That used to be repeated habit of the Chair, and we adopted that rule to avoid that. Now there are Members, other Members, who have be asking for several days to have their items on the Speaker's Table considered, and to have somebody given special consideration when the rules of the House deny that opportunity is a mistake. That's one reason I rise in opposition to this particular Resolution. There's another and deeper reason. We ought not be urging anylody to adopt any coastal zone management program. That is land management in its worst form. We ought not be regulating private property owners at the state level and to urge somebody to adopt a program or to development a program to do that would be a terrible mistake. I believe that if you consult with the citizens who are property owners, who would be so regulated, they would be unanimous in opposing anything of this nature. We ought not be doing that. believe that if you would talk to the people intimately engaged in land use regulation in this state, people the realtors, the developers and so forth, the bankers, they would tell you that this sort of thing can only damage the economic growth and vitality of Chicago and the metropolitan area. And I believe finally that this afternoon. I believe at 2:00, there is a Committee Meeting... there is a Committee Meeting on the question of the World's Fair. We ought not be passing Resolutions out here giving the Department of Transportation new

136th Legislative Day

June 20. 1984

authority, develop new programs, in regard to coastal zone management when that is clearly a subject tied to the World's Fair. We ought to orderly... in an orderly fashion deliberate the subject of the World's Fair. I would urge a "no" vote on this particular Besolution and request a verification should it get the requisite number of votes. And I believe, Madam Speaker, that you would find under Rule 43(c) that it requires 60 votes because it involves the expenditure of state funds."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Eullock."

- Bullock: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. The distinguished Gentleman from DeWitt is quite eloquent in his presentations, but quite often engages in fantasy land. I don't want to belabor this point, and I don't want to cause this House to spend a lot of time on this subject which has been addressed before. The Bill was on Third Reading, and I put it back in Interim Study. We've established a Subcommittee in this chamber to hold hearings on the subject. So at the moment, I think I'd like to take the Fill out of the record, talk to the Representative from DeWitt, but I will call this proposition before June 30th."
- Speaker Breslin: "Out of the record. Representative Jaffe is recognized for the purposes of a Motion. Representative Jaffe."
- Jaffe: "Yes, Madam Speaker, I would have... I would like to waive the appropriate rule so that the Judiciary can meet at 1:00 in Room 400 relative to Judge "Comulford"s" recommendations with regard to bail. I think this has been cleared on both sides of the aisle, and the Judiciary Committee would then meet at 1:00 in Room 400."
- Speaker Breslin: "The... The Judiciary will meet at 1:00 in Boom
  400. Representative Jaffe, you have to move to suspend the
  rule to allow that meeting to go forward. I understand.

136th Legislative Day

- June 20, 1984
- Representative Jaffe has moved to suspend the rule for the Judiciary Committee to meet at 1:00. Ecaring no objection, that rule is suspended. Representative Flinn."
- Plinn: "Well, Madam Speaker, I'd like to remind all the Members of the Financial Institutions Committee that we will be meeting at 1:00 in Boom 118 to hear the Continental Bank Bill which is Senate Bill 1236. If all the Members will be there promptly in order that we have a quorum, get the meeting started, we'll try to finish in one hour."
- Speaker Breslin: "Very good. Ladies and Gentlemen, for an announcement, concurrences are being passed out on your desks on blue paper. They will appear on the Calendar tomorrow. Please read them and be prepared for action on them tomorrow. General Resolutions."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 1073, Daniels; and House Joint Resolution 164, Vinson."
- Speaker Breslin: "Committee on Assignment. Speaker Madigan in the Chair."
- Speaker Madigan: "Hr. Clerk, would you please read House Resolution 1058?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 1058, by Speaker Madigan.
  Whereas, the Honorable Edward W. Wolbank served the State
  of Illinois as a Hember of the House of Berresentatives
  from 1963 through 1970; and whereas, Mr. Wolbank has
  generously contributed works of art to the state most
  notably the crystal chandeliers in Eccm 212 of the State
  House which were designed and crafted in Vienna, Austria;
  and whereas, Mr. Wolbank is known as an authority on
  antiques and at one time was an appraiser of antiques on
  ABC television; and whereas, Mr. Wolbank is donating to the
  House of Representatives an 1870 lithograph of the 15th
  Amendment of the United States Constitution, which states
  that, 'The right of citizens of the United States to vote

