Speaker Breslin: "Ladies and Gentlemen, the House will

136 Legislative Day

June 27, 1986

- I would ask all Hembers to be in their seat. The Chaplain for today will be the Reverend Alvin of Trinity Lutheran Church of Nokomis. Reverend Rodeck is the quest of Representative Karen Hasara. Mou 1 d guests in the gallery please rise for the invocation?" Reverend Rodeck: "In the Name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit. Amen. Let us pray. blessed Holy Trinity, we thank You for bringing us all here again for the purpose of doing Your work and preserving and state and all citizens of our commonwealth. We acknowledge that in You we live and root and have our We pray that You would enable our lawmakers to legislation that provides our foster government with and power tempered by justice. Bless all these, Your Representatives, with wisdom to write and to laws that will guarantee safety, protection and integrity, Inspire them to encourage goodwill among the people, citizens may grow in appreciation of justice. Lord. use the efforts of those who write the laws and those who interpret them for the accomplishment of what is We ask all this in the will and what is pleasing to You. Name of Jesus our Saviour. Amen. May the Lord bless you in your work."
- Speaker Breslin: "We will be led in the pledge 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 Breslin: "Roll Call for Attendance. Representative Piel,
 for what reason do you rise?"

136 Legislative Day

June 27, 1986

- Piel: "Yes, would the record show that Representative McCracken is excused today, Madam Speaker?"
- Speaker Breslin: "The record should show that Representative excused for the dav. Mr. Clerk. take the is record. The record shows that there are 117 Members Call. and a quorum of the House is the Roll answering present and ready to do work. Ladies and Gentlemen. in a few minutes, hopefully about five minutes, we are ready to go to the Order of Appropriations. So, would all of Appropriations Staff and Committee Members come to the chamber and prepare to do that work? Agreed Resolutions.
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Joint Resolution 231, offered by Representative Dunn; 234, by Representative Weaver. House Resolution 1507, Hasara; 1508, Davis; 1509, Wolf; 1510, Johnson and Black; 1511, Terzich; 1513, Mulcahey; 1515, Pullen and McAuliffe; 1517, Barger and Greiman et al; 1518, Brookins et al."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Matijevich on the Agreed
 Resolutions."
- Matijevich: "Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, these are all agreed. I would like to ask leave. House Joint 231, by Dunn, congratulates Dick Lockhart, and he would like to have all Members of the Body added as Cosponsors and leave of the House for that."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has leave. Representative

 Matijevich has leave of the Body to add all Members as

 Cosponsors to that Resolution. Turn on Representative

 Matijevich."
- Matijevich: "And now would move adoption of the Agreed Resolutions."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Matijevich moves for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the

136 Legislative Day

- June 27, 1986
- Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the Agreed Resolutions are adopted. Death Resolutions."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Joint Resolution 230, offered by Representative Daley, with respect to the memory o f Francis LaVelle Gudgeon. House Resolution 1514, offered by Representative Martinez, with respect to the memory of House Resolution 1512. Alicia Quiroga. offered bу Representative Currie, with respect to the memory of Alvin A. Rider, Sr."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Matijevich moves for the adoption of the Death Resolutions. All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the Death Resolutions are adopted. General Resolutions."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Joint Resolution 232, offered by Representative Braun. And House Joint Resolution 233, offered by Representative Braun."
- Speaker Breslin: "Committee on Assignment. Representative Kulas is recognized on a point of personal privilege."
- Kulas: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I enjoy being the first one on the House floor to be able... I'd like to ask a question of my seatmate, Representative Ronan. Representative Ronan, could you tell the House what happens when you use a driver and then a four iron and then you sink a ten foot pole at the rail, isn't that a 469 yard par five hole?"
- Ronan: "Representative Kulas, in order to answer that very difficult question, on the fifth hole, which is 469 yards long, when you hit a driver, a four iron, and you sink a ten foot putt, you must be Representative Jack Kubik, because that's what he did this morning. He eagled the fifth hole over at the rail, and I feel that we should give him a round of support. Obviously, Representative Kulas and I never had that experience, so that we thought we'd

136 Legislative Day

June 27, 1986

just pay a little homage to Representative Kubik. Thank

- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Kubik, can you tell us how you did it?"
- Kubik: "It's called luck, I think. But Representative Ronan and Representative Kulas, if you keep playing with me, you may also at one time in your life have an eagle as well."
- Speaker Breslin: "Ladies and Gentlemen, while we wait for the Appropriations Staffs and Committees to prepare for the o f appropriations agenda, we will go to the Order nonappropriation items. It starts on page Nonconcurrence. six on your Calendar. That's the Order of Nonconcurrence. and will be calling those Bills that are not appropriation matters. Representative Kulas, for what reason do you rise?"
- I think that, maybe, before we Kulas: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. start the nonconcurrence, I had a parliamentary question yesterday, and I was serious and neither Representative Representative Giglio were able to answer that question and they gave me a runaround, and this might again today. and I'd like to get an answer on if the House refuses... if there is a Motion to refuse to recede. the House refuses to refuse to recede and then a substitute Motion is made to recede on the Senate Amendments, then the people who have refused to refuse to recede should they be voting 'yes' or 'no' on the Motion to recede?"

Speaker Breslin: "They should vote 'no'."

Kulas: "Thank you."

Speaker Breslin: "Definitely. On page six on your Calendar, the first Bill is Senate Bill 1468, Representative Daniels. Is there someone able to present that? Out of the record.

Senate Bill 1517, Representative Terzich or McGann.

136 Legislative Day

June 27, 1986

Representative Terzich or McGann. These are nonconcurrence Motions, Ladies and Gentlemen. They should be very easy to present. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1552, Representative Giglio, on a nonconcurrence Motion. This is an Act in relation to the conducting of charitable games. Call the Bill. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1552, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act in relation to the conducting of charitable games. The Senate has refused to concur in House Amendment #1."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Giglio."

Giglio: "Madam Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I
move to refuse to recede from Amendments... Amendment #1 to
House... Senate Bill 1552."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved to refuse to recede to

Senate Amendment #1 to... to House Amendment #1 to Senate

Bill 1552. And on that question, Representative Piel, at

Representative Vinson's desk."

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

Speaker Breslin: "He will."

Giglio: "To Representative Piel, yes."

Piel: "Thank you, Frank. Could you explain to us what the Bill is without and then with the Amendment so we know exactly what we're voting for?"

Giglio: "Well, the House Amendment to Senate Bill 1552 was to not have the... not have cash prizes. We had... the House passed... we passed our Bill where we didn't have cash prizes. We had the five dollar limit and we also had no poker in our Bill... or our Amendment."

Piel: "So in other words, what you're saying is... you want to refuse to recede on this because with the Amendment on there, it would allow cash prizes or it would not allow cash prizes?"

136 Legislative Day June 27, 1986

Giglio: "With the Amendment on, it's no cash prizes."

Piel: "So, if you do not want cash prizes, you should vote with you, correct?"

Giglio: "Right. You should vote with me and refuse to recede from this Amendment."

Piel: "Fine. Good. I will vote with you then. Thank you."

Giglio: "Thank you."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Lee, Representative Olson."

Olson: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in support of Representative Giglio's Motion. This was described at Judiciary II when it came to us, and it is a good position which to be. We would go with him on his Motion to refuse to recede."

"There being no further discussion, the question Speaker Breslin: *Shall the House refuse to recede from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1552? All those in favor say *aye*, all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair. the 'aves' have it. and the House refuses to recede from the House Amendment to Senate Bill 1552. Senate Bill 1565, Representative O°Connell Preston. Excuse Representative Giglio, did you wish to request a Conference Committee on House Bill (sic - Senate Bill) 1552?"

Giglio: "Yes. Yes. Madam Speaker."

Breslin: "He does. The Gentleman has requested Speaker Conference Committee on Senate Bill 1552, and a Conference Committee will be appointed. Senate Bill 1565 has been Representative O'Connell. called. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1666, Representative Hoffman or Cowlishaw. of the record. Senate Bill 1709, Representative Out of the record. Senate Bill 2018. Representative Mays. Representative Mays, it's Senate Bill 2018. It amends the Illinois Vehicle Code."

Mays: "Yeah, Madam Speaker, we would like to hold this for just a

136 Legislative Day

June 27, 1986

second while we get everything squared away on this."

- Speaker Breslin: "Out of the record. Senate Bill 2020,

 Representative White. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 2020, a Bill for an Act to amend the
 Illinois Public Aid Code. The House... or the Senate
 refused to concur with House Amendments #5. 6 and 7."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative White."
- White: "Madam Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, on Senate Amendments 5 and 6, I°d like to recede, and on Senate Amendment #7, I°d like to refuse to recede from that Amendment."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative White, has moved to recede from House Amendments #5 and 6 to Senate Bill 2020. Is there any discussion? All those in favor vote *aye*. all vote *no*. Voting is open. This pertains to Amendments 5 and 6. We are receding from these Amendments, Ladies and Gentlemen. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk On this question, there are 106 will take the record. voting 'aye', none voting 'no', and I voting 'present', and the House does recede from Amendments 5 and 6 to Bill 2020-Representative White, now moves to refuse to recede from House Amendment #7 to Senate Bill 2020discussion on that Motion? Hearing none, the anv question is, 'Shall the House refuse to recede from Bi11 2020 and requests a Conference Committee... Conference Committee. All those in favor say opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'aves' have it. and the House refuses to recede from House Senate Bill 2020: Amendment #7 t o and a Conference Committee will be appointed. Senate Bill 2108, Representative McPike. Out of the record. Senate Bill Representative O'Connell. Representative Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

136 Legislative Day

- June 27. 1986
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 2129, a Bill for an Act to amend the Code of Criminal Procedure. The Senate has refused to concur in House Amendment #2."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Daley."
- Daley: "Thank you, Madam Speaker and Members of the House. I ask
 that the House refuse to recede on House Amendment #2 and
 that a Conference Committee be appointed."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Daley requests that the House refuse to recede from House Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 2129. And on that question, the Gentleman from Macon, Representative Tate."
- Tate: "Thank you. Madam Speaker. I would just like to ask the Gentleman to explain what Amendment 2 does."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Dalev."
- Daley: "The Amendment... the Amendment, Representative, dealt with jury exemptions, juvenile law, narcotic offenses and the state's right to a jury trial."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Olson, on the question."
- Olson: "Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. Would the Sponsor yield?"
- Speaker Breslin: "He indicates he will."
- Olson: "Just to refresh my mind, is this the Bill which
 Representative O'Connell and Representative Davis spoke to
 just the other day, and this is the area where we're going
 to provide for the demands, state's attorney wise, with
 regard to narcotics use as far as trials are concerned?
 Thank you very much. I..."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Dale... Representative Daley,
 you have to speak closer to your microphone because your
 answers are not being recorded."
- Daley: "That's correct."
- Olson: "Thank you very much. I feel a little bit uncomfortable with that. I'm not going to be able to support you on

136 Legislative Day

June 27, 1986

this. Thank you."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Braun, on the Motion."

Braun: "Will the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Breslin: "He indicates he will."

Braun: "Representative Daley, Amendment 2 specifically referred to the state's right to a jury trial, is that correct, and it was rejected by the Senate?"

Daley: "That is correct."

Braun: "And, what was the vote in the Senate on that?"

Daley: "I... It was a voice vote."

Braun: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Daley has moved to refuse to recede from House Amendment #4. The question is, "Shall the House refuse to recede from House Amendment #4 to Senate Bill 2108 (sic - 2129)?" All those in favor say "aye", all those opposed say "no". In the opinion of the Chair, the "ayes" have it, and the House refuses to recede from House Amendment #4 to Senate Bill 2108... excuse me, House Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 2129, and a Conference Committee will be appointed. With leave of the Body, we'll go back to Senate Bill 1666. Hearing no objection, read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1666 (sic — Senate Bill 1666), a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. The Senate has refused to concur in House Amendments #1 and 2."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Cowlishaw."

Cowlishaw: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move to refuse to recede from House Amendments #1 and 2 to Senate Bill 1666. The original Bill provides a definition of the term 'dropout', and it also specifies that the State Board of Education shall give the General Assembly annually a report on high school dropout rates and students enrolled in bilingual education programs.

136 Legislative Day

June 27, 1986

changed the grade levels Amendment #1 effected from K through 12 to 1 through 12 because of the fact that in many cases kindergarten students dropout and begin instead. kindergarten year the following year And Amendment #2 defines dropout as a child who is nο longer attending either public or a private school. those provisions need to be included in this legislation. and for that reason, I urge that this Body refuse to recede from House Amendments #1 and 2 to Senate Bill 1666."

- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Cowlishaw moves that the House refuse to recede from House Amendments 1 and 2 1666. And on that question, is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, *Shall the House refuse from House Amendments 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 1666? All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the House refuses to recede from House Amendments 1 and Senate Bill 1666, and a Conference Committee will be appointed. Again, we are preparing now to go to the Order of Appropriations. If all staff Members would come to the floor, we would get underway. On the Order of Concurrence, appropriation Bills only, page three οn your first Bill. House Bill 2975. Representative Barnes. the record. House Bill 2976. Representative Barnes.
- Barnes: "Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move to concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2."
- "Representative Barnes moves to concur in Senate Speaker Breslin: Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 2976. And on that question, is there any discussion? Hearing none. *Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 2976?* A11 those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted

136 Legislative Day

June 27, 1986

who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 115 voting 'aye', none voting 'no', and none voting 'present'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 2976. House Bill 2978, Representative Barnes. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. That applies to House Bill 2976, Representative Barnes. Clerk, read the Bill."

- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2978, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Office of State Fire Marshall, together with Senate Amendments #1 and 2."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Barnes."
- Barnes: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the

 House. I move to concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to

 House Bill 2978."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Lady moves to concur in Senate Amendments
 #1 and 2 to House Bill 2978. And on that question, the
 Gentleman from Cook, Representative Leverenz."
- Leverenz: "Thank you. I agree with what she is doing if she can just simply say what those two Amendments do. It will satisfy some questions on my side."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Barnes, tell us what the Amendments do if you can, please."
- Leverenz: "Just a brief 1 and 2 do this and this, so the people over here know what we're doing and we're okay."
- Barnes: "To 2978, Senate Amendment #1 made guideline cuts totalling \$116,500 Fire Prevention Fund, cuts including phasing longterm vacancies 23,000; holding pay raises within guidelines \$47,500; elimination of funding for a lump sum vacation pay 12,500, as well as guideline cuts in other lines. Appropriates \$20,000 federal funds for the community fire prevention program. This includes \$10,000 received during Fiscal Year '86 which was not expended

136 Legislative Day

June 27, 1986

because the office lacked appropriation authority; transfers 1.3 million from the Fire Prevention Fund to the General Revenue Fund due to the fact that Fiscal Year *86 Prevention Fund receipts are almost 2.000.000 higher than estimated; increases the appropriation of the Chicago Fire Department Training Program by \$189.700 to account for the higher receipts mentioned above. The effective Senate Amendment #2 appropriates \$5,000 General Revenue Fund Office of the State Fire Marshall for the purpose of making grants to areas not currently located when the fire protection district to defray the cost of organizing new fire protection districts."

- Speaker Breslin: "The question is, "Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 2978?" 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 115 voting "aye", none voting "no", and none voting "present". And the House does concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 2978, and this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2979, Representative Barnes. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2979, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Liquor Control Commission, together with Senate Amendment #1."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Barnes."
- Barnes: "I move to concur in Senate Amendment 31 which just conforms with the guidelines. There is no dollar change."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Lady has moved to concur in Senate
 Amendment #1 to House Bill 2979. Is there any discussion?
 Hearing none, the question is, "Shall the House concur in
 Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2979?" All those in

136 Legislative Day

June 27, 1986

ave. all those opposed vote *no*. favor vote Voting is This is final action. open. Have all voted who Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 115 voting *aye*. none and none voting *present*, and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2979. and this 8111. having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby House Bill 2980. Clerk, read the declared passed. Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2980, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Illinois Educational Labor Relations Board, together with Senate Amendment #1."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Barnes."

Barnes: "I move to concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill
2980. Madam Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House,
and what it specifically does is decreases personal service
by \$21,000 and it conforms to guidelines."

Speaker Breslin: "The Lady has moved to concur in Amendment #1 to House Bill 2980. Is there any discussion? the question is. *Shall the House concur in Hearing none. Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2980? 411 in those vote "aye", all those opposed vote "no". favor Voting is This is final action. Have all voted open. who all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 114 voting 'ave', none and none voting *present*, and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2980, and this Rill. having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2981. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2981, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Local Labor Relations Board, together with Senate Amendment #1."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Barnes."

Barnes: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the

136 Legislative Day

June 27. 1986

House. I move to concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House
Bill 2981. It's a total reduction of \$26,900 from the
General Revenue Fund."

- Speaker Breslin: "The Lady has moved to concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2981. Is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 29817* A11 those favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is This is final action. Have all voted who wish? onen. The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 115 voting 'aye', none voting 'no', and none "present", and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2981, and this Bill. having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared. House Bill 2982. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2982, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the State Labor Relations Board, together with Senate Amendment #1."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Barnes."
- Barnes: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move to concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2982. The effect of the Amendment is a total reduction of \$9,300 from the General Revenue Fund."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Lady has moved to concur in Amendment #1 to House Bill 2982. Is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, *Shall the House concur Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2982? All those in favor vote "aye", all those opposed vote "no". Votina open. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the this question there are 110 voting "aye", none voting 'no', and none voting 'present', and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2982, and this Bill,

136 Legislative Day

June 27, 1986

having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared. House Bill 2983. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2983, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Health Care Cost Containment Council, together with Senate Amendment #1."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Hastert."

Hastert: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the
House. House Bill 2983 is the ordinary and contingent
expense to Health Care Cost Containment Council, and I move
to concur with Senate Amendment 1 which are guideline

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Hastert has moved to concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2983. Īs discussion? Hearing none, the question is Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 298324 All those in favor vote "aye", all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 114 voting 'aye', none voting *no*, and none voting 'present', and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2983, and this Bill, received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2984. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2984, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Guardianship and Advocacy Commission, together with Senate Amendments #1 and 2."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Hastert."

Hastert: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. House Bill 2984 is the ordinary and contingent expense of the Guardianship and Advocacy Commission, and I move to concur in Senate Amendment #1 which are our guideline cuts."

Speaker Breslin: "It's 2984, Mr. Clerk."

Hastert: "Correction. Amendment #1 and 2."

Speaker Breslin: "Okay. Representative Hastert moves that the

136 Legislative Day

June 27, 1986

in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill House concur 2984. Is there any discussion? Hearing none, the guestion is. 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments #1 Bi 11 2984?* All those in favor vote *ave*, all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. This action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. this question Ωn there are 109 voting 'aye', I voting 'no', and none voting *present*, and the House does concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 2984, and this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2986, Representative Barnes. Clerk. read the Bill."

- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2986, a Bill for an Act making appropriations of the Illinois Farm Development Authority, together with Senate Amendments #1 and 3."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Barnes."
- Barnes: "Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move to nonconcur in the Senate Amendments to House Bill 2986."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Lady has moved to nonconcur in Senate

 Amendments #1 and 3 to House Bill 2986. Is there any
 discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative
- Leverenz: "Thank you. Just to indicate that we agree and we'll be going to a Conference Committee."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has... yes, the Gentleman has moved to nonconcur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 2986. 1 and 3."
- Leverenz: "Just indicating we're agreeing with her."
- Speaker Breslin: "Okay. The question is, "Shall the House nonconcur in Senate Amendments #1 and 3 to House Bill 2986?" All those in favor say "aye", all those opposed say "no". In the opinion of the Chair, the "ayes" have it, and

136 Legislative Day

June 27, 1986

the House does nonconcur in Senate Amendments #1 and 3 to House Bill 2986. House Bill 2987. Representative Hastert. Clerk, read the Bill."

- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2987, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Department of Alcoholism and Substance Abuse, together with Senate Amendments #1 and 2."

 Speaker Breslin: "Representative Hastert."
- Hastert: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the
 House. House Bill 2987 is the ordinary and contingent
 expenses of the Department of Alcohol and Substance Abuse.

 I move to concur in Senate Amendment #1 which are guideline
 cuts and also Senate Amendment #2 which is phase in of
 certain... various vacancies."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved to concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 2987. Hearing question, is there any discussion? none. question is. 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 2987?* All those in favor vote *ave*. all those opposed vote *no*. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 115 voting *aye*, 1 voting *no*, and none voting *present*, and does concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to Bill 2987, and this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2988. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2988, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Department of Corrections, together with Senate Amendments #1, 2, 3, 45, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 and
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Barnes."
- Barnes: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move to nonconcur in the Senate Amendments in

136 Legislative Day

June 27, 1986

House Bill 2988 and request a Conference."

Speaker Breslin: "The Lady has moved to nonconcur in... All
Amendments, Representative Barnes? All that are..."

Barnes: "For all practical purposes, yes, Madam Speaker,"

Speaker Breslin: "Okay. The Lady has moved to concur in Senate Amendments #1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 and 11 to House Bill 2988. Is there any discussion on that nonconcurrence Motion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall the House nonconcur in Senate Amendments #1 through 11?* A11 favor sav 'aye', all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the House does nonconcur in Senate Amendments #1 through 11 to House Bill 2988. House Bill 2989, Representative Barnes. read the Bill."

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

Speaker Breslin: "Excuse me. The Clerk has to read the Bill first."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2989, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Department of Commerce and Community Affairs, together with Senate Amendments #1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28 and 29."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Barnes."

Barnes: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the
House. I refuse to concur with all the Senate Amendments
for practical purposes to House Bill 2989 and request a
Conference Committee."

Speaker Breslin: "The Lady refuse... the Lady moves to nonconcur in all of the Senate Amendments to House Bill 2989. Is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall the House nonconcur in all of the Senate Amendments to this Bill?' All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes'

136 Legislative Day

June 27, 1986

have it, and the House does nonconcur in all of the Senate

Amendments to House Bill 2989. House Bill 2990,

Representative Barnes. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2990, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Department of Financial Institutions together with Senate Amendments #1 and 2."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Barnes."

- Barnes: "Madam Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move to concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 2990.

 And Senate Amendment 1 deals with the Bureau of the Budget guidelines and Senate Amendment 2 is an increase of a \$163.000 General Revenue Fund."
- Speaker "The Lady has moved to concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 2990. Τc there anv discussion? Hearing none. the question is. "Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House 8111 299021 A11 those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. This is final action. who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. 0 n this question there are 113 voting 'ave'. none voting 'no'. and none voting 'present'. Representative Hawkinson wishes to vote *aye*. There Representative Black votes 'aye'. There are 115 100--voting "ave", none voting "no", and none voting and the House does concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 2990. House Bill 2991, Representative Leverenz. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2991. Bi 11 а for Act an making appropriations the Historic tο Preservation Agency, together with Senate Amendments #1, 2 and 4."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I would move the House would nonconcur in Senate Amendments 1, 2 and 4."

136 Legislative Day

June 27, 1986

- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Leverenz moves to nonconcur in Senate Amendments #1, 2 and 4 to House Bill 2991. And on that question, is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall the House nonconcur in Senate Amendments #1, 2 and 4 to House Bill 2991. All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the House does nonconcur in Senate Amendments #1, 2 and 4 to House Bill 2991. House Bill 2992. Clerk. read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2992, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Civil Service Commission, together with Senate Amendment #1."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Barnes."

- Barnes: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the
 House. I move to concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House
 Bill 2992. The effect of the Amendment is just confining
 itself to the Bureau of the Budget guidelines."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Lady has moved to concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2992. Is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall the House concur Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2992? All those in favor vote *aye*, all those opposed vote *no*. Have all voted who wish? This is final action. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 114 voting 'aye', none voting 'no'. and none voting 'present'. and the House does in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2992, and this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is declared passed. House Bill 2994. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2994, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Department of Registration and Education, together with Senate Amendment #1."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Barnes."

136 Legislative Day

June 27. 1986

- Barnes: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move to concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2994. The Amendment reduces GRF for a total of \$65,700."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Lady has moved to concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2994. Is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, *Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2994?* All those favor vote 'ave'... I got ... all those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 117 *ave*, none voting *no*, and none voting *present*, and the does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2994. House Bill 2995. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2995, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Department of Public Aid, together with Senate Amendments #1, 2, 4, 5 and 6."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Hastert."

- Hastert: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of House Bill 2995 is the ordinary and contingent House. Public Aid. expenses for the Department of We move to concur in Senate Amendment #1 which is an addition. Also. Senate Amendment #2 which is an increase in domestic violent shelters... violence shelters. Senate Amendment #4 federal demonstration grant. and Amendment #6 which is a grant to Human Services."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Hastert has moved to concur in Senate Amendments #1, 2, 4, 5 and 6 to House Bill 2995.

 And on that question... Excuse me. Did you include Senate Amendment #5?"
- Hastert: "I believe I did, but I would move to concur with Senate

 Amendment #5."

136 Legislative Day

June 27, 1986

- Speaker Breslin: "Very good. He moves to concur in all οf the Senate Amendments to House Bill 2995. Ιc there anv discussion? Hearing none, the question is, •Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments #1, 2, 4, 5, and 6 to House Bill 2995?* All those in favor vote *ave*. opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are Ill voting 'aye', 4 voting 'no', and 1 voting 'present'. the House does concur in Senate Amendments #1, 2, 4, 5 and 6 to House Bill 2995, and this Bill, having received Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2997. Clerk, read the Bill. Excuse me. Bill 2996."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2996, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Department of Public Health and the Governor's Council of Health and Physical Fitness, together with Senate Amendments #1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Hastert."

- Hastert: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. 2996 is the ordinary contingent expenses for the Department of Public Health, and I move to concur in all Senate Amendments."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman moves to concur in Senate Amendments #1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7 to House Bill 2996. 15 any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, *Shall the House concur in all the Senate Amendments House Bill 2996? All those in favor vote 'ave'. all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who The wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 112 voting 'aye', 1 voting 'no', and 2 voting 'present', and the House does concur in Senate Amendments #1, 2, 3, 4, 6 and 7 to House Bill 2996. House Bill 2997. Clerk. read

136 Legislative Day

June 27. 1986

the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2997, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Department of Rehabilitation Services, together with Senate Amendments #1, 2 and 3."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Hastert."

- Hastert: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 2997 is for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Department of Rehabilitation Services. I move to concur in Amendment #1 which makes guideline reductions. Senate Amendment #2 which deals with the Vocational Rehabilitation Fund. Senate Amendment #3... And ask for your concurrence in those Amendments."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved to concur in Senate Amendments #1, 2 and 3 to House Bill 2997. And ΔD is there any discussion? There being ១០ discussion, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments #1, 2 and 3 to House Bill 2997?* AII those in favor vote *aye*, all those opposed vote Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted The Clerk will take the record. there are 115 voting 'aye', none voting 'no', and 1 voting *present*, and the House does concur in Senate 2 and 3 to House Bill 2997, and this Bill, Amendments #1. having received the Constitutional Majority. is declared passed. House Bill 2998. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2998, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Department of Transportation, together with Senate Amendments #1, 3, 6, 7, 8, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17 and 18."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I would move that the House nonconcur in those Senate Amendments enumerated by the Clerk at this time."

