129th Legislative Day

June 13, 1986

Speaker McPike: "... will come to order. Members will be in their seats. The Chaplain for today will be the Reverend Ernest Breithaupt, Pastor of Illinois District United Pentacostal Church of Wapella. Pastor Breithaupt is a guest of Representative Mike Weaver and Representative Sam Vinson. Will the guests in the balcony please rise and join us for the invocation?"

Reverend Breithaupt: "Our . Father and Creator. who. from everlasting to everlasting, reigns on high and rules in the affairs of men, we resound to You today a tribute of praise and thanksgiving for Your grace whereby You have allowed us to become the sons of God. We thank You for the high state that You have given us humble creatures in Your Creation. Help us to administer our office ever with the knowledge the earth and the fullness thereof belongs to You. Today, our Lord, we thank you especially for State of Illinois that is so rich in soil, rich in resources and, most of all, rich in dynamic people. Иe pray for our elected officials of this great state that you grant to them wisdom and direction in a measure greater than the magnitude of the problems they encounter. prav especially for the Leadership and the Representatives in this House that You will endure an abundant measure of courage and conviction to face the complex challenges of our generation and help them to find resolution to the outpouring of human need and suffering that is represented in many of the Bills consider. Their responsibility to this generation great, but I pray that abundant grace and wisdom be imparted unto them. Our glorious Lord, who sits upon the circle of the earth and sees the end from the beginning, we ask that divine providence be favorably inclined to this

129th Legislative Day

June 18, 1986

Assembly and that it be received with humble submission. Let Christian virtues influence and dominate decision that is made by this House. Let love. brotherly kindness and peace be uppermost in the heart οF Member of this Assembly as they give themselves to the act of governing this great state. Thank You, Father, for blessings so richly bestowed and totally undeserved that come to us in our lives. To You be glory and honor forever in the saving power of the Name of Jesus. Amen."

Speaker McPike: "Be led in the Pledge of Allegiance by Representative Ropp."

Ropp — et al: "I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United

States of America and to the Republic for which it stands,

one Nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice

for all."

Speaker McPike: "Roll Call for Attendance. Excused absences?

Mr. Piel."

Piel: "No excused absence today, Mr. Speaker"

Speaker McPike: "Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, not on this side either."

Speaker McPike: "Thank you. Take the record, Mr. Clerk. 117

Members answering the Roll Call, a quorum is present. If

the Chair could have your attention for a brief

announcement by Pete Miller."

Miller: "Thank you. Ladies and Gentlemen, I feel like a mailman taking a walk on his day off. Been here so manv times. you, it's always a pleasure, because my but-I'11 tell heart is with this House. You know that I served here many years. But we can't forget the kids of Springfield. Every year, since 1941, I've made all the games. three or four operations, I still had my operations before the ballgame or after. Now, my daughter's here with the tickets. You know, we always have to have... I've got five

129th Legislative Day

June 18. 1986

number three daughter Μv was selling tickets this time. So, please open up your hearts kids of Springfield. We have very little delinguency in Springfield, because we've given those kids a hall they play with something useful in their leisure time. And it's because of the General Assembly that kids have that ball park and as a credit to you and I and all of us, we open our pocketbooks once a year here to kids of Springfield. And I appreciate it. I want to thank you on behalf of all the kids that love that stadium. They play there from nine in the morning till midnight. them are going to be great athletes someday. be playing in the big leagues and basketball, but you've I want to thank you personally and I hope possible. that you don't beat us too badly tonight. Thank you."

- Capparelli: "Ladies and Gentlemen, what we're going to do is have... Gordon Ropp's going to have somebody on that side of the aisle go through and sell tickets and we'll have Jimmy DeLeo on this side of the aisle go through with our tickets and sell them. Give as much as you can for Pete Miller and for his long stay here in the General Assembly and for the ball team. Thank you. See you tonight."
- Speaker McPike: "Page five of the Calendar, Senate Bills appears Senate Bill 332, Representative AcGann. Senate Bill 415, Representative Out of the record. Representative Keane in the chamber? Out of the record. Senate Bill 602. Representative Hastert. Representative chamber? Out of the record. Hastert in the Senate Bill Representative Panayotovich. Braun Brookins. Representative Braun, on Senate Bill 937, will you handle the Bill? Read the Bill, Ar. Clerk."
- Clerk O"Brien: "Senate Bill 937, a Bill for an Act in relation to certain projects financed through issuance of certain bonds

129th Legislative Day

June 18, 1986

and to amend certain Acts herein named. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments.

Speaker McPike: "Any Floor Amendments?"

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

Speaker McPike: "Representative Dunn. Representative Dunn in the chamber? Representative Dunn. Representative Braun, Representative Dunn is not in the chamber."

Braun: "Yes, take the Bill out of the record."

Speaker 'McPike: "Out of the record. Senate Bill 1063,
Representative Keane. Representative Keane here? Out of
the record. Senate Bill 1320, Representative Ewing.
Gentleman's not here. Out of the record. Senate Bill
1491, Representative Deleo. Read the Bill. Hr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1491, a Bill for an Act relating to child abuse investigations. Second Reading of the Bill.

Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker McPike: "Any Motions filed?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed."

Speaker McPike: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1492, Representative Giorgi. Representative Giorgi. Representative Giorgi in the chamber? Out of the record. Senate Bill 1516, Representative Keane. Here's Representative Giorgi. We'll go back to 1492. Senate Bill 1492. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1492, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Liquor Control Act of 1934. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker McPike: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. Representative Hastert, would

129th Legislative Day

June 18, 1986

you like to return to your Bill?"

Hastert: "Yes."

Speaker McPike: "Alright. Let's return and pick up Representative Hastert's Bill, Senate Bill 602. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 602, a Bill for an Act in relation to the manufacturing, machinery and equipment exemptions from state occupation and use taxes. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker McPike: "Any Motions filed?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed."

Speaker 'McPike: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1516, Representative Welsh... I'm sorry, Representative Keane. Gentleman in the chamber? Representative Keane here? Out of the record. Senate Bill 1564, Representative Kirkland. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1565, Representative O'Connell. Is he here? Out of the record. Representative Keane, for what reason do you rise?"

Keane: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If you want, I'm happy... I'm ready to go with 415 on page five."

Speaker McPike: "Alright, let's go back and pick up Representative Keane's Bill. Senate Bill 415. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 415, a Bill for an Act to amend the Revenue Act. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker McPike: "Any Motions filed?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed."

Speaker McPike: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. Mr. Keane, on 1063."

129th Legislative Day June 18, 1986

Keane: "Yes, I'd like to call that also."

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

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1063, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Income Tax Act. Second Reading of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Keane, we have to take this out of the record. The Committee Amendment was somewhat lengthy and has not been distributed yet. It should be available later today. So, this Bill will be taken out of the record. And on 1516, read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1516, a Bill for an Act to require oral proficiency in the English language among all classroom instructors of public instructions of higher education. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker McPike: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. And we will return then to Senate Bill 1570, Representative Regan. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1570, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Criminal Code of 1961. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker McPike: "Any Motions filed?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed."

Speaker McPike: "Any Floor Amendments?"

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

Regane"

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

Regan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Amendment
#2 is a request of the Department of State Police for some
technical changes in regards to the administration of the
Firearms Owners' and Identification Act. These changes
currently have had some problems in regards to the

129th Legislative Day

June 18, 1986

administration of the cards and it's deals definitively to take care of those problems. I move for its adoption."

Speaker McPike: "Gentleman moves for the adoption Floor Amendment

#2. Is there any discussion? Representative Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Yes, would the Sponsor yield for a question, please?"

Speaker McPike: "Representative Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Yes, I wanted to know if he would yield for a question."

Speaker McPike: "Yes, he will."

Cullerton: "Yes, Representative Regan, this Amendment appears to

be of the nature of a Bill that was previously filed. Is

that correct?"

Regan: "Yes, Mr. Cullerton."

Cullerton: "And what was... do you know the number of that Bill?"

Regan: "It was House Bill 2368."

Cullerton: "House Bill 2368? And did we pass that Bill?"

Regan: "We passed the Bill and it went to the Governor's Office.

It had an amendatory veto that did not pass. That
amendatory veto is not in these changes."

Cullerton: "You mean... what did the amendatory veto deal with?

What issue did that deal with?"

Regan: "That the cards shall be valid until 30 days after the notice of expiration has been forwarded to the Department.

The Department of State Police does not care to have that in, did not want it in, does not have it in now."

Cullerton: "Okay. So, this was a Bill that was passed, you mean, last year."

Regan: "Yes."

Cullerton: "And has this... substance of this Amendment been introduced and considered by a Committee this year?"

Regan: "No, it was considered last year and passed."

Cullerton: "Do you happen to know why this has not been reintroduced as 3ill and considered in the Committee this

129th Legislative Day

June 18, 1986

year?"

- "No, I don't. Representative Cullerton. I know that Regan: there's been many things that we try to get through this year that we couldn't get through last year in regards to being killed in Rules Committee because of nonemergencies. think this probably falls into the same thing. and J However, it's very important to the Department of State Police that this be accomplished."
- Cullerton: "Well, I'm not suggesting that I'm opposed to the Bill. I'm just trying to clarify whether or not this Bill was also... the subject matter of this Amendment was introduced as Bill this year. I think it was, and I'm trying to find that... if it was, I'd like to find our file for that Bill and to find out just..."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Greiman in the Chair."
- Cullerton: "... to be able to compare. I'd like to just be able to compare, you know, the language in this Amendment with any Bill that we may have passed."
- Regan: "Yeah, I'd be glad to hold it out of the record for a time being till we can locate that problem. Okay. Fine."
- Cullerton: "We'll come right back to it. I appreciate it. Thank

 you. So, Representative Greiman, Representative... Mr.

 Speaker. Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker Greiman: "Yes."
- Cullerton: "Just to let you know what we've been doing out here.

 We've been discussing the Amendment \$2 to this Bill, and

 the Sponsor of the Amendment and the Bill has agreed to

 take it out of the record for a few mintues with the

 understanding that we would come right back to it once we

 clarify something."
- Speaker Greiman: "Alright. We'll take this Bill out of the record then. House Bill... Senate Bill 1570 will be out of the record. On page six of the Calendar on Senate Bills

- 129th Legislative Day

 Second Reading appears Senate Bill 1576. Mr. Clerk, read
 the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1576, a Bill for an Act to amend

 Sections of the Liquor Control Act. Second Reading of the

 Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."
- Speaker Greiman: "Are there any Motions with respect to Amendment #1?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed."
- Speaker Grieman: "Are there any Floor Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."
- Speaker Grieman: "Third Reading. On the Order of Senate Bills

 Second Reading appears Senate Bill 1577. Mr. Clerk, read

 the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House (sic Senate) Bill 1577, a Bill for an Act
 to amend the Liquor Control Act. Second Reading of the
 Bill. No Committee Amendments."
- Speaker Greiman: "Are there any Floor Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment £1, offered by Representative

 Countryman."
- Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from DeKalb, Mr. Countryman. Mr. Countryman appears not to be in the chamber. Do you want to take that out of the record, Ms. Parcells? Alright. This Bill will be out of the record then. On the Order of Senate Bills Second Reading appears Senate Bill 1589. Mr. McCracken, did you wish to proceed? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1589, a Bill for an Act to amend

 Sections of the Criminal Code. Second Reading of the Bill.

 No Committee Amendments."
- Speaker Greiman: "Are there any Floor Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."
- Speaker Greiman: "Third Reading. On the Order of Senate Bills Second Reading appears Senate Bill 1601. Mr. Steczo? Out

129th Legislative Day

- June 18, 1986
- of the record. Senate Bills Second Reading appears Senate Bill... appears Senate Bill 1624, out of the record. And 1634, out of the record. 1659, out of the record. Now, on page seven, Senate Bills Second Reading, appears Senate Bill 1700. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1700, a Bill for an Act in relation
 to municipal tax increment allocation financing and
 amending certain Acts therein named. Second Reading of the
 Bill. No Committee Amendments."
- Speaker Greiman: "Are there any Floor Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."
- Speaker Greiman: "Third Reading. On the Order of Senate Bills

 Second Reading appears Senate Bill 1709. Mr. Clerk, read

 the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1709, a Bill for an Act relating to certain taxes. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."
- Speaker Greiman: "Are there any Floor Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative
 Churchill."
- Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Churchill, on
 Amendment #1. Mr. Churchill in the chamber? Mr. Keane,
 what is your pleasure?"
- Keane: "Let's take the Bill out of the record until he gets here."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Bill will be out of the record. On the Order of Senate Bills Second Reading appears Senate Bill 1728. Ms. Deuchler. Out of the record. Okay. On page seven, we've skipped over Senate Bill 1711. On that Order of Business appears Senate Bill 1711. Mr. Clerk. Out of the record. On the Order of Senate Bills Second Reading on page nine appears Senate Bill 1799. Out of the record. On the Order of Senate Bills Second Reading appears Senate

129th Legislative Day

June 18, 1986

Bill 1804. Mr. Clerk... Mr. Levin. Mr. Clerk, call the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1804, a Bill for an Act to amend the

Absestos Abatement Act. Second Reading of the Bill. No

Committee Amendments."

Speaker Greiman: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Greiman: "Third Reading. On the Order of Senate Bills

Second Reading on page nine of the Calendar appears Senate

Bill 1809. Mr. Hannig. Out of the record. On the Order

of Senate Bills Second Reading appears Senate Bill 1814.

Mr. Phelps. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1814, a Bill for an Act in relation to county jails. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment &1 was adopted in Committee."

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

Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Greiman: "Are there any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments?"

Speaker Greiman: "Third Reading. On the Order of Senate Bills

Second Reading appears Senate Bill 1815. Ms. Didrickson,

did you wish to proceed? Out of the record. On the Order

of Senate Bills Second Reading appears Senate Bill 1837.

Mr. Johnson, 1837. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1837, a Bill for an Act designating a portion of the middle fork of the Vermilion River a protected river of the State of Illinois. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment 31 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Greiman: "Are there any Motions with respect to Amendment #1?"

Clerk Leone: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Greiman: "Are there any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No Floor Amendments."

129th Legislative Day

June 18, 1986

- Speaker Greiman: "Third Reading. On the Order of Senate Bills
 Second Reading appears Senate Bill 1838. Out of the
 record. On the Order of Senate Bills Second Reading
 appears Senate Bill 1845. Out of the record. Alright.
 Ms. Didrickson has returned, Mr. Clerk. Mr. Clerk, on page
 nine of the Calendar appears Senate Bills Second Reading,
 appears Senate Bill 1815. Would you read the Bill?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1815, a Bill for an Act to amend the
 Illinois Controlled Substance Act. Second Reading of the
 Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."
- Speaker Greiman: "Are there any Motions with respect to Amendment #1?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Greiman: "Are there any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

- Speaker Greiman: "Third Reading. We will go back and pick up a couple of... four Bills that we passed over, the Sponsors being off the floor, with leave of the House. Leave is granted. Alright, on page six of the Calendar, Senate Bills Second Reading, appears Senate Bill 1577. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1577, a Bill for an Act to amend the
 Liquor Control Act. Second Reading of the Bill. No
 Committee Amendments."

Speaker Greiman: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative

Countryman."

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from DeKalb, Mr. Countryman."

Countryman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Floor Amendment #1 extends
the provision of this Bill and the Dram Shop to cases which
occur to persons within this state, but for alcoholic
beverages which were licensed under the laws of this state
or any other state to sell alcoholic beverages. In

129th Legislative Day

June 18, 1986

essence, it extends the Dram Shop exposure to persons injured within the State of Illinois by persons who served liquor outside the State of Illinois. And that, in essence. is this border problem that's existed for a number of years where people have been going into others states, becoming intoxicated and then driving back into Illinois and receiving injury. Now, if you remember last year amended the Dram Shop Act so the intoxicated person themselves or their dependents have no cause of action for loss of means of support. So, in essence, this would be to protect the innocent third parties, generally, who are injured as a result of intoxicated persons who instance, go to Wisconsin, get intoxicated, come back and injure an Illinois resident within the bounds of the State The injury must occur within the State of of Illinois. Illinois. In addition to that, the Amendment makes the Act effective upon becoming law. I'd ask for its adoption."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from DeKalb moves for the adoption of Amendment \$1 to Senate Bill 1577. And on that, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Hould the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Greiman: "Indicates he'll yield for a question."

Cullerton: "Representative Countryman, you may recall in the Judiciary I Committee I handled a Bill for Representative Daley dealing with the issue of people drinking in another state and coming into our state and I believe that the substance of that Bill, or one of the provisions was to provide that the Dram Shop Act did apply to out of state liquor establishments. How does your Amendment differ from that Bill?"

Countryman: "The Amendment isn't much different from that Bill, except that that Bill contains a great deal more in terms of some other areas of the criminal law."

129th Legislative Day

June 18, 1986

Cullerton: "Right."

Countryman: "As I recall, it deals with losses of drivers."

Cullerton: "That's correct."

Countryman: "And my concern is that that Bill will get bogged down in that portion and it should have been brought as a separate Bill."

Cullerton: "Okay. So, this is not inconsistent with the provisions that are in that Bill."

Countryman: "No, and... "

Cullerton: "Is it even..."

Countryman: "... it's not as broad."

Cullerton: "Is it possibly identical to that Section of the other Bill?"

Countryman: "Excuse me. 2165, which is the other Bill, also applies if the injuries were in the State of Wisconsin but the sale was in Illinois. This Bill does not... this Amendment is not nearly as broad. This is drafted so that the injury must occur within the State of Illinois."

Cullerton: "Okay. Do you..."

Countryman: "Now..."

Cullerton: "Do you think that the provisions in the Bill that I presented in Committee have some constitutional problems but that this one would not have any?"

Countryman: "That's my concern, too, yes; that the jurisdictional problem — I don't know if it's necessarily constitutional in its ramifications, but jurisdictional in terms of where we get the jurisdiction in the State of Illinois, to impose what we call the liability here. And this one, I think, no question — the injury occurs in Illinois, there's jurisdiction."

Cullerton: "Right. If the injury occurs in Illinois right now,

but they were sold liquor outside of Illinois, the Dram

129th Legislative Day

June 18, 1986

Shop Law does not apply."

Countryman: "That's correct."

Cullerton: "And so, this Amendment would correct that."

Countryman: "That's correct."

Cullerton: "Okay. Fine. I support the Amendment."

Speaker Greiman: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from DuPage,

Mr. McCracken."

Cullerton: "Turn me off."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. McCracken."

McCracken: "Hill the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Greiman: "Indicates he'll yield for a question."

McCracken: "Representative Countryman, there was a recent
Illinois Appellate Court decision denying jurisdiction on
this fact pattern under our long arm statute, is that
right?"

Countryman: "That's correct."

McCracken: "Does this amend the long arm statute?"

Countryman: "Only indirectly. It amends the Dram Shop Act to give the Dram Shop Act, in essence, a long arm approach,

McCracken: "Okay."

Countryman: "... remember that the injury must occur in Illinois
under this Amendment."

McCracken: "Now, did that court discuss any due process implications of their finding? Did they resort to the due process clause in order to reverse that decision holding jurisdiction was properly before the court?"

Countryman: "I don't remember them doing that. My memory is that
they stated there was no cause of action, and my memory of
that, and, believe me, I would like to review the opinion
before I give you a definite answer on this, but was that
the Dram Shop recovery statutory nature in the statute...
statute didn't provide for this and; therefore, it wasn't

129th Legislative Day

June 18, 1986

intended by the Legislature."

McCracken: "Okav. Thank vou."

Speaker Greiman: "Further discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall this Amendment be adopted?' All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', those opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it and the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #2; offered by Representative

Countryman."

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from DeKalb, Ar. Countryman, on
Amendment #2."

"Thank you. Mr. Speaker. Amendment \$2 is Countryman: language which makes it clear in the statutory construction of this Act, should it become law, that it was not the intention of this Legislature, in any way, to abolish the affect of the Dram Shop prior to the Amendment. And let me inform the Members of the reason why. Last year, when we Amendments to the Dram Shop Act, we took away a cause of action to the intoxicated person and his dependents. essence. And in doing so. some trial courts overconstrued that and wrongly construed that to say that that means that if, in fact, he did not have... if he had a cause of action before it became law, it was abolished because it was statutory. Now, that isn't what the law in this state, nor was it the intention of this Legislative yet, some trial courts have ruled that. others have had more sense and not ruled that. And this is just language to make sure and clarify that portion of the statute, should this Act become law, that that's not the case here. And not only is it not the case here, but it was not the case last year when we made the amendments to the Dram Shop Act and that was a Bill in which I was the Chief Sponsor. So, I know that that wasn't our intention.

129th Legislative Day

June 18, 1986

And I, therefore, ask for the favorable adoption of this Amendment. It has no substantive change in the Bill. It's merely language to make sure that the law is construed properly by the courts. So, I move its adoption.

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from DeKalb, Hr. Countryman, moves for the adoption of Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 1577. And on that, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Yes, would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Greiman: "Indicates he'll yield for questions."

Cullerton: "I understand that the problem that we had last year
with that Bill and the interpretation given by the courts.

But is there anything in this Bill or in your Amendment #1
that could be construed as taking away a cause of action?"

"No, Representative Cullerton, there is not. Countryman: Matter of fact, it would grant a cause of action, but I I'm playing it very safe this year so the courts understand we're saying by amending the Dram Shop. And if you remember in Committee, I asked you. when VOI were presenting a Bill, if you were abolishing the old Dram Shop I don't want any Amendment to be and creating a new. construed by any court to effectively abolish anvbody*s cause of action prior to the day."

Cullerton: "Well, while I have you here, on Amendment #1, which dealt with granting the ... extending the Dram Shop Act to a situation where someone is injured in Illinois but was served liquor in another state, does it also apply to the manufacturer of the... of the liquor?"

Countryman: "No."

Cullerton: "The language in Amendment #1 says *any person*s

licensed under the law of any jurisdiction to manufacturer,

distribute or sell beverages, causes the intoxication while

intoxicated*. Does that mean that all the breweries in

Wisconsin that manufacturer alcohol, then distribute it to

129th Legislative Day

June 18, 1986

- a tavern that is then sold to an individual and that individual is injured in Illinois, would there be a cause of action against the manufacturer of the liquor?"
- Countryman: "No. The key phrase, the words that you need to look at, is the person who, by selling or giving alcohol... alcoholic liquor, and that's the present law of this state.

 It's the person who makes the sale or gives the alcoholic liquor who the cause of action is against, not the person who manufacturers it or distributes it in any other way."
- Cullerton: "Alright. So now... Okay. However, as you may know from your travels in Wisconsin, they have a number of these breweries that distribute liquor right at the brewery, like in 'La Cross', the Heileman... G. Heileman Brewery. They have a tour of the plant and the 'krausening' process is explained and then, at the end of that, they distribute liquor. They distribute beer. This would cover that situation."
- Countryman: "Yes. If the liquor is given away at some instance
 like that, then, yes, it would trigger this. However..."
 Cullerton: "And perhaps rightfully so."
- Countryman: "Yeah. Rightfully so. But, however, if they manufacturer the beer as they do at many of those places in Wisconsin and ship it out, it goes through the distribution process and goes out to one of the taverns on the border, the manufacturer is not responsible under this Act."
- Cullerton: "Because they were not the one that, by sale or gift, caused the intoxication."
- Countryman: "That's right. And, you know, it doesn't change the status of Illinois law which... which is that the manufacturer or distributor is not liable under the Dram Shop. It's the party who delivered the goods by sale or gift."
- Cullerton: "Okay. Well, we'll have our lawyers further research

129th Legislative Day

June 18, 1986

that and, if there's any question about the intent on Third Reading, we can perhaps talk about it again."

Countryman: "We'll be glad to do that. We have our lawyer over here who's so knowledgeable on this subject available to discuss with yours."

Cullerton: "Thank you. No further questions."

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Knox, Mr. Hawkinson. Mr. Hawkinson."

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

Speaker Greiman: "Indicates that he'll yield for questions."

Hawkinson: "Representative, on Amendment \$2, did I understand you to, in explanation, we passed a Bill last year which increased some limits under Dram Shop and restricted some of the causes of action — is the purpose of this Amendment to clarify that that restriction of the cause of action was to be prospective only?"

Countryman: "That's absolutely correct, Representative, and that's the purpose of this Amendment. And I would hope that the court would construe this Amendment as affecting last year's Amendments to the Bill, too."

Hawkinson: "Thank you."

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Speaker, would the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Greiman: "Indicates he'll yield for questions."