136th Legislative Day

June 20, 1984

shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or any state on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude'; and whereas, this lithcgraph, published Thomas Kelly of New York from an original design by James C. Beard and registered with the library of Congress was presented to William Gates Le Duc, a Brigadier General of the Union army during the Civil War Commissioner of Agriculture under President Rutherford E. Hayes, by President Ulysses S. Grant through whose effort the Amendment was introduced in Congress; and whereas. William Gates Le Duc was a prominent citizen of the State of Minnesota and the lithograph was displayed in the Le Duc mansion at Hastings for half a century before it was acquired by Mr. Wolbank. Now therefore, be it resolved, by the House of Representatives of the 83rd Illinois General Assembly that we express our appreciation to Mr. Wolbank for his meaningful gift to the State of Illinois in the \*Land of Abraham Lincoln, \* where it can be viewed as a lasting reminder that freedom and justice are the rights of all citizens, and that a suitable copy of this Resolution and Preamble be given to Mr. Wolhank with the sincere gratitude of all the Members."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Clerk, has this Besolution been adopted? You've all beard the Resolution. Ed Wolbank is a former Member of the Bouse of Representatives, who represented district on the near north side of Chicago, which today is represented by Representative Jesse White. He's been so kind as to donate this lithcgraph to the Rouse ο£ Representatives in the State of Illinois. Нe rill b€ available after this ceremony in the Speaker's Conference Room for a reception. And at this time, I would Wolbank if he would offer a few remarks to the Eody. Wolbank."

136th Legislative Day

June 20, 1984

Ed Wolbank: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Those were very kind words you said, Mr. Speaker. I don't deserve it, but I like it. It gives me great pleasure to present and an honor to present this picture to the Speaker of the House. And I also want to thank Mrs. Anna May "Goss" of the Legislative Council for helping me bring this picture here from Minnesota. The picture says everything, and it's been told what it contains. I think it's going to have a great interest to both Members of the House and Senate, and I want to thank you. It's nice to be tack."

Speaker Madigan: "Bepresentative Eullock."

Bullock: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the I think Representative White wishes recognized also since the Gentleman's a constituent of his. just want Mr. Wolbank's to know that certainly I am delighted, and I am humbled and I am rleased that ís donating this excellent lithograph to this chamber. Most of us are familiar with the 15th Amendment to the Constitution as the Clerk so enunciated. I certainly think that it is by far one of the more far reaching Amendments to the U.S. Constitution - nct only that it enabled this country to get on with the business of rebuilding itself after a very turbulent period, but it set a standard for all times, for this nation, for people to understand the importance of human rights. And I want to thank you, personally for sharing with us this excellent piece of art, and I can ensure you that many, many people throughout this state express to you their gratitude for your kindness and for your contribution."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative White."

White: "Mr. Wolbank, you are one of my constituents, and I d like
to extend to you my deep appreciation for sharing with this
Body this wonderful piece of art which has a great impact

136th Legislative Day

June 20, 1984

upon our history. And again, speaking for this Body, I'd like to again thank you for sharing this great piece of art with us."

- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Farley. Mr. Farley."
- Farley: "When you're finished with this Order, I'd like to be recognized."
- Speaker Madigan: "Okay. I believe that we are prepared to move from this Order of Business, so Eddie, thank you... thank you very much for coming. The Chair recognizes Mr. Farley."
- Parley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like leave of the Body to have my vote changed from 'aye' to 'present' on Senate Bill 1844. I was inadvertently off the floor."
- Speaker Madigan: "Is there leave? Leave is granted. Consent Calendar."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Consent Calendar Third Beading, Second Senate Bill 1381, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act concerning the Chain C\*Lakes - Fox River Waterway. Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1456, a Bill for an Act in relation to the compensation ... computation of the principal and interest payable on certain honds. Third Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1518, a Bill for an Act to regulate solicitation and collection of funds for charitable purposes. Third Reading of the Bill. Bill 1655. a Bill for an Act concerning law enforcement agencies concerning lost, missing and runaway children. Third Reading of the Bill. Senate Eill 1801, a Bill for an Act to provide for the use of gas transmission facilities for private energy entities. Third Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1862, a Bill for an Act to amend the Environmental Protection Act. Third Reading of the Bill. Bill 1938, a Bill for an Act to amend the Environmental Protection Act. Third Reading of the Bill.