136 Legislative Day

June 27. 1986

- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Leverenz has moved that the House nonconcur in Senate Amendments #1. 3. 6. 7. 14, 15, 16, 17 and 18. And on that question, is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall House concur in those Senate Amendments... not concur. rather, in those Senate Amendments previously enumerated to House Bill 2998? All those in favor say 'aye', all opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the House does nonconcur in all the Senate House Bill 2998. House Bill 2999. Amendments to Clerka read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2999, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Department of Transportation together with Senate Amendment #1."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Barnes."
- Barnes: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move to concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2999. The effect of the Senate Amendment is a total reduction of \$256,092,907."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Lady has moved to concur #1 to House Bill 2999. And on that question. is Amendment there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is. in Senate Amendment #1 to House *Shall the House concur Bill 2999?* All those vote 'ave'. in favor all opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 111 voting 'ave', none voting 'no', and none voting 'present', and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2999, and this Bill. having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Bill 3000. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3000, a Bill for an Act making

136 Legislative Day

June 27, 1986

appropriations to the Department of Mines and Minerals, together with Senate Amendments #1, 2, 3 and 4.

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Barnes."

you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the "Thank Barnes: I move to concur in Senate Amendments #1. 2. 3. 4 House. to House Bill 3000. Senate Amendment #1 reduces some of the agency operations according to guidelines. Senate #2 breaks out some of the funding Amendment for a passthrough. Amendment #3 is a no dollar change, just some transfers, and Amendment #4 increases the lump sum through federal funds."

Speaker "The Lady has moved to concur in Senate Amendments #1 through 4 in House Bill 3000. Is there anv discussion? Hearing none. the question is. *Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments #1 through 4 in House Bill 30007* A11 those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. This is final Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 114 voting "ave". 1 voting "no". and none voting 'present', and the House does concur Senate Amendments #1, 2, 3 and 4 to House Bill 3000, and this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, hereby declared passed. House Bill 3001. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3001, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Department of Human Rights, together with Senate Amendments #1 and 2."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Hastert."

Hastert: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the
House. House Bill 3001 is the ordinary and contingent
expense of the DHR. I move to concur with the Senate
Amendments 1 and 2."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman moves to concur in Senate

136 Legislative Day

June 27 . 1986

Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 3001. Is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 3001?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Is the voting open?"

Hastert: "Speaker."

- Speaker Breslin: "Excuse me. Representative Hastert. None of us are being recorded. Just a minute. All those in favor concurring in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 3001 should be voting 'ave'. This is final passage. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk On this question there are 105 voting take the record. 'ave'. 7 voting 'no'. and 3 voting 'present'. and the House does concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House and this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House 8111 3002-Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3002, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Human Rights Commission, together with Senate Amendments #1 and 2."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Hastert."

- Hastert: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 3002 is the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Human Rights Commission. And I move to concur with Senate Amendment #1 which is a... reduces the Commission budget by \$33,000, and the guideline cut in Senate Amendment #2."
- Speaker Breslin: *The Gentlemen has moved to concur in #1 and 2 to House Bill 3002. Is there any Amendments •Shall discussion? Hearing none, the question is, the House concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill All those in favor vote *aye*, 30027* all those vote 'no'. Voting is open. This is final action. Have

136 Legislative Day

June 27, 1986

all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 103 voting "aye", 6 voting 'no', and none voting 'present', and House does concur... Representative Laurino 'aye'. Representative Panayotovich votes *aye*. Representative Brookins votes *ave*. Representative Washington votes "ave". Representative Nelson Rice votes 'ave'. Representative Pangle votes 'aye'. And Representative Christensen votes 'aye'. Have all voted who On this question there are 110 voting 'ave'. 6 voting 'no', and none voting 'present', and the House does in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 3002. House Bill 3003. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3003, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Industrial Commission, together with Senate Amendment #1."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Barnes."

Barnes: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move to concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3003. That reduces the budget by \$67,900 and guideline cuts."

Speaker Breslin: "The Lady moves to concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House 8111 3003. Is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Amendment #1 to House Bill 3003? All those in favor vote "aye", all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? will take the record. On this question there are 110 voting "aye", 4 voting 'no", and 1 voting 'present', and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bi 11 3003, and this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill Clerk, read the Bill."

136 Legislative Day

June 27, 1986

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3004, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Medical Center Commission, together with Senate Amendments #1 and 2."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Hastert."

Hastert: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 3004 is the ordinary contingent expenses of the Medical Center Commission. I'd ask to concur in Senate Amendment #1 and Senate Amendment #2."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved to concur in Senate
Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 3004. And on that
question, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative
Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Yes, Madam Speaker, this is final passage?"

Speaker Breslin: "It is."

Cullerton: "Representative... Will the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Breslin: "He will."

Cullerton: "Representative Hastert, what is the Medical Center

Commission? I thought we abolished all commissions."

Hastert: "Well, the Senate... Senate... I'm sorry. Excuse me.

The Medical Center Commission is a Commission that is tied with the University of Illinois to propagate economic development around the University of Illinois Hospital and Medical Center district in the near west side in Chicago."

Cullerton: "And how much is their budget?"

Hastert: "It's \$976,000."

Cullerton: "And how much of that goes to personnel? How many people do they have working for them?"

Hastert: "They have eight people working for them. The amount is approximately \$200,000."

Cullerton: "And so, where does the other \$700,000 go?"

Hastert: "One of the purposes of the Medical Center Commission is
to buy land for the district, and they buy that land and

136 Legislative Day

June 27, 1986

develop it and then are paid back for that land."

Cullerton: "So, how much money are we spending on things other
than the ordinary and contingent expenses of the personnel
services and travel and contractual services and the like,
how much more are we spending on other items such as land

Hastert: "Well, part of this is GRF, and only about half of this budget is GRF, I think, \$490,000, but the rest of that is Medical Center interest income funds, and that's 372,000.

That money is reappropriated, 200,000 of that is reappropriated every year to buy land. If that land is not purchased, then that money is not spent."

Cullerton: "I see. Then what are the Senate Amendments that we're concurring with? What do they do?"

Hastert: "I beg your pardon?"

Cullerton: "What are the Senate Amendments that we're concurring with? What do they do?"

Hastert: "We are concurring with Senate Amendment #1 which reduces personal service lines, a total \$2.400 which includes retirement, social security lines, and Senate Amendment #2 appropriates \$105,900 for the purpose building a temporary parking lot in the Center for the Chicago technological park, and that was an agreement that we had because there was a House Amendment that was removed by the Senate. This was necessary for them to have parking for tenants that they had, that they had entered into contracts with... with the Medical Center Commission. And that's what those two Amendments did."

Cullerton: "Fine. Thank you very much."

Hastert: "You're welcome."

Speaker Breslin: "Is there any further discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 3004?' All those in

136 Legislative Day

June 27, 1986

favor vote "aye", all those opposed vote "no". Voting is open. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 105 voting "aye", 6 voting "no", and 2 voting "present", and the House does concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 3004, and this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3005. Out of the record. Out of the record.

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3006, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the State Emergency Services and Disaster Agency, together with Senate Amendments #1 and 2."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Barnes."

Barnes: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move to concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 3006. The effect of Senate Amendment #1 is a total reduction for some guidelines of \$24,200, and the effect of Senate Amendment #2 is merely a transfer."

Speaker Breslin: "The Lady moves to concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 3006. Is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall the House concur Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 3006? All those in favor vote 'ave', all those opposed vote "no". open. This is final passage. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. this question there are 113 voting 'aye', none voting On 'no', and none voting 'present', and the House does concur Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 3006, and this having received the Constitutional Majority, hereby declared passed. House Bill 3035. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3035, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Secretary of State together with

136 Legislative Day

June 27. 1986

Senate Amendments #1. 2. 3 and 4."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Hensel."

- Hensel: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Members of the Assembly. I move to concur with Senate Amendments 1, 2, 3 and 4. The effect of Senate Amendment #1 makes a total reduction of \$3,141,365. Senate Amendment #2 adds \$250,000 to the General Revenue Fund. Senate Amendment #3 adds \$139,200. It also makes some restorations and transfers. Senate Amendment #4 adds \$100,000. I ask for a favorable vote."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved to concur in Senate Amendments #1 through 4 on House Bill 3035. T s there discussion? Hearing none, the question is. *Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments #1, 2, 3 and 4 to House Bill 3035?* A11 those in favor vote "ave", all those opposed vote *no*. Voting is open. This is final all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 112 voting 'ave'. none voting 'no'. and none voting 'present'. and the House does concur in Senate Amendments #1 through 4 to House Bill 3035, and this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Bill 3050. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3050, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the State Board of Education together with Senate Amendment #1."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Bowman."
- Bowman: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Amendment #1 reduces the appropriation of this Bill to one dollar. So, I, therefore, move to nonconcur in Senate Amendment #1."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman moves to nonconcur in Senate

 Amendment #1 to House Bill 3050. Is there any discussion?

 Hearing none, the question is, *Shall the House nonconcur

136 Legislative Day

June 27. 1986

in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3050? All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the House nonconcurs in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3050. House Bill 3090. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3090, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the State Board of Education together with Senate Amendments #1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 8, 10, 13, 14 and 15."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Madam Speaker, the... House Bill 3090 is the Bill to appropriate monies for grants in the ordinary contingent expenses of the State Board of Education. Amendment #1 makes a reduction in the operation adds 75,000 for high school transition Board and programs. Amendment 2 transfers appropriations contained in the school reform program Bill with some adjustments. Amendment #3 adds 150.000 for the Summer School for the Amendment 4 adds 50.000 Arts. for grants to reduce illiteracy. Amendment 5 is a 20,000 increase to 130-000 the Government Student Internship Program. Amendment #8 increases gifted ed reimbursement program by \$2,500,000. Amendment 10 reduces early ed by \$3,520,000 and increases the truant alternative dropout the same amount in program. Amendment 13 adds 50.000 for ag education. increases the Mathematics and Science Academy 14 bν \$3,103,712. Amendment 15 adds 100,000 for grant t o the Entrepreneurial Rural Government Finance and Policy I move to concur with Senate Amendments 1. 2. 4, 5, 8, 10, 13, 14 and 15."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Matijevich moves to concur in Senate Amendments #1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 8, 10, 13, 14 and 15 to House Bill 3090. And on that question, is there any

136 Legislative Day

June 27, 1986

discussion? Hearing none... The Gentleman from McLean.

Representative Ropp, on the question.

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

Speaker Breslin: "He indicates he will."

Ropp: "Representative, are you concurring with Amendment 13, and if you are, I think we conversed on this about the possible increase in some other appropriation, is that being considered?"

Matijevich: "We're not aware of it being anywhere else."

Ropp: "Well, I thought that there was some consideration that was supposed to put some additional money because this is a total insult to the whole program that was established in 3200 or later, 2255."

Matijevich: "Move the adoption... move to concur with the Amendments that I have iterated."

Speaker Breslin: "He doesn't wish to answer any further questions, Representative Ropp. Do you wish to speak to the question?"

Ropp: "Well, yes, on this particular issue, it is rather substantial, major concern that we have dealing with ag education. I think we had about a 1,000 young involving FFA down a couple of days ago. I think there is general support to move in this program and that 3200 passed with something like 113 votes. did put in Me \$5,000,000 initially which was granted rather a substantial amount. I'm telling this Body that 50,000 is a total insult to this program, and I would ask that we not support this unless we get some consideration that we're able to consider putting something in some other Bill which is I thought that we had possibility. and ifa... Same discussion about this issue on the other side and 1 * m willing to support the total acceptance of all of these if this is all that we're getting. It just... you as

136 Legislative Day

June 27, 1986

well not even do anything as to give this amount. That's \$125 per high school that's teaching ag. That doesn't do anything."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Satterthwaite, on the Motion."

Satterthwaite: "Sponsor yield for a question, please?"

Speaker Breslin: "He indicates he will."

Satterthwaite: "As I understand it, John, the reform package now in this Bill, and I think, perhaps. some explanation needs to be made in regard to the lack Part of our reform funding for summer school programs. package, of course, was to encourage our school districts have summer school programs on a reimbursement basis, and I would not like to leave the local school the impression that thev are not aoina reimbursed.

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Representative Satterthwaite, I share your concerns, however, there are no funds here for the summer school program. That's one part of the school reform that we do not finance through this appropriation Bill."

Satterthwaite: "Is it my understanding, however, that we intend to fund those programs in next year's budget?"

Matiievich: "Right."

Satterthwaite: "And so, the school districts can assume that if
they go forward with summer school programs this year,
there will be reimbursement provided."

Matijevich: "You're... you're absolutely right. It will be shifted over to next year's appropriation."

Satterthwaite: "Fine, I just think we ought to have that on record that we are making a commitment, however, to follow through with that portion of our reform package and provide reimbursement even though the timing may be somewhat different than we had originally anticipated."

136 Legislative Day

June 27 • 1986

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Bowman, on the Motion."

- "Yes, thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise in support of the Bowman: Gentleman's Motion. I just want to comment on a couple of issues that have been raised. Representative Ropp had spoken with me about the agricultural education program. and I indicated that because there was a very delicate balance achieved among various programs in this Bill that there was a lot of sentiment from keeping this Bill out of Conference Committee. However. I did agree to work with him in trying to see what could be done to enhance that particular program's funding in some other Bill. We did send House Bill 3050 to Conference. I am the Bill, and I'm sure that there are a few loose ends in addition to Representative Ropp's loosed end that needs tied up in some other Bill. and we already have moved the Bill into a position to deal with that and I promised work with him. And so, I think this Bill is in proper shape to be moved out as it is with that addendum. So. support the Motion."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Hoffman. Representative Hoffman, on the Motion."
- Hoffman: "Thank you very much, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Given the givens in terms of the resources available and the needs of the programs, I rise in support of the... of concurring in Senate Amendments to House Bill 3090."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Lee, Representative Olson, on the Motion."
- Olson: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'd like to rise and join with Representative Ropp in his concerns with the effect of Senate Amendment #13.