Matijevich: "Representative Countryman, I don't have the Amendment. this Amendment and the last one, and only for my own purposes of clarification, many years ago, as you know, we had the language in the Dram Shop where one, in whole or in part, contributed to the intoxication, and that caused the problem where every bar owner, for example, if you served somebody 8:00 in the morning, you could be just as liable as the person that served you at midnight,

129th Legislative Day

June 18, 1986

actually when you were under the influence. Neither of these Amendments change that at all, do... or... One of the Bills, as introduced, used the language 'contributed to', which I thought was the same as the in whole or in part language, and I want to make sure as to the explanation of this Amendment and the prior Amendment, that neither one of them change the present law where it's the person that caused the intoxication."

Countryman: "You are correct, Representative Matijevich. This does not change the existing law. All it does is extend — and this is Amendment #1 — all it does is extend the cause of action to injuries occuring within this state that... where the liquor was sold, in essence, in another state. It gives us jurisdiction over those people"

Matijevich: "Thank you."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Bureau, Mr. Mautino"

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

Speaker Greiman: "Indicates he'll yield for questions.""

Mautino: "Representative Countryman, in Amendment #1, as... is
this correct... Floor Amendment #2, or are we discussing
#1?"

Countryman: "Excuse me. I... We're on Amendment #2. Amendment #1 has been adopted, if you're asking me that question."

Mautino: "And that Amendment #1 was the provisions that any manufacturer, distributor, etcetera, be held liable in any cause of action, if, in fact, they sold that product? Has that #1?"

Countryman: "That was Amendment #1."

Mautino: "And that was adopted?"

Countryman: "Yes."

Mautino: "And how was that adopted?"

Countryman: "Just a minute ago."

Mautino: "By a voice vote?"

129th Legislative Day

June 18. 1986

Countryman: "Yes."

- Mautino: "For an inquiry. Are you saying to me, because I now may have the opportunity to reconsider since it was a voice vote, in Amendment #1, which was just adopted, a manufacturer or a distributor is being held liable for the product that they have either manufactured or distributed as a cause of action in this state?"
- Countryman: "No, Sir. And I just answered those questions for Representative Cullerton, even though we're on Amendment \$2, that pertained to Amendment \$1, and I think that our staff is over there to explain it adequately to you. I thought that was your concern, because I saw you near Representative Cullerton's chair and, you know, I know the nature of your concern on these Bills. It's certainly not our intent to do that and the language does not so state."
- Speaker Greiman: "Further discussion? Gentleman from DuPage. Mr. McCracken."
- McCracken: "Speaker, I would move to reconsider the vote by which

 Amendment #1 passed, its having been a voice vote."
- Speaker Greiman: "I'm sorry. Hould you repeat that?"
- McCracken: "I move to reconsider the vote by which Floor

 Amendment #1 passed. That was a voice vote."
- Speaker Greiman: "Yes, Mr. McCracken, the... this would be an improper... not a timely moment to entertain a Motion to reconsider. But in any event, the Motion to reconsider because we adopted that on a voice vote would be the inappropriate Motion to make. I would recognize you for the appropr... on an appropriate Motion after we are through considering Amendment #2. Mr. McCracken."
- McCracken: "Parliamentary inquiry. What would the correct Motion be?"
- Speaker Greiman: "Well, if I were on the floor, I might move to table that Amendment."

129th Legislative Day

June 18, 1986

McCracken: "Okay. Thank you."

- Speaker Greiman: "Proceeding... Mr. Mautino. Alright. There being no further discussion. Mr. Countryman. to close."
- Countryman: "Well. thank you. Mr. Speaker. He've had quite a bit on Amendment #2 on Amendment discussion 21. And technically I should have made a point of order and asked the Chair to rule that that discussion shouldn't place, but I didn't want anybody on this floor not to understand what's going on. And, therefore, I think we*ve thoroughly debated Amendment #1 when we should have been talking about Amendment #2. So, let me briefly state the Members that Amendment #2 is only language to clarify that we're not removing any cause of action by making the ... making this apply prospectively only, not apply it prospectively only or removing any cause of action that existed on the day that the Amendment takes place which is a problem we had last year. For that reason, I don't think there's any objection to Amendment #2, and I ask for adoption."
- Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Vinson, for what purpose are you seeking recognition? Do you want to explain your vote because we've closed debate? You have a point of order to make?"
- Vinson: "Yes. An inquiry of the Chair. Is it possible for you today to go to the point of having real Roll Calls on things rather than just 'ayes' and 'nays'? And I would like you to do that on this particular issue, if you would."
- Speaker Greiman: "Alright. The Gentleman has requested a Roll Question is, 'Shall Amendment #2 be adopted?' Call. A11 those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed vote *nay*. Voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk. take the record. On this question there are 50 voting

129th Legislative Day

- June 18, 1986
- *aye*, 46 voting *no*, 1 voting *present*, and the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative

 Countryman."
- Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from DeKalb, Mr. Countryman."
- Countryman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If Amendment #1 is on the
- Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Countryman, would the Gentleman in front of you please move so I can have eye contact with you?"
- Countryman: "If Amendment #1 is adopted, Amendment #3 should be withdrawn. I have some concern, because you've now given parliamentary procedure to Members of this side of the aisle as to how to kill Amendment #1. If that would be with... tabled, then I need to have Amendment #3 on the Bill. Amendment #3 only states that it becomes effective upon becoming law."
- Speaker Greiman: "Well, alright. I think I did indicate to Mr.

 McCracken that I would recognize him. So, are you suggesting that the better procedure would be to have a discussion on Amendment &... the Motion... a possible Motion to table? Is that what you're suggesting?"
- Countryman: "Well, I think a Motion to table is out of order, but if you're going to let them have it, I think you ought to have it and then I come back to 3, knowing whether it's on or off."
- Speaker Greiman: "Alright. The Clerk has read Amendment #3. He
 will back up, take Amendment #3 out of the record at this
 moment. The Bill is still in the record. Recognize Mr.
 McCracken for a possible Motion. Mr. McCracken, what is
 the Motion that you are on?"
- McCracken: "I believe that Mr. Mautino is the maker of the Motion in writing."
- Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Mautino has indeed presented us with a

129th Legislative Day

June 18, 1986

Motion to table Amendment #1. And on that Motion, the Gentleman from Bureau, Hr. Mautino.

- Mautino: "Thank very much. Mr. Speaker. vou Ladies and in to support the Motion to table, I Gentlemen. risina believe that everyone realized how much confusion there was concerning exactly what Amendment \$1. ₩hich was adopted I read this Amendment and voice vote, presented. As having some knowledge of the industry, I would think, it basically states that anyone who manufactures, distributes or sells the alcoholic beverage in any state surrounding Illinois, where their distribution area overlaps, would be responsible for a cause of action in the State of Illinois. This is virtually an issue which I believe is detrimental not only to business entities in Illinois, but it certainly sets up additional litigous positions that could occur. And I feel it's an Amendment that certainly should a vote other than voice and I believe that for the betterment of those entities in Illinois, as well those manufacturers, as well as distributors, it should be removed from the Bill. And I so move and have filed the proper Motion."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Bureau, Mr. Mautino, moves
 to table Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1577. And on that,
 the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. O'Connell."
- O'Connell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Actually, the reason I'm rising at this point in time, I was off the floor on the vote for Amendment #1 and my vote was inadvertently punched as 'no' and I would simply like the record to show that, had I been on the floor, I would have voted 'aye'."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman..."

O'Connell: "I'm sorry. Amendment #2, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Greiman: "Alright, yes. Amendment #1 was adopted on a voice vote. The Gentleman from DeKalb, Mr. Countryman."

129th Legislative Day

June 18, 1986

Countryman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Point of order, first. Is
the Amendment in... the Hotion in order?"

Speaker Greiman: "Under our rules, a Motion to table would be appropriate at Second Reading. And in order to... seem to me, to make for orderly process of the understanding and handling of the debate on this Bill, we allowed the Motion to be made. And I think it is proper... proper at this time."

Countryman: "Well, I certainly don't have the expertise of the rules, as you do, having... you having many more years here in the House than I have."

Speaker Greiman: "I make them up as I go along."

Countryman: "But it seems to me that an appropriate Motion to table is to...on an Amendment that has previously Reading or in Committee and not one adopted on another that's just been adopted. You know, these Gentlemen And I... matter of fact, went to great lengths to attempt to explain this to them. Nobody asked for matter of fact, many Members agreed in their Call. And. speaking with the Amendment. And now, in essence, οn Amendment \$2 they raised a lot of questions about Amendment #1 and they want to get a second day in court. And I don't think it's appropriate. But I understand the ruling of the Chair. Let me say that Representative Hautino, had he been and listened to the answers to the questions that I gave to Representative Cullerton, who does such an able job over there in pointing these things out, would have heard that, in fact, the concerns that he has aren't born out by the Amendment. And if you read the Amendment, it says 'any person licensed under the law of anv iurisdiction to manufacture, distribute or to sell alcoholic beverages who, by the sale or gift of the alcoholic beverages, outside of Illinois causes the intoxication of any person who, while

129th Legislative Day

June 18, 1986

intoxicated. injures another person... and so forth. So, in essence, if that brewery was here in Illinois... I'm saving is under existing law. they'd be responsible under the Dram Shop and they should be responsible Bram Shon-So. he shouldn't have concerns for breweries that are in 'O'Clair'. Wisconsin and Milwaukee. Wisconsin and St. Louis, Missouri and places like that, if, in fact, those breweries caused the intoxication by sale of gift of the alcoholic beverage. And I further stated that the Amendment does not create, and I think there's books - as I remember the beer distributors ran a Bill a couple of years ago, that makes it clear that you're liable under the Dram Shop for manufacture of distribution of the beer... of the alcoholic beverage so long directly to the consumer. beverage is not sold they re using a party who otherwise is. you know. distributor or down to a person who sells it, the person who's responsible is the person who ultimately sells the product and that's the way it is under the Dram Shop. And if the manufacturer ultimately distributes the product. then he could have they do these tours, some responsibility for it, but that's only a rare instance. And they seem to be controlled. I haven't spent my life traveling through these brewery tours, but T know offer a minor sample at the end of some of them. But it is a bogus issue that they re construing on this and it really what the Amendment says. And I guess that's my opposition to it. I don't mean to cause a ruckus by all of this. There's other legislation pending before this House that's broader in its scope. And it's my construction that is something that gives jurisdiction and that many this people in their districts are still having problems being injured in the State of Illinois by somebody

129th Legislative Day

June 18. 1986

who goes to another state and becomes intoxicated and then back here in a drunken state and injures innocent And the Illinois Supreme Court has said they don't And all we're saving is that have a cause of action. have a cause of action. People who are operating should these establishments have responsibilities to the citizenc of the State of Illinois and this makes them responsible in that context. It does not change the Dram Shop Law as applies in Illinois right now. It's a good Amendment. It's good government, and I ask you to oppose this Motion to table."

Speaker Greiman: "Ladv from Cook. Ms. Parcells."

- Parcells: "Thank vou. Mr. Speaker. This is originally... I am the House Sponsor of this Bill and I'm afraid there's much controversy on this Amendment #1 that I would ask the Sponsor of the Amendment to withdraw it because Ŧ I'm not even quite sure it's germane to the we've lost Bill. The people that were covered under the Bill who were renting a hotel or motel room so that a those young... young people under the age... the drinking age of 21 could have a drinking party. And it was to hold those people responsible. Now, all of a sudden, we're into the manufacturers and the bartenders. And I think perhaps this whole other Bill. and I would ask the Sponsor to withdraw the Amendment."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from DeWitt, Mr. Vinson. Mr. Countryman, excuse me."
- Countryman: "Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I asked the
 Lady if I could put these Amendments on her Bill. She
 indicated to me that she would. In light of the fact that
 she's asked me now on the floor of the House, even though
 she is my seatmate she could have leaned over and asked
 me to withdraw the Amendments, I am not going to amend

129th Legislative Day

June 18. 1986

her Bill against her will. And for that reason, I'll withdraw Amendment $\$1.^n$

- Speaker Greiman: "No, no. You have to... What you have to do is
 to join with Mr. Mautino in urging the House to table

 Amendment #1. So, we're on the Motion to table. Mr.

 Mautino, to close."
- Mautino: "Thank you. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen. glad to hear that the Sponsor of the original Amendment willing to reconsider his position and this House's action on that effort. There's very little more I need to say on it, except that the logic that the Sponsor of the Amendment its original form Amendment #1 presented, is one that and would also, I would then say, that could very well be used, for example, to the farmer who grew the corn who made beverage that was sold to the guy that had the problem. And I'm sure you don't want to bring that guy into it I think that that farmer, whatever. it's well intentioned. I don't think it's drafted correctly, as put in the manufacturers and specifically the distributors. to address your question. I'd be happy to help you... with providing that action, if, in fact, we can Make it vou in so it doesn't cause a burden on the manufacturers as well as the distributors in this state. Therefore, I renew my Motion."
- Speaker Greiman: "Question is, 'Shall Amendment #1 be tabled?"

 Those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. Amendment #1 is tabled.

 Now, on Amendment #3. Do you wish to withdraw that, Ar.

 Countryman? You wish to proceed with Amendment 3?

 Alright. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative

 Countryman."
- Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from DeKalb, Hr. Countryman, on

129th Legislative Day

June 18, 1986

Amendment #3."

- Countryman: "I believe the board is inaccurate, Mr. Speaker,
 Members of the House. I don't think we want to table #3.

 Alright. Now, we have #1 is tabled, #2 is on, #3 only
 makes it an immediate effective date. And we need 3 if 1
 is off, and I'd ask for its adoption."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from DeKalb moves for the adoption of Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 1577. And on that, is there any discussion? There being none, 'Shall the Amendment be adopted?' Those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The Amendment's adopted. Further Amendment?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Greiman: "Third Reading. On the Order of Senate Bills

 Second Reading these are Bills that we have previously

 called this morning appears Senate Bill 1711. 1711 is on

 page seven of the Calendar. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1711, a Bill for an Act to amend
 Sections of the Illinois Domestic Violence Act. Second
 Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in
 Committee."
- Speaker Greiman: "Are there any Motions with respect to Amendment #1?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Greiman: "Are there any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

- Speaker Greiman: "Third Reading. On page seven of the Calendar, on the Order of Senate Bills Second Reading appears Senate Bills 1728. Alright. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1728, a Bill for an Act relating to the Illinois Mathematics and Science Academy and its employees. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

129th Legislative Day June 18, 1986

Speaker Greiman: "Are there any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

- Speaker Greiman: "Third Reading. On the Order of Senate Bills

 Second Reading appears Senate Bill 1799. Mr. Clerk, call
 the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1799, a Bill for an Act to amend
 Sections of the School Code. Second Reading of the Bill.

 No Committee Amendments."
- Speaker Greiman: "Are there any Floor Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative

 McPike."
- Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Cook, Ar. Cullerton, on Floor
 Amendment 81."
- Cullerton: "Yes, thank you, Ar. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen
 of the House. Amendment #1 makes the provisions of the
 Bill applicable for 1986. I move for the adoption of the
 Amendment."
- Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Cullerton, moves for the adoption of Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1799. On that, is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall the Amendment be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The Amendment's adopted. Further Amendment?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative

 Madigan Cullerton."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Ar. Cullerton, on Amendment #2."
- Cullerton: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #2 does two things. First of all, with respect to staff development programs, it provides that school districts may contract with not-for-profit organizations to conduct summer staff development program

129th Legislative Day

June 18, 1986

institutes. And with respect to the reimbursement of transportation, it redefines the term "qualifying pupil" to include full time students living within one and a half miles from the school and who did not have access transportation or could not safely walk to school and it school provides procedures for districts tο obtain reimbursement from the state. This would apply to the 1985-86 school year. Move for the adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Cullerton, moves for the adoption of Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 1799.

There being no discussion, the... Oh, I'm sorry. The Lady from Champaign, Ms. Satterthwaite."

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

Speaker Greiman: "Indicates he will."

Satterthwaite: "Representative Cullerton, I don't have the
Amendment before me, but did I understand that this deals
with transportation reimbursement for children in summer
schools?"

Cullerton: "No, only a full time enrolled in the kindergarten through twelvth grade."

Satterthwaite: "What... How does it change the transportation reimbursement to those students?"

the definition Cullerton: "It expands qualifying pupil to of indicate that a pupil who did not have access t o transportation to include the following qualifications: the pupil did not have access to transportation provided at public expense; conditions are such that walking to school constitutes a serious hazard to the safety of the pupil due to vehicular traffic, and the Department of Transportation would determine with their own guidelines what should be deemed to be a safety hazard. And..."

Satterthwaite: "I thought that was already part of current law."

129th Legislative Day

- June 18, 1986
- Cullerton: "Well, I think that it was part of a Bill that we have passed out of the House but that is currently stalled in the Senate."
- Satterthwaite: "Does this apply just to the Chicago schools or is this a statewide application?"
- Cullerton: "No, I think it would... it certainly isn't limited to any certain counties. So, it could possibly..."
- Satterthwaite: "Is it... Is it a ... what is the statutory reference to the Section?"
- Cullerton: "The Chapter 122, it appears to be."
- Satterthwaite: "Paragraph..."
- Cullerton: "All I have... I'm not sure of the Chapter. It's

 Section... yeah, Chapter 122, Section 29.5. So, I'm not

 sure whether that applies just to Cook County."
- Satterthwaite: "I think that applies statewide then, but I still don't understand what it does different from the current law because there is already current law that indicates that children can be transported if they live within the mile and a half of the school where there is a hazardous condition."
- Cullerton: "Yes, I think that maybe the operative language that might be different from current law is that it talks about hazards that occur within the mile and a half of the residence. Perhaps that might clear it up. The serious hazard in this case can be within one and a half miles."
- Satterthwaite: "Currently... currently, children who live within
 a mile and a half of the school can get reimbursement for
 transportation if there is a hazardous condition. And I
 still don't understand how this would change current law."
- Cullerton: "Well, I think that... I think that this Amendment just applies to all... all schools."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Lady from DuPage, Hs. Cowlishaw."
- Cowlishaw: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

129th Legislative Day June 18, 1986

Speaker Greiman: "Indicates he'll yield for a question."

Cowlishaw: "Representative Cullerton. Representative Cullerton."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Cullerton. You have yielded for questions
to be directed to you."

Cowlishaw: "It is my understanding that the current provisions of the School Code, as they apply to public schools only, provide that if a student lives within one and a half miles of his attendance center, but there is a serious safety hazard involved in walking, that if that public school district makes the decision to transport that student by bus, that student qualifies for state reimbursement of the transportation system just as though he lived one and a half miles or more from his attendance center. Is that correct?"

Cullerton: "Yes."

Cowlishaw: "Alright. What this Amendment does, as I understand is to supplement to some extent the provisions that we enacted as part of the reform legislation last year which what Ī have termed the transportation applied to reimbursement for private school students, because this Amendment provides that any student, regardless of whether he or she attends a public or a private school, falls under those same provisions about safety hazards, except that this case we're not talking about a reimbursement to a public school district, but, rather, a reimbursement to the parents or guardians of that student who is avoiding hazard."

Cullerton: "Yes, I think you have made it very clear as to what
the purpose of the Amendment is, and I thank you for that."
Cowlishaw: "You're very welcome. Thank you for your answers."

Speaker Greiman: "Further discussion? There being none, Ar.

Cullerton, to close."

Cullerton: "Yes, I think that the Amendment has been fully

129th Legislative Day

June 18. 1986

discussed and explained by the Lady from DuPage, and I appreciate her support... ${\bf q}$

Speaker Greiman: "Question is, 'Shall Amendment #2 be adopted?'

All in favor signify by saying 'aye', those opposed 'no'.

In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "There are no further Amendments."

Speaker Greiman: "Third Reading. On the Order of Senate Bills

Second Reading, on page nine of the Calendar. appears

Senate Bill 1809. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill. And Ms.

Breslin in the Chair."

Clerk Leone: "On the Order of Second Reading, Senate Bill 1809, a

Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. Second Reading

of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Breslin: "Any Motions filed?"

Clerk Leone: "There are no Motions filed."

Speaker Breslin: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative
Ropp."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Ropp."

Ropp: "Thank you, Madam Speaker and Members of the House. Amendment \$2 to Senate Bill 1809 is the culmination of three Bills that passed this chamber a couple of weeks ago with more than a hundred votes. The first portion adding public counselors... public school counselors and administrators in vocation education to participate in the summer training programs that we currently now allow for vocational people to attend. It also added a phrase as to the areas of education being taught which included opportunities for employment. And the final Section dealt with adding vocational education as one of the electives in those schools that listed requirements for college graduation. I welcome any questions or also welcome your

129th Legislative Day

June 18, 1986

support as you supported it a couple of weeks ago."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 1809. Is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall Amendment #2 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 #3, offered by Representative

Satterthwaite and Cowlishaw."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Satterthwaite."

Satterthwaite: "I would ask to table Amendment #3 please."

Speaker Breslin: "Withdraw Amendment #3. Are there any further

Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #4, offered by Representative

Satterthwaite and Cowlishaw."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Satterthwaite."

Satterthwaite: "Amendment #4 incorporates into this Bill the substance of House Bill 3061 which passed with over a hundred votes on the House floor. It is the scholarship program for teachers to encourage these students who graduate in the top fourth of their class to go into the teaching profession. We have passed this twice before, but the Senate unfortunately did not permit it to come out of Rules Committee, and I would ask for your support in putting it in this Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Lady moves the adoption of Amendment #4 to Senate Bill 1809. On that question, Representative Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Yes, would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Breslin: "She will."

Cullerton: "What would you say is the economic benefit of one of these scholarships over the course of a four year period?"

129th Legislative Day

June 13, 1986

Satterthwaite: "Well, over the course of a four year period, it would amount to probably something like 12,000 dollars, but it would be... it covers tuition and fees... excuse me, that s... three, yeah. That's right. It covers tuition and fees and a 1500 dollar a year stipend for the student."

Cullerton: "Tuition and fees are about 1500 dollars?"

Satterthwaite: "A little less on the average, but close to that."

Cullerton: "Now, what happens if the person takes the scholarship

for the four years and graduates and then decides that they

really don't want to become a teacher?"

Satterthwaite: "There is a pay back provision, so that if the student does not teach. So, it would apply to the student who got the degree but did not teach or it would apply to the student who decided not to finish the degree. They would have to repay the entire amount if they do not pay it back as a teacher."

Cullerton: "They have to pay back the entire amount, or they have to pay back one fourth of the scholarship plus interest?" Satterthwaite: "Well, the pay back provision says that for each year of teaching, you are forgiven for one year of the scholarship benefits and that you must complete four years of teaching out of the first seven years after you get your teaching degree. What I was indicating was that for person who got the teaching degree and did not teach at all, they would be required to pay the full amount had received. For a student who might not complete their teaching degree at all, they would still be required to pay back the amount of the scholarship."

Cullerton: "Fine. Thank you very much."

Speaker Breslin: "Is there any further discussion? Hearing none,
the question is... Representative Satterthwaite, would you
wish... do you wish to close?"

Satterthwaite: "Simply to ask the support of the Members on

129th Legislative Day

June 18, 1986

legislation that we have already passed."

Speaker Breslin: "The question is, "Shall Amendment #4 to Senate Bill 1809 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: "There are no further Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. House (sic - Senate) Bill 1838.

Excuse me. Senate Bill 1838."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1838, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act in relationship to limited partnerships in corporations.

Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment &1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Breslin: "Are there any Motions filed?"

Clerk Leone: "There are no Motions filed."

Speaker Breslin: "Or any Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "There's no Floor Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Take the Bill out of the record. House 3ill...

House... It was taken out of the record, Mr. Cullerton.

House (sic - Senate) 3ill 1845. Senate 3ill 1845,

Representative Cullerton. Clerk, read the Bill. Out of

the record. Senate Bill 1852, Representative Ropp. Clerk,

read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1852, a Bill for an Act creating the Board of Higher Education. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Are there any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative

McPike and Cullerton."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Yes, thank you, Madam Speaker and Ladies and
Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #1 says that
implementation of the new statewide minimum admission

129th Legislative Day

June 18, 1986

requirements and standards for public community colleges state universities established and announced by the Board back in December of *85 shall be deferred a minimum one year as provided in this Subsection. The Board shall continue to work with the State Board of Education the clarification of these minimum admission requirements and standards and the public community colleges and state..."

- Speaker Breslin: "Excuse me, Mr. Cullerton. Mr. Clerk, can you tell us if this Amendment has been printed and distributed?

 It has been printed and distributed, Representative Ropp."
- Cullerton: "As I was saying before I was so rudely interrupted."