136th Legislative Day

June 20, 1984

Senate Bill 1944, a Bill for an Act in relation to labeling of equipment and facilities concerning hazardous waste materials. Third Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1953, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Hazardous Material Bailroad Transportation Act. Third Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1954, a Bill for an Act to amend the Environmental Protection Act. Third Reading of the Bill." Speaker Madigan: "The question is, 'Shall these Pills pass?\* Those in favor of the passage of these Bills shall vote 'aye', those opposed shall vote 'no'. Have all voted wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 111 'ayes'. These Bills, having received a Constitutional voting 'no'. Majority, are hereby declared passed. The Chair recognizes Representative Capparelli."

Capparelli: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Fellow colleagues, today we play the Senate, and they challenged us. And we have two Leaders in this House that keep the game going. That's Mike Madigan and Lee Daniels. And if Iee Daniels would to come up here, we'd like to make a presentation to Lee and to Mike Madigan. Oh, I'm sorry, Iee. Mr. Speaker, we've got a nice shirt here for you. We want you to be out there to throw the ball out with the Governor. And a hat for you, Mr. Speaker."

Ropp: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Coach Capparelli. It's a pleasure to present an extra, extra large shirt for our Leader, Representative Lee Daniels. And a nice hat, too."

Daniels: "I'll ... I'll play if the Speaker will play."

Speaker Madigan: "Well, Lee and I are very happy to participate in the continuation of this great Bouse institution...

House - Senate institution called the Legislative Baseball Game - Legislative Softball Game. Bight, Lee?"

Daniels: "Let me... Let me just say that the Leaders met this

136th Legislative Day

June 20, 1984

morning, and the score of the game will be, House 20 - Senate 0, as usual."

- Speaker Madigan: "The Leaders met this morning to discuss several issues, and we were looking toward an agreement. And the one thing we agreed upon was the game. Everything else is still unresolved."
- Daniels: "But there will be 55 more Republicans starting tomorrow."
- Speaker Madigan: "Fine. Very good. So we're prepared to adjourn, and there will be a request for a Republican Conference, which means that the Committees which Were scheduled for 1:00, which would be the Judiciary Committee and the Committee on Financial Institutions, will meet at If you have not yet been advised ... If I could have your attention please. If you have not yet been advised, please be advised that the plan is to adjourn on Friday sometime in the afternoon and to return to Springfield, Monday morning at 10:00 a.m. Now, please understand that the deadline for floor consideration of Senate Fills is Monday. Given that deadline, for gractical considerations, you wish to amend a Senate Bill, your Amendment should be adopted no later than Friday. So Friday will be the last day for Second Readings, unless you wish to amend on Monday and then suspend the rules to consider the the same day that it was amended. I just want everybody to please understand that since we will not be here Saturday and Sunday and with Monday as the deadline for floor consideration of Senate Bills, any Amendment should be adopted on Friday. So we'll leave some time Friday afternoon. We'll come back Monday morning at 10:00 a.m. The Chair recognizes Representative Dwight Friedrich."
- Friedrich: "Mr. Speaker, could we extend that to 1:40 please. We need about 30 minutes for the Financial Institutions and

136th Legislative Day

June 20, 1984

Judiciary."

Speaker Madigan: "Fine. So..."

- Friedrich: "Alright. Bay I make... May I mak∈ a further inquiry?

  The 2:00 meeting will still meet a 2:00. Is that right,

  Sir?"
- Speaker Madigan: "Well, I think that in light of the other changes that it might be best if the 1:00 Committees would meet at..."

Friedrich: #1:40?#

Speaker Madigan: "Well, why don't we... why don't we have them meet at 1:45."

Friedrich: "Alright. And the 2:00 meeting at..."

Speaker Madigan: "2:15."

- Friedrich: "2:15. Thank you, Sir. I'd like to request a Republican Conference in Room 118 immediately. It's important that you get there because the room has to be vacated for the meeting to follow. Republican Conference in Room 118, please."
- Speaker Madigan: "And with that, the Chair recognizes

  Representative Matijevich."
- Matijevich: "Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I now move that the House stand in adjournment until 11:00 a.m. tomorrow. Does the Clerk need any time? Alright. We stand in adjournment until 11:00 a.m., Thursday, tomorrow."
- Speaker Madigan: "Those in favor say 'aye', those opposed say
  'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Motion is adopted. The
  House does stand adjourned until tomorrow morning at 11:00
  a.m."