 It is not the kind of message we should be sending to our agriculture community, particularly in view of the impact

136 Legislative Day

June 27, 1986

of agricultural exports in this state, and I'm extremely disappointed that it comes down in this form."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Klemm, on the Motion."

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

Speaker Breslin: "He indicates he will."

Klemm: "Representative, I noticed on Senate Amendment #3 we have
a 150,000 in GRF for the Illinois Summer School for the
Arts. Is that correct? Would you turn on the Sponsor,
Representative Matijevich?"

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Yes, Sir, Dick."

Klemm: "Is that what you were looking for, \$150,000?"

Matijevich: "That... that's right. That's for start up for the Summer School for the Arts. The fact of the matter is that we've got in the community college Bill also, but we want to avoid a Conference Committee on this..."

Klemm: "Okay. My question was that on Senate Bill 1611, you have
a 150,000 on Amendment 1, and I didn't know if... You're
going to take that off, then, later on?"

Matijevich: "I had spoken to the staff about taking it off of this Bill, but... so that we get no confusion when the Bill goes back to the Senate. They would rather that I concur in all Amendments. I appreciate your concern that it not be in two places."

Klemm: "Well, that's what I was wondering about."

Matijevich: "I don't like to do business that way, but I am taking their advice in having it in two places,"

Klemm: "So, it will go to... you're recommending it goes to the

Governor in two places, but you only need one of them."

Matijevich: "Yeah. Sure. I want to make the Governor look good where he can cut the 150,000 out of this, and, you know, it looks like he's really slashing."

Klemm: "But really only 150,000."

136 Legislative Day

June 27 • 1986

Matijevich: "Right."

Klemm: "And so the Governor is going to do one or the other."

Matijevich: "Correct. Correct."

Klemm: "Alright. Thank you very much."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Cowlishaw, on the Motion."

Cowlishaw: "Thank you. Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the I, too, stand in support of this concurrence Houses In most respects when these Amendments are all taken together along with the underlying Bill, we have something which, I believe, is comparatively fair. each of us might want to shift some of these monies from one program to another, but the fact is that I believe whole, this is comparatively fair. Absolutely, the only objection that I can find to it is that, in fact, to education and to education reform could be met better with a larger number of dollars, but that's true in all state programs. On the whole, I think this is a balanced measure. I think it helps us to fulfill our truly solemn obligation to education, and I move the previous question."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Cowlishaw, I can't recognize the move of the previous question when a Member has spoken on the issue, but there are no other Members seeking recognition except Representative Ropp. And you have already spoken in debate, Sir. It is not proper to speak again. Representative Ropp, for what reason do you rise?"

Ropp: "Madam Speaker, I was going to move to divide the question on 13."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman moves to divide the question so that the Motion applies to all other Amendments, save Senate Amendment #13. Is that correct?"

Ropp: "Yes, Ma'am."

Speaker Breslin: "Is there any discussion of the Motion?

136 Legislative Day

June 27 • 1986

Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "I have a problem with that, Representative Ropp. Senate Amendment #13, I believe that's the number in any event, the Amendment with the relation to There is every effort to keep this 8111 So, if this goes back - and let's Conference Committee. say that we did vote, you know, we want to express concern about rural agricultural education - and it went back to the Senate in nonconcurring, they would very recede, and you'd get absolutely zero. And I don't think you want that to happen. So, it's alright to divide, but I hope that when we do divide that we concur Amendment, because then the issue is you want \$50,000 for ag ed or nothing. I believe Representative Woods says that in another vehicle Bill - and there are some vehicles and there is one on education also - that is going to make every effort to increase the appropriation for agricultural education, but I don't think this is the way to do it. You have the right to divide, but I would hope that you withdraw that and work with Woody Bowman, and he's going to be on every Conference Committee relating to appropriations."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Hoffman. The Gentleman..."

Hoffman: "Thank you... thank you, Madam Speaker. With all due respect to the interest of the... of the Gentleman to divide this question, if we divide anything off and don't get a recede on the part of the Senate, and there is a big difference here, we throw it all into Conference, and I don't think it's in our best interest to do this. And I would hope that the Gentleman withdraws his Motion in terms of the better and the bigger good."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Ropp, do you persist in your right to divide the question?"

136 Legislative Day

June 27. 1986

- Ropp: "Madam Speaker, with the understanding that Representative Matijevich has that he, too, in good faith will work on behalf of this with Representative Bowman and others, I'll withdraw this Motion, because I do have faith in their judgment. This particular amount is a total insult to the whole program, and I... I'll allow this Bill to move, but we certainly want to do better in 3050."
- Speaker Breslin: "The question is, "Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments #1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 8, 10, 13, 14 and 15 to House Bill 3090?" All those in favor vote "aye", all those opposed vote "no". Voting is open. Representative Mulcahey, one minute to explain your vote."
- Mulcahey: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I, likewise, am aoina a protest. especially on Senate Amendment #13. register discussing here for which we have heen the nast And also to let the record show that I very minutes. strongly object to the increase for the grant in the Illinois Mathematics and Science Academy of OVER \$3,000,000, which I think is worthless, but you can't throw the baby out with the bath water, and I vote "aye"."
- Speaker Breslin: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will the record. Excuse me. Representative Dunn votes 'aye'. On this question there are 1... there are 108 voting 'aye', 7 voting 'no'. and none voting 'present'. and the House does concur in Senate Amendments #1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 8, 10, 13, 15 to House Bill 3090, and this Bill, having and received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3091, Representative Steczo. The Gentleman here? Representative Matijevich, will you handle that Bill? Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3091, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the State Board of Education together with Senate Amendments #1 and 2."

136 Legislative Day

June 27, 1986

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Madam Speaker, this is the Bill for the general state aid for education, summer school payments and other supplementary payments. Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3091 is a total net reduction of 23,345,100. Senate Amendment #2... Senate Amendment #2 has a total of 11,500,000 in elementary supplementary funds and 10,000,000 for the City of Chicago. I would move to concur with Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 3091."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Matijevich moves to concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 3091. And on that question, is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 3091?' Representative Mulcahey, do you wish to discuss this question?"

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

Speaker Breslin: "He indicates he will."

Mulcahey: "Representative Matijevich, there is a restoration of 8,000,000 for supplementary state aid payments to elementary districts. Would you explain that?"

Matijevich: "That is Senate Amendment #1..."

Mulcahey: "Number... #2."

Matijevich: "Right at 2. Senate Amendment #2. From three and a half million to 11,500,000."

Mulcahey: "According to what I have right here, it restores 8,000,000 for supplementary state aid."

Matijevich: "Correct."

Mulcahey: "What is that ... what is that for? What's ... "

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Pangle, on the Motion."

Matijevich: "That's for the... to continue the hold harmless that we had for elementary education."

Mulcahey: "Okay, that is the hold harmless provision for elementary, and that's for one year?"

136 Legislative Day

June 27. 1986

Matijevich: "Correct."

Mulcahey: "Okay, and then, the... what is the... what is the 10,000,000 for for supplementary payments to district 299?"

Matijevich: "That's a grant to the City of Chicago school district."

Mulcahey: "For what, John?"

Matijevich: "That's a grant probably to live up to a commitment that was made earlier, I'm sure."

Mulcahey: "Okay, so we're talking..."

Matijevich: "Half... half a commitment, I guess."

Mulcahey: "We're talking in terms of a two year contract that was... was given to the Chicago school teachers and the Governor promised to provide the funds necessary for that.

So, this is the 10,000,000 that will go towards... towards that commitment."

Matijevich: "We're not sure it was a promise. It depends on how you read it."

Mulcahey: "Thank you."

Matijevich: "Pledge."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Pangle, on the Motion."

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

Speaker Breslin: "He will."

Pangle: "Representative, is Amendment #2 — I just wanted some clarification, if I could please — is Amendment #2 \$10,000,000 for a school district in Chicago?"

Matijevich: "There is only one school district in Chicago."

Pangle: "Okay. And is that going to be all of the taxpayers throughout the total State of Illinois that's going to be paying that \$10,000,000?"

Matijevich: "They pay for everything else."

Pangle: "Okay, and so, in other words, the people that might live in my district, if I should vote for this Bill, will be

136 Legislative Day

June 27, 1986

voting for an extra \$10,000,000 for the Cook County School District. Is that correct?"

Matijevich: "It's no different than the taxpayers in Chicago paying for your school district too."

Pangle: "But this is an extra \$10,000,000, right?"

Matijevich: "Well, it all depends on how you use the word

extra."

Pangle: "Thank you. To the Bill, Madam Speaker."

Speaker Breslin: "Proceed."

Pangle: "I just wanted to bring it to the attention of the downstaters, in fact, this is the Bill that we discussed in reference to the, what I feel, is the additional \$10,000,000 to bail out the Cook County School District last year made by the Governor."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Marion, Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Breslin: "He will."

Friedrich: "Representative Matijevich, we're appreciative of getting this money back in for the hold harmless, but where is the substantive language? I've been told that there is a question about that since we're fanning our wings here if we just provide the money and then no enabling legislation."

Matijevich: "Well, we haven't adjourned yet, Dwight."

Friedrich: "Well, I'm aware of that. I just want some kind of commitment out of you or somebody on that side of the aisle that we're going to get the substantive language."

Matijevich: "Well, you know, around here you wait long enough, you can see anything. So, I'm sure we'll have some language."

Friedrich: "Is that... is that... I assume that's a commitment.

You're sure?"

136 Legislative Day June 27, 1986

Matijevich: "I'm never sure of anything."

Friedrich: "I thought you were. Well, we do need the substantive language."

Matijevich: "There are vehicles. There are vehicles though."

Friedrich: "I would call it to the attention of the Hembers that while we're getting the money in this appropriation, it will be futile unless we can get the enabling legislation also."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Bowman, on the Motion."

thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of Bowman: "Yes, I rise in support of the Motion to concur the House. in Amendments. I would just like to point out to Senate those people who feel that somehow there is extra money for Chicago that they are being injured. Let me make two points. Number one, we have in this same Bill money for supplemental appropriations additional to elementary school districts throughout the state, and I'm these districts are in Representative sure number of Pangle's area as well as in most other districts in this This money is over and above the regular state aid money is provided grant. for in substantive legislation that, as far as I know, hasn't yet passed, and so, we are kind of going out on the limb here. for the elementary school districts throughout the state. I think fair is fair that we have in this Bill money to balance interests in city and suburban and rural areas. would encourage people to, indeed, to vote their interest. And think if you vote your own interest, vou'll be voting for this Bill. The other point I like to make for those who somehow feel that... that it is wrong under any circumstances to put additional money in... to fund the Chicago school settlement that was

136 Legislative Day

June 27, 1986

fail to do this. there is every that i f we reason to believe that there will be a strike in the then, because the Governor is on the hook, we'll be hearing a Special Session in the fall during campaign time, and I think that is a prospect that everybody should wish avoid. So. if you wish to avoid a rancorous Special Session in which nobody is going to come out the winner, and if you wish to vote for a Bill that has, indeed, something for everybody, then I think you want tο support the Gentleman's Motion and concur in Amendments 1 and 2."

Speaker Breslin: "The Lady from DuPage, Representative
Cowlishaw."

Cowlishaw: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the I stand in support of this concurrence Motion. House. Wе ought not to be passing anything here, because we want avoid unpleasantness at some later period of time. Me ought to be passing things because we believe them to bе and fair and balanced and iust. That's what [right believe that this is. There are some provisions for the school settlement for the City of Chicago. Those are essential to continue the system of education in Chicago. are some provisions to help elementary Those are the same provisions to which a year ago as part of the education reform package. but the most important element in this Bill is that with these Amendments adopted, and we need to all be aware of this because it is what, and I do not like this term. but it is what is now called the bottom line. The fact is that Bill as amended provides overall in appropriations for the fourth coming fiscal year 8.5% over that appropriation for this year, and that increase will help us all. And I move the previous question."

136 Legislative Day

June 27, 1986

Speaker Breslin: "Representative... Representative Klemm, on the Motion."

- Klemm: Madam Speaker. When we had House Bill 3091, "Thank vou. we passed an Amendment which was mine to give us the hold barmless. it was about 11.9 something million. After it went to the Senate, we adopted that, as you know. on the hold harmless for the elementary districts. When it went to the Senate, we found out we didn't really and the State Board had recommended that it be And I think what they did in Senate Amendment and #2 was to remove and then restore to the level of what the State Board said we needed for the hold harmless, which was about \$500,000 less than what we sent over there. really it's meeting the needs of our elementary districts that we had fought for before. and it does dollars on that, and I understand language will be. hopefully, adopted before we leave to give us a substantive language to expend that money. So, I stand in support of the Amendment."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentlemen from Rock Island, Representative

 DeJaegher."
- DeJaegher: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. John, for my personal benefit, constructed in 3091 are two elements. One element basically is that we will provide an additional \$10,000,000 in funding for the Chicago School District. Is that right? Also, John, structured within 3091, there is also a \$11,000,000 appropriation for elementary schools."
- Matijevich: "Yes, for the hold harmless provision which as someone said we are working on in, I'm sure, will be Conference Committee for the substantive language."
- DeJaegher: "The next question then, John, if this does not get the necessary votes, there is a possibility that this could go into Conference, and we could possibly lose \$11,000,000

136 Legislative Day

June 27, 1986

in elementary fund for downstate school districts."

Matijevich: "That's always a possibility."

DeJaegher: "Thank you, John."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative

you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Hoffman: "Thank I stand in support of House Bill 3091. It well illustrates the importance of this kind of a process where we can come together in some middle ground. who had questions in reference to the statutory language on the elementary hold harmless. it's understanding that that will be coming back to us in a Conference Committee Report, and will opportunity to vote that issue. And so. I stand in on support of House Bill 3091."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from St. Clair, Representative

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

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Flinn 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 Matijevich, to close."