 Speaker Breslin: "Excuse me, Sir."
- Cullerton: "The public community colleges and state universities shall adopt these minimum admission requirements and standards for entering freshman no later than the fall of 1992. So, that's what the Amendment does in toto."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of
 Amendment & 1 to Senate Bill 1852. And on that question,
 the Gentleman from DuPage, Representative McCracken."
- McCracken: "The Sponsor of the Bill hasn't seen it yet. I

 haven't seen it yet. I wonder if we could take it out of

 the record for just a moment. We don't have it over here."
- Speaker Breslin: "We'd love to, Representative McCracken.

 Representative Ropp, would you consent to taking the Bill

 out of the record? He will. Out of the record. Senate

 Bill 1855. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1855, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act concerning administrative duties relating to credit union insurance. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendments #1 and 2 were adopted in Committee."
- Speaker Breslin: "Any Motions filed?"
- Clerk Leone: "There are no Motions filed."

129th Legislative Day June 18, 1986

Speaker Breslin: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #3 is offered by Representative

Flinn and Leviń."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Flinn."

Flinn: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Amendment #3 simply strikes out of the Bill language that requires the United States Government be responsible for the principle and interest of Israel bonds. The federal chartered credit unions are allowed to buy Israeli bonds now and the state chartered are not. And simply this Amendment is try to make state chartered credit unions the same as the federal chartered, and I ask for the adoption of this Amendment."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 1855. And on that question, is there any discussion? Hearing no discussion, the question is, 'Shall Amendment #3 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: "There are no further Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1856. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1856, a Bill for an Act to amend the Pharmacy Practice Act. Second Reading of the Bill.

Amendments 1, 2, 3 and 4 were adopted in Committee."

Speaker Breslin: "Are there any Motions filed?"

Clerk Leone: "There are no Motions filed."

Speaker Breslin: "And are there Floor Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #5, is offered by Representative Levin."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Levin."

Levin: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Bill, like the last Bill, is a JCAR Bill, and

129th Legislative Day

June 18, 1986

of the things you find when you carry JCAR Bills is one that you sometimes end up in the middle of controversies that you didn't foresee. And what Amendment 85 does is to delete from the Bill the multiple exchange provisions prescriptions with the respect to pharmacies. This is agreed to by the Pharmacist Association and Walgreens the department, and the intention is that by taking it out of the Bill, it will be an issue which, next year when Pharmacy Act expires, it will become the subject discussion but that neither side will start out at an advantage with something that's in the statute. So, this simply deletes that provision from the Bill so they can start at fresh on it next year."

- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #5 to Senate Bill 1856. Is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall Amendment #5 be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment &6, offered by Representative

 Stevenson and ... Stephens and Hawkinson."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Stephens."
- Stephens: "You got to be very careful with that name, I'm very sensitive about that, especially, this year. As a matter of fact, I don't even own a horse. I would like to withdraw Amendment #6."
- Speaker Breslin: "Withdraw #6. Are there any further
 Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment &7, offered by Representative

 Stephens and Hawkinson."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Stephens."
- Stephens: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Amendment &7 is, in fact,

129th Legislative Day

June 18, 1986

House Bill 347 which passed out of the House 103 to 0 earlier in the year, but was not allowed to be heard in the Senate. The Sponsor and all the Members... all interested parties are in agreement. Just to refresh your memory, it allows pharmacies to choose among several accepted compendium as to which they wish to use in their practice of pharmacy in their particular location. Be happy to answer any questions and I move for its adoption."

- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Amendment #7 to Senate Bill 1856. And on that question."
- Cullerton: "Yes, has this been printed and distributed?"
- Speaker Breslin: "Mr. Clerk. It has not been printed and distributed, Representative Stephens. The question is. •Will Representative Levin consent to hold the Bill until vour Amendment can he printed and distributed?* Representative Levin."
- Levin: "Yeah, if... if we can have leave to come back to it. I
 think it's in the process of being printed now. If we can
 have leave to come back to it, I have no problem with
 taking it out of the record momentarily."
- Speaker Breslin: "We will do the best we can. Out of the record.

 House Bill 1931, Representative Cullerton. Clerk, read the
 Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1931, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act..."
- Speaker Breslin: "Out of the record. Senate Bill 1934,

 Representative Daley. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1934, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act relating to school holidays and school student records.

 Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."
- Speaker Breslin: "Any Motions filed?"

129th Legislative Day June 18, 1986

Clerk Leone: "There are no Motions filed with respect to $\text{Amendment } \#1 \bullet "$

Speaker Breslin: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment \$2, is offered by Representative

Rvder."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Ryder. Representative Ryder, on Amendment #2."

Ryder: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. This Amendment is a duplicate of a Bill that passed out of the House without any objection, and it simply eliminates residency as a ... residency as a requirement for nonprofessional school employees."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of

Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 1934. And on that question."

the Gentleman from Cook. Representative Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Yes, will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Breslin: "He indicates he will."

Cullerton: "First of all, Representative Ryder, is it my understanding that this Amendment does not apply to the City of Chicago?"

Rvder: "Correct."

Cullerton: "And it does not apply to school teachers."

Ryder: "Nonprofessionals. That is correct."

Cullerton: "So, it applies to people who work in schools who are not school teachers..."

Ryder: "Correct."

Cullerton: "...Like janitors. And the effect of the Amendment is
to say that the school district cannot tell them that they
have to live within a certain school district or school
county or are there any such residency requirements right
now imposed on school teach... on nonteaching personnel?"

Ryder: "There's statutory requirement that will not allow them to be imposed on teachers or professional staffs. They are

129th Legislative Day

June 18, 1986

nonconcerning."

Cullerton: "But are... are there any residency requirements that

you are aware of right now that this Bill is designed to

change?"

Ryder: "No. No. I don't know. I have no knowledge whether there are some in effect as of this moment or not."

Cullerton: "So, this is prophylactic in nature?"

Ryder: "Hell, if one needs to be that careful, Ar. Cullerton. I

don't know what it is that you wish to cover, but I'm sure
that the caution may be necessary."

Cullerton: "What is the need for the Amendment?"

Ryder: "Well, it's simply indicating that if teachers are not required to live within the district, that it inequitable to then require other folks who are nat receiving the same kinds of compensation. or maybe, part time employees or people who do not have the funds available to make them have this onerous burden of changing the place of employ... or changing the place of residence for employment for that purpose."

Cullerton: "And, do you know what happened to the House Bill that
we passed that did the same thing?"

Ryder: "Like many Bills that passed here, they are safely a sleep, deep sixth in the Senate."

Cullerton: "Senate Rules Committee or the Senate Commitee?"

Ryder: "Rules."

Cullerton: "Rules. Okay, thank you."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 1934. Is there any further discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall Amendment #2 be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"

129th Legislative Day

June 18, 1986

- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #3, offered by Anthony Young."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Young. Repre... Mr. Clerk, has the Amendment been printed and distributed? It has not been printed and distributed. Representative Daley, would you agree to hold this Bill for Representative Young's Amendment? He will hold the Bill. Out of the record. We will try to get back to it, Sir. Senate Bill 1951, Representative Giorgi. Representative Giorgi. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1957, Representative Homer. Clerk, read the Bill. Excuse me. Representative Homer."
- Homer: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Parliamentary inquiry on that Bill. Has the... House Amendment 1 been distributed?"
- Speaker Breslin: "Amendment \$1 has been distributed. Let's read the Bill then. Excuse me, that was a Committee Amendment, you understand."
- Homer: "I'm sorry, there is... it's my understanding that

 Representative Levin has filed a Floor Amendment that...

 apparently, it's House Amendment 2. Has that been

 distributed?"
- Speaker Breslin: "No, it has not."
- Homer: "Could we, then, Madam Speaker, have leave to take it out of the record until such time as the Amendment has been distributed?"
- Speaker Breslin: "Surely. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1991.

 Representative Steczo. Clerk. read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1991, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. Second Reading of this Bill. Amendments #1 and 2 were adopted in Committee."
- Speaker Breslin: "Out of the record. With leave of the Body, we'll now go back to Senate... to Representative Daley's Bill, Senate Bill 1934. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill. Mr. Clerk, Senate Bill 1934. Are there any Amendments filed?"

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1934, next Amendment offered is offered

129th Legislative Day

- June 18, 1986
- by Representative Anthony Young, Amendment &3."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Young withdraws Amendment #3.

 Are there any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #4, offered by Representative
 Young. Anthony Young."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Young withdraws Amendment 94.Are there any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "There are no further Amendments."
- Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. The next Bill on this Order of
 Call is Senate Bill 2000. Representative Greiman McPike
 or Levin. Out of the record. Senate Bill 2003,
 Representative Cullerton. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 2003, a Bill for an Act to amend the Criminal Code. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Cullerton."
- Cullerton: "Out of the record, please."
- Speaker Breslin: "Out of the record. Senate Bill 2006,
 Representative Greiman Preston Sutker. Out of the
 record. Senate Bill 2017, Representative Didrickson.
 Excuse me. Representative Preston Wishes to handle Senate
 Bill 2006. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 2006, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act to establish Military and Naval Code for Illinois. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."
- Speaker Breslin: "Any Floor Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "There are none."
- Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 2017,
 Representative Didrickson or McCracken. Out of the record.

 Senate... Representative McCracken wishes to call the
 Bill. Call the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 2017, a Bill for an Act to amend the Cannabis Control Act. Second Reading of the Bill. No

129th Legislative Day

June 18. 1986

Committee Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative
Didrickson."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Didrickson."

Didrickson: "Thank you, Madam Chairman. What this Amendment says is that in any prosecution for any violation of this Act where a defense is going to be an affirmative defense, the defendant is required to give notice to the State of Illinois prior to trial that this will be the defense that is going to be used."

Speaker Breslin: "The Lady has moved for the adoption of Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 2017. Is there any discussion? Hearing none... The Gentleman from DeKalb, Representative Countryman."

Countryman: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Breslin: "She will."

Countryman: "Will you tell me again what notice has to be given by the defense?"

Didrickson: "The notice has to be given seven days prior to trial that an affirmative defense is going to be used and has to notify the state of that."

Countryman: "Only in cannabis trials?"

Didrickson: "He're under this Act, which is an Act dealing with... changing from a controlled substance 1 to a controlled substance 2 schedule of a pharmaceutical drug which is the derivative of cannabis called dronabinol, and what we're doing is changing the schedule based on the federal schedule change."

Countryman: "Why should we do this in this case and not amend the criminal procedure, generally?"

Didrickson: "I have talked with legal counsel on the House floor here and also off floor and that has been their consensus."

129th Legislative Day June 18, 1966

Countryman: "How many days notice is... do they have to give?"

Didrickson: "Seven days prior to the trial."

Countryman: "And do they have to specify the affirmative defense that they're going to use or is it generic, just an... a affirmative defense?"

Didrickson: "Correct. Correct."

Countryman: "Just a affirmative defense."

Didrickson: "An affirmative defense is going to be used."

Countryman: "Alright. Representative Hawkinson says to me that if this doesn't go on, the burden of proof is on the defendant. Does this shift the burden of proof back to the state then?"

Didrickson: "Yes, that is correct."

Countryman: "He's asking... He's raising the question and answering it too. Okay."

Didrickson: "The legal counsel that I have chatted with on this has been, Representative Hawkinson and Representative Cullerton."

Countryman: "Okay."

Didrickson: "Along with some others."

Countryman: "Alright. No further questions."

Didrickson: "Thank you."

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

Representative Dunn."

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

Speaker Breslin: "She indicates she will."

Dunn: "As I read Amendment #1, the seven day requirement is limited only to an affirmative defense that the controlled substance was a prescription. Is that or does seven days apply to any affirmative defense you want raise at a trial?"

Didrickson: "No, you were correct the first time."

Dunn: "That the... the defense... The seven day requirement only

129th Legislative Day

June 18, 1986

applys to the controlled substance prescription situation."

Didrickson: "That is the prescription. That is correct."

Dunn: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Breslin: "There being no further discussion. The question is, 'Shall Amendment #1 be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "There are no further Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 2018, Representative Mays. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 2018, a Bill for an Act to amend the
Illinois Vehicle Code. Second Reading of the Bill.

Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Breslin: "Any Motions filed?"

Clerk Leone: "There are no Motions filed."

Speaker Breslin: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "There are no Floor Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 2020,

Representative White — Churchill. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 2020, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Public Aid Code. Second Reading of the Bill.

There are no Committee Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "There are none."

Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 2022,

Representative Bowman or McPike. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 2022, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Public Aid Code. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "There are no Floor Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "There are no Floor Amendments, Representative

129th Legislative Day

- June 18, 1986
- Bowman, but there is a request for a fiscal note, so the...

 The Gentleman is now filing and complying with the request for the fiscal note.
- Clerk Leone: "Fiscal note on Senate Bill 2022 has just been filed."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Bowman, the date on... Okay,
 the fiscal note has been filed on Senate Bill 2022. So,
 the Bill now moves to Third Reading. Senate Bill 2037,
 Representative McGann. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 2037, a Bill for an Act relating to the imposition of state occupation and use taxes. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."
- Speaker Breslin: "Any Floor Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "There are none."
- Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. Senate 8ill 2042.

 Representative Daley. 2042. Clerk, read the 8ill."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 2042, a Bill for an Act to amend the Senior Citizens' and Disabled Persons' Property Tax Relief and Pharmaceutal Assistance Act. Second Reading of the Bill. There are no Committee Amendments."
- Speaker Breslin: "Any Floor Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #1, is offered by Representative

 Daley."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Daley."
- Dalev: "Madam Speaker, Members of the House, House Amendment @1 amends the Pharmaceutical Assistance Act. Basically it does is delay the effective date of the department survey of professional pharmacy dispensing fees by It clarifies the definition of the survey and; thirdly, it increases the effective date to July 31 of the professional dispensing fees to \$3.30 to \$3.60 per prescription. These changes have been agreed to by the Illinois Pharmacist and the Department of Revenue."

129th Legislative Day

June 18, 1986

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment &1 to Senate Bill 2042. And on that question, the Gentleman from DuPage, Representative McCracken."

McCracken: "Representative Daley, is the \$3.60 fee something that the pharmacist charges, is that it?"

Daley: "Yes."

McCracken: "Okay. So, they're in favor of it?"

Daley: "Yes, they are. They do support it."

McCracken: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #1 to Senate
Bill 2042 be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye', all
those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the
'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Are there any
further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "There are no further... there are no further

Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 2076,

Representative Churchill. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 2076, a Bill for an Act in relationship
to the adoption of persons. Second Reading of the Bill.

No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment &1, offered by Representative
Churchill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Churchill."

Churchill: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Floor Amendment £1 was an attempt to clarify the language in the original Bill. What it does is it clarifies that the father must be notified that he is the father of a likely father before there can be a commencement or a paternity proceeding to terminate his parental rights and provides the time period in which he must act; clarifies alternative grounds for a termination relating to failure to provide for child

129th Legislative Day

June 18, 1986

support and delivery expenses and limits the availability of such grounds in certain situations which are commenced by the mother or her new husband, and it clarifies the language on defenses limiting the standard of proof to the preponderance of evidence for the father's defense.

- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 2076. And on that question, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Cullerton."
- Cullerton: "Yes, thank you, Madam Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. If I could ask Representative Churchill just a favor. As you know, these Bills were considered in Committee, they were discharged, and supported you on a Motion to discharge, but our staff, in analyzing the Bills, this one and the next one, saw some potential problems which may have been cleared up in Amendment. but we haven't had the chance to verify that So, if you could just - the staff person here - if you could just take it out of the record for just a second, we can analyze those Amendments and see how it fits in with his analysis and there probably won't be any problems. but I'd appreciate if we had that opportunity."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Churchill."

- Churchill: "Madam Speaker, would you take this Bill out of the record momentarily?"
- Speaker Breslin: "Out of the record. Senate Bill 2077,
 Representative Churchill. Out of the record. Senate Bill
 2078, Representative McCracken Cowlishaw. Clerk, read
 the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 2078, a Bill for an Act relating to
 eminent domain. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #2
 was adopted in Committee. Amendment #1 had lost in
 Committee."

Speaker Breslin: "Any Motions filed or Amendments filed?"

129th Legislative Day

- June 18, 1986
- Clerk Leone: "No Motions filed with respect to Amendment #2.

 Floor Amendment #3, is being offered by Representative

 Davis."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Davis is not present.

 Representative McCracken."
- McCracken: "If we could take it out for a brief moment so he can present that."
- Speaker Breslin: "Out of the record. Senate Bill 2087,

 Representative Daley. Representative Daley, do you wish
 this Bill called? Clerk, read the 3ill."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 2087, a Bill for an Act to amend the Liquor Control Act. Second Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Breslin: "Out of the record. We'll go back with leave of the Body to House Bill 2078. Representative Davis, on Amendment #3."
- Davis: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Amendment #3 is a permissive Amendment that permits a water commission to be established in any county adjacent to a county bordering Lake Michigan. The ... if that ... if that is the desire of the collar counties, and that's really what we're talking about, the approval for the water commission has to be put to the voters on a front door referendum and all the other powers that are in the Act as it currently exists must also including general obligation bonds levies, whatever the case may be. Everything has to done by county board resolution and then a referendum. front door to the voters at the appropriate consolidated election effort. So, I would move for the adoption of Amendment #3."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 2078. Is there any discussion?

 Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall Amendment #3 be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed

129th Legislative Day

- June 18, 1986
- say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it.

 The Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment \$4, offered by Representative
 Williamson."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Williamson."
- Williamson: "Amendment 34 adds language to change the appointment to the river conservatory district trustees in counties three million or more when such a district is wholly located within the corporate limits of a municipality with five thousand or more population; provides that the appointment of all five trustees shall be from the same municipality rather than three from the municipality and two at large. I ask for a favorable vote."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Lady has moved for the adoption of Amendment #4 to Senate Bill 2078. And on that question, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Cullerton."
- Cullerton: "Yes, Madam Speaker, before I ask the Lady questions about the Amendment, first, I'd like to question the germaness of the Amendment."
- Speaker Breslin: "Mr. Clerk, would you give us a copy of the Bill, please? Representative Cullerton, it's the opinion of the Chair that the Amendment is germane. Representative Cullerton, on the Amendment."
- Cullerton: "Yes, I wonder now if the Sponsor could tell me what the Bill... what the Amendment does."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative..."
- Cullerton: "I don't mean... I mean repeat your... your..."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Williamson."
- Williamson: "Representative Cullerton, this was brought to me by
 a former State Representative, Representative Doyle. In
 the City of North Lake, the river conservatory district..."
- Cullerton: "Isn't that the fellow that you defeated?"

129th Legislative Day

June 18, 1986

Williamson: "Yes, it is."

- Cullerton: "And so, you're offering this because he doesn't sit here anymore."
- Williamson: "Yes, he is no longer in this House and so I am now doing his work for him. The river conservatory district is in the Village of North Lake, and what he is asking is that he has the choice with the consent of the board to have all five trustees come from the Village of North Lake."
- Cullerton: "Well, Representative, weren't you the one that campaigned against the person who gave you this Amendment by claiming that he did some outrageous things with the... by changing the form of city government and by using power plays, and wouldn't it be the case that this is another example of more things that you campaigned against when you ran and now you want to sponsor something like this?"
- Speaker Breslin: "Excuse me. Representative Hoffman, for what reason do you rise and snap your fingers?"
- Hoffman: "Madam Speaker, I think that the debate ought to be germane to the issue of not raising questions that set up some kind of a discussion between the parties."
- Speaker Breslin: "Your point is well taken, Representative

 Hoffman. Confine your questions to the Amendment,

 Representative Cullerton."
- Cullerton: "Right. So, the question is, doesn't this Amendment give an inordinant amount of power to one person who could abuse it?"

Williamson: "No."

Cullerton: "Why not?"

- Williamson: "What this would do is it gives the presiding officer, with the consent of his board, the authority to appoint those trustees. This has also been okayed by George Dunn, with my understanding."
- Cullerton: "Well, let's not bring personalities into this. Let's

129th Legislative Day

- June 13, 1986
- talk about what the Amendment does. What is the current law and how is it a change of the current law?"
- Williamson: "Currently, the village has the power to appoint
 three of the trustees, two would be appointed at large, and
 this changes the two from at large so that all five will be
 in the conservatory district. This, also, is the only
 conservatory district in the State of Illinois that would
 be affected by this."
- Cullerton: "So, it's special legislation then? Okay. Thank
- Speaker Breslin: "Is there any further discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall Amendment #4 to Senate Bill 2078 be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "There are no further Amendments."
- Speaker Breslin: "There are no further Amendments, but there is a request for a fiscal note. Representative McCracken, the Bill will be held on Third Reading... on Second Reading.

 Representative McCracken, for what reason do you rise?"
- McCracken: "I don't see how a State Fiscal Note could be applicable. I move that it's not applicable."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman moves that the Fiscal Note Act does not apply. And on that question... and on the question of the applicability of the Fiscal Note Act, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Cullerton."
- Cullerton: "Yes, I have an inquiry of the Chair. The... Is the fiscal note on the Bill as amended or on the Bill itself or are there more than one fiscal note request passed and is Representative McCracken familiar with the Amendments that have been adopted?"
- Speaker Breslin: "It is... the request is on the fiscal note...

129th Legislative Day

June 18. 1986

or the fiscal note is on the Bill as amended. I do not know whether or not the Representative is familiar with the Amendments. Representative Cullerton."

- Cullerton: "Well, if I could just recommend that, perhaps. Representative McCracken could take the Bill out of the record for a few minutes and we can discuss the need for the fiscal notes. There... there was an Amendment offered in Committee that deals with adjudication of parking fines. and which. I think, that does have some fiscal impact. He may not be familiar with the total ramifications of that Amendment. T also think that Amendment #3, offered by Representative Davis. our staff has found has some defects in it, and with Representative Davis understanding, we were drafting a corrected Amendment, and yet, without the correct Amendment being adopted, and then, finally, we have this new Amendment by Representative Williamson that's just been adopted and may also have some fiscal impact. So, I think that, perhaps, the most prudent course would be to just simply take it out of the record for a few minutes until we can clear up those issues."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative McCracken, do you agree to take
 the Bill out of the record and keep it on Second at the
 moment?"

McCracken: "Yes."

- Speaker Breslin: "Hold the Bill on Second, Mr. Clerk. The next
 Bill on this Order of Business is Senate Bill 2091,
 ... Bepresentative Greiman. Out of the record. Senate Bill
 2100. Two thousand one hundred, Representative Keane.
 Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 2100, a Bill for an Act to amend the
 Illinois Municipal Code. Second Reading of the Bill. No
 Committee Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Any Floor Amendments?"

129th Legislative Day

- June 18, 1986
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative
 Williamson and Pullen."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Williamson."
- Williamson: "Amendment #1 prohibits any future construction of new runways on O'Hare Airport; protects property owners' rights under a Federal part 1..."
- Speaker Breslin: "Excuse me. Excuse me. Representative Keane,
 for what reason do you rise?"
- Keane: "Has that Amendment been distributed?"
- Speaker Breslin: "It has not been printed and distributed,
 Representative Williamson. Representative Keane, what is
 your pleasure? Representative Keane."
- Keane: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Senate Bill 2100 is a tax increment financing Bill. It's a very important Bill of municipal government, and I would like to keep it moving and would make a Motion to table Amendment #1."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman moves to table Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 2100. And on that question, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Cullerton."
- Cullerton: "Yes, I would also, before we go to that Motion, question the germaness. If the Amendment is not germane, there would be no need to vote on the Motion."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Motion made first is the one that will be taking then, that is the Motion to table Amendment #1. Is there any further discussion? Hearing none, the question is, "Shall Amendment #1 be tabled?" All those in favor say taye". all those opposed say "no". All those in favor vote, "aye", all those opposed vote "no". Voting is open. Representative McCracken, for what reason do you rise?"
- McCracken: "Just to verify if it appears to get the requisite number to defeat... or to pass the Motion."
- Speaker Breslin: "In that event, Representative Flinn has asked leave to be verified when we get to that... that Order of

h Legislative Day June 18, 1986	186
Business. Is that acceptable? That is acceptable. On	
this question Mr. Clerk, take the roll. On this	ıc e
question there are 59 voting *aye*, 55 voting *no*, and) v e
none voting *present*, and the Amendment is would be	146
tabled, but the Gentleman has asked for a verification of	• b €
the Affirmative votes. Verify the Affirmative, Mr. Clerk.	
k Leone: "Poll"	
ker Breslin: "Excuse me。 Representative Levin asks leave"	is
n: "Leave to be verified."	11.
ker Breslin: "Representative Levin asks leave to be verified	
also, Representative McCracken. Representative McCracken.	
Repre Representative McCracken.	ed•
acken: "Yes•"	
er Breslin: "Younge and Levin are granted leave to be	
verified, and Dunn. And Dunn. And Representative Hartke.	Van
Representative Hartke, for what reason do you rise?"	oll
e: "I'd like to change my vote to 'aye'."	
er Breslin: "Change Hartke from "no" to "aye". Proceed, Mr.	
Clerk•"	io.
Leone: "Poll of the Affirmative. Alexander. Berrios.	: in
Bowman. Braun. Brookins. Brúnsvold. Bullock.	
Christensen. Cullerton. Curran Currie. Daley.	
DeJaegher• Ounn• Farley• Flynn• Flowers• Giglio•	the
Giorgi. Greiman. Hannig. Hartke. Homer. Huff. Keane.	the
Krska. Kulas. Laurino. LeFlore. Levin. Martinez.	
Matijevich。 Mautino。 McGann。 McNamara。 McPike。	
Mulcaheva Nasha O'Connella Panayotowicha Panglea	John
Phelps. Preston. Rea. Rice. Richmond. Ronan.	move
Satterthwaite. Shaw. Steczo. Stern. Sutker. Turner.	
Van Duyne. Washington. White. Wolf. Anthony Young.	
Wyvetter Younge. And Mr. Speaker.™	8111
er Breslin: "Representative McCracken, do you have any	him
questions of the Affirmative Roll?"	
1	

129th Legislative Day

June 13, 1986

McCracken: "Representative Bullock."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Bullock. Representative Larry
Bullock. The Gentleman is not in the chamber. Remove him
from the Roll Call. Representative John O'Connell has
returned to the chamber. Add him to the Roll Call."