Matijevich: "Madam Speaker, I appreciate the support of the Body on the Motions to concur. The only two issues I hear is the fact that we have not yet passed the substantive language on the hold harmless provision. I don't think we ought to stop this appropriation Bill, and we are working on that substantive language. The other relates to the grant for the City of Chicago. I think, in the Body of this Bill, we have taken care of, through the school aid formula, and downstate does fairly well with the formula.

136 Legislative Day

June 27, 1986

I would appreciate the support of the concurrence Motion.*

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman moves to concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 3091. All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open.

Representative Huff, one minute to explain your vote."

- Huff: "Yes. Madam Speaker, in explaining my vote. I just want the record to show that not one dime of this extra money will go to enhance the curriculum of education in the school district of Chicago. I think we've stretched this euphulsm beyond all rounds of credibility when we say we are funding education when, in fact, we are just funding the special interest of those entities that are plugged into the educational system in Chicago. ₩e must notwithstanding the fact that we fund 1.600.000.000 dollars to the school system in Chicago, Chicago remains a 2% school system, because 98% of every dollar that goes into that system goes to these special interest groups and is it any wonder, Ladies an $oldsymbol{\phi}_i$ Gentlemen, that we continue to produce 80% dropout at the high school levels and 50% of the graduating students from ... *
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Brunsvold, one minute to explain your vote."
- Brunsvold: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. To explain my *present*
 vote, I agree with everything on the education Bill except
 for the money to solve the strike in Chicago. We had a
 strike in my district, a small district in Mercer County.
 The Governor did not come down at that time and solve our
 strike problem there. Our teachers got a \$50.00 raise last
 year in Wenona, and that's why I'm voting 'present' on this
 Bill and object to the Governor interfering with the
 collective bargaining process. Thank you."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Van Duyne, one minute to explain your vote."

136 Legislative Day

June 27, 1986

- Van Duyne: "Yes, thank you, Madam Speaker. I think there is a little bit of confusion about this. The simplistic version of this is that the City of Chicago gets 10,000,000 dollars downstate gets the other eleven, and that's kind of a half way reasonable approach, but one thing ſ think people are forgetting is that Cook County is not most removed from this. So, of that 11,000,000 dollars that's supposed to be downstate, Cook County is going to be in there fighting for their portion of this too. So. I figure that when the ... all the arguments are all over that Will County will probably come out with about ten or 15,000 dollars out of this, and I don't think that's good for Will County. So, I'm voting 'no'."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Ropp, one minute to explain your vote."
- Ropp: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I don't want to beat a dead horse necessarily to death, but this is actually the Bi11 that had the \$5,000,000 in for agricultural education. And don*t know why it ever got into 3090. supported education whole heartedly. I'm just really pleased with the idea that we have that. *Well we*11 work with you. I certainly think we need more of a commitment than. 'Well. I'll be happy to work with you. And I have good faith in all these people, but the Senate seems to not have the same kind of philosophy, but... that's why I'm voting 'no'."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Satterthwaite, one minute to explain your vote."
- Satterthwaite: "Madam Speaker and Members of the House, in the legislation that we passed last year, we agreed for a one year hold harmless for elementary school districts in the recognition that we have been disadvantaging unit districts throughout the state for years. That was to be a one year

136 Legislative Day

June 27, 1986

agreement. The fact that this now extends that to a second year is a disadvantage to every school district that does not... that is something other than an elementary district. I think for that reason, we should not be supporting this Bill unless we have a large number of separate elementary school districts within our legislative district. And for that reason. I'm voting 'no'."

- Speaker Breslin: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. Representative Hicks, votes 'aye'. On this question, there are 80... Representative Hicks. On this question, there are 83 voting 'aye', 31 voting 'no', and 2 voting 'present'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 3091. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3092. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3092, a Bill for an Act making appropriations from the Common School Fund to the State Board of Education together with Senate Amendment #1."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Hastert."

- Hastert: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move to... 3092 is the appropriation to the State Board of Education and down state teachers... Chicago Teachers. Retirement System and move to concur in Senate Amendment #1, and that brings it at a 60% level of payout."
- Breslin: "The Gentleman moves to concur in Speaker Amendment #1 to House Bill 3092. And on that question. there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, *Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 30927* 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 113 voting "aye", 2 voting 'no", and 1 voting 'present'.

136 Legislative Day

June 27. 1986

And the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill. having Bill 3092. And this received the Majority, is hereby declared passed. Constitutional House excuse me, House **Bill** 3093, Representative Mati ievich. Clerk. read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3093, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Department of Central Management Services together with Senate Amendment #1."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Matijevich."

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

Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3093 cuts in half from

500,000 to 250,000 monies needed to implement the

Employees* Suggestion Award Program under the Department of

Central Management Services. I move to concur with Senate

Amendment #1."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman moves to concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3093. And on that question, is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, *Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to 3093?* All those in favor vote "ave", all those Voting is open. This is final opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are none voting 'no", and none 114 voting *ave*. votina And the House does concur in Senate Amendment *present*. to House Bill 3093. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is here... hereby declared passed. Representative Stange wish to have been recorded as voting 'ave' on House Bill 3093. House Bi11 3165. Representative Bowman. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3165, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to various agencies together with Senate Amendments #1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14,

136 Legislative Day

June 27, 1986

15, 16, 17, 18, 19, and 20."

- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Bowman, are you presenting this?"

 Representative Bowman."
- Bowman: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is a supplemental appropriation to various state agencies and; because, there are always last minute things that need taken care of, we need to get this Bill into Conference Committee. So, I move we now nonconcur on all Senate Amendments to this Bill."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman moves to nonconcur in all Senate Amendments to House Bill 3165. Is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall the House concur... nonconcur in Senate Amendments... in all of the Senate Amendments to House Bill 3165?' All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the House does nonconcur in all Senate Amendments to House Bill 3165. House Bill 3191, Representative Bowman. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3191, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Department of Mental Health and Developmental Disabilities together with Senate Amendments #1 and 2."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Bowman."
- Bowman: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is one of the... the Bills that we've been talking about that we need to use to tie up loose ends for the next year's OCE's. So, I move to nonconcur in both Senate Amendments to this Bill."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved to concur in Senate
 Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 3191. Is there any
 discussion? Hearing none, the question is, *Shall the
 House concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill
 3191?* All those in favor vote *aye*, all those opposed

136 Legislative Day

June 27, 1986

vote 'no'. Voting is open."

Bowman: "Nonconcur."

Speaker Breslin: "Excuse me."

Bowman: "Nonconcur. I moved to nonconcur."

Speaker Breslin: "Excuse me. Would you dump the Roll Call, Mr. Clerk?"

Bowman: "Wrong Motion."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved to nonconcur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 3191. Is there any discussion on that Motion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall the House nonconcur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 3191?" All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the House does nonconcur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 3191. House Bill 3255. Out of the record. House Bill 3257, Representative Matijevich.

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3257, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Supreme Court together with Senate

Amendments #1 and 2."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Madam Speaker, I want to get my cue from Chairman Chairman or Veronica up there. I've got a hold leverenzon this. I'm ready to nonconcur, but I don't want to anvthing too quickly. Can I nonconcur? Madam Speaker, I move to nonconcur on Senate Amendment #1. The ... It makes some reductions in the Supreme Court, and they're trying to work it out. We probably will have to do that through a Conference... Committee. I'm going to concur with Senate Amendment #2. It makes some restorations for probation officers. I will move to nonconcur with So. Senate Amendment #1."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman moves to nonconcur in Senate

136 Legislative Day

June 27, 1986

#1 to House Bill 3257. And on that question, is Amendment there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is. *Shall the House nonconcur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3257?* All those in favor say *aye*. a11 opposed say "no". In the opinion of the Chair, the "ayes" And the House does nonconcur in Senate Amendment have it. #1 to House Bill 3257. On Amendment #2. Representative Matijevich."

- Matijevich: "Madam Speaker, I will concur with Senate Amendment
 #2. This makes some restorations in probation officers and
 appreciate your support on..."
- Speaker Breslin: "You have heard the Gentleman's Motion to concur in Senate Amendment #2. Is there any discussion? none. the question is. *Shall the House concur in #2 to House Bill 32577 All those in favor vote Amendment *ave*, all those opposed vote *no*. Voting is open. Have a 1 1 who wish? Have a11 voted who voted wish? votes 'aye'. Representative Mulcahev Representative Kirkland votes 'aye'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 100 16 voting 'no', and none voting 'present'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendment #2 Ladies and Gentlemen. we will now ao to appropriations only on the Order Nonconcurrence. Ιt of on your Calendar. starts on page Six The first appropriation to appear under the Order of Nonconcurrence Senate Bill 1698, Representative Leverenz. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1698, a Bill for an Act to provide for
 the ordinary and contingent and distributive expenses of
 the State Comptroller and various state agencies. The
 Senate has nonconcurred with House Amendment #2."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Leverenz. Representative

136 Legislative Day

June 27. 1986

leverenz."

- Leverenz: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I would move the House recede in Amendment #2. It's a \$75,000 amount. It has no substantive language. We will pick it up in a different Bill once the substantive language has been passed. This time I move we recede from House Amendment #2."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman moves to recede from House Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 1698. And on that question, is there any discussion? Hearing no discussion, the question is. Shall the House recede from House Amendment #2 t o Senate Bill 1698? All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say "no". In the opinion of the Chair, the "ayes" have it. And the House does recede from House Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 1698. We'll have to do it with a Roll Call. All those in favor vote *aye*, all those opposed vote *no*. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will On this question, there are 112 voting take the record. 'aye', none voting 'no', and none voting 'present'. And does recede from House Amendment #2 to Senate House 1698. Senate Bill 1737, Representative Hastert. Representative Hastert. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1737, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Department of Aging. The enate has nonconcurred with House Amendments #1, 3, 4, 5, 14, 15, 16, 17, and 18."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Hastert."

- Hastert: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the
 House. I move to refuse to recede from House Amendments 1,
 3, 4, 5, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, and 19... 18."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved to refuse to recede...
 refusing to recede to House Amendments 1, 3, 4, 5, 14, 15,
 16, 17, and 18 to Senate Bill 1737. Is there any
 discussion? Hearing none, the question is, *Shall the

136 Legislative Day

June 27, 1986

House refuse to recede from House Amendments #1, 3, 4, 5, 14, 15, 16, 17, and $187^{\circ n}$

Hastert: "Madam Speaker."

- "And the Gentleman requests a Speaker Committee be appointed. All those in favor sav *ave*. all opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the *ayes* have it. And the House does refuse to recede from Amendments to Senate Bill 1737 and a Conference Committee will. bе appointed. Senate Bi11 Representative Hastert. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1738, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Department of Mental Health and Developmental Disabilities. The Senate has nonconcurred with House Amendment #3."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Hastert."

- Hastert: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Senate Bill 1738 is the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Department of Mental Health. The Senate has refused to nonconcur in Senate... House Amendment #... House Amendment #3. I move to recede."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman moves to recede from Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 1738. And on that question, is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, *Shall the House recede from House Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 1738?* All those in favor say "aye", all those... all those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Representative Terzich, one minute to explain your vote. The Gentleman indicates he does not wish to explain his vote. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 117 voting 'aye', none voting 'no', and none voting 'present'. And the House does re... recede

136 Legislative Day

June 27, 1986

from House Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 1738. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1748. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1751, Representative Barnes. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1751, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Department of Corrections. The Senate has nonconcurred with House Amendments #3, 4, 6, 9, and 11."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Barnes."

Barnes: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the

House. I move to recede from House Amendments 3, 4, 6, 9,

and 11 to Senate Bill 1751."

Speaker Breslin: "The Lady moves to recede from House Amendments

3, 4, 6, 9, and 11 to Senate Bill 1751. And on that
question, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative
Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Yes, what do the Amendments do?"

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Barnes."

Barnes: "House Amendment #3 provides 2.5 million to the Winnebago County Board for purchasing of a juvenile detention center. Amendment #4 provided \$750.000 General Revenue Fund for reimbursement of counties for the medical expenses o f prisoners in county iails. House Amendment #6 reduced funding for the Hill Correctional Center. Amendment #9 restored \$2,068,300 cuts by the Senate from the introduced budget for Hill Correctional Center. Amendment #11 transfers some personal service and related line items at Dwight, Menard, Pontiac, and Statesville Correctional Centers."

Cullerton: "When... when were all... When it's all said and done,

how is the budget compared to the... how does the
appropriation compare to the budget?"

136 Legislative Day

June 27, 1986

Barnes: "I think it's pretty much in line with the way it's supposed to be, Representative."

Cullerton: "Does that mean it's... it's as the... when the budget
book was printed, the budget book contained a certain
dollar amount and the appropriation is close to that or
identical to that?"

Barnes: "Just one moment, we'll get to the proper figures. As it
was introduced, Representative Cullerton, it was
421,285,000, and as amended, it's approximately
\$427,495,700."

Cullerton: "So, it's only a couple million dollars short?"

Barnes: "That's right."

Cullerton: "Thank you."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Knox, Representative

Hawkinson, on the Motion."

Hawkinson: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I wonder if the Sponsor would take this Bill out of the record for a few minutes?