McCracken: "Representative Alexander."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Alexander is in the center aisle. Representative Larry Hicks votes 'aye'. And, of course, his... voted in person, so..."

McCracken: "Representative White."

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

McCracken: "Representative Bowman."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Bowman. Representative Woods

Bowman. The Gentleman is not in the chamber. Remove him

from the Roll Call."

McCracken: "Representative Panayotovich."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Panayotovich. Representative

Sam Panayotovich. The Gentleman is not in the chamber.

Remove him from the Roll Call."

McCracken: "Representative Stern."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Stern. Representative Grace
Mary Stern. The Lady is not in the chamber. Remove him
from the Roll Call... remove her from the Roll Call. Add
Representative Woods Bowman voting *aye*."

McCracken: "Representative Hartke."

Speaker Braun: "Representative Hartke voted in person."

McCracken: "Representative Saltsman."

Speaker Braun: "Representative Saltsman. Representative Don Saltsman. The Gentleman is not in the chamber. Re..."

McCracken: "He voted 'no'. I'm sorry."

Speaker Breslin: "That's right, he voted 'no'. Grace Mary Stern

129th Legislative Day

June 13, 1986

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

McCracken: "Representative Flowers."

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

McCracken: "Representative McNamara."

Speaker Breslin: *Representative McNamara. Representative John

McNamara. The Gentleman is not in the chamber. Remove him

from the Roll Call.**

McCracken: "Representative Giorgi."

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

McCracken: "Representative Sutker."

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

McCracken: "Representative Leverenz."

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

Representative Leverenz. Excuse me. Representative..."

McCracken: "Oh, he's not voting. I'm sorry."

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

McCracken: "Representative Turner."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Leverenz is now in the chamber and wishes to vote Taye". Record the Gentleman as voting

McCracken: "Representative Berrios."

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

McCracken: "Representative Krska."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Krska. Representative Krska.

The Gentleman is not in the chamber. Remove him from the Roll Call. Representative Terzich seeks recognition and asks to be voted 'aye'. Vote the Gentleman 'aye'.

Representative Kulas has returned to the chamber. Record

129th Legislative Day

June 18, 1986

the Gentleman as voting 'aye'."

McCracken: "Representative Greiman. Representative Greiman."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Greiman. Representative Richmond has returned to the chamber. Record the Gentleman as voting 'aye'. And Representative Greiman will be here in a second, I understand, but at the moment he is not in the chamber, so remove him from the Roll Call."

McCracken: "I'm all done. Oh, no, there he is."

Speaker Breslin: "Here is Representative Greiman. The Gentleman is in the chamber. Record him voting 'aye'. You're all

McCracken: "No, I'm not. Representative DeJaegher."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative DeJaegher. Bob DeJaegher is in his chair."

McCracken: "Nothing further."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Change my vote to 'yes' to 'no'."

Speaker Breslin: "Change Representative Leverenz from 'aye' to
'no'. Are there any further changes in this matter?

Hearing none, there are 50..."

McCracken: "Representative Flowers."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Flowers was already verified once and is still in the chamber."

McCracken: "Oh, okay. Thank you. Nothing further."

Speaker Breslin: "Okay• Representative Keane• for what reason do you rise?"

Keane: "I will yield to Representative Cullerton."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Yes, we would... in the event that the Motion to table fails, I would ask to verify the Negative Roll Call."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has asked to verify the Negative.

Read the Poll of the Negative, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Poll of the Negative. Barger. Barnes. Black.

129th Legislative Day

June 18, 1986

3

Capparelli. Churchill. Count...

Speaker Breslin: "Excuse me. Representative Leverenz, for what reason do you rise?"

Leverenz: "Can I have leave to be verified?"

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has leave to be verified.

Proceed, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Countryman. Cowlishaw. Daniels. Davis. DeLeo.

Deuchler. Didrickson. Ewing. Virginia Frederick.

Dwight Friedrich. Goforth. Hallock. Harris. Hasara.

Hastert."

Cullerton: "Madam Speaker."

Speaker Breslin: "Yes."

Cullerton: "If you could ask Mr. Leony to slow down a little bit,

I would certainly be appreciative."

Speaker Breslin: "I'm sure he will, Mr. Cullerton."

Clerk Leone: "Hawkinson. Hensel."

Speaker Breslin: "Excuse me, Mr. Clerk. We think we can resolve this more quickly. Record Representative Breslin as voting "aye". Record Representative Saltsman as voting "aye". Representative Ryder, for what reason do you rise?"

Ryder: "I'm sorry, Madam Speaker, I was asking to be verified."

Speaker Breslin: "Okay. Representative Ryder has leave to be verified, and that is granted. But, there are now 56 voting 'aye', 54 voting 'no', and there is no need to verify the Negative at this point. Representative McCracken, for what reason do you rise?"

McCracken: "Well then, we'll verify the Affirmative."

Speaker Breslin: "You have already..."

McCracken: "You... you interrupted a verification of the Negative to put affirmative votes on, and now, you're saying after you've allowed them to put the votes on, after we have completed our verification and you're in the mist of a reverse verification, that you're going to claim that now

129th Legislative Day

June 18, 1986

there is no issue because you ve allowed those on in the mist of his verification. It's completely out of order. They had their opportunity during the verification. You declared that result. You move onto a verification of the Negative, interrupted yourself and put on some positive votes which were not in order at that time."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative, I do not agree with comments that it is out of order. There are votes present and voting on the floor. There is no need to take up time of this House If it is unnecessary. The ... and when... at any time when the affirmatives are out voting the negatives. There is no necessity to verify negatives, and it was done before the Gentleman started the verification of the Negative. He was merely negative votes at the time. Remember, of course, that we only have a few more days to act on Senate Bills, so we are trying to do this as expeditiously as possible. There are 56 voting "aye" and 54 voting 'no' on this Motion. Do you have anything further to say, Representative McCracken."

McCracken: "Yes, I'm seeking a verification of the Affirmative."

Speaker Breslin: "You have already had that verification, and it

is out of order. Representative Piel, for what reason do
you rise?"

Piel: "Madam Speaker, you were in the middle of a verification, whether you be... whether it be starting with... at the alphabetical order of going through the negatives or the positives or whether it is the person who is on the floor at the time verifying who is on the floor, you were in the middle of a Negative Verification. I believe it is completely wrong on the Chair's part to sit here and call a Roll final when you are in a... the process of a verification on the Negative Roll, and I would ask at this time that you reconsider that."

129th Legislative Day

June 13, 1986

ä

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Yes, I don't think it's necessary to make these comments, but I... I'd be happy to do so in complimenting the Chair in their ruling. The... When my Motion to... was made, it was in order because the Motion had failed. At the time that the people changed their vote and voted. it was clear then that my Motion was out of order and; for that reason, I would withdraw my verification request because it was not in order, and secondly, if we are to... if everytime someone changes their vote during the course verification after the... the side doing the verification has finished. then we have to have new verifications everytime someone change their vote which is on the side of ludicrous. I think a quick reference Rule 58(b) would resolve this matter. I think i f Representative McCracken and Piel would sit down and read that, it... there won't be any problem in the future."

Speaker Breslin: "Gentlemen, the Gentleman has withdrawn his request for the verification. On this question... Representative McCracken, any Member of this Body has the right to change their vote until... Well, Representative McCracken, I am not sure that that is correct. And, for one thing, I was one of the votes that voted, and I had not been recorded as voting at all. Of that, I am sure, as to the other Member. I am not sure whether there was a change or not, but they were here voting and wished to be recorded in a particular manner, and they are recorded as they wished to be recorded. There are 56 people voting 'aye', there are 54 people who wish to vote *no*, and the Motion to table carries. Are there any further Motions, Mr. Clerk, or Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "There are no further Motions."

Speaker Breslin: "And there are no further Amendments, so...

129th Legislative Day

June 18, 1986

اند ا

since this Amendment has been tabled, the Bill now moves to Third Reading. Representative Piel, for what reason do you seek recognition?

Piel: "Parliamentary inquiry, Madam Speaker."

Speaker Breslin: "State your inquiry."

Piel: "I would like this basically on the record for future reference. Is it the ruling of the Parliamentarian that at anytime... Now, I've got a question. Just.. Alright. so you said the Motion... or the question of the Verification of the Negative at that point was not needed because the... even though we were in the middle of a verification on that, whether it be the beginning or the end, but you said it was not needed, then, the point arose that the positives have the vote. My question is, for the future, what would happen if out of a clear blue sky, right in the middle of your comments or you... reading the record that two negatives walked in the room. Now, the negatives are in the majority again, now will we start all over again? That's where I was getting at, Madam Speaker. I think once you have started that, I think the precedent has been set. You know, fine, if it ends up with 60 *yes* and 10 *no*, that's one thing, but I think once you've started that, you verification, the verification should be closed because what you had done, you had this stapped verification. Now, the verification has stopped, you're saying that it is not needed. You cannot, according to your ruling to what Mr. McCracken just said, you cannot go back to it. So, what would happen if the "nos" came on the floor?"

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Piel, you have been a Member of this chamber for a long time."

Piel: "I'm just asking for a verification of the

129th Legislative Day

- June 13, 1986
- Speaker Breslin: "If there is... if there is any Member who wishes to withdraw a request for a verification, it is withdrawn and it has always been so."
- Piel: "I'm sorry, Madam Speaker, Mr. Cullerton had not withdrawn until after we started the discussion. You withdrew it."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has graciously withdrawn it, and it is withdrawn."
- Piel: "He finally did. He finally did, but my question is, what are we going to do in the future if that type of a thing came up?"
- Speaker Breslin: "When it comes up, we'll address it,

 Representative Piel. The next Bill is House... is Senate

 Bill 2108, Representative McPike. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 2108, a Bill for an Act to amend the
 Illinois Public Accounting Act. Second Reading of this
 Bill. There are no Committee Amendments."
- Speaker Breslin: "Are there any Motions filed or Floor
 Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #1, was offered by Representative

 Countryman."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Countryman. Representative Ryder."
- Ryder: "Madam Speaker, it's my understanding that Amendment 1, 2, 3 and 4 have not been printed and distributed, if that's the case. Is that the case?"
- Speaker Breslin: "Is that the case, Mr. Clerk? Amendment #1 is printed, but there are five Amendments offered.

 Representative McPike, for what reason do you rise?"
- McPike: "Madam Speaker, would you take this out of the record?"
- Speaker Breslin: "Out of the record. Senate Bill 2117,

 Representative Matijevich. Out of the record. Senate Bill

 2123, Representative Phelps. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 2123, a Bill for an Act to amend the

129th Legislative Day

June 18, 1986

General Obligation Bond Act. Second Reading of the Bill.
No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Are there any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "There are no Floor Amendments."

Breslin: "Third Speaker Reading. Senate Bill 2129. Representative O'Connell. O'Connell - Davis. Out the Senate Bill 2157. Out of the record. Senate Bill 2162. Representative Turner. Out of the record. Senate Bill 2164, Representative O'Connell - Stern. Out of the Senate Bill 2165, Daley - O'Connell. Out of the record. record. Senate Bill 2166, Representative Hicks - Richmond. Out of the record. The Chair would like to introduce Representative Glenn Snyder, joining us on the right hand side of the aisle. Welcome, Representative, without a tie, again. With leave of the Body, we will go back to Representative O'Connell's Bills that were just taken out of the record, if there are no objections. The first is Senate Bill 2129. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 2129, a Bill for an Act to amend the Code of Criminal Procedure. Second Reading of the Bill.

There are no Committee... Amendment \$1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative O'Connell."

O°Connell: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Has Amendment #2 been printed and distributed?"

Speaker Breslin: "No, it has not."

O'Connell: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Hay I take it out of the record, please?"

Speaker Breslin: "Out of the record."

O'Connell: "Thank you."

Speaker Breslin: "Senate Bill... You want to go with 2164?

Representative O'Connell, do you want to go with 2164,

2165?"

129th Legislative Day

June 18, 1986

O'Connell: "Yes, please."

Speaker Breslin: "Okay, 2164."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 2164, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act in relationship to the detection and prevention of suicide by adolescents. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Breslin: "Any Motions filed?"

Clerk Leone: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Breslin: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 2165. That was

Daley - O'Connell. Do you want to do it now? Out of the

record. Still out of the record. House Bill 2173,

Representative McGann. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 2173, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Income Tax Act. Second Reading of the Bill.

Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Breslin: "Any Motions filed?"

Clerk Leone: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Breslin: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #2, is offered by Representative
Churchill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Churchill."

Churchill: "Madam Speaker, move to withdraw Floor Amendment #2."

Speaker Breslin: "Withdraw #2. Are there any further

Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative Rea and Phelps.""

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Rea. Representative Rea, on
Amendment #3. Ladies and Gentlemen, would you clear the
center aisle so that Representative Rea can present his
Amendment, please? Representative Rea on an Amendment."

Rea: "Is... is the Amendment printed?"

129th Legislative Day

June 18, 1986

Speaker Breslin: "No, it is not."

Rea: "Could I ask the Sponsor to take it out of the record and if
we could get back to it?"

Speaker Breslin: "Representative McGann, the Gentleman's

Amendment has not been printed. He requests that you hold

the Bill on Second until he can have it prepared. What is
your pleasure?"

McGann: "Could we just take it out of the record for just a few moments, Madam Speaker?"

Speaker Breslin: "We'll do the best we can, Representative."

McGann: "Senate Bill 2185, Representative Homer. Representative 8111 Homer. Out οf the record. Senate 2190. Representative White - Rvder. White - Rvder. Out of the Senate 3ill 2191, Representative Ryder - White. record. Senate Bill 2192, Representative Ryder Out of the record. White. Out of the record. Senate Bill 2193. Representative Ryder - Representative #hite. Out of the record. Senate Bill 2194, Representative Ryder -Out of the record. Senate Bill 2196, Representative Regan. Mr. Clerk. read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 2196, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act relating to abused and neglected minors. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Breslin: "Any Motions filed?"

Clerk Leone: "There are no Motions filed."

Speaker Breslin: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "There are no Floor Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Cullerton, for what reason do you rise?"

Cullerton: "Yes, would the Sponsor yield? Representative Regan,
did we, in Committee, talk about a possible Amendment to
this Bill?"

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Regan. Regan."

129th Legislative Day

June 18, 1986

Cullerton: "Is it your recollection that we talked about a possible Amendment in the Committee to this 3ill?"

Regan: "Yes, Representative, it's Senate Bill 2293, I believe, that we have the Amendment to."

Cullerton: "Not... not on this Bill, though."

Regan: "No."

Cullerton: "Okay. It would be fine to move it to Third Reading.

I just would point out that there is a possible drafting error in the Bill and we'll have a staff person from... one of our attorneys speak to you about it and; if you agree with the possible problem, you can, perhaps, bring it back for an Amendment on later."

Regan: "Fine."

Speaker Breslin: "The Bill moves to Third Reading. House Bill...

Senate Bill 2197, Representative Mays. Clerk, read the
Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Sill 2197, a Bill for an Act to amend the Wildlife Code. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment & was withdrawn in Committee. Floor

Amendment #2, is offered by Representative Mays — AcPike —

Rea and Hicks."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Mays."

Mays: "Thank you very much, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #2, we were going to offer in Committee, but Representative Hicks raised some questions. One of those questions have been resolved. Hhat the Amendment does is allow a new type of steel shot to be used in hunting in the State of Illinois and I believe it's an agreed Amendment, and so, I would offer it for..."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 2197. Representative

129th Legislative Day

June 18, 1986

Cullerton, on that question."

Cullerton: "Yes, would the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Breslin: "He will."

Cullerton: "This Amendment deals with BB guns. Is that correct?"

Mays: "No. No. It deals with shot... shotguns."

Cullerton: "Shotguns."

Mays: "The pellets from the shot."

Cullerton: "Oh, okay. And this would allow for something that is now not admissible."

Mays: "That's correct. It would... It's a different type of steel shot that has been field tested and is ready to go."

Cullerton: "Okay. I'm told that this is okay by..."

Mays: "Can... can you believe it."

Cullerton: "Yeah. Now, I think you have a problem with the Bill, a technical problem with the Bill. I know that what you're talking about here is you want to allow deer hunting permits without charge for people to own their own land, as I recall, right? And there might be another, again... once again, there might be a drafting error that one of our lawyers picked up, but we could move it back to Third if you have that problem."

Mays: "Okay, thank you very much. I'll have the department to come over and see what kind of technical Amendment we can come up with."

Cullerton: "Okay, thank you."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Vinson, on the question."

Vinson: "Yes, Madam Speaker, I wonder if the Sponsor would yield for a question?"

Speaker Breslin: "He will."

Vinson: "Is that Representative Mays?"

Speaker Breslin: "Yes."

Vinson: "Is this the issue of out of state people who have land in the state being able to hunt for deer. Is that what

129th Legislative Day

June 18, 1986

we're talking about here?"

Mays: "Not in this Amendment. The underlying Bill would expand the use of nonresident deer permits."

Vinson: "Okay. What I am curious about, I read this Bill late at night, and I'm curious about what the law is on a related subject because I may want to file my own Amendment. Can a land owner in the State of Illinois, who wants to kill a deer on his own property, kill his deer without a permit?"

Mays: "No."

Vinson: "No?"

Mays: "No."

Vinson: "Okay. I got my Amendment drafted. Thank you."

Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #2 to Senate
Bill 2197 be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye', all
those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the
'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Are there any
further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. With leave of the Body, we'll now go back to Representative Ryder's Bills that were just called and taken out of the record. The first one is Senate Bill 2190. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 2190, a Bill for an Act in relation
to the suspensions of licenses issued to health care
professionals. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee
Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 2191. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 2191, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Public Aid Code. Second Reading of the Bill.

Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

129th Legislative Day June 18, 1986

Speaker Breslin: "Any Floor Amendments or Motions?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Breslin: "Any Floor Amendments?"

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

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Cullerton."

Cullerton: "May I have one moment, please? Are we on 2198, Madam Speaker?"

Speaker Breslin: "We're on 2191. We already moved 2190 to Third Reading."

Cullerton: "The board... the board shows 2198. Okay. Yes, this is a technical change in the Bill. It simply changes 'an explanation' to the word 'explanation'. I move for its adoption."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #1 or 2, Mr. Clerk?"

Cullerton: "#2."

Speaker Breslin: "Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 2191. Is there any further discussion? Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "I'm sorry that I didn't hear and I don't have before me... if the Representative would simply read to me again what the technical sense of the Amendment accomplishes, please."

Speaker Breslin: "Okay. Representative Cullerton, would you read again the technical change made?"

Cullerton: "Yes, I will try to. In Section 11-26, (e)2, we delete 'an explanation' and we insert the word 'explanation'."

Ryder: "Okay. Thank you, Madam..."

Speaker Breslin: "There being no further discussion, the question is, 'Shall Amendment 32 be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted.

129th Legislative Day

June 18, 1986

Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading."

Ryder: "Madam Chairman (sic — Madam Speaker), if I may, I wish to state that there... there are some folks that may be proposing an additional Amendment on this, and I have agreed to work with them and if necessary, bring it back from Third to Second at the appropriate time to do that, and I will stand with that commitment in the event that we have an Agreed Amendment."

Speaker Breslin: "In that same regard, I believe Representative

Cullerton would like to talk to you before going to the

next three Bills."

Ryder: "I'm sorry, Madam Chairman (sic - Madam Speaker)."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Cullerton would like to discuss with you the next... before we go to the next three Bills.

So, if you..."

Ryder: "May we take them out of the record for a moment and I will be glad to discuss them with him."

Speaker Breslin: "That's fine. Great. Senate Bill 2198,
Representative Davis - Phelps. Representative Davis. Out
of the record. Senate Bill 2212, Representative Kirkland.
Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 2212, a Bill for an Act to amend the
Unified Code of Corrections. Second Reading of the Bill.

No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Any Floor Amendments?"

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

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Ryder."

Clerk O'Brien: "Slater."

Speaker Breslin: "Excuse me, Representative Slater."

Slater: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Floor Amendment #1 adds the

129th Legislative Day

June 18, 1986

Bi 11 3522. provisions in House Ιt provides that preliminary hearings will not be necessary when parole revocation is based on new criminal charges and there has been a fining of probable cause. Secondly, it provides that names may be changed by prisoners in DOC only by civil law, and thirdly, it provides for reimbursement of employees of the department, if they are required to attend civil hearings"

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 2212. Is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall Amendment #1 be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye, all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 2231,

Representative Preston. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 2231, a Bill for an Act to add a paragraph to the Civil Administrative Code of Illinois.

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

Speaker Breslin: "Any Motions filed?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Breslin: "Any Floor Amendments?"

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

Levin."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Levin."

Levin: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Before I present Amendment \$2, I have filed a letter with the Clerk of the House, which I would ask to have journalized as part of the debate on these two Amendments, and it simply discloses the fact that I enjoy,

129th Legislative Day

June 18, 1986

you know, a counsel relationship with the law firm that represents condominium and community associations. Moving to Amendment \$2. Amendment \$2 is a technical Amendment which simply authorizes condominium associations, by a majority vote of the unit owners, to grant an easement for water projects. This is something that is required both by the Army Corp of Engineers and I believe also by our State Department of Transportation Water Resource Division for the construction of any project that they have to an easement to get to it and also to maintain it.

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment 32 to Senate Bill 2231. Is there any discussion?

Representative Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Yes, would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Breslin: "He will."

Cullerton: "Maybe, I can ask this Gentleman in front of me to,

Speaker Breslin: "Excuse me. Gentlemen clear... clear the aisle in front of Representative Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Yes, Representative Levin, Amendment 32, is this the subject matter of a House Bill?"

Levin: "This Amendment is not. The next Amendment is."

Cullerton: "Well so, what does this Amendment do then? If it wasn't Amend... a subject matter of a House Bill, it's a new concept and I wanted to... wanted you to explain it."

Levin: "This Amendment is an integral part of the program of the basic Bill, which deals with water projects. The Army Corp of Engineers requires that they... that the governmental entity that's sponsoring a water project have an easement to be able to gain access to the projects with purposes of construction and maintenance. This provides authority for that kind of easement."

Cullerton: "No further questions. Thank you."

129th Legislative Day

June 18, 1986

- Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment @2 to Senate
 Bill 2231 be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye', all
 those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the
 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Are there any
 further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative

 Levin."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Levin."
- Levin: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #3 is identical to House Bill 562, which passed out of this House unanimously the Amendments to the Condominium Act and; just to refresh your memory as far as what it did, it deals with a number of condominium particularly the issues. vou know. establishment condominium insurer authorizing the establishment condominium insurance pool. It's been worked out with both the Department of Insurance, with Fanny Mae, the secondary mortgage market, the realtors, you know, everybody's in support of what was in the Bill, and we're simply adding it on here."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 2231. Is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall Amendment #3 be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 2232,

 Representative Preston Bowman Levin. Preston. Clerk,

 read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 2232, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act in relation to natural resources.

129th Legislative Day

June 18, 1986

research, data collection, and environmental studies. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment ${\it til}$ was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Breslin: "Any Motions filed?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Breslin: "Any Floor Amendments?"

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

Preston."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Preston, on Amendment #2."

Preston: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Amendment #2 just makes technical changes in the Bill as it was amended in the Committee by changing some of the word... about four different words in the Bill to make technical corrections."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 2232. Is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall Amendment #2 be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 2255,

Representative Richmond — Phelps. Out of the record.