Alright, then in that event, Madam Speaker, I'm going to move to divide the question as to Amendment #9, and then I would like to speak to that Motion."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman is within his rights. moved to divide the question so that Amendment #9 will not be considered in this Motion. We will go to the then get back to Amendment #9. The question and before the House is, 'Shall the House recede from House Amendments 3, 4, 6, and 11 to Senate Bill 1751? All those in favor vote "aye", all those opposed vote 'no'. is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all wish? This is final action. Have all voted who wish? will take the record. On this question, there are Clerk 114 voting 'ave', 2 voting 'no', and none voting 'present'. And the House does recede from House Amendments 3. and 11 to Senate Bill 1751. And now to the Motion,

136 Legislative Day

June 27, 1986

Representative Barnes makes a Motion to recede from House

Amendment #9 to Senate Bill 1751. And on that question.

the Gentleman from Knox, Representative Hawkinson.

- Hawkinson: "Thank you. Madam Speaker. 1 rise in opposition to the Motion to recede from Amendment #9. Two days ago we had this Motion on Amendment #9. T+ Was Verified Roll Call. This is the Notion which I offered along with Representative Barnes, Homer, and Mays restore \$3,000,000 so that the Hill Correctional Center in Galesburg can be open this fall. Now the facility will he completed before then. The facility will be ready for occupancy to relieve the prison crowding in the correctional institutions around the state. The Senate cut two million, the House cut another million from that, which would. have the effect of postponing the opening of that facility, leaving it ready to go, but not opened and not being used by our correctional system. Sixty-six of you voted with me to approve this Amendment and to not cause within our correctional system. I would ask you to join me again today in opposing this Motion to recede from House Amendment #9."
- Speaker Breslin: "Is there any further discussion? Hearing none,

 Representative Barnes... Excuse me. Representative

 Leverenz. on the Motion."
- Leverenz: "Well, the Gentleman is correct, and we did run a nice

 Amendment and whatever. The fact is, I believe this gives
 us nine months funding on Hill Correctional Center and the

 Department concurs. And I would ask that we not go with
 this Motion and defeat this Motion so that we can recede
 from Amendment #9 and get this Bill to the Governor's

 desk."
- Speaker Breslin: "Sir, the Motion before us is to recede.

 Representative Hawkinson has just spoken in opposition to

136 Legislative Day

June 27, 1986

the Motion."

Leverenz: "Well, then we vote "aye"."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Barnes, to close."

Barnes: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. The Department of Corrections feels it will only delay the opening by two months. We... they do want to avoid going to a Conference Committee and I would agree with Representative Leverenz."

Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall the House recede from Senate Amendment #... from House Amendment #9 tο Senate Bill 1751?* All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. This is final Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question. there are 82 voting 'aye', 35 voting 'no', and none voting 83---*present*. And the House does recede from House Amendment #9 to Senate Bill 1751. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1752. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1752, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Department of Energy and Natural Resources. The Senate has nonconcurred with House Amendments #1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 8, 11, 12, 13, 14, 18, 21, and 22."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Barnes."

Barnes: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move to nonconcur in House Amendments 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 8, 11, 12, 13, 14, 18, 21, 22 for all practical purposes to Senate Bill 1752 and request a Conference Committee."

Speaker Breslin: "The Lady refuses to recede from all of the House Amendments that were put on Senate Bill 1752. Is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall the House refuse to recede from House Amendments 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 8, 11, 12, 13, 14, 18, 21, and 22 to Senate

136 Legislative Day

June 27. 1986

8111 17522* All those in favor vote "aye"... all those in say 'aye', all those opposed say "no". In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the all of the House Amendments that refuses to recede from adopted to Senate 8111 1752. Senate Rill . . . wara Conference Committee will be appointed. Representative Senate Bill 1753. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1753, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Environmental Protection Agency. The Senate has nonconcurred with House Amendments #2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, and 28."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Barnes."

Barnes: "Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I move to nonconcur in the Amendments to Senate Bill 1753 and request a Conference Committee."

Speaker Breslin: "The Lady has moved to refuse to recede from all of the House Amendments to Senate Bill 1753. Is there Hearing none, the question is, *Shall the House refuse to recede from all of the House Amendments Senate Bill 1753?* All those in favor sav "ave", all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'aves' refuse to recede from have it. And the House Amendments 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26. 27. Senate Bill 1753. Senate Bill 1756. Clerk, read the Bill. And a Conference Committee, by the way, will be appointed, Representative Barnes, for Senate Bill 1753, Proceed, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1756, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Department of Nat... of Nuclear... Nuclear Safety. The

136 Legislative Day

June 27 • 1986

Senate has nonconcurred with House Amendment #5."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Barnes."

Barnes: "I move to recede from that Amendment to Senate Bill 1756."

- Speaker Breslin: "The Lady moves to recede from House Amendment 5 to Senate Bill 1756. Is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, *Shall the House recede from House Amendment #5 to Senate Bill 1756?* All those in favor vote *aye*, all those opposed vote *no*. Voting is open. is final passage, Ladies and Gentlemen. Have all voted who Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the wish? On this question. there are 114 voting "ave". none voting 'no', and none voting 'present'. And the House does recede from House Amendment #5 to Senate Bill 1756-Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1758. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1758, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Department of State Police. The Senate has nonconcurred with House Amendments #3 and 4."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Barnes."

- Barnes: "I move to recede from House Amendment #3 which involves
 the Toxicology Lab. And House Amendment 4 which just
 restores some guidelines to Senate Bill 1758."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Lady moves to recede from House Amendments 3 and 4 to Senate Bill 1758. Is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, "Shall the House recede from House Amendments 3 and 4 to Senate Bill 1758?" All those in favor vote "aye", all those opposed vote "no". Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? This is final passage. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 115 voting "aye", none voting

136 Legislative Day

June 27, 1986

no, and none voting *present*. And the House does recede from the House Amendments on Senate Bill 1758. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1759, Representative Hastert. Clerk, read the Bill.*

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1759, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Department of Veterans" Affairs. The Senate has nonconcurred with the House Amendment 37."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Hastert."

Hastert: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 1759 is the ordinary and contingent expenses for the Department of Veterans' Affairs. House Amendment #7 was a guideline for... to restore cuts due to Gramm-Rudman. What actually happened is those cuts never came about, so this restoration was not necessary; therefore, we move to recede from Amendment #7."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman moves to recede from House
Amendment 7 to Senate Bill 1758 (sic - 1759). And on that
question, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative
Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Breslin: "He will."

Leverenz: "Was that the contra-aid that we put in the budget?"

Hastert: "I don't think that was contra-aid."

Leverenz: "Oh, thank you very much."

Speaker Breslin: "There being no further discussion. The question is, "Shall the House recede from House Amendment 7 to Senate Bill 1759?" All those in favor vote "aye", all those opposed vote "no". Voting is open. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 116 voting "aye", none voting "no", and none voting

136 Legislative Day

June 27, 1986

present. And the House does recede from House Amendment 7 to Senate Bill 1759. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1763. Clerk, read the Bill."

- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1763, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Capital Development Board. The Senate has nonconcurred with House Amendments #1 thru 16, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 25 thru 36, 38, 39, 40, 42 thru 48, 52, 54 thru 62, 64, 65, 66, and 67."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Barnes. Representative Barnes."
- Barnes: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move to nonconcur from all those Amendments for practical purposes. And I refuse to recede and request a Conference Committee."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Lady refuses to recede from all of the House Amendments put on Senate Bill 1763. Īs discussion? Hearing none, the question is. 'Shall the House recede from all of the House... shall the House refuse to recede on all of the House Amendments to Senate All those in favor vote *aye*... all those Bill 1763?' 'ave', all those opposed say 'no'. opinion of the Chair, the "ayes" have it-And the refuses to recede from the House Amendments to Senate Bill And a Conference Committee will 1763. be appointed. Senate Bill 1765. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1765, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Court of Claims. The Senate has nonconcurred with House Amendment #1."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Barnes."
- Barnes: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I move to recede from House

 Amendment #1 which is a reduction of some service line
 items to Senate Bill 1765."

136 Legislative Day

June 27. 1986

- Speaker Breslin: "The Lady recedes... moves to recede from House 1 to Senate Bill 1765. Is there any discussion? Amendment Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall the House recede from House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 1765? All those in favor vote 'ave'. all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 110 voting 'aye', 3 voting 'no', and 1 voting *present*. And the House does recede from House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 1765. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority. is hereby declared Representative Laurino wishes to be recorded as *ave* and the record will 50 reflect Representative Laurino. Senate Bill 1770. Representative Clerk, read the Bill." Rarnec.
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1770, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Pollution Control Board. The Senate has nonconcurred with House Amendment #1."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Barnes."
- Barnes: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move to recede from House Amendment #1. And what it does, it restores some of the guidelines back to the Bureau of the Budget."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Lady moves to recede from House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 1770. Is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, *Shall the House recede from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 17707 All those in favor vote 'ave'. all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted Clerk will The take the record. who wish? On this question, there are 113... 114 voting 'aye', 1 voting 'no', and none voting *present*. And the House does recede

136 Legislative Day

June 27, 1986

House Amendment I to Senate Bill 1770. And this Bill.

having received the Constitutional Majority. is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1774. Clerk. read the Bill.

- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1774, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Office of the Commissioner of Savings and Loan. The Senate nonconcurred in House Amendments #1 and 3."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Barnes."
- Barnes: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the
 House. I refuse to recede from House Amendments #1 and 3
 to Senate Bill 1774 and request a Conference Committee."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Lady moves to refuse to recede Amendments 1 and 3 to Senate Bill 1774-Is there any discussion? Hearing none. the question is. * Shall the House refuse to recede from House Amendments 1 and 3 to Senate Bill 1774?* All those in favor say *aye*, all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the have it. And the House refuses to recede from the House Amendments adopted to Senate Bill 1774. And a Conference Committee will be appointed. Senate Bill 1778. Clerk. read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1778, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Local Governmental Law Enforcement Officers' Training Board. The Senate refused to concur in House Amendment #1."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Barnes."
- Barnes: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the
 House. I refuse to recede from House Amendment #1 to
 Senate Bill 1778 and request a Conference Committee."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Lady re... moves to refuse to recede from

 House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1778. Is there any
 discussion? Hearing none, the question is, *Shall the

136 Legislative Day

June 27, 1986

House refuse to recede from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1778? All those in favor say "aye", all those opposed say "no". In the opinion of the Chair, the "ayes" have it. And the House refuses to recede from House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 1778 and a Conference Committee will be appointed. Turning to page eight on your Calendar appears Senate Bill 1808, Representative Leverenz. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1808, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Office of the State's Attorneys'

Appellate Prosecutor. The Senate refused to concur in House Amendments #1, 3, 4, and 5."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I would refuse to recede in House Amendments 1, 3, 4, and 5."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman moves to refuse to recede from House Amendments 1, 3, 4, and 5 to Senate Bill 1808. Is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall the House refuse to recede from House Amendments 1, 3, 4, and 5 to Senate Bill 1808? All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the House refuses to recede from the House Amendments to Senate Bill 1808, and a Conference Committee will be appointed. Senate Bill 1841.

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1841, a Bill for an Act making reappropriations for permanent improvements, minor capital improvements, repairs and maintenance, and related purposes. The Senate nonconcurred in House Amendments #1,

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Barnes."

Barnes: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I refuse to recede from House Amendments #1 and 3

136 Legislative Day

June 27, 1986

and request a Conference Committee."

Speaker Breslin: "What are you going to do with Amendment #2,

Representative Barnes? Are you going to move to concur on

that?"

Barnes: "Well I'll..."

Speaker Breslin: "Recede rather refuse to recede..."

Barnes: "I'll refuse to recede for purposes..."

Speaker Breslin: "Okay."

Barnes: "...of discussion."

Breslin: "Okay. The Lady moves to refuse to recede from Speaker House Amendments 1, 2, and 3 to Senate Bill 1841. Is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall House refuse to recede from House Amendments 1, 2, and 3 to Senate Bill 1841? All those in favor say "ave", all those In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' opposed say *no*. And the House refuses to recede from the House Amendments to Senate Bill 1841, and a Conference Committee will be appointed. Ladies and Gentlemen, we're going to the Order of Nonconcurrence on the nonappropriation Bills. I see some Sponsors are here. I will go through this to see if you wish to present your Bill. We'll skip over Representative Daniels' Bill first until we want it out of the record? You We'll come back to it if vou find a Sponsor. Senate Bill 1517. on oπ Nonconcurrence. page six on VOUE Calendar. Representative Terzich. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1517, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. The Senate nonconcurred in House Amendment #2."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Terzich."

Terzich: "Yes, Madam Speaker, I'd like to refuse to recede from

House Amendment #2 and ask for a Conference Committee."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman moves to refuse to recede from

136 Legislative Day

June 27, 1986

House Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 1517. And on that question, is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Piel."

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

Speaker Breslin: "He indicates he will."

Terzich: "Yes."

Piel: "Correct me if I'm wrong, Representative, but didn't we have this same Motion yesterday?"

Terzich: "Yes. we did."

Piel: "Pardon me?"

Terzich: "Yes."

Piel: "What was the outcome on that vote... well obviously, it was defeated. correct?"

Terzich: "I haven't figured it out yet."

Piel: "Hold on for one second."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Piel."

Piel: "I think... I just talked to Representative Parke. I think
we've got everything worked out, and I would ask for a
favorable vote on this Motion."

Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall the House refuse to recede from House Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 1517?' All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the House refuses to recede from House Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 1517, and a Conference Committee will be appointed."

Terzich: "Thank you. If Representative Piel figured it out, I wish he'd let me know about it."

Speaker Breslin: "Senate Bill 1565, Representative O'Connell.

Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1565, a Bill for an Act to amend the
Unified Code of Corrections. The Senate refused to concur
In House Amendments #1, 3, and 4."

136 Legislative Day

- June 27, 1986
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative O'Connell. Representative O'Connell."
- O'Connell: "Madam Speaker, I would refuse to recede and request that a Conference Committee be appointed."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative O'Connell moves that the House refuse to recede from House Amendments 1. 3. and 4 to Senate Bill 1565. Is there any discussion? Hearing none. the question is, 'Shall the House refuse to recede from House Amendments 1. 3. and 4 to Senate Bill 1565? those in favor say 'ave', all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the "aves" have it. And the House refuses to recede from the House Amendments on Senate Bill 1565. Senate Bill 1709, Representative Senate Bill 2018. Representative Keane. Out of Senate... Senate Bill 2108. Representative record. McPike. Out of the record. Representative Keane, for what reason do vou rise?"
- Keane: "Yes. Thank you, Madam Speaker. If you are looking for something..."
- Speaker Breslin: "Excuse me. Representative Keane."
- Keane: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. If you wish... looking for something to do, I would like to go to Senate Bill 1709, on Nonconcurrence, page six. Nonconcurrence. Would that be appropriate at this time?"
- Speaker Breslin: "Yes, we have called that Bill twice already today. On the Order of Nonconcurrence, Ladies and Gentlemen, on page six of your Calendar. Does the Gentleman have leave? Hearing no objection, he has leave.

 We'll call Senate Bill 1709. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1709, a Bill for an Act relating to certain taxes. The Senate nonconcurred in House Amendments #1, 2, 3, and 4."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Keane."

136 Legislative Day

June 27, 1986

- Keane: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I refuse to recede from House

 Amendments 1, 2, 3, and 4 and would ask for a Conference

 Committee to be appointed. I have discussed this with the

 Minority Spokesman on Revenue."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman moves to refuse to recede from House Amendments 1, 2, 3, and 4 to Senate Bill 1709-Ts there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is. *Shall the House refuse to recede from the House Amendments to Senate Bill 1709? All those in favor sav *ave*• all opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the those *ayes* have it. And the House refuses to recede from House Amendments 1, 2, 3, and 4 to Senate Bill 1709. Conference Committee will be appointed. Leave of the Body, Ladies and Gentlemen. we'll go to the Order of Speaker's Table, SJR 101, on page nine on the Calendar. Clerk, read the Resolution."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Joint Resolution 101, creates the Council on the Revision of the Illinois Constitution under the auspices of the Joint Committee on Legislative Support Services to help advise the General Assembly and the public on constitutional issues. Rules Committee recommends 'be adopted'."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Cullerton."
- Cullerton: "Yes, Madam Speaker, I believe there is an Amendment to this..."
- Speaker Breslin: "Is there an Amendment filed, Representative

 Clerk... Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative

 Cullerton."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Cullerton, on Amendment #1."
- Cullerton: "Yes, thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen

 of the House. The Resolution created the Council on the

 Revision of the Illinois Constitution. The Amendment

136 Legislative Day

June 27, 1986

provides, instead, for the creation of a Committee of 50 to the Illinois Constitution. The difference Re-examine between the Amendment and the original Resolution as i + Senate is that it's a passed the Committee of 50 to re-examine the Constitution as opposed to a Council on Revision o F the Illinois Constitution. emphasize in this change that it may be the Committee decide that there shall be no changes to the Illinois Constitution, and so, in reflecting that we just the word 're-examine' to the Council on the Revision. sorry, the opposite, the Committee of 50 to Re-examine rather than the Council of ... on the Revision. So. Itd move for the adoption of the Amendment."

- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Cullerton moves for the adoption of Amendment #1 to SJR 101. And on that question, the Gentleman from DeKalb, Representative Countryman."
- Countryman: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Will the Gentleman yield?"
- Speaker Breslin: "He indicates he will."
- Countryman: "Representative Cullerton, I noticed that the Board of Regents is appointed to serve as kind of the staff for this Council. Is that correct?"
- Cullerton: "I think that that is not covered in the Amendment. I
 think that's in the original Joint Resolution. So, if you
 wish to address that when we vote on the Resolution, I'd be
 happy to answer it. My understanding is that the Illinois
 Commission on Intergovernmental Cooperation shall provide
 the Council with appropriate staff."
- Countryman: "So, the Amendment would not change that fact, is that correct?"
- Cullerton: "Let me tell you what the Amendment does. It calls for the Joint Committee on Legislative Support Services to appoint a Steering Committee of twelve members from the

136 Legislative Day

June 27, 1986

Committee of 50 to supervise and coordinate activities of the Commission on Intergovernmental Cooperation, and the Regency University System in administering the function set forth in the Resolution."

- Countryman: "So, the Amendment does mention the Regency
 University System?"
- Cullerton: "Right. The original Bill said that the Illinois
 Commissioner on Intergovernmental Cooperation shall provide
 the Council with appropriate staff. The Amendment, which
 moves the numbers of people on the Committee from 20 up to
 50 and whose purpose is to involve more people at the
 educational level in the Committee. We add that the
 Regency University System will assist the Commission on
 Intergovernmental Cooperation in administering the function
 set forth."
- Countryman: "Well, will this require staff time and necessary appropriations to this unit to the Regency University System to handle this?"
- Cullerton: "No, the money to administer this is about \$63,000, which is in the budget of the Commission on Intergovernmental Cooperation. So, the money for the staff will come from the Inter... their budget."
- Countryman: "And what will they do then, make a grant or a contract with the Regency Universities?"
- Cullerton: "I don't think that there is any agreement on that.

 The point of the Amendment was just because we're going to be adding people from the educational community, the thought was to bring in the Regency University System in assisting in the administration. I imagine there could be... Since the Commission is called the Intergovernmental Cooperation Commission, it would make since if they would cooperate intergovernmentally with the Regency University System in some fashion."

136 Legislative Day

June 27, 1986

- Countryman: "So then, under the Amendment, there would be this

 Steering Committee of 12, and the Council would go from 20
 to 50?"
- Cullerton: "That's correct."
- Countryman: "What was the reason for bringing the Council from 20 to 50?"
- Cullerton: "We wanted to involve former members of the 1970

 Con-Con Convention more closely. People like, Dwight

 Friedrich, Mike Madigan... Who are some of the other

 members then? Harlem Rigney, if he's still alive."
- Countryman: "Well, you know, my... my..."
- Cullerton: "So, that was the first point, and then the second point was to bring people from the educational level, some of the fine educators out in northern Illinois at the university system out there, to bring their expertise into this discussion."
- Countryman: "Well, I certainly wouldn't want to exclude some of those fine people, but I... I think going from 20 to 50 makes a... a big jump, and then, you have the Steering Committee..."
- Cullerton: "It's approx... that's approximately 30 new people."

 Countryman: "Right, but then you have the Steering Committee so

 you need something smaller or more workable, like a board

 of directors to govern it."
- Cullerton: "Yes, can you imagine what would happen if the 20 people sat down, and they didn't have any Steering Committee? There probably wouldn't... and then if you have a lot of educators there, nothing would get done. So, this way you get 50 people who can put it on their resume, but you have 12 people who are the Steering Committee."
- Countryman: "Well, if those 12 people were Legislators, maybe nothing would get done."
- Cullerton: "Well, take for example, our Conference Committees" we

136 Legislative Day

- June 27 1986
- get a lot done in Conference Committees., and they have 10 Legislators on there.
- Countryman: "Alright, I don't have any further questions. Thank
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from McLean, Representative Ropp."
- Ropp: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I have a point of order or parliamentary procedure. I guess I question how in the world does this particular item get on the Speaker's Table without going to Committee? Isn't it the normal procedure for the Rules Committee to approve an item and then direct it to a Committee? Does... does the Rules Committee have the authority just to put it on the Speaker's Table and recommend 'do adopt'?"
- Speaker Breslin: "I don't know the history of this particular

 Resolution, but I will certainly find out and get back to

 you, Representative Ropp."
- Ropp: "Well, it makes a lot of difference as to whether or not we should even be discussing this if, in fact, it's out of order and should have been assigned to a Committee."
- Speaker Breslin: "I don't think it's out of order, but I will get

 back to you, and we'll continue the discussion. The

 Gentleman from Lake, Representative Churchill."
- Churchill: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Will the Gentleman yield?"

 Speaker Breslin: "He will."
- Churchill: "Representative Cullerton, this is a Council that will act as a voluntary organization?"
- Cullerton: "Absolutely, there will be no draft of people."
- Churchill: "Then, will..."
- Cullerton: "They won't be forced by law to be on this Committee.

 They will have to volunteer."
- Churchill: "Then will they receive any reimbursement for expenses or any salary?"

136 Legislative Day

June 27, 1986

- There probably would Cullerton: salary. travel reimbursement. I can check the Resolution. The Resolution that the Illinois Commission on Intergovernmental Cooperation is the that will provide the staff. one secretarial. logistic services for the performance of the It doesn't authorize any salary or any even."
- Churchill: "So, is it your position that if this passes that the

 Resolution does not authorize any money to go to the

 participants in this voluntary organization?"
- Cullerton: the money that goes to the Intergovernmental Commission may be authorized to Cooperation reimburse people for travel. But the Amendment is silent on that issue. Ιt only talks about giving money to the Commission."
- Churchill: "Why do we have to set up a Council for something that's going to be voluntary? I mean, if it's voluntary, why don't they voluntarily just come together and do it of there own accord?"
- Cullerton: "Well, you have to have some structure to get the Council in order. I mean, you don't just put a call out to press release and anybody whot wants to show up in Springfield to give their views. That may bе the may be public testimony taken, but you have to have actually somebody on the Council who has some expertise in the area."
- Churchill: "But... but someone such as yourself could start a small group and then you could put public announcements in the paper and say this is a voluntary organization, that you're spear heading it and set some definite times and the parties could come together on a voluntary basis with no expense to the state. And you could do that completely voluntary. You would not have to form this Council. I

136 Legislative Day

June 27. 1986

think it would be a great thing for you to take the lead on that. $\ensuremath{^{\prime\prime}}$

Cullerton: "Well, thank you."

Churchill: "Let me ask you this, is... is this Council something like the House Subcommittee on the Insurance Crisis?"

"The House Subcommittee, no. The House Subcommittee Cullerton: composed of House Members. And we had a... we allowed was a... I think an 18 year old kid from the Republican allowed to sit in. but this is much different. This was sets up a voluntary organization composed of the Governor. President of the 1970 Constitutional Convention. the scholars, educators, government officials at the various levels of government, legal experts, and public opinion leaders, and they will be here to help advise the General Accemblu. along with educators. school children• and I think it's much different than the House Subcommittee on Insurance."

Churchill: "Hell... will each of the members of this Council have
the same amount of impact on the final decision that the
Members of the House Subcommittee on Insurance Crisis had?"

Cullerton: "Well, the Members of the House Subcommittee on the Insurance Crisis had a lot of input, and I'm sure these people will too."

Churchill: "Thank you."

Speaker Breslin: "Is there any further discussion? Hearing none, Representative Ropp. Representative Ropp. Representative Ropp. I have an answer to your question. Refer to House Rules on Committees, Rule 14. you will see that there is a special provision that all Special House or Joint... which create a Special House or Joint Committee must be assigned to the Rules Committee. And for that purpose. are to... the rules operate as they set standing substantive Committee to consider that Bill in particular.

136 Legislative Day

June 27, 1986

That's Rule 14, Subsection A(1) and 8. Okay? Representative Klemm."

Klemm: "A parliamentary inquiry?"

Speaker Breslin: "State your inquiry."

"Well if we look at Subsection 14, Subsection A, (1), Klemm: and (3). those are the three distinct classifications that the Bill or Resolution would go to the Rules Committee. the first one says a Special House or Joint Committee, And which this is not creating. Secondly, it Legislative Commission or Board. We specifically enumerate I mean, excuse me. Commission or Board and it must be legislative, and the third was directing legislative study. The Resolution creates a Council or suggests a Council be created. not a Committee. Board, not a Commission, not to conduct a study, not to do anything or be part of any part of the makeup that under the ruling of 14 A or B. And therefore. called for it really is not proper for the Rules Committee to avoid going through a Rules of... or Committee of Assignment."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative, we consider this Resolution to be in the nature of a Legislative Commission. And we have ruled that it is a Special Joint Committee."

Klemm: "Alright. So... So even though it's enumerated when it
was clear to the House, it's the Chair's liberal
interpretation that we can include anything and everything
really that hasn't been enumerated in here?"

Speaker Breslin: "Well, not anything and everything, but it certainly is creating a Special Joint Committee for... it's certainly for a specific purpose that's very special, highly specialized and it is a Joint Committee."

Klemm: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Breslin: "So following those rules, it went to the Rules

Committee and was reported out and recommended "be

136 Legislative Day

- June 27, 1986
- adopted. Representative Frederick, on the Amendment.