Senate Bill 2271, Representative McGann. Representative

McGann. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 2271, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Health Maintenance Organization Act. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendments #1 and 2 were adopted in Committee."

Speaker Breslin: "Any Motions filed?"

Clerk O'Brien: "A Motion to table Amendment 32, filed by Representative McGann."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative McGann moves to table Amendment

129th Legislative Day

June 18, 1986

#2. Is there any discussion? There being no discussion,
the question is... Representative McCracken, on Amendment
#2 tabling."

McCracken: "Parliamentary inquiry. Whose Amendment is it?"

Speaker Breslin: "Representative McGann's, I believe. Is that correct, Representative McGann?"

McGann: "No, it's Representative Ronan's."

McCracken: "Oh. okav. No objection."

Speaker Breslin: "Excuse me. Representative McGann, I could not hear your response. Who is the Sponsor of Amendment #22° "Representative Ronan is the Sponsor of the Amendment." Speaker Breslin: "Representative Ronan is the Sponsor of the Amendment. Representative McCracken. Anv further discussion? There being no further discussion. question is, 'Shall Amendment #2 be tabled?' All those in say 'aye', all those opposed say *no*-In the

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment Ø3, offered by Representative
McGann."

is tabled. Are there any further Amendments

opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment

Speaker Breslin: "Representative McGann."

McGann: "Madam Speaker, I'd ask leave of the House to withdraw

Amendment #3 to..."

Speaker Breslin: "Withdraw #3. Are there any further
Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "No further Amendments. Third Reading. Senate

Bill 2271. Excuse me, 2274, Representative Mays. Clerk,

read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 2274, a Bill for an Act to amend the law concerning veterans' affairs. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Are there any Floor Amendments?"

129th Legislative Day

June 18, 1986

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. Senate dill 2283.

Representative Churchill. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 2283, a Bill for an Act to amend

Sections of the Cannabis Control Act. Second Reading of

the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Breslin: "Any Motions filed?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Breslin: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. Senate 3ill 2285,

Representative Mautino - Mays. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 2285, a Bill for an Act to establish regional groups and development quarters of opportunity.

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

Speaker Breslin: "Are there any Motions filed?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Breslin: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 2288,

Representative Mautino - Mays. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 2288, a Bill for an Act to amend the
Illinois Income Tax Act. Second Reading of the Bill. No
Committee Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Any Floor Amendments?"

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

Homer."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Homer is not in the chamber.

Oh, yes he is. Representative Homer."

Homer: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. During the previous Session of the General Assembly, a legislation was passed to allow for a... income tax deduction to be

129th Legislative Day

June 18, 1986

taken for certain training, employee training expenses. The Amendment #1 would change the deduction to a credit. Previously, it was a 25% deduction. It would now become 1.6% credit and; in addition, there would be a limitation that it could be used only by corporations for employees. emplovees that are either trained here in that are Illinois residence Illinois. ٥r Illinois corporations that train Illinois residence out of state, but it would not be available for out of state corporations to train out of state employees. I'd be happy to answer any questions, and I would move for the adoption."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 2288. And on that question, Representative Mautino."

Mautino: "Thank you very much, Madam Chairman (sic — Madam Speaker). In response to Amendment, House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 288 (sic — 2288), I stand in support of the provisions, and I'm happy to provide the vehicle for the establishment of an excellent program that has support on both sides of the aisle, both by Caterpillar Tractor Company, for example, and United Auto Workers. It's a very unique proposal and I accept it on this legislation."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Cullerton, on the question."

Cullerton: "Yes, I wonder if the Sponsor would yield?"

Speaker Breslin: "He will."

Cullerton: "Representative, we haven't had a chance to analyze
this. Is this... was this the subject matter of a House
Bill?"

Homer: "It was the subject matter of Senate Bill 2104 which died in Rules Committee."

Cullerton: "Senate Bill 2104?"

Homer: "Correct."

Cullerton: "Oh so, a Senate Bill that... a Senate Bill that

129th Legislative Day

June 18, 1986

passed the Senate, but that we in the House... and our House Rules Committee didn't let it out."

Homer: "That's correct."

Cullerton: "What was that Senate Bill number?"

Homer: "Senate Bill 2104."

Cullerton: "Well, was there any testimony heard in the House

Rules Committee that elicit what the problems were with it

or..."

Homer: "No. It... there was no testimony. It got caught up in a... in a squeeze. I don't believe there was really any opposition to the Bill, at least, none was made known to me."

Cullerton: "Well, the squeeze of the Rules Committee. Let me ask

you this, it's a kind of a long Amendment, maybe you could

explain again what it does."

Homer: "Well, let me just... Aright, let me... let me iust sav that existing law allows for a training expense tax deduction, and it... in the current law, this allows deduction to be taken for all employees, whether they be Illinois employees or not. And 50+ what the Amendment simply does is two things; one, it changes it from a deduction to a credit, and it's determined that 25% deduction is the equivalent of a 1.6% credit. And so, the Bill is revenue neutral and the Illinois Department Revenue is in support of the Bill. In addition. it tightens the language by limiting the impact only to employees so that, for example, General Motors, who would pay Illinois income tax because they do here, could not use this credit or the current deduction for employees that they trained in Detroit, which the law would have allowed them to do. And so, what current this attempts to do is make certain that what we're trying to accomplish through this kind of legislation is to reward 129th Legislative Day

June 18, 1986

Illinois employers to encourage Illinois employers to train Illinois employees, and that is what the legislation attempts to do. It's designed to be the revenue neutral or, in fact, revenue plus and the Department of Revenue is, therefore, in favor of the Bill."

Cullerton: "Was there something also in there about assisting local government programs for gang control?"

Homer: "Now, I believe... that is not a part of Senate 3ill 2104.

I think the reason that is in this Amendment is because that was in Representative Mautino's original Bill, 2288, and in order to conform. As I understand it, this Amendment to his Bill without deleting the provisions of his Bill, it was necessary to redraft them in this Amendment, but Representative Mautino could better address that aspect of the Amendment."

Cullerton: "Well, at this point, it seems fine, and I just am going to go back and review the record of that Rules

Committee and find out why the Senate Bills didn't seem to get out, because it seems on the face of it to be just fine."

Homer: "Thank you."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative McCracken, on the question."

McCracken: "I rise in support of the Amendment also, and I think I have the answer as to the Rules Committee. I think one of the parties who was a... to be affected by this Bill was a member of the Illinois Coalition on the Insurance Crisis, and that's not politically popular with some people these days, and as I understand it, the Bill was held in Rules for that reason. So, I'm glad to see it out on the floor where it belongs to be. I think it should be debated openly, and it's a good idea. I stand in favor of it."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Churchill, on the question."

Churchill: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Will the Gentleman yield?"

129th Legislative Day

June 18, 1986

Speaker Breslin: "He indicates he will."

Churchill: "This provides for an income tax credit. Is that correct?"

Homer: "That's correct. He currently allow for an income tax deduction, but this would change... change it from a deduct... eliminate a deduction, but implement a credit."

Churchill: "And this will be on the corporate tax return?"

Homer: "Correct."

Churchill: "And it's figured as 1.6% of the expense. Is that correct?"

Homer: "Right. In other words... yes. 1.6% is correct, and that is.. has been determined to be the equivalent, basically, of 25% income tax deduction. That's what... that's what a 25% income tax deduction is worth, if were to become a tax credit. is 1.6%."

Churchill: "And that's so that the employer can provide educational and vocational training. That's to retrain people. Is that correct?"

Homer: "Correct."

Churchill: "And how does the... does the employer hire somebody outside of the employment of that business to do this or would the employer be able to send the employee to a local community college to receive this training?"

Homer: "It's my understanding, Representative Churchill, it is done both ways, both in house and by contracting with community colleges in outside educational facilities. I don't believe the Bill would be limited to one form or the other, but it deals basically with educational and vocational training in the semi technical or technical fields."

Churchill: "Then this Bill would encourage the employment of additional people and encourage the training and retraining of those people. Is that correct?"

129th Legislative Day

June 18, 1986

- Homer: "That's... That's correct."
- Churchill: "And it provides that type of economic incentive to the employer to make his employee better trained for his position."
- Homer: "That... That is correct."
- Churchill: "And I assume that all of the labor unions would appreciate this type of a Bill to... to employ and train additional people."
- Homer: "Well, I would think this would be a 3ill to be supported by both business and labor, since the thrust is to... to provide our labor force with the skills to utilize the new technology that is coming to our industry."
- Churchill: "And so, then, this was a Bill that both labor and business would have enjoyed, and yet this was a Bill that was killed in our Rules Committee when it went into the Committee. Is that correct?"
- Homer: "Well, the Bill did not come out of the Rules Committee.

 Senate Bill 2104, I'm not sure as to the... as to all the reasons for that."
- Churchill: "I see, but the Rules Committee did not allow the Bill out, which is a Bill that's for business and for labor, and this Bill was not allowed out of the Rules Committee."
- Homer: "Hell, the Rules Committee did not allow Senate Bill 2104
- Churchill: "Yes, I think this is a very good Bill, and I... I
 hope that all the Members on both sides of the aisle will
 support this Amendment to place this tax credit onto Senate
 Bill 2288."
- Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #1 to Senate
 Bill 2288 be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye', all
 those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the
 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Are there any
 further Amendments?"

129th Legislative Day June 18, 1986

- Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 2292,

 Representative Parke. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 2292, a Bill for an Act to require the registration of habitual child sex offenders..."
- Speaker Breslin: "Out of the record. Senate Bill 2293,

 Representative Regan. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 2293, a Bill for an Act in relation to sexual offenses against children and family members. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment 31 was adopted in Committee."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Regan, do you want to take this

 Bill out of the record at the request of your Leadership?"

 Regan: "At the request of my Leadership? Okay."
- Speaker Breslin: "Out of the record. Senate Bill 2294,
 Representative Pullen. Out of the record. Senate Bill
 2300, Representative Flinn Friedrich. Representative
 Flinn? Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 2300, a Bill for an Act to establish
 the Illinois Bank Examiners' Education Foundation to amend
 various other Acts herein named. Second Reading of the
 Bill. No Committee Amendments."
- Speaker Breslin: "Are there any Amendments on the floor?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Flinn, there is a fiscal note filed on this Bill, so the Bill has to remain on the Order of Second Reading until that is complied with. Senate Bill 1521, Representative Hoffman. Representative Hoffman. Clerk, read the Bill. Senate Bill... Excuse me. I moved to the wrong page. Mr. Clerk, I would like to ask for the status of Senate Bill 1856."
- Clerk O'Brien: "The Bill was taken out of the record when it was called on Second Reading."

129th Legislative Day

June 18, 1986

- Speaker Breslin: "Let's call that Bill, then, at this time.

 Senate Bill 1856, with leave of the House. Excuse me. All

 of the paperwork is upstairs, so we need a minute to get it

 down. In the meantime, let's go to Senate Bill 1709.

 Representative McGann... or was that Representative Keane?

 Representative Keane, 1709, yes. Mr. Clerk, read the

 Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1709, a Bill for an Act relating to certain taxes. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."
- Speaker Breslin: "Are there any Floor Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative
 Churchill."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Churchill."
- Churchill: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Floor Amendment #1 reduces the penalty levied by the Department of Revenue for late payments or nonpayments of sales tax to 15 percent. This puts it into conformance with House Bill 3449 which we passed out of the House earlier this year and is sitting over in the Senate so that the two limits are exactly the same."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1709. And on that question, is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall Amendment #1 be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative
 Churchill."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Churchill."
- Churchill: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Floor Amendment #2 changes the tax formula for monies that are earned by political

129th Legislative Day

June 18, 1986

committees and increases the amounts due for U.S. Senatorial and Congressional Committees so that the amounts that they pay as a total portion of their tax is exactly the amount that would be paid by a State Repesentative under the same earning schedule."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 1709. And on that question, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Keane."

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

Speaker Breslin: "He will."

Keane: "Could you explain exactly what Amendment #2 does and how it changes the Bill as it is now... as it is now... as it passed out of the House Committee?"

Churchill: "Yes. The wav that earnings are οn Congressional Committees and say. for example. other committees such as political a State Representative's campaign committee would be that the state tax would be the same on both committees, but at the federal level, the Congressman would be taxed at a 26 percent rate, and the State Representative would be taxed at a 46 percent The original Bill created a difference in the state tax to tax local committees at the individual rate of two and a percent. and the U.S. Congressional half and Senate candidate... committees at at the higher corporate What I have done is, in... in accelerating that change that attended in the original Bill, I have made it so that the total tax burden paid by those political campaign committees at the United States level would be exactly the same as the total tax burden paid by a local committee such as a State Representative or State Senate campaign committee."

Keane: "To the Amendment. I have... personally, I just have a...

129th Legislative Day

June 18, 1986

I think it was better the way it was. I think that each Member in the House should consider how they... how it affects them and vote accordingly. Thank you."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 1709. And on that question, is there any further discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall Amendment #2 be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it and the Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. The next Bill is Senate Bil1 2173. Ιt appears on page 12 on your Calendar. Representative McGann. Clerk, read the Bill. and Ladies the Chair has received Gentlemen. objections + 0 unauthorized members on the floor. Would all people who are unauthorized remove themselves from the House floor? Representative McGann, we'll get right back to it, because Bill has already gone upstairs again. About Senate Bill 2192. Mr. Clerk. Do you have that within vour possession? 2192. Yes, Senate Bill 2192, Representative Rvder. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill(sic - Senate) 2192, a Bill for an Act concerning public aid benefits and amending certain Acts herein named. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Breslin: "Motions filed?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Hotions filed."

Speaker Breslin: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Any... Any Motions filed?"

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

Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, do we have Senate

129th Legislative Day

June 18, 1986

Bill 2173 for Representative McGann?"

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill (sic - Senate Bill) 2173. This Bill has been read previously today on Second Reading.

Amendment 32 was withdrawn."

Speaker Breslin: "Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #3, offered by Rea and Phelps."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative... Representative Rea."

Rea: "I wish to withdraw Amendment 3."

Speaker Breslin: "Withdraw #3. Are there any further
Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, do you have Senate
Bill 1564 in the House's possession? Let's call 1564 for
Representative Kirkland, if there are no objections.
Hearing none, read 1564."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1564, a Bill for an Act to amend

Sections of the Juvenile Court Act. Second Reading of the

Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Any Floor Amendments?"

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

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Kirkland."

Kirkland: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. The original Bill deletes
the current statutory prohibition against requiring a
juvenile to perform public service work outside his home
municipality or township. The Amendment would remove Cook
County from that simply because of its size. Thank you.

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Amendment &1 to Senate Bill 1564. On that question, is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, "Shall Amendment &1 be adopted?" All those in favor say "aye", all those opposed say "no". In the opinion of the Chair, the "ayes" have it, and the Amendment is adopted.

129th Legislative Day

June 18, 1986

Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, do you have Senate

Bill 1063 in the House's possession? Read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill... Senate Bill 1063, a Bill for an

Act to amend the Illinois Income Tax Act. Second Reading

of the Bill. Amendment #2 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Breslin: "Are there any Motions filed?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Breslin: "Any Floor Amendments?"

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

Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. Ladies and Gentlemen, we are now going to go to page three on your Calendar, Senate Bills Second Reading — Short Debate Calendar. The first Bill there appears House Bill (sic — Senate Bill) 233.

Representative Curran? Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 233, a Bill for an Act in relation to anatomical gifts. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1517,
Representative Terzich. Out of the record. Senate Bill
1520, Representative Ewing. Out of the record. Senate
Bill 1558, Representative Hannig. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1558, a Bill for an Act to amend the
Illinois Vehicle Code. Second Reading of the Bill. No
Committee Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Any Floor Amendments?"

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

Speaker Breslin: "Representative DeLeo."

DeLeo: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

129th Legislative Day

June 18, 1986

is very simple. Prior to January of 1984, a Amendment #1 driver was arrested and charged with a minor traffic violation, he had the option of posting bail, either a cash amount or his Illinois... valid Illinois driver's license. In 19... Public Act 83-385 enacted in Illinois terms the non-resident violator compact which allowed motorists charged with minor traffic... to sign a promise to instead of posting a cash bond or Illinois driver's license. We've had... the Amendment repeals this provision that we allowed them the signature... the promise to I ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of
Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1558. And on that question,
the Gentleman from OuPage, Representative McCracken."

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

Speaker Breslin: "He will."

McCracken: "Representative, has a problem arisen with the use of the signature, promise or whatever it's called?"

DeLeo: "Yes. As a matter of fact, our 'no appearances' in this courts have risen over 400 percent. We lost revenues in the local municipalities over four million dollars last year."

McCracken: "For failures to appear who have not been brought to justice, so to speak?"

DeLeo: "Absolutely."

McCracken: "Okay. Are the municipalities or the local courts issuing warrants for the arrest of those people?"

Deleo: "I'm sorry, Tom. Would you repeat that?"

McCracken: "Are they issuing warrants for the arrest of the people who don't appear?"

DeLeo: "Well, what happens is, in their second appearance, when they fail to appear, their license goes back... excuse me.

They get notified of suspension from the Secretary of

129th Legislative Day

June 18. 1986

State's Office. We currently have a backlog of thousands and thousands. People fail to realize when they've missed their court appearance and they get stopped again for a minor traffic violation and find out that they're driving on a suspended license, and this has resulted in a major backlog in the Secretary of State's Office."

McCracken: "And under this Bill, would there still be a provision for suspension of licenses for failure to appear?"

DeLeo: "That's correct."

McCracken: "What... What offenses were covered by this promise to appear?"

DeLeo: "These are all minor traffic violations, red lights, stop signs, minor speeding tickets, equipment violations."

McCracken: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Olson on the question."

Olson: "Would the Sponsor yield, please?"

Speaker Breslin: "He will."

Olson: "I believe this came through Judiciary II. Didn*t it.

Representative DeLeo?"

DeLeo: "That's right."

Olson: "And I think the 39 state compact on notice to appear still remains fileable."

DeLeo: "Yes."

Olson: "To the Bill. I would like to rise in support of this
Amendment. Having been a circuit clerk and having spoken
with circuit clerks on a continuing basis, the essence of
what Representative DeLeo is saying is correct. The
problems are manifest as far as getting a good cash flow in
the circuit clerk's office to the counties, so as a
consequence, please support this Amendment."

Speaker Breslin: "Is there any further discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall Amendment... Excuse me.

Representative Hawkinson on the Amendment."

129th Legislative Day June 18, 1986

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

Speaker Breslin: "He will."

Hawkinson: "Representative, what was the House Bill number on this subject?"

DeLeo: "The original House Bill?"

Hawkinson: "Right."

DeLeo: "2947."

Hawkinson: "And is this the Bill that... that's now in this

Amendment #1 that would provides that Illinois residents

could no longer promise to appear, but if they're from out

of state, they could still exercise their right to promise

to appear?"

DeLeo: "That's correct."

Hawkinson: "Thank you."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Turner on the question."

Turner: "Hill the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Breslin: "He will."

Turner: "Jimmy, I didn't hear... You're saying now that if I get
a ticket, I can no longer post my drîver's license, that I
would have to... or is it... "

DeLeo: "Currently, under Illinois law on a minor traffic violation, we just... we have a statute, "sign and go". He no longer post our driver's license or have the option of posting a bond card or a cash bond. This is repealing the sign and go and going back to a motor club, your driver's license or a cash bond."

Turner: "Are you... Am I to assume, then, that the sign and go is not working, or why do we want to repeal it?"

DeLeo: "Because the sign and go isn't working. We have a major backlog in the courts and the Secretary of State's Office which is called an '09 suspension'. And an 09 suspension is when you fail to appear on a traffic violation in some local municipality or courtroom. And our 09 suspensions

129th Legislative Day

June 18, 1986

went up over 400 percent in 1985-86 Fiscal Year for failure to appear. People no longer have... still have their driver's license in their possession and forget to come to the local traffic courts throughout the state."

Turner: "What happens if I fail to appear? What does the Department do?"

DeLeo: "When you're issued a minor traffic violation on your first court date is issued... if you fail to appear on your first court date, the Judge issues an ex parte, in which gives you an automatic next court date. On your second date, if you fail to appear, the Secretary of State gets notified, and your driver's privileges are suspended. And that's where we've had an influx of no appearances."

Turner: "Okay. Thank you, Jim."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Ewing on the Amendment."

Ewing: "Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I have visited with my circuit clerk about this problem. I think this Amendment at least addresses a portion of that problem. I think that we are entitled to either get something that will require the appearance of these people or... the present system is not working, and I certainly would encourage the adoption of this Amendment."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Shaw... withdraws his comments. Is there any further discussion? Hearing none, the question is, *Shall Amendment #1 Senate Bill 1558 pass... or be adopted?* All those in favor say 'aye'. all those opposed say 'no'. f n the opinion of the Chair... Representative Shaw, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

Shaw: "Roll Call, please,"

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman asks for a Roll Call. All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no' for the adoption of Amendment \$1. Have all voted who wish? Have

129th Legislative Day

June 18, 1986

all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 70... Representative Curran wishes to vote 'aye'. There are 76 voting 'aye', 11 voting 'no', and 2 voting 'present', and the Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment \$2, offered by Representative

Hannig."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Hannig."

Hannig: "I'd like to withdraw this Amendment, please."

Speaker Breslin: "Hithdraw #2. Are there any further Amendments?"

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

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Hannig."

Hannig: "Yes, thank you, Madam Speaker and Members of the House.

This is an Amendment that was requested by the Department of State Police, and it increases the penalty for unauthorized use of a red or blue oscillating, rotating or flashing light other than for unlawfully stopping or detaining a person, and it increases that penalty from a petty offense to a Class A misdemeanor, and I move for the adoption of this Amendment."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 1558. And on that question, the Gentleman from DuPage, Representative McCracken."

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

Speaker Breslin: "He will."

McCracken: "I'm unclear as to the application of the Amendment.

The underlying Bill makes it a felony offense to use the oscillating or rotating lights in an effort to detain."

Hannig: "That's correct."

McCracken: "Under what circumstances will this... or what act are you making a Class A misdemeanor?"

129th Legislative Day

June 18, 1986

Hannig: "Okay. The purpose of the Amendment as requested by the

State Police is to actually increase the penalties were an

oscillating light used illegally but for other than

unlawfully stopping or detaining."

McCracken: "Okay."

Hannig: "For like running through stop lights with the red light

on. That would be an illegal use that would be addressed

by this penalty... by this Amendment."

McCracken: "Okay, thank you."

Speaker Breslin: "Is there any further discussion? Hearing none, the question is, "Shall Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 1558 be adopted? All those in favor say "aye", all those opposed say "no". In the opinion of the Chair, the "ayes" have it. The Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment &4, offered by Representative
Steczo."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Steczo."

Steczo: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Members of the House.

Amendment #4 to Senate Bill 1558 would allow the trustees... the board of trustees or members of the board of trustees of a fire protection district to use the blue oscillating light when responding to a bona fide emergency.

I would move for the adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #4 to Senate Bill 1558. And on that question, is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall Amendment #4 be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment is adopted. Are there further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #5, offered by Representative

DeLeo."

129th Legislative Day

June 18, 1986

Speaker Breslin: "Representative DeLeo."

- Deleo: "Thank you, Speaker. Amendment £5 is a technical Amendment. It's just changing a line. It says, Line 6 shall comply with the provisions of Section 6-803 of this Code." That's putting in Amendment £1 to just make sure that we have the out-of-state compact, residents only."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #5 to Senate Bill 1558. On that question, is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall Amendment #5 be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

- Speaker Breslin: "Representative McCracken, for what reason do you rise?"
- McCracken: "I believe there's an Amendment #6."
- Speaker Breslin: "Mr. Clerk, are there any further Amendments?

 Yes, there is an Amendment #6."
- Clerk O'Brien: "You're right. Floor Amendment... Floor Amendment #6, offered by Williamson — Daniels — Pullen and Wojcik."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Cullerton, for what reason do you rise?"
- Cullerton: "Yes, I would question the germaneness of Amendment
- Speaker Breslin: "Can you give me the Amendment, Mr. Clerk?
 Representative Williamson, the Gentleman has questioned the germaneness of Amendment #6. The Chair rules that the Amendment is not germane. The Bill to which it is amended amends the Vehicle Code with regard to license as bail.

 Your Amendment deals with the Department of Transportation establishing an Elgin-O'Hare expressway. The Chair rules that that is not germane. Representative Williamson?"

129th Legislative Day June 13, 1986

Williamson: "Out of the record."

Speaker Breslin: "Out of the record. Are there any further
Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

- Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1608,

 Representative Cowlishaw. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1608, a Bill for an Act to amend

 Sections of the School Code. Second Reading of the Bill.

 No Committee Amendments."
- Speaker Breslin: "Any... Any Floor Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative

 Anthony Young."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Anthony Young. Representative
 Young withdraws Amendment #1. Are there any further
 Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative

 Anthony Young."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Young. Withdraw Amendment #2.

 Are there any further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #3, offered by Anthony Young."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Young. Withdraw Amendment #3.

 Are there any further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Breslin: "No further Amendments. Third Reading. Ladies and Gentlemen, with leave of the Body, we will go back to a Bill on the Order of Senate Bills Second Reading appearing on page 11 on your Calendar for Representative Churchill. Hearing no objection, Mr. Clerk, read Senate Bill 2076. These were both Bills that we agreed to come back to when the Sponsor graciously agreed to take them out of the record so that further study could be made. Senate Bill 2076."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 2076. This Bill has been read a

129th Legislative Day

June 18, 1986

second time previously today. Amendments 3... "

Speaker Breslin: "Are there Motions filed, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Correct that. This Bill was taken out of the record. Senate Bill 2076, a Bill for an Act in relation to the adoption of persons and repeal an Act herein named.

Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment &1, offered by Representative
Churchill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Churchill."

Churchill: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I believe that I had already presented Floor Amendment \$1, and I was asked to take the Bill out of the record to make sure that the other side of the aisle understood exactly what the Amendment contained, and I believe we have now covered the Amendment and..."

Speaker Breslin: "Briefly remind us what the Amendment does."

- Churchill: "This Amendment clarifies the original Bill and cleans up the language providing for notification to the father in a paternity proceedings to terminate parental rights. It provides a time period for the father to be notified. It clarifies the alternative grounds for termination relating for failure to provide child support or delivery expenses. It clarifies the language on defenses limiting the standard of proof to preponderance of the evidence for the father's defense."
- "The Gentleman has moved for the Speaker Breslin: adoption of Amendment \$1 to Senate Bill 2076. Is there any further discussion? Hearing none, the question *Shall is. Amendment #1 be adopted?" All those in favor say "aye", all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment's adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"

129th Legislative Day

June 18, 1986

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

- Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 2077,

 Representative Churchill. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 2077, a Bill for an Act in relation to adoption of persons. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."
- Speaker Breslin: "Are there any Floor Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative
 Churchill."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Churchill."
- Churchill: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Floor Amendmet &1 rewrites
 the Bill primarily for clarity. It does amend provisions
 requiring the consent in the case of newborns. It amends
 alternative defenses to read that the father need only have
 lived with the child for one half of its life prior to
 placement for adoption, and it simplifies some additional
 language in the Bill."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment &1 to Senate Bill 2077. And on that question, the Gentleman from Rock Island, Representative Brunsvold."
- Brunsvold: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Will the Gentleman yield for a question?"
- Speaker Breslin: "He will."
- Brunsvold: "Representative, do the Bills that you've had... the last two Bills address any particular situation? I had a lot of letters over the last year dealing with this situation. Does this address the... the adoption and the consent of the father. The case I am thinking of, a baby was adopted and was in the home for two years, and then the father came back and through the court system got the baby away from the parents... from the... from the parents that had adopted the child, after two years."

Churchill: "I think you're discussing the 'Santarelli' case."

129th Legislative Day

June 18, 1986

Brunsvold: "Yes."

Churchill: "And both of these Bills are aimed at clarifying that
language on the 'Santarelli' case so that that could...
would help to prevent that from occurring again."

Brunsvold: "Thank you."

Speaker Breslin: "There being no further discussion, the question is, 'Shall Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 2077 be adopted?'

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

In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. With leave of the Body, we'd now like to go back to Senate Bill 1957 appearing on page 10 on your Calendar for Representative Homer. Hearing no objection, read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1957, a Bill for an Act in relation to criminal law. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Breslin: "Are there any Motions filed?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Breslin: "Any Floor Amendments?"

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

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Levin."

Levin: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #2 is in effect, House Bill 2966 that we passed out of here unanimously. It provides that an individual who is convicted of lying on his immigration form as far as his association with the government of Nazi Germany, after a full opportunity for a court hearing and appeal, is to be denied eligibility for certain state grant programs. If there are any questions, I'd be happy to answer them. We passed this Bill once, and the Sponsor was

129th Legislative Day

- June 18, 1986
- kind enough to provide this form so that we can pass it again."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 1957. And on that question, the Gentleman from DuPage, Representative McCracken."
- McCracken: "I... I haven't seen the Amendment, and it's not in our file... my file. Has it been printed and distributed?"
- Speaker Breslin: "Mr. Clerk, has this Amendment been printed and distributed? The answer is ves."
- McCracken: "Alright. Would the Gentleman explain briefly what it does?"
- Levin: "Be happy to. What the Bill provides is that an individual who has been convicted, after a full trial before an immigration Judge and has had that conviction affirmed by the Board of Immigration... by the Immigration Review... Appeals Court as far as on the issue of lying on his immigration form with respect to his past associations with the government of Nazi Germany and its allies, is to be denied eligibility for..."
- McCracken: "I remember. No objection."
- Speaker Breslin: "Excuse me. Any further discussion? Hearing none, the question is... Representative Vinson would like to discuss Amendment #2."

Vinson: "Yes, will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Breslin: "He will."

Vinson: "Representative, is this the same language that you had on your House Bill?"

Levin: "Approximately so, yes."

Vinson: "Have you dealt with the problem in this... in this

Amendment that we discussed on your House Bill?"

Levin: "Representative, I'd be, you know, happy to explore that problem with you, but you know, this particular draft is

129th Legislative Day

June 18, 1986

basically the same."

Vinson: "I'm sorry. I can't hear you."

Levin: "I'd be happy... as I had indicated in the last debate...

last discussion of this, I'd be happy to explore the
question that you raised at the time. This Amendment, in
its current form, is... you know, is basically the same as
the Bill that we passed."

Vinson: "What is the posture of your House Bill?"

Levin: "Like many other Bills that left this chamber."

Vinson: "I see. I see. It's still in the Senate Rules

Committee."

Levin: "That's correct. It is sleeping, to use an expression of one of the Members on the your side of the aisle."

Vinson: "Now, are you really willing to work out the problem...

particular problem of due process that I have, here? So

that if we find out that a guy really was wrong 'in having

these benefits taken away from him, that they can be

restored somehow?"

Levin: "Certainly, yes."

Vinson: "Okay. I've got no objection."

Speaker Breslin: "Is there any further discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 1957 be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. Ladies and Gentlemen, we will now go to the Order of Consent Calendar Second Reading, appearing on your Calendar on page 14. Hr. Clerk, read the Bills."

Clerk O'Brien: "Consent Calendar Second Reading, Second Day.

Senate Bill 1521, a Bill for an Act to amend the School

129th Legislative Day

June 18, 1986

Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bi11 1666. Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. Amendment \$1 was adopted in Committee. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1858, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Relations Act. Amendment #1 adonted Committee. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1988. an Act to amend the Pharmacy Practice Act. Bill for Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 2025, a Bill for an Act to amend the Abused and Neglected Child Reporting Act. Second Reading Senate Bill 2105, a Bill for an Act to of the Bill. Licensing Act. Committee Amendment #1 was the Hospital adopted in Committee. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill Bill 2177. for an Act to amend the Illinois Enterprise Zone Act. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 2205. а Bi 11 for an Act to amend the Fish Second Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Third Readings. Ladies and Gentlemen, the Chair is now prepared to go to Senate Bills Third Reading, appearing on page three on your Calendar. The first Bill on that Order of Call, Senate Bills Third Reading appears House Bill 96. Representative Ropp. Out of the record. Senate Bill 241, Representative Cullerton. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 241, a Bill for an Act to amend the Criminal Code of 1961. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Thank you. Madam Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen the House. This Bill is identical to a Bill that we passed of the House which I believe was House Bill 500. out deals with the redefining of the definition of "dwelling" for the offense of residential burglary. Sangmeister passed this Bill out of the Senate. The

129th Legislative Day

June 18, 1986

offense of residential burglary created back in 1982. The very long and extensive <u>Law Review</u> article was written dealing with the problems of the interpretation of the word What we say with this Bill is that for the *dwelling*. purposes of residential burglary, it means a house. apartment. a mobile home, a trailer or other living quarters in which at the time of the alleged offense. the owers or occupants actually resided in. in their or absence, intended, within a reasonable period of time. t o reside in. It was pointed out in this Law Review article that the way the Bill was originally drafted, that it could also include such things as tents and abandoned buildings. the purpose of the Bill was to redefine it. It passed the Senate on a vote of 59 to 0. Although we have passed an identical Bill, this one would go to the Governor because it hasn't been amended, so for that reason I would think it would be appropriate to pass it today. Be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 241. And on that question, the Gentleman from DuPage, Representative McCracken."

McCracken: "Thank you. Will the speaker (sic — Sponsor) yield, please?

Speaker Breslin: "The Sponsor will yield, yes."

McCracken: "Representative, this dwelling would still cover summer residences because they would be intended to be occupied at some future date?"

Cullerton: "Yes, that's correct."

McCracken: "And any attachment to the residence or home such as an attached garage, would still be covered."

Cullerton: "Right. That's correct."

McCracken: "As well as the other items which may not be attached but are left in the definition. You know, the trailers and

129th Legislative Day

June 18, 1986

all that."

Cullerton: "Could you repeat that question again?"

McCracken: "Yes. There are other... dwelling places other than homes or residences. There's trailers..."

Cullerton: "Oh, yes. It's specifically mentioned in the Bill —
mobile home, trailer, or other living quarters."

McCracken: "Okay... And you withdrew Amendment #1?"

Cullerton: "Yes, that was the subject matter of the pretrial services which has passed the House, passed the Senate Committee, and it's on its way to the Governor."

McCrackn: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from DuPage (sic - DeWitt),

Representative Vinson, on the question."

Vinson: "Madam Speaker, despite my voting record, I'd like to correct you. I don't represent DuPage, I represent DeWitt. And while I wish I had a county populous as DuPage to represent, I don't. While I wish I had a county as wealthy as DuPage, I don't, and I'd like you to remember that it's DeWitt. I wonder if the Sponsor might yield for a question?"

Speaker Breslin: "He will."

Vinson: "Representative, are you familiar with the concept of mens rea?"

Cullerton: "Yes."

Vinson: "Would you explain that so that the Membership understands that for the discussion on this Bill?"

Cullerton: "Yes. Well, it would probably be best to go back to
the original Latin definition of mens rea, which means,
'The mind is itself.' I don't know if that's helpful, but
what it really means in terms of criminal law, it deals
with the mental state. It says that there should be a
mental state that must be existent in defining a criminal
act. In other words, a person must... a person must have a

- 129th Legislative Day $\qquad \qquad \qquad \text{June 18, 1986}$ proper mens rea or a mental state in defining a criminal act."
- Vinson: "And would you agree that that general rule on mens rea in the criminal law is that the perpetrator of a crime has to have a guilty mental state or the crime must include a requirement that the perpetrator have a guilty mental state for the Legislature to make it a crime."
- Cullerton: "In... In virtually every case. There are a few exceptions where we do have some offenses of a quasi-criminal nature such as some traffic offenses where there is no mens rea, there is almost strict liability, but in most of the cases, we would have one."
- Vinson: "Now, your Bill is not really a mens rea Bill, though, is it?"
- Cullerton: "It doesn't change the element of the offense, it changes the definition of 'dwelling', which is found in residential burglary statute right now."
- Vinson: "And to the extent that your Bill deals with intent of mental states, it doesn't deal with the intent or the mental state of the accused person. Is that correct?"
- Cullerton: "Yes, I think that's accurate."
- Vinson: "In fact, it deals with the mental state or intent of an individual who isn't even a party to the particular suit in question... to the prosecution."
- Cullerton: "Well, I wouldn't... I think you're confusing the mental state of the homeowner, which is necessary in defining 'dwelling' with the mental state of the perpetrator, so the alleged perpetrator, as we... as the policemen always say, is the criminal... the alleged criminal... they have to have a mental state of performing the act which constitutes the offense. We are saying the definition of 'dwelling' in trying to define what is going to be the subject matter of this residential burglary that

129th Legislative Day

June 18, 1986

the mental state of the... of the homeowner would be relevant."

- Vinson: "So, to the to the extent that intent is a factor in Senate Bill 241, it is the intent of the victim of the crime, not the intended criminal. Isn't that a fair statement?"
- Cullerton: "The intent of the victim of the crime is relevant to

 the issue of the definition of what is a dwelling, in the

 offense of residential burglary, yes."
- Vinson: "Thank you. I appreciate that. I wanted to make sure I was correct about that. Now, to the Bill, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I think the Legislature to take particular concern and vad attention to this Bill. What we are, in fact, doing with this Bill if we pass it is to say that whether or not crime has committed... has been committed. is dependent upon the mental state of the victim of the crime. It is the mental state of the homeowner whose residence has been invaded that determines whether or not the criminal is guilty burglary if this Bill passes. Otherwise, if the... if the homeowner doesn't have the mental state that the in the Bill, then no crime of burglary has proposes And I want you to stop and think about what that occurred proposition would mean if we spread it across the criminal person who is killed, if their mental state were different, would be... would not be the victim of Would be the victim of some other crime. anv more. get yourself into an incredible cul-de-sac when you start determing what appropriate criminal sanctions are on the basis of the mental state of the victim of the crime. What you really want to do and what the criminal law has always done is to pay attention to the actions and the mental state of the accused person - or the criminal. the

129th Legislative Day

June 18, 1986

has mens rea or a bad mind or a guilty frame of criminal reference and performs certain actions, then we can convict him. hold him guilty. sentence him. send him off throw away the key. What this Bill proposes is that not only does the accused person have to have a bad mind and perform bad actions. but also you now have to have a special frame of mind for the victim of the crime. that's going too far to try to get criminals off scott free and to get them out of jail. I can understand why, if the criminal thinks he's doing a good thing and still does a bad thing, that you might want to let him go. In certain conditions, that makes some sense. It's a little more liberal that I'd like to be, but it might make some sense. But it sure doesn't make any sense to start talking about the frame of mind of the victim of the crime. He's already been victimized. Why does he have to go in and prove frame of mind in a criminal prosecution? It's a bad Bill. We ought to reject it. It's a Bill to let criminals go off It's a Bill... It's a Bill that will let. in some circumstances, a criminal go off free just because of the frame of mind of the victim. I'd urge a * 00* vote on this."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman form Knox, Representative Hawkinson."

Hawkinson: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. 1 rise in support of With all due' respect to Senate Bill 241. the prior speaker, I don't think that this is the only instance where the intent of the victim of the crime comes into play. Ιn many so-called... of the sex offenses, the mental state of the adult person may determine in... whether not. a victim. In theft cases, whether that person is something is offered for sale or whether it's to be a it's been abandoned, the intent of the former owner of 129th Legislative Day

June 18, 1986

the property can come into bear on whether or not a crime is committed, and this is really no different. The reason this language is placed into this Bill distinguish between buildings that may have been abandoned. completely abandoned or run down, and someplace that is used as a summer home. It's really, I think, put in there protect the summer home and include the summer home as some place that can be a place where a residential burglary takes place, and I don't think that it in any way lessens the effect of the residential burglary Section. 3elieve me, we've suspected the Sponsor of this of trying to do that on numerous occasions, but I don't think this is one of them, and I would support the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Kendall, Representative

Hastert."

Hastert: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Breslin: "He will."

Hastert: "Representative Cullerton, you are the Sponsor.

Correct?"

Cullerton: "Yes."

Hastert: "A couple of years ago, I know when I caught grief from you when we did this, but I was one of the Sponsors that passed the residential burglary Bill. I had my feelings why it was passed, and I'm certainly... I know you had your feelings about it, too. What... A couple of simple questions. Does this water down the present statute, in your opinion?"

Cullerton: "There could be a situation where someone's charged with residential burglary of, say, a tent, and they're charged with residential burglary and they got convicted.

Under this... an abandoned tent or an abandoned house where we always thought it would be burglary, but it was

129th Legislative Day

June 13, 1986

interpreted because of the definition of 'dwelling' to be a residence, under those circumstances, people had been getting convicted. This would, to a certain extent, limit that. So they'd still be guilty of burglary, but they wouldn't be guilty of residential burglary, because... because we felt at the time we passed it that we were going after people who break into residences where people live, and that's why we were going to make it a serious offense.

- Hastert: "Well... Fine. I... You know, I don't... I'm not on the

 Judiciary Committee and I've never passed the bar... too

 many bars, anyway... that... so, to understand the intent

 or the mental state of a victim..."
- Cullerton: "Yeah. Let me say this to you. Let me say this The Bill was sponsored by Senator Sangmeister who is VOU. certainly known as a law and order man. The Bill passed 59 to O in the... in the Senate. The identical Bill, House Bill 500. passed on May 23rd, 113 to 2. Now, I suspect that you were not one of the two people that voted I suspect Representative Vinson was not one of the two people that voted against it. But. it's not 8--dramatic change. It's just one that... that is based on fairness."
- Hastert: "Alright. Well, my concern is that certainly, when we passed this legislation, there was a threat to the life and safety of people who dwelled in houses that were being burglarized..."

Cullerton: "Absolutely."

- Hastert: "I just wanted to make it clear on the record that this doesn't change that intent of that Act."
- Cullerton: "Right. You're absolutely correct. It does not, and

 I have indicated to other people I would like to change the

 one portion of the residential burglary statute that says

129th Legislative Day

June 18, 1986

that for first offenders, 17 year old kids who break into attached garage, they can't get probation. I would like to change that, but this Bill doesn't do that. This addresses another section of that statute."

Hastert: "Fine. Thank you for your explanation."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Cullerton to close."

Cullerton: "Yes, thank you Madam Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Let me make this very clear because there may have been some confusion interjected. The Bill passed out of the Judiciary Committees 11 to 0. The Senate passed out 11 to 0. The House Bill passed out 13 to 0. vote on this Bill already, when it was a House Bill. I t passed 113 to 2. It... It does deal with the issue of the intent of the victim only where the victim inhabiting a dwelling, and we just say in this Bill that if that person intends to reside at that dwelling period of time, then that will be considered to be a dwelling. That would be like a summer home. summer home a dwelling? Yes, it is, if the victim of the potential residential burglary intends to live there. That's the only part that deals with intent. Representative Vinson was talking about is, he... 1 think he was saying that he doesn't think we should have anything about the intent of the victim. Well. if that's the case, then how could we ever define a residence? ever define a residence? He might be advocating the elimination of residential burglary, i f because there's... should be no consideration at all of the intent of the person who lives in the dwelling, well then, there'd be no way of knowing whether it was a residence or don't know if I want to go as far as Representative Vinson is suggesting, that we eliminate residential Once again, this is a Bill that passed 113 to 2. burglary.

129th Legislative Day

June 18, 1986

have the Roll Call in front T Λf me canaaa Representative Vinson voted 'yes'. Nothing has changed then. There has been a couple of people who I'll be tell them who they were, that voted 'no'. meantime. I'd like to have 113 renew their support for the concept and pass Senator Sangmeister's Billa"

Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 241 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. This is final passage. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 110 voting *ave*. and 1 voting 'present'. This Bill, having *no** received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared Ladies and Gentlemen, we are now going to go to passed. the Order of Senate Bills Second Reading, Appropriation Matters only. The first Bill on that Order of Call appears six on your Calendar. Senate Bill 1519. Representative Keane. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1519, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Auditor General. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Breslin: "Are there any Motions filed?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Breslin: "Are there any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1602,

Representative Keane. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1602, a Bill for an Act making certain appropriations for higher education. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Any Floor Amendments?"

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

129th Legislative Day

June 13, 1986

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Keane. Representative Keane. on
Amendment #1."

Keane: "Can .you take that Bill out of the record for a minute?"

Speaker Breslin: "Out of the record. Senate Bill 1605,

Representative Keane. Clerk, read the Bill. Mr. Clerk,

1605."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1605, a Bill for an Act to make an appropriation to the Board of Governors of State Colleges and Universities. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1610.

Representative Countryman. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1610, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Board of Regents. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Breslin: "Any Motions filed?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Breslin: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1626,

Representative Madigan — Daniels — Leverenz. Clerk, read

the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1626, a Bill for an Act making certain appropriations for higher education. Hrong Bill.

Senate Bill 1626, a Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expense of the General Assembly.

Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1627,

Representative Leverenz. Clerk, read the Bill."

129th Legislative Day

June 18, 1986

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1627, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the General Assembly. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1639,

Representative Leverenz. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1639, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the Office of State Treasurer. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Any Floor Amendments?"

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

Leverenz."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Amendment \$1, \$7,800,000 transfer from the General Obligation Bond Retirement and Interest Fund interest line to the GO and RI Fund principal line. I move for the adoption of the Amendment. No money, just a transfer."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1639. Is there anv discussion? Hearing none. the question *Shall is. Amendment #1 be adopted? All those in favor sav all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment is adopted. there any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1698,

Representative Leverenz. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1698, a Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent distributive expense of the State Comptroller and various state agencies. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendments #1, 2 and 3 were adopted

129th Legislative Day

June 18. 1986

in Committee."

Speaker Breslin: "Any Motions filed?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Breslin: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1736.

Representative Barnes - Daniels. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1736, a Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expense of the Office of Lieutenant Governor. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1737,

Representative Hastert. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1737, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Department of Aging. Second Reading of the Bill.

Amendments #1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 were adopted in Committee."

Speaker Breslin: "Any Motions filed?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Breslin: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #6, offered by Representative

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Bowman on Amendment #6."

Bowman: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Amendment makes no dollar change. It merely puts some clarified language in the... the legislation. In response to questions from the Members of the Committee, the Department made certain representations to the Committee, and the intent of this Amendment is to codify those representations in the caption of the appropriate line item. I move for its adoption."

129th Legislative Day

June 18, 1986

- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #6 to Senate Bill 1737. Is there any discussion? Hearing none, the guestion is. *Shall Amendment #6 be adopted?* All those in favor say *aye*, all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Are there anv Amendments? Amendment #6 was adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #7, offered by Representative
 Leverenz."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Leverenz on Amendment #7.

 Representative Leverenz."
- Leverenz: "Thank you, Madam Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Amendment, while it is technical in nature, would completely revise the new grant—in—aid line for the purpose of breaking down the money distribution by the 13 areas of aging in the state. It would provide equality on a per capita basis at the rate of \$22.37 for every senior citizen served. What we find is that there's a great disparity among those 13 agencies. I would move for the adoption of the Amendment #7."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #7 to Senate Bill 1737. And on that question, Representative Hastert."

Hastert: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Breslin: "He will."

Leverenz: "Sure."

Hastert: "Representative, does this... does this change the funding formula for the Department of Aging?"

Leverenz: "It makes the funding formula obsolete."

Hastert: "Would you explain that, please?"

Leverenz: "Yes, I will. For those of us that serve a suburban constituency, suburban Cook County, we are reimbursed at a

129th Legislative Day

June 18, 1986

rate of about 13 or 15 dollars per senior served. In southern Illinois, there is one area out of the 13 where they are reimbursed at the rate of 30 dollars, or over twice as much as we get in the suburban area. In the collar counties in which you represent, that is almost twice as much as what you receive in your area per capita. What this does is even it out in the entire state."

- Hastert: "So what this does is actually change the intent of the Older Americans Act. Is that correct?"
- Leverenz: "This makes obsolete the formula by which the

 Department hands out money, making it equal across the

 state, taking care of suburban Cook County so they are

 treated fairly, and the collar counties and the areas

 served by Peoria."
- Hastert: "Okay. And so, this actually hurts downstate rural

 Illinois and the City of Chicago. Is that correct?

 Because we're actually reallocating money."
- Leverenz: "No, it does not. No, as a matter of fact, it will help a tad the City of Chicago also, because they get 20 or 21 dollars per senior. This would give them 22 dollars per senior a little more than 22 and it would give equality to the suburban, the collar counties and Peoria."
- Hastert: "Okay. Well, according to the readout that we have here, Region 12, which is the City of Chicago, would go from 10,800,000 dollars to 9,700,000, which in my book, isn't an addition."
- Leverenz: "That... Well, the numbers are based on what is being served in the current FY *86 year. If that is true, those are a hypothetical figure for FY *86 now for what goes to the City of Chicago. The Amendment is drafted so that Chicago, suburban Cook, the collar counties and the rest of the state, including Peoria, which is very badly hurt now, would all be treated the same on a per capita breakout of

129th Legislative Day

June 18, 1986

the monies."

Hastert: "In the Federal Act, the Older Americans Act, there's a provision to fund 60 plus years of age individuals with a formula, and you say you're doing away with this formula, but that's... it's in the Act, and the rural areas, impacted areas, all these figuring into the formula, you're saying that this Bill does away with that formula. Is that correct?"

Leverenz: "Yes, that is correct."

- Hastert: "Alright, thank you. To the Bill. Madam Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, t think probably Representative Leverenz has a unique idea and certainly an idea that would benefit some of us, but would be a detriment to other of us. The Department of Aging does not amend... support Amendment 37, and I think, however, would probably help, specifically, people in my district. There's people in other districts that it will not help. And according to the readouts that we have in this piece of legislation what this Amendment would do. it would injure those people, the senior citizens in downstate Illinois, it would injure senior citizens in the City of Chicago and other areas. I think we should be very careful. You should be aware of what you are voting on, and this is a very parochial piece of legislation, and you should be aware of how it affects your back yard."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Bowman on the question, or to make a Motion."
- Bowman: "Yes, Madam Speaker, I've been advised that in order for this Amendment to be in order, we need to table Amendment #2. If that's the case, I'll be happy to make that Motion.

 Is that agreeable with Representative Leverenz? Okay. I move to table Amendment #2."

Speaker Breslin: "Okay. So that everybody understands what has

129th Legislative Day

June 18, 1986

taken place, the Gentleman has noted that we have to table Amendment #2 so that Amendment #7 will be in order. Is there any discussion on that question? Representative Hastert? No? Okay, is there any problem with that? Any discussion on that Motion? No. The question is, 'Shall Amendment #2 be tabled?' All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. Amendment #2 is tabled. And now, to the question of Amendment #7. Representative Hastert."

Hastert: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I would just ask for a Roll
Call vote."

Speaker Breslin: "Amendment #7, surely."

Hastert: "Yes."

Speaker Breslin: "On... On Amendment #7, Representative Mays."

Mays: "Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. Would the Gentleman yield for a question?"

Speaker Breslin: "He will."

Mays: "Why would you want to do such a pernicious thing to downstate senior citizens, Mr. Chairman... Mr. Chairman, Mr. Appropriations, Sir? Why would you want to do such a damaging, dastardly thing to the City of Chicago and downstate senior citizens? My people want to know."

Leverenz: "Are you really speaking for Chicago, Representative

Mays? Or are you reading the prepared analysis that was

fed to you by staff?"

Mays: "It happens... It happens that it appears that my interests and those of my constituents may be common to the City of Chicago, and I want to know why you would want to do these things to my constituents, my senior citizens, and all those of the City of Chicago and all those of all these other downstate areas. Did you wake up on the wrong side of the bed this morning, or something?"

Leverenz: "Is that a good question? That's a good question. You

129th Legislative Day

June 18, 1986

to the City of Chicago. indicate harm Currently, in FY are getting 9,603,000 dollars. Amendment, they get over 10,000,000 and almost 11,000,000 dollars, so therefore, they would get more, fact it's one thing to treat every area fairly. Some areas or one or two areas may have been treated overtly fair in downstate Illinois. The design of the Amendment is not to hurt them, and it is that we want to treat them all the same, and it is about time that we reverse the In the City of Chicago, they are reimbursed on disparity. a per capita base of about 20 dollars per senior served. the suburban Cook County area, it's 13 dollars or thereabout. In the collar counties, it's about and in one area in the state. one area, under the formula by the Department. it's been 30 dollars a senior. or So. I think they've been overly fair and they've much. got that program up and operating. If the Department of Aging can provide a more equal treatment under the formula that they are to enforce or put into effect, happy to take the Amendment off. The fact is that whatever gets set in the new formula is set for the next four. five or six years in a row; therefore, the entire state should be treated equally."

Mays: "Let me make sure I heard you correctly. You said that one area of the state is going to benefit somewhat, under your proposed formula greater than they were benefitting under last year's distribution. Is that not correct?"

Leverenz: "That's the area I represent. That's true."

Mays: "If the formula were not changed, would they not benefit even greater?"

Leverenz: "That is not correct, as I know it to be now,"

Mays: "Well, your figures and my figures don't jive at all and I trust my figures at this time, and as a result, I want to

129th Legislative Day

June 18, 1986

speak to the Amendment itself and again ask for a Roll Call."

Leverenz: "Proceed."

Mays: "Thank you very much, Ar. Chairman, Sir. As I understand it, this is a very, very self-interested Amendment here. It's going to benefit one or maybe two regions in the whole state to the detriment of all of the others. For this reason, I would suggest that each and every one of you, if you don't know the answer to this, the better response would be a 'no' vote and then you can get the answer later from either the Chairman, according to his figures, or our staff, according to our figures. I would urge a 'no' vote though if you have any questions because by and large, the predominant number of regions in the state are going to be damaged by this Amendment."

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

Hartke: "Will the Sponsor vield?"

Speaker Breslin: "He will."

Hartke: "Mr. Leverenz, in this new formula change, as I understand, the last formula change was in 1979 and Amendment \$2, which was just tabled, would have changed that formula. You're suggesting scrapping both formulas and going to a totally equal distribution. Is that correct?"

Leverenz: "Correct."

Hartke: "Okay, what you're doing then basically is southern Illinois, where senior citizens center... we have to have the senior citizen van and so forth and... is not taking into account the miles that have to be traveled in the rural areas. Is that correct?"

Leverenz: "No, I don't... I don't think that's correct. That's not the thrust of the Amendment. We have senior citizen

129th Legislative Day

June 18. 1986

suburban Cook County. Peoria and the collar counties and the City of Chicago. They have been. unfairly treated, under the Department's formula. This will... This Amendment might do one of two things. will either make the Department of Aging revise its formula so all areas of the state, one of which I represent. or this will become the formula. treated fairly. every case, what each agency area received this year, al 1 thirteen, as the Amendment is crafted, under the Amendment, each area would get more money than they did in the current So, no one really gets hurt. What we are doing is saving if you are serving a hundred seniors, then you get a formula multiplied by twenty-two dollars and some odd to find out how much you should get rather than the differences that exist now. In one area, \$13 per another area. \$30 a senior. That is like nine. almost ten dollars more than the City of Chicago gets and what we want. I believe, by this Amendment, is fairness."

Hartke: "Well. I do believe that, as was explained in Committee. that the new formula that was approached was done fairness basis simply because it was based on the number of senior citizens that were 60 years old and over and then those in the county or area that were 60 years old and over who were living alone. It took into account those who were disabled, those that were living the rural areas al 1 these were put a percentage factor on and I do believe that the formula proposed was possibly better than the old formula of 1979. But I totally disagree with this concept because it doesn't take into account those seniors living alone, those that are disabled, those that are 75 years old and older."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman... the Lady from Cook, Representative Didrickson."

129th Legislative Day

June 18, 1986

Didrickson: "Thank you, Madam Chairman. Would the Sponsor yield for a question, please?"

Speaker Breslin: "He will."

Didrickson: "Representative Leverenz, I have been notified by people in my district of this same concern and I have a couple of questions. Number one, is this Bill revenue neutral?"

Leverenz: "I just didn't hear the last part."

- Didrickson: "Is this Bill... this Amendment revenue neutral...

 budget neutral? I mean. we're not..."
- Leverenz: "Yes, that's correct. We're not adding any money.

 What we did by tabling Amendment 2 is delete the four

 million we added in Committee. This simply redistributes

 what's in the pot."
- Didrickson: "Okay, that's what I'm asking. My next question then is with regards to the formula. A new formula with the factors for distribution will be created by the Department on Aging or are we going to use the one presently which looks at, as I understand it, distribution of senior citizens within the state, the extent of economic need, the minority status and the rural population of the state. Are those going to be the factors?"
- Leverenz: "Not under the Amendment. The Amendment will be a per capita distribution throughout the state, based on the inequities in four areas; suburban Cook, collar counties and Peoria and Chicago."

Didrickson: "Okay, so we won't have those factors?"

Leverenz: "No, and it's difficult to do that because they are right now, this month, either Thursday or Friday last week, they were having hearings in Oak Park. I would hope to either end up with a formula that we can all go home and justify, especially in the suburban and collar counties and especially add to that the City of Chicago, which probably

129th Legislative Day

June 18, 1986

produces at least two-thirds or three-quarters of the House of Representatives or we will either get a better formula that we can justify and we don't need the Amendment, or if they don't have a new formula, we will take home an equal amount of money based on a per capita across the state."

- Didrickson: "Okay, final question with regards to the old formula, the distribution, the \$30 per capita for downstate rural Illinois, do you have any idea of why that occurred, what the rationale behind that was?"
- Leverenz: "Yes, the rationale was that those programs did not exist down there and they needed a few years to get them up and operating and they have had those few years to get them up and operating and I believe now they should be funded on a per capita base."
- Didrickson: "Thank you. And I also support your Amendment. I think it's a good Amendment."

Leverenz: "God bless you."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Kubik, on the question."

Kubik: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I don't think anybody would argue that... that there shouldn't be some factors involved in giving money to... when the Department on Aging decides how to distribute money. The problem is, very simply, that they are assigning weight factors to these various categories and these factors are not necessarily due to any reason. I testified in Oak Park and asked a number or questions and it was said that there justification for the increased cost to rural areas. There difference or no discernable difference between service in suburban areas and rural areas, absolutely none. There is no difference according to the Department so that when we testified in that, they said Aging, and that there was no discernable difference. ₩ith that in mind and with the fact that this formula seems to be very,

129th Legislative Day

June 18, 1986

very arbitrary, I would support Representative Leverenz® Amendment for a very simple reason. What could be more fair than on a per capita basis where an area that has most seniors should get the money to service those seniors? That's all this Amendment does. Nothing else. seniors should with more get a greater share of the dollars. I support the Amendment. It's a good Amendment."

- Speaker Breslin: "There being no further discussion, the question is... excuse me, Representative Leverenz. Would you like to close on Amendment #7? Representative Hastert."
- Leverenz: "Madam Speaker, not relating to Amendment 7, but apparently, there's a conflict in Amendment 6, so the Sponsor intends to take it out of the record."
- Speaker Breslin: "Okay, you wish to do that at this time and go through the debate on Amendment #7 all over again?"
- Hastert: "Madam Speaker, if you would wish... if it's your pleasure to finish the debate on Amendment 27, fine. At the appropriate time then I would like to take this out of the record so we can discuss a problem that we have with Amendment #6 with staff, okay?"
- Speaker Breslin: "Okay. Representative Leverenz, let's close on
 Amendment #7 and then we'll take the Bill out of the
- Leverenz: "Thank you. The Amendment that I had had offered Committee, I believe, is tabled and this replaces that. He simply readjusting the amounts of money distributed to the thirteen areas on aging by per capita at approximately one dollar more than the City of Chicago is getting in the current year. It will help Chicago. It will help suburban It will help the collar county areas. Cook. It will the area served by Peoria. And it will treat the rest of the state equally rather than the strong disparity they have under the current system. I would move for the

129th Legislative Day

June 18, 1986

adoption of Amendment 7."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #7 to Senate Bill 1737. There has been a request for a Roll Call. All those in favor vote *aye*, all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there Representative Mautino votes 'aye'. Representative Rea votes *ave*. Change Representative Rea from 'no' to 'aye', Mr. Clerk. On this question, there are 79 voting *aye*, 28 voting *no*, and 2 voting *present*, and the Amendment is adopted. Representative Hastert now takes the Bill out of the record, leaving it on Second Reading. Representative Hastert."

Hastert: "Yeah, if we can work this out, we're willing to come back to this right away too."

Speaker Breslin: "Surely. Surely. House Bill 1737,
Representative Hastert. Clerk, read the Bill. I see.
1739. Senate Bill 1739, Representative Barnes. Clerk,
read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1739, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the Abandoned Mined Lands Reclamation Council. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendments #1 and 2 were adopted in Committee."

Speaker Breslin: "Are there any Motions filed?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Breslin: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1740,

Representative Barnes. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1740, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the State... Illinois State Lottery.

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

129th Legislative Day

June 18, 1986

Committee."

Speaker Breslin: "Any Motions filed?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Breslin: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #2... Amendment #2 was lost in

Committee. Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative

Shaw."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Shaw, on Amendment #3."

- Shaw: "Thank you, Madam Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment \$3, as amended, is taking \$2,000,000 from the lottery advertising program. They want an increase from 9.5 million dollars to 16.5 million dollars, and this Amendment would reduce that to... by \$2,000,000."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 1740. And on that question, the Lady from Cook, Representative Barnes."
- Barnes: "Thank you... thank you, Hadam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Representative Shaw offered this same Amendment in Committee, and it failed because the Members felt that the money from the lottery is going to the educational fund which is one of our top priorities, and for that reason, I would recommend a "no" vote on this Amendment."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from St. Clair, Representative
 Stephens."
- Stephens: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. This Bill was defeated in Committee. This is really ridiculous to consider taking advertising... this Amendment, I'm sorry, is really ridiculous to consider taking advertising money away from the lottery, which is a revenue producer for the State of Illinois, to a tune of about a half a billion dollars a year, and especially, for Representative who offered the Amendment, the very money that he would be taking is going

129th Legislative Day

June 18, 1986

in great numbers of dollars to his district. So, actually, Representative, this will hurt your district. I can't understand why, after it was defeated in the Committee, that you would bring it here to the House floor. It's a bad Amendment, and I urge its defeat."

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

Brookins: "Yes, Ms. Speaker, would Representative Shaw yield for a question?"

Speaker Breslin: "He will."

Shaw: "Yes."

Brookins: "Representative Shaw, would you please explain to me what the \$2,000,000 would be doing?"

Shaw: "Yeah, what we... what I'm... this Amendment will do, the Lottery has asked for a 85% increase in its advertising budget. Eighty-five percent, now mind you, they won't... they last year... this year they spent 9.5 million dollars. Next year's request was \$7,000,000 onto the 9.5 million dollars which would bring it up to 16.9... 16.5 million dollars, and that's only in advertisement. That is... that has nothing to do with the schools of Illinois."

Brookins: "Representative Shaw, is... how much money is produced,

if you know, in your area, in your district from lottery?"

Shaw: "In my area, \$357,000 a week is spent on the lottery.

That's in the zip code 28 of my district. That doesn't cover the whole district."

Brookins: "Wouldn't you have any idea how much money is put back
in your area in the newspapers and minority publications in
the south side of Chicago?"

Shaw: "Statewide, they... the Lottery spent \$180,000 statewide and with minority vendors."

Brookins: "To the Amendment, Madam Speaker. I rise in support of this Amendment. I would say that the production... the

129th Legislative Day

June 18, 1986

production production and the greatest of monies are the produced in the Cook County areas, south side οf Chicago and the west side of Chicago, and then, in the form of advertisement, less than one percent of all money in advertising is put back in those communities. Sa-I think that Representative Shaw has hit upon a therefore. that money away so it can good idea in taking he distributed more adequately."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Rock Island, Representative

DeJaegher."

DeJaegher: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Representative Shaw. really don't know what the purpose of this Amendment is. It don't seem like there's much substance in reducing their advertising budget. I think it's a known fact that Illinois, presently, has one of the most successful lotteries any place in the United States. Thev are our fourth largest source of income. There are expectations that very shortly that lottery will derive become the third largest source of income in the State of Illinois. And, basically, when you're speaking business. the crux of business and the success that business is often attributed by advertising. I think that you would seriously impair lottery production or sales to cut back on their advertising costs. And I can't really understand the purpose of the Amendment or the explanation you have given me at this particular time on why we should reduce that advertising cost, and I would like to have from you, if possible, a more clear explanation of why you want to cut this advertising out."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative

Leverenz. You can answer that question in your close,

Representative Shaw. Representative Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Let me.... Let me speak to the Amendment singly... or

129th Legislative Day

June 18. 1986

that. I don't need to ask a question. To the people iust on the House floor, the lottery this year is spending 9.6 million dollars to an advertising agency in Chicago to promote the lottery. They came in for sixteen million five hundred, almost double the amount, and we think especially in the Senate, they already cut 3.5 million dollars in advertising. To cut an additional \$2,000,000, I think. is justified. You just can't keep buying and advertising money around. If we adopt the throwing Amendment, the lottery will have an amount egual spent in advertising last year and an additional thev \$2.000.000. So, in essence, we can say in the year budgeting for, currently, with this Amendment, we'll have a 20% increase in the amount of money able to throw to the firm that handles the advertising who turns around and sprinkles all their goodies back to the employees of the lottery. I would urge your 'aye' vote to adopt the Amendment."

Speaker Breslin: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Braun, on the Amendment."

Ladies and Gentlemen of the Braun: "Thank you, Madam Speaker• House. And this goes in specific response to Renaa Representative DeJaegher's questions that were put to Representative Shaw and to others who may be concerned wondering why it is that Representative Shaw would like to have the amount appropriated requested for advertising for the lottery reduced. The fact of the matter is, that when the lottery first started this advertising budget. were some Hembers on the other side of aisle, I'm looking at one of them now, who argued very vigorously that the for all intents and purposes a tax on lottery be... was poor people and that to advertise was simply encourage poor people to spend their meager earnings on the

129th Legislative Day

June 18, 1986

the disadvantage of themselves and their lotterv to children and their families and their communities. have seen is that the advertising for the lottery has not been responsible advertising. It has been advertising literally to shake from those who have the least to that while it is a revenue producer for the state, and I think you know that all of us want to see the state's revenues, the state's coffers healthy, at the same time, it is not fair and it is not appropriate that we should continue to pump money into a money making... into a money machine that focuses its advertising efforts on the poorest and the least able to play the lottery in the That is what is happening now. And for that reason. I believe that Representative Shaw's Amendment is a responsible Amendment. It's an Amendment which goes to our role as protecters of the poor, protecters of people should not be taken advantage of. We don't wan't to see this advertising budget become a budget for the... for advantage of poor people in the State of Illinois, and for that reason, we hope to keep it within line of was in previous Sessions. and so, I rise in support of Amendment 3."

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

Harris: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Question of the Sponsor."

Speaker Breslin: "Proceed."

Harris: "Representative, let me get this straight. If we pass this Amendment, the lottery still gets 2,000,000 more dollars in their advertising budget than they had last year? Would you... would you turn on..."

Shaw: "Yes."

Harris: "So... so we... so that's... and that's over a 20% increase... with the adoption of your Amendment, they still

129th Legislative Day

June 18, 1986

get a 20% increase?"

Shaw: "Right."

Harris: "Hell, to the Amendment, Madam Speaker. It certainly seems to me that a 20% increase in virtually any budget is sufficient to do the job that needs to be done, especially with a successful program like the lottery, and I see more lottery commercials than I see, I think, of any other commercial and; if they're going to increase it, apparently, by an additional 20%, I'm going to see even more lottery commercials. I think the Representative has a good Amendment, and we should vote 'yes' on it."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Adams, Representative Mays." Mays: "Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. This is clearly Amendment by the Sponsor. dilatory He tried it in Committee and it didn't work. The Chairman got all upset because he supported it in Committee. It didn't work either. All we're seeing is them coming right back trying to dilute one of the most effective advertising campaigns that we've had in government. Now, everybody always tells us you got to spend money to make money. We always hear that. We got to spend money in this agency to get those federal dollars in here or we got to spend money for this horse racing show so we can get a private match that's much bigger, and we got to spend money to get more money in here. If there has ever been an effective way for us to spend money in the State of Illinois, it's promotion of the state lottery. That is now the third or fourth largest revenue source of the state, and it didn't get there by wishing it to be there. It's clearly a dilatory Amendment. I would urge opposition."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative

Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. Will the Sponsor

129th Legislative Day

June 18, 1986

of this Amendment yield to a question?"

Speaker Breslin: "He will."

Hoffman: "Could you give me some examples of the kind of advertising in your neighborhoods to which you object to and feel that by reducing these resources, you'll be able to address some of that?"

Shaw: "Yes. The one comes to mind is that billboard that they have, talking about you're on Fifth Street and this is the way to easy street. You see them all over the state."

Hoffman: "You say... you know, this is Madison street and this is your way to get on easy street, and it's an ad for the lottery?"

Shaw: "Yeah, that's... that's one of them. Right."

Hoffman: "Alright. You're suggesting then, that the lottery is playing to the lowest of human propensities. Is that a fair statement?"

Shaw: "I would say that's correct."

Hoffman: "Alright. Fine. Thank you very much."

Speaker Breslin: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Didrickson."

Didrickson: "Yes, thank you, Madam Speaker. I would just probably like to reiterate a couple of other persons. comments with regards to it being the third or fourth revenue producer for us in the State of Illinois. advertising budget money is needed for expanded advertising markets down in the St. Louis area, as the director testified in Committee. We know that it is a dedicated source now into the Common School Fund. I think ought to think about that, and we also have to remember that we're not using General Revenue Funds. These are funds that they generate themselves. I think this is a bad Amendment, and I think Representative Mays probably said it best."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Marion, Representative

129th Legislative Day

June 18, 1986

Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Breslin: "He will."

- Friedrich: "Representative Braun has pointed out that at this point, probably a large number of people on public aid are buying lottery tickets, and that's been a hangup of mine for some time, even though the lottery people say that that is not the way it is. Gould you go along with an Amendment which would make it illegal for anyone on public aid to buy a lottery ticket and take away the temptation?"
- Shaw: "I'll go along with... with the... with Amendment #3 which reduces the advertising budget."
- Friedrich: "Would you say that again? I got a little noise over
- Shaw: "I would support Amendment #3 which will reduce the advertising budget."
- Friedrich: "Hell, that... that doesn't solve the problem, I don't think. My question was, would you support an Amendment to make it illegal for anyone on public aid to buy lottery tickets? It's obvious that if they are spending the money according to their budget, they can't afford a lottery ticket. So, that's my question."
- Shaw: "Well, it doesn't make any difference about my support,

 Representative friedrich."
- Friedrich: "Oh, it makes a lot of difference."
- Shaw: "No. Why don't you just prepare the Amendment and introduce it?"
- Friedrich: "Well, to the Amendment. When I tried to put on an Amendment to eliminate instant lottery, I got no support from these same people who are now crying that it preys on the poor."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from DeWitt, Representative

 Vinson, on the Amendment."

129th Legislative Day

June 18, 1986

Vinson: "Thank Madam Speaker. I appreciate vou. vour recognition. and I appreciate the opportunity to address the House on this issue again. I remember some two believe i t was, Representative Braun... Representative Braun, you spoke very directly to me on this issue earlier, and I want to speak directly in response you, because I do recall addressing the General Assembly on this issue about two years ago and; at that time, I felt and still feel that there is a... an enormous the state actually promote a gambling enterprise. Often, perhaps most of the time, perhaps nearly all of the gambling, in my judgment, is totally a legitimate time. form of recreation that is just a matter of contract people who are engaging in the gambling, and most of the time. I don't find it to be an objectionable Where person is a compulsive gambler, then event. а gambling can be... can prey on them. Their participation in the promotion of the gambling is an evil, and it's unfortunate to ever have the state involved in something that is an evil, even for a small number of people. think the problem that we have with the lottery is that chosen to have the state actually run the lottery and promote the lottery. We'd be much better off having regulate gambling and tax gambling and let those people who were regulated and taxed do the promotion. that we would not be involved directly in the commission of the evil of gambling for the compulsive gambler. we all recognize that problem and we all recognize that the lottery has been an easy source of money at a time when Legislators are unwilling to raise taxes and at a time when is popular opposition to taxes, and yet, at a time when Legislators like to spend money in appropriations. I would suggest is that we ought to get out of the

129th Legislative Day

June 18, 1986

business of the lottery and subsidize... and substitute for the money, regulation and taxation of private is not going to occur in this Legislative Session. unfortunately. And, as you all know, my interest in I have had continuing dialogue this year not waned. with the administration on the subject. Former Representative Reilly, who is Deputy Governor, has the at my request, to personally review and get agreed. involved in this issue, and Mr. Reilly and Rebbecca Paul, the current Superintendent of the Lottery have been far more forth coming in their discussions about the problem lottery advertising poses than the dialogue I had with administration two years ago on the ads then in question. And the ads that Mr. Shaw particularly refers to, the street billboards, have now been terminated. They're being I think this week, and ads of that sort. I am pulled. advised, will not be run again, and I share in that with you, I did not make any public issue of this this year, but I have been assured by Rebbecca Paul, the Superintendent of the Lottery and by Mr. Reilly, that there will be some effort, some more substantial effort that has occurred in the past to try to exercise self-discipline by the lottery and the method of its advertising, and I can assure this current campaign is being pulled. I take no position on the Amendment in question. I could criticize Amendment in question, in that î t doesn't do far enough, and we probably ought to delete all advertising for the lottery or I can support it in that it goes part of the way toward curing an evil. Not being willing to untangle those particular problems, I'm going to take no position on the Amendment. I'm just going to inform you that we're making some progress on a matter of mutual concern, and I m glad that this year you're joining me, and I would suspect

129th Legislative Day

June 18, 1986

that the growing group of people who are concerned about potential excesses of the lottery will lead us to a more balanced decision about how we deal with the problem of government and gambling in the future. And I will vote 'present', and perhaps, privately cheer for you."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Madison, Representative Wolf."

Wolf: "Madam Speaker, I move the previous question."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman moves the previous question. The question is, "Shall the main question be put?" All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the main question is put. Representative Shaw, to close."

"I want to thank Representative Vinson for his support on Shaw: the Amendment, but we talk about the increase in from 9.5 million dollars to 16.5 million dollars and deleting \$2,000,000 out of that 3.5 million dollars because the Senate... the Senate had cut 3.5 million dollars, but what I think is that this is far too much money, far too big of an increase in any budget, a 85% increase that should not vote for 85% increase, and I be... we don't... I believe that we would be in keeping with the program in terms of the 3% increase in salaries Governor*s and state spending. And why should we do any different for the lottery? It's... it's no one in this state that haven't heard of the lottery. And when you tell me that you need 16.5 million dollars to advertise for the lottery, that's ridiculous, and I think that for good government, as we say in Committee, this is a good government Amendment and this is not big spending, and I think that you should vote for the Amendment. And I ask for an 'aye' vote on the Amendment."

Speaker Breslin: "The question is, "Shall the House adopt

129th Legislative Day

June 18, 1986

Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 1740?* All those in favor vote *aye*, all those opposed vote *no*. Voting is open.
Representative Tate, one minute to explain your vote.*

- Tate: "Thank you, Madam Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of First of all, I'd like to bring to the attention of House. the chamber. of the Members. that the Illinois State Lottery last night received the Batchy award for 1986. which is the best advertisement of any lottery in the nation, that the industry awarded that in Seattle last niaht. Second of all, there has been some misinformation distributed on this floor about who buys lottery tickets. surveys would reflect the middle class supports National The Illinois State Lottery has the lottery. conducted a study on household incomes that would also reflect that over. over 60% of the people purchasing lottery tickets have an income of over \$20,000. Ladies and Gentlemen, I would..."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative McGann. Excuse me.
 Representative McNamara, one minute to explain your vote."
 McNamara: "Thank you. On that particular issue, last year's
 award was presented last night, but last year's award was
 also based on last year's budget. This year's budget,
 significantly higher, does not mean that we have to go to a
 much larger, larger budget and do excessive spending in
- Speaker Breslin: "The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 64 voting "aye", 44 voting "no", 2 voting "present", and the Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"

this state. He need the dollars. I vote 'yes'."

- Clerk Leone: "There are no further Amendments."
- Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. Representative Matijevich is recognized for a Motion. Representative Matijevich, please, for a Motion. Would you turn on Representative

129th Legislative Day

June 18, 1986

Matijevich, please?"

- Matijevich: "Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House I ask leave of the House and use of the Attendance Roll Call for that purpose to suspend the provisions of Rule 24, which prohibits a Committee to meet concurrently while the House is in Session. The reason for waiver of this Rule is so that the House Rules Committee can meet immediately in the Speaker's Conference Room to hear one Bill, Senate Bill 1200, that has been posted for a hearing."
- Speaker Breslin: "You have heard the Gentleman's Motion. He wishes to suspend Rule 24 so that the House Rules Committee can meet at concurrently with the House chamber. And on that question, the Gentleman from DeWitt, Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "Madam Speaker, I object."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman objects. The question is, 'Shall the House suspend Rule 24 so that the House Rules Committee can meet concurrently with the House?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open.

60 votes are required for the adoption of this Motion.

Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the... Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "Request a verification of the affirmative."

Speaker Breslin: "Surely. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 63 voting 'aye', 49 voting 'no', and none voting 'present'. Ladies and Gentlemen, there has been a request for a verification of the affirmative votes. Would all people be in... who are voting 'aye' be in their seats and ready to prepare for a verification. When you name is called, raise your hands. Representative Shaw and Representative Panayotovich asks leave to be verified. May they verified, Representative Vinson, and Representative Dunn?"

129th Legislative Day

June 18, 1986

Vinson: "No. No."

Speaker Breslin: "No, he is not granting any leaves for verification. Representative Steczo votes 'aye'. Mr. Clerk, poll the affirmatives."

Clerk Leone: "Poll of the Affirmatives. Alexander. Berrios."

Speaker Breslin: "Ladies and Gentlemen, if you will sit in your seats and raise your hand when your name is called, we can do this quickly so those people who needed to go out of the room may do so. Proceed. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Bowman. Braun. Breslin. Brooking. Brunsvold. Bullock. Capparelli. Christensen. Cullerton. Curran. Currie. Daley. DeJaegher. DeLeo. Dunn. Farley. Gialio. Flinn. Flowers. Giorgi. Greiman. Hannia. Hartke. Hicks. Homer. Huff. Keane. Kulas. Laurinos Levin. Martinez. LeFlore. Leverenza Matijevich. McGann. McNamara. McPike. Mautino. Mulcahey. Nash-O'Connell. Panavotovich. Phelps. Preston. Rea. Rice. Ronan. Satterthwaite. Shaw. Steczo. Sutker. Terzich. Turner. Van Duyne. Washington. White. Wolf. Anthony Young. Wyvetter Younge. And Mr. Speaker." Speaker Breslin: "Any questions of the Affirmative Roll. Representative Vinson?"

Vinson: "Mr. Berrios."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Berrios is in the chamber.

Representative Giorgi, for what reason do you rise?"

Giorgi: "Madam Speaker, before I ask to be verified on the Roll Call, I'm wondering why the Minority Leader is objecting to his Leader's Bill that we're trying to suspend the rules to be heard. It's a Rock — Daniels Bill, and I want to go on record as supporting the Rock — Daniels Motion to suspend the rule to have this Bill heard in Rules, and I would like to hear from the Minority Leader, unless he's in his oats or something, as to why he's doing this."

129th Legislative Day

June 18, 1986

Vinson: "I'll get him a memo."

Speaker Breslin: "Excuse me. Representative Giorgi, you are out

of order. Do you have any questions of the affirmative?"

Vinson: "Mr. DeLeo."

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

Vinson: "Mr. Farley."

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

Vinson: "Representative Flowers."

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

Vinson: "Representative Hartke."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Hartke. Representative Chuck

Hartke. The Gentleman is not in the chamber. Remove him

from the Roll Call."

Vinson: "Mr. Huff."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Huff is not in the chamber.

Remove him from the Roll Call."

Vinson: "Mr. O'Connell."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative O'Connell is in the chamber."

Vinson: "Mr. Rea."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Rea is in the chamber.

Representative Hartke is in the chamber. Add him to the

Roll Call voting 'aye'."

Vinson: "Mr. White."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative White. Jesse White. The Gentleman is not in the chamber. Remove him... Oh, he is.

Representative White is in the chamber."

Vinson: "Mr. Christensen."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Christensen. Ray Christensen.

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

Vinson: "Mr. Laurino."

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

Vinson: "Mr. Giglio."

129th Legislative Day

June 18, 1986

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

Vinson: "Mr. Leverenz."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Leverenz. Representative Leverenz is not in the chamber. Remove him from the Roll Call."

Vinson: "Mr. Van Duyne."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Van Duyne is in his chair."

Vinson: "Mr. Hicks."

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

Vinson: "Mr. Sutker."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Sutker is in the chamber.

Representative Leverenz has returned to the chamber. Add
him to the Roll Call voting 'aye'."

Vinson: "Mr. Ronan."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Ronan. Representative Al Ronan.

The Gentleman is not in the chamber. Remove him from the Roll Call. Representative Saltsman seeks recognition and wishes to vote 'aye'. The Gentleman votes 'aye'.

Vinson: "Mr. LeFlore."

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

Vinson: "No further questions."

Speaker Breslin: "There being no further questions, there are 61 voting 'aye', 49 voting 'no', and none voting 'present', and the rules are suspended. Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Yes, to remind the Members of the Rules Committee that we will meet immediately in the Conference...

Speaker's Conference Room. Also, to remind the Democrats based on that objection, I would urge all of them to be there immediately."

Speaker Breslin: "The next Bill on the Order of Senate Bills

129th Legislative Day

June 18, 1986

Second Reading is Senate Bill 1745. Representative Barnes. Representative Barnes. Ladies and Gentlemen, here is a Rules Committee meeting immediately in the Speaker's Conference Room. Would all Members of the Rules Committee go to the Speaker's Conference Room immediately. In the meantime, we will go back to the Order of Senate Bills Second Reading, appropriations matters only. The next Bill is Senate Bill 1745. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1745, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Judicial Inquiry Board. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Are there any Motions filed?"

Clerk Leone: "There are no Motions filed."

Speaker Breslin: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1746. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1746, a Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Office of the Governor. Second Reading of the Bill. No..."

Speaker Breslin: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1748. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1748, a 3ill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Deparment of Central Management Services. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendments \$21,2,3,4,5 and 6 were adopted in Committee."

Speaker Breslin: "Any Motions filed?"

Clerk Leone: "A Motion to table. I move to table House Amandment
#1 to Senate Bill 1748, filed by Representative Vinson."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Vinson."

129th Legislative Day

June 18, 1986

Vinson: "What?"

Speaker Breslin: "A Motion to table Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1748."

Vinson: "Give me the file."

Speaker Breslin: "Who filed the Motion... who is the Sponsor of the Amendment. Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #1 was a Committee Amendment, filed by Representative Leverenz in Appropriations #1"

Speaker Breslin: "Excuse me, Representative Vinson. The Clerk
believes that he has misread the request for the Amendment
and that the Sponsor of this tabling Motion is
Representative Nash, and that is correct. Representative
Nash, on a Motion to table. Representative Vinson."

Vinson: "Madam Speaker, I can understand how we might look alike, but not how our signatures would appear to be the same."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Nash, on the tabling Motion."

Nash: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #1 which reduces the budget by 41 vacancies for total of \$950 is for positions that have already been filled. This is an agreed Motion with talks by the department, with the Chairman of the Committee and the Minority Spokesman. I move the Amendment be tabled. Committee Amendment #1 be tabled."

Speaker Greiman: "Representative Greiman in the Chair. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Nash, moves to table Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1748. And on that, is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, "Shall this Amendment be tabled?" Those in favor say "aye", opposed "no". In the opinion of the Chair, the "ayes" have it. Amendment #1 is tabled. Are there further Motions?"

Clerk Leone: "No further..."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Vinson. Excuse me, Mr. Clerk. Yes, Mr. Vinson."

129th Legislative Day

- June 18, 1986
- Vinson: "Mr. Speaker, I have just been requested by the Minority

 Leader to request a Republican Conference at 5:30, and I'm

 advised that it's the most important Conference. It won't

 take very long, but it is a most important Conference."
- Speaker Greiman: "Alright, Mr. Vinson, I'm not sure the timing will certainly... before the day is over, I'll give you that opportunity. On the timing, I'm not sure whether we can accommodate you exactly on the timing, but we'll certainly try to do as closely as we can, Sir. Are there further... further Motions? Mr. Vinson."
- Vinson: "Well, Mr. Speaker, if 5:30 is a problem, we'd like to do it immediately after this Bill."
- Vinson: "Mr. Vinson, we will... we're running the business of the

 House. We will try and give you... accommodate you as

 closely as we can do so. Sir. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "There are no further Motions. Amendment 37 was withdrawn. Next Amendment is Floor Amendment #8, offered by Representative Leverenz."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Leverenz, on Amendment \$8."
- Leverenz: "This time I wish to move to table Amendment 2, my

 Amendment, and replace it with 8."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Leverenz, moves to table Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 1748. On that, is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall this Amendment be tabled?' All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. Amendment #2 is tabled. And now, Mr. Clerk, on Amendment #8."
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #8, offered by Representative

 Leverenz."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Ar. Leverenz, on Amendment #8."

129th Legislative Day

June 18, 1986

- Leverenz: "Thank you, Central Management Services provided us with an update on the numbers for the appropriations for the administrative expense related to the state self insurance plan, and this Amendment would do that, and I will move now for the adoption of Amendment #8."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Leverenz, moves for the adoption of Amendment #8 to Senate Bill 1748. And on that, is there any discussion? Being none, the question is, 'Shall this Amendment be adopted?' Those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Are there further Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #9, offered by Representative
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Bureau, Mr. Mautino, on Amendment #9."
- Mautino: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. What I would like to do before addressing Amendment #9, I would like to table Amendment #4 that was adopted in Committee which was my Amendment and in lieu of that Amendment #4, go forward with the identical Amendment in terms of funding it that is embodied in Amendment #9."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Bureau, Mr. Mautino. moves to table Amendment #4 to Senate Bill 1748. And on that, is discussion? There being none, the question is, there anv *Shall this Amendment be tabled?* Those in favor 'aye', opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the "ayes" have it, and the Amendment is tabled. Mraga Excuse Mr. Mautino, we'll just change the Order for a moment and come right back to your Amendment. Committee Reports."
- Clerk Leone: "Committee Reports. The Committee on Rules has met and pursuant to Rule 29 (c)-3, the following Bills have been ruled exempt on June 18, 1986, Senate Bills 1200 and

129th Legislative Day

- June 18, 1986
- Senate Bill 2061, filed by Representative Matijevich, Chairman on Rules.
- Speaker Greiman: "Alright. And now, Mr. Mautino, on... back on the Order of Senate Bills Second Reading. Excuse me. Mr. Clerk. Supplemental Calendar announcment."
- Clerk Leone: "Supplemental Calendar #1, is now being distributed."
- Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Mautino, on Amendment #9."
- Mautino: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen.

 Amendment #9 replaces Amendment #4, which we just tabled,

 appropriates the same dollar amount for the same provisions

 for the facility in Princeton, Illinois, and it is a... the

 Amendment designates a single line item appropriation in

 lieu of a lump sum that was included in the original

 Amendment. Therefore, I move for its adoption."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from... from Bureau moves for the adoption of amendment 39 to Senate Bill 1748. And on that, is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall this Amendment be adopted?' All in favor say 'aye', those opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment is adopted. Further
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #10, offered by Nash Leverenz and Barnes."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Nash, on Amendment \$10."
- Nash: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentleman of the House, this is an Agreed Amendment between both sides of the aisle which allows the Department of Central Management Services to lease purchase a building for a communciation center near the Capitol Complex. This site will provide a central location for major communication functions, such as statewide paging, credit card calling, video conferencing

- 129th Legislative Day

 June 18, 1986

 and teleconferencing. Total amount, \$305. I move for its

 adoption."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Nash, moves for the adoption of Amendment &10 to Senate Bill 1748. And on that, is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall this Amendment be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye', those opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment is adopted. Alright. On a Bill... Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Greiman: "Third Reading. We just have a Bill to go back to to pick up that we had taken out of the record so we can go back to. On page 11, appears Senate Bill 2087, on the Order of Senate Bills Second Reading. Senate Bill 2087.

 Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 2087, a Bill for an Act to amend the
 Liquor Control Act. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment
 #1 was adopted in Committee."
- Speaker Greiman: "Are there any Motions with respect to this

 Amendment?"
- Clerk Leone: "A Motion to table Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 2087, filed by Representative Mautino."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Bureau, Mr. Mautino, on Amendment #1... on a Motion to table Amendment #1."
- Mautino: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In discussing the rationale for the Amendment that was adopted in Committee, with those people who are knowledgeable within that industry, we find that, as drafted, that Amendment would probably put out every licensed distributor in the State of Illinois. Therefore, it being certainly unfair and detrimental to the, I guess you might call it, the business time of the state, I move that that Amendment be tabled."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Bureau, Mr. Mautino, moves

129th Legislative Day

June 18, 1986

to table Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 2087. And on that, is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall this Amendment be tabled?' All in favor say 'aye', those opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the Motion is adopted, and the Amendment is tabled. Are there further Motions?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Motions."

Speaker Greiman: "Are there further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative

Cullerton."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Cullerton, on Amendment #2."

Cullerton: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen

of the House. This is very similar to Amendment number, I

think, 1, but it doesn't apply to beer. I move for the
adoption of Amendment \$2."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook moves for the... Mr. Cullerton moves for the adoption of Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 2087. On that, is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Bureau, Mr. Mautino."

Mautino: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Amendment #2 is similar to #1.

I've had the opportunity to try and contact individuals in this industry. Some of them told me that they have a geographical agreement with their suppliers, but to accommodate the Majority Leader, who has asked that this be placed on this legislation and also giving some of us the opportunity to check back with our local wholesalers, that we have no objection at this time on Second Reading for the adoption of this Amendment."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from DeHitt, Mr. Vinson."

Vinson: "I would largely reiterate what Mr. Mautino said, this

Amendment is certainly preferable to the prior status of

the Bill, and I believe that it approves the Bill. We'll

129th Legislative Day

June 18, 1986

have to take a very close look at it on Third Reading. but I certainly don't object to the Amendment.

Speaker Greiman: "There being no further discussion, the question is, 'Shall this Amendment be adopted?' All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the . 'ayes' have it, and Amendment \$2 is adopted. Are there further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "There are no further Amendments."

Speaker Greiman: "Third Reading. Alright. Mr. Friedrich, did
you wish to have your Conference at this time?"

Friedrich: "I yield to Sam. I yield to Representative Vinson."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Vinson, is your light not working? It's

not blinking. Oh. it is now."

Vinson: "Thank you."

Speaker Greiman: "Proceed, Sir."

Vinson: "Yes, I'd like to have a Republican Conference immediately in Room 118. I would like to urge all Republican Members to attend. It will be short, but most important."

Speaker Greiman: "Alright. We are preparing to ad iourna Alright. Alright. Alright. Alright. Ladies and Gentlemen, Mr. Vinson and Mr. Friedrich has announced a Republican Conference directly after adjournment in Room The Gentleman... the Chair recognizes the Gentleman 118. from Madison, Mr. McPike. Mr. McPike moves that the House stand adjourned until the hour of ... Mr. McPike withdraws Motion for the moment. Alright. Mr. Mc... Alriaht. I'm advised that we will be... we are planning to be in Session on Friday, so you should make your arrangements accordingly. And now, the Gentleman from Madison moves that the House stand adjourned until the hour of 12:00 tomorrow, 12:00 noon. All those in favor signify by saying *aye*, those opposed *no*. In the opinion of the Chair.

129th Legislative Day

June 18, 1986

the 'ayes' have it, and the House stands adjourned until the hour of 12:00 noon tomorrow, allowing the Clerk perfunctory time for Messages from the Senate and such other matters that may be come before him."

"A Message from the Senate by Mr. Wright, Secretary. Clerk Leone: ·Mr. Speaker. T am directed to inform the House Representatives. that the Senate has concurred with the House Representatives in the passage of the following Bills, together with Amendments and adoption to which I am instructed to ask concurrence of the House. to wit: House Bills 1467, 2060, 2581, 2612, 2724, 2770, passed the Senate amended June 18, 1986. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. Committee Reports. Representative Bowman, Chairman from the Committee on Appropriations II, to which the following Bills were referred, action taken June 18,1986 and reported the same back with the following recommendations: • do Senate Bills 1606, 1609, 1825, 1826; 'do pass as nass* amended Senate Bills 17... Senate Bills 1607 and 1611. Representative Leverenz. Chairman from the Committee on Appropriations I, to which the following Bills action taken June 18, 1986 and reported the same back with the following recommendations; 'do pass' Bill 1765; 'do pass as amended' Senate Bills 1747, 1750, 1756, 1757, 1778 and 1822. Corrected Committee Report. Senate Bill 2018 should have been reported out of Committee Transportation on June 13, 1986 as 'do pass as amended' on the Consent Calendar. Being no further business. the House will now stand adjourned till tomorrow at 12:00 noon."

REQ STORE PRINT D
DOCUMENT NAME OPER GROUP COMMAND DATE COPY WIDTH DEPTH ERROR
T061886 28 0 pj 07/23/86 1 66 78

08/14/\$6 09:15-

STATE OF ILLINOIS 84TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES DAILY TRANSCRIPTION OF DEBATE INDEX

PAGE 1

JUNE 18, 1986

\$3-0233	SECOND	READING	PAGE	92
SB-0241	THIRD A	READING	PAGE	106
SB-0415		READING	PAGE	5
SB-0602		READING	PAGE	5
		READING	PAGE	6
SB-1053			PAGE	92
SB-1491		READING	PAGE	4
SB-1492		READING	PAGE	4
		READING	PAGE	6
SB-1521		READING READING	PAGE	115
		READING	PAGE PAGE	105 92
SB-1564		READING	PAGE	91
SB-1570			PAGE	6
SB-1570			PAGE	8
SB-1576	SECOND		PAGE	9
SB-1577	SECOND	READING	PAGE	9
SB-1577	SECOND	READING	PAGE	12
\$8-1589	SECOND	READING	PAGE	9
SB-1605	SECOND	READING	PAGE	116
		READING	PAGE	100
SB-1610		READING	PAGE	116
		READING	PAGE	116
SB-1627		READING	PAGE	117
		READING	PAGE	117
		READING READING	PAGE	106
		READING	PAGE	117
		READING	PAGE PAGE	10 88
		READING	PAGE	29
		READING	PAGE	29
		READING	PAGE	118
		READING	PAGE	118
SB-1737	SECOND	READING	PAGE	118
SB-1739	SECOND	READING	PAGE	129
		READING	PAGE	129
		READING	PAGE	146
		READING	PAGE	146
		READING	PAGE	146
SB-1748		RECORD READING	PAGE	149
SB-1804		READING	PAGE PAGE	30
		READING	PAGE	11 34
		READING	PAGE	11
SB-1815			PAGE	12
SB-1837	SECOND		PAGE	11
SB-1852	SECOND	READING	PAGE	37
SB-1852	OUT OF	RECORD	PAGE	38
SB-1855	SECOND		PAGE	38
		READING	PAGE	39
SB-1856			PAGE	41
		READING	PAGE	106
SB-1934		READING	PAGE	41
SB-1934			PAGE	44
SB-1934 SB-1957		RECORD READING	PAGE	44
SB-1988		READING	PAGE PAGE	103 106
SB-2006	SECOND		PAGE	45
SB-2017	SECOND		PAGE	45
SB-2018	SECOND		PAGE	48
SB-2020	SECOND		PAGE	48
SB-2022	SECOND		PAGE	48
SB-2025	SECOND		PAGE	106
SB-2037	SECOND		PAGE	49
SB-2042	SECOND	READING	PAGE	49

08/14/86 09:15,

STATE OF ILLINOIS 84TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

PAGE 2

ΕX

JUNE 18, 1986

DAILY	TRANSCRIPTION	OF	DEBATE	INDE

SB-2076	SECOND	READING	PAGE	50
SB-2076	SECOND	READING	PAGE	100
SB-2076	OUT OF	RECORD	PAGE	51
SB-2077	SECOND	READING	PAGE	102
\$3-2078	SECOND	READING	PAGE	51
SB-2078	SECOND	READING	PAGE	52
SB-2078	OUT OF	RECORD	PAGE	52
SB-2087	SECOND	READING	PAGE	151
SB-2100	SECOND	READING	PAGE	56
SB-2105	SECOND	READING	PAGE	106
SB-2123	SECOND	READING	PAGE	67
SB-2129	SECOND	READING	PAGE	90
SB-2129	SECOND	READING	PAGE	90
SB-2164	SECOND	READING	PAGE	69
SB-2173	SECOND	READING	PAGE	69
SB-2177	SECOND	READING	PAGE	106
SB-2190	SECOND	READING	PAGE	73
		READING	PAGE	73
		READING	PAGE	90
		READING	PAGE	70
SB-2197	SECOND	READING	PAGE	71
SB-2205			PAGE	106
SB-2212			PAGE	75
·		READING	PAGE	76
		READING	PAGE	78
		READING	PAGE	79
SB-2274	SECOND	READING	PAGE	80
		READING	PAGE	81
SB-2285			PAGE	81
88-2288			PAGE	81
\$3-2300			PAGE	87
SB-2300	RECALLE	ED	PAGE	87

SUBJECT MATTER

HOUSE TO ORDER	PAGE	1	
SPEAKER MCPIKE IN CHAIR	PAGE	1	
PRAYER	PAGE	1	
PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE	PAGE	2	
ROLL CALL FOR ATTENDANCE	PAGE	2	
COMMITTEE REPORTS	PAGE	149	
ADJOURNMENT	PAGE	153	
PERFUNCTORY SESSION	PAGE	154	
MESSAGES FROM THE SENATE	PAGE	154	
PERFUNCTORY SESSION - ADJOURNMENT	PAGE	154	