 Representative Frederick.
- Frederick: "Madam Speaker, would the Sponsor yield, please, for a question?"
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Cullerton will yield for a guestion."
- Frederick: "Representative Cullerton, could you tell me was there such a preliminary council prior to the last convening of the Illinois Constitutional Convention?"
- Cullerton: "I was only about 12 years old then, and I..."
- Frederick: "Well, I thought perhaps you might have a staff report on that."
- Cullerton: "Yeah, I know... maybe Dwight knows. He was there and the Speaker was there, and he's not here now. I think

 Dwight was a little older than me then. Dwight might remember, I don't know."
- Frederick: "Okay."
- Cullerton: "But they put in there that every 20 years..."
- Frederick: "Yeah, I know. Was there... was there any academic community input before the last Convention?"
- Cullerton: "After reading the Constitution, I would say apparently not."
- Frederick: "No. Could you... could you tell me is it hoped that

 at this Constitutional Convention we will totally rewrite

 the Constitution as we did before?"
- Cullerton: "No. That's why I want Representative Friedrich to distinguish, hopefully, between the Amendment and the final vote on the Resolution, because the Amendment changes the wording so as to create a Committee to Re—examine as opposed to Revise the Constitution. The way the... the way the Resolution reads now, before this Amendment is adopted, it said... it says that the Council should revise the Illinois Constitution. Now, let's say we... we don't plan

136 Legislative Day

June 27, 1986

- to make any changes at all, then that word 'revise' would be deceptive. So we're saying, re-examine. And then maybe leave it the way it is. So, that's why I would think that you'd be in support of... if you wanted the Constitution to stay the way it is, you'd be in support of this Amendment. If you don't think we should have a Committee to examine it, then... then you'd vote against the Joint Resolution."
- Frederick: "Well, based on my recollection of the last Convention, it seems to me this is a good idea, because as I recall, the delegates spent a great deal of time doing the preliminary work that could have been done before, and so, I really support this Resolution."
- Cullerton: "Okay, well this is just the Amendment at this point, but I'd appreciate your support for the Amendment too."
- Speaker Breslin: "There being no further discussion. The question is, 'Shall Amendment #1 to Senate Joint Resolution 101 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 Cullerton, now to present Senate

 Joint Resolution 101."
- Cullerton: "Yes, thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. If you were to pick up the copy of your Constitution, Article 14, Section 1(B) states that if the question of whether a Convention should be called is not submitted during any 20 year period, the Secretary of State shall submit such question at the general election in the 20th year following the last submission. And so, since that time is coming up, the purpose of this Joint Resolution then is to convene a Committee of 50 to

136 Legislative Day

June 27, 1986

it will consist of the Governor, the President of debate. the last Convention, and numerous of scholars. educators. officials. The ... they would also... the Committee of 50 reconvene all members 1970 Constitutional Convention in Springfield at the Historic Old State Capitol for the purpose of assessing the success of the 1970 Constitution in securing the rights of the people of the State of Illinois. So, that will have all the people that were at the old Convention can come back and talk about what a good job they did don*t maybe parts that thev like. For example. Representative Madigan might come back and say, "You biggest mistake we ever made was giving that Governor the power of the amendatory veto.* That might be might want to say at this meeting. So. then they will meet as necessary over the period from the date passage of this Resolution through December of 1990. will prepare a public report with recommendations that will deal with the structure and the operation αf role of the General Assembly, federal, state and local government relations, elections, taxes and spending, The ... they will have open forums of meetings that be held in various parts of the state for discussion And the... from all of the citizens. as T indicated before, the Illinois Commission on Intergovernmental the Regency University Systems Cooperation and provide the Committee with staff. An appropriation is in the Illinois Commission on Intergovernmental Cooperation for about 62... \$63,000. There would be a Steering Committee of 12 members from the Committee 50 OD and coordinate the activities of the Commission on Intergovernmental Cooperation and the Regency System administering the functions of the Resolution.

136 Legislative Day

June 27, 1986

finally, the Committee of 50 will report its findings to the General Assembly and the Governor and the Supreme Court no later than January of 1990. I would be happy to answer any questions. And I would appreciate your support for this Senate Joint Resolution.

- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Senate

 Joint Resolution 101. And on that question, the Gentleman

 from Marion, Representative Friedrich."
- "Well. Madam Speaker, Members of the House, with all Sponsor, I think this... respect to the what he ic proposing here is an exercise in futility. You're going to a bunch of people to run around and hold hearings They have no authority to do knows who will end up being the 50 people. But regardless of what they do, there will he proposal to call a Convention on the ballot. The Secretary of State has to do it at the 20 year cycle. I would tell you, in my opinion, this Constitution is under constant the Members of this House and the Senate, the bу people in government at all levels and I don't think you'll ever get a consensus out of 50 people, even if they couldn't do anything about it. So I... it's just another one of these things, people running around holding spending your money and I don't think it's any hearings. good."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Lady from Marshall, Representative Koehler, on the Resolution."
- Koehler: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Would the Sponsor please yield for a question?"
- Speaker Breslin: "He will."
- Koehler: "Representative Cullerton, you say that this is a Commission that would be created of about 50 individuals

136 Legislative Day

- June 27, 1986
- that would hold hearings throughout the state, is that correct?"
- Cullerton: "No, let me correct you. We are... it's called a

 Committee and it's not about 50, it's exactly 50. So, it's

 not a Commission, it's a Committee. It's not about 50,

 it's exactly 50."
- Koehler: "Thank you very much. And would these recommendations... the recommendations would be formulated from the testimony of citizens who would give their views as to the changes that should be made in the Constitution or things that they felt should be retained in the Constitution?"
- Cullerton: "Yes, one of the resolved paragraphs says that, 'That periodic symposia, open forums and meetings be held by the Committee in various areas of the state for government and public opinion leaders to discuss the constitutional questions.' That's in the Resolution."
- Koehler: "Well, as Representative Friedrich pointed out, it is...

 the people of Illinois will have an opportunity to vote in
 1978, excuse me, 1988, as to whether or not they want to
 call a Constitutional Convention. What is the purpose of
 this Committee as it relates to that vote?"
- Cullerton: "Well. the purpose would be to inform the... to inform the public who are voting on that issue report. Whether they think there shall be the need for Constitutional Convention. They... and specifically, potential changes... if they make... if they decide to make any changes, what those changes might be. I'll give you an When we pass a change in the Constitution, analogy. we it as you know, in the General Assembly, then it vote on goes on the ballot. Right now, we are preparing arguments for and against the change in the Constitution. in the House, do that, the House and the Senate.

136 Legislative Day

June 27, 1986

have sent out to every registered voter, a... vou mav recall this from previous constitutional changes, arguments both for and against. They're formulated by a Committee Members of the House and the Senate. of And the purpose of that is to inform voters as to why thev should vote for the constitutional Likewise, you're going to have on the ballot as per the Constitution, a... a question submitted at the general election in the 20th year following the last submission. going to be on the ballot, and the Convention shall be called if three-fifths of those voting a majority of those voting in the election or approve it. So, I would think that it would make sense some... some input some... some information gathered from throughout the state so as to inform the public whether or not they should vote for or against the calling of a new Convention."

Koehler: "Well, thank you, Representative Cullerton. And. Madam rise in support of this Resolution. T think there are very important questions that the citizens should have a opportunity to discuss with regard creating another Constitutional Convention. think of two very important issues that people throughout Illinois have been deeply concerned about. The one is the matter of redistricting and the fact that during the last redistricting plan that was drawn there verv definitely was gerrymandering, not only in Central Illinois where I won Supreme Court battle in which the Supreme Court stated unanimously that my district was unconstitutional regard to compactness and redrew my district. And in the Chicago area, there very definitely were severe violations of citizens' rights in the redistricting plan.

136 Legislative Day

June 27, 1986

that it is important that we discuss the opportunity to create a constitutional mandate that redistricting be done in a fair and impartial manner that does not trample upon the rights of the citizens of Illinois. Furthermore. we discussed another very important issue, and that is the issue of the Compensation Review Board. and I predict that if that Board is allowed to stand and operate as it has done in the past, that the citizens of Illinois want an opportunity to say that we no longer want a Compensation Review Board. That is t o representative government and certainly to accountability that is a part of the entire representative system of Illinois and our democracy. So. I stand in this Resolution. and I certainly hone Sponsor of this Resolution will listen to the people of Illinois as they express their dismay. Thank you."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Lee, Representative Olson."

Olson: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Breslin: "He will."

Olson: "Representative Cullerton, in your reference to the esteemed Member of the Senate, Senator Harlan Rigney of the 35th..."

Cullerton: "Yes, Sir."

Olson: "...it is my extreme pleasure to inform you. Sir, that today is his birthday, now,..."

Cullerton: "You mean, it would be his birthday?"

Olson: "He is... he is either 93 or 53, debating on whom you speak to, and his wife is yet to be heard from."

Cullerton: "You mean, it would be his birthday, or it actually is his birthday?"

Olson: "It... it is alleged to be his birthday."

Cullerton: "I see. So, it's good to know that he's still alive."

Olson: "That is an allegation."

136 Legislative Day

June 27, 1986

Cullerton: "And according to this Resolution he will get to go to

Springfield to reconvene with all of his colleagues from
the 1970 Constitutional Convention."

Olson: "His... his elderly colleagues."

Cullerton: "By that time."

Olson: "Thank you, Sir."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Cullerton, to close."

Cullerton: "Yes, first o f all, I would like to Representative Koehler for her support. appreciated the... I believe the fifth speech against the pay raise that we've had in the last couple of davs. as her willingness to support a Resolution that calls for the expenditure of \$63.000. I think that it is a very worthwhile Committee that would be set up. I think it would be best... able to give some input and some advice to the people of the State, who will be called upon by the Secretary of State pursuant to the Constitution who will submit this question to the voters. So, I would appreciate an *aye* vote on this important Senate Joint Resolution."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Cullerton has moved for the adoption of Senate Joint Resolution 101. All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Representative Koehler, you spoke in debate, for what reason do you rise?"

Koehler: "Thank you, Hadam Speaker. But my name was mentioned in debate, and so, on a point of personal privilege. I would like to tell Representative Cullerton that \$63,000 expended in trying to protect the rights of the 11,000,000 citizens of the State of Illinois against the political gerrymandering that went on with the Democrats in 1981 is certainly dollars well spent. And I'm glad to support it."

Speaker Breslin: "Have all voted who wish? Representative

Leverenz, one minute to explain your vote."

136 Legislative Day

June 27, 1986

- Leverenz: "She did stand up, but did she get your approval to talk? There are no TV cameras here today. We don't need this."
- Speaker Breslin: "I asked the Lady for what reason she rose, and she told us."

Leverenz: "Oh."

- Speaker Breslin: "I would suggest that no one use other Members'
 names in debate, and then, we won't have these
 controversies in the future."
- Leverenz: "Well, I know how to refer to those on the other side of the aisle. I don't even have to use their names."
- Speaker Breslin: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 98 voting 'aye', 17 voting 'no', and none voting 'present'. And the House does adopt Senate Joint Resolution 101. Representative Pangle, for what reason do you rise?"
- Pangle: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I just wanted to announce to the rest of the House today that our good friend and my seatmate, Sam Panayotovich, is having his 40th birthday, and we're all pleased with that. We have his new wife's favorite hazel nut cake that everybody enjoyed last year. And we appreciate the former Representative and now the Secretary of State coming over to help celebrate Sam's birthday. And everyone's welcome to come over."
- Speaker Breslin: "Very good. And now we know that Representative Panayotovich and Senator Rigney have something in common. Happy birthday. Representative... former Representative and Member of the House, Secretary Edgar is recognized on the Democratic side of the aisle. Welcome. Representative Panayotovich. for what reason do you rise?"
- Panayotovich: "I'd just like to invite everybody over for a piece
 of hazel nut birthday cake. 'Buy American' birthday cake.
 Gordy Ropp."

136 Legislative Day

June 27. 1986

- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Ropp, there was no debate. Your name was not used in debate. The Gentleman rose on a point of personal privilege and stated his point. Do you have a response to that? Come on, let's see how quick you can think on your feet."
- Ropp: "Well, thank you, Madam Speaker. It's always a pleasure to respond to you, but particularly to wish the good Representative from the Chicago area a happy birthday, and I always wanted to wish him best wishes in his new business venture as an attempt to develop economic development in the State of Illinois and certainly here in Springfield and commend him for that, and we'll be over to get several pieces of cake and I'm sure that part of it may have come from Canadian wheat, maybe."
- Speaker Breslin: "Ladies and Gentlemen, we will go to the orders of those Resolutions on the Speaker's Table. Starting on page eight on your Calendar, the first Resolution is House Resolution 638, Representative Bowman. Out of the record. House Resolution 665, Representative Madigan. Is anyone authorized to present this for Representative Madigan? Out of the record. House Resolution 124... House Resolution 1164. Representative Hallock."
- Hallock: "Yes, Madam Speaker, this Resolution which requests that
 we recycle our paper is waiting for an Amendment on more
 paper. And so, we'll withdraw it at this time until we get
 that prepared."
- Breslin: "Okav, we'll take it out of the Speaker Representative Giorgi. Is Representative Giorgi the oπ Very good. We're going to go back now with leave floor? of the Body to House Resolution 1124. It urges the Congress to disapprove the sale of Conrail. Mr. Clerk, read the Resolution."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 1124, urges the U.S. Congress to

disapprove the sale of Conrail to Norfolk

136 Legislative Day

June 27, 1986

Southern.

Transportation and Motor Vehicles recommends *be adopted*.** "Representative Ronan, would you mind if we take Speaker Breslin: the record for the moment and go on until we can get back to it? Okav. The House... next one on the... this Order is House Joint Resolution 92. Representative Is anyone authorized to present this for Speaker Madigan. Madigan? Out of the record. House Joint Resolution Representative Curran. The Gentleman is not in chamber. We'll come back to it with leave of the Body. House Joint Resolution 127. Representative Preston. Mr. Clerk, read the Resolution."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Joint Resolution 127 urges the adoption of a policy of 'vertical prosecution' by the State's Attorney.

Judiciary II Committee recommends 'be adopted'."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Preston."

Preston: "Excuse me, Madam Speaker, Madam... Madam Speaker, this
is a Motion to take from the Speaker's Table or to adopt
HJR 1277"

Speaker Breslin: "It's a Motion to adopt the Resolution."

Preston: "Okav. Well. I do so move to adopt HJR 127 which is a that ask the prosecutors the Resolution state*s attorneys, in each of Illinois 102 counties to have what is called *vertical prosecution of child abuse "Vertical prosecution" is where and when possible a prosecutor is assigned to the case from the time of the intake interview until the time of trial. The reason for this Resolution is so that a child need not have to tell and retell the intimate details of the sexual assault to under... unfortunately,... unfortunate current procedure up to some six or eight different prosecutors. The result is that children who are sex abuse victims cannot undergo that additional trauma and cannot go through the prosecutorial

136 Legislative Day

June 27, 1986

process. When that happens, the... the offender goes free.

And I'd ask for your 'aye' vote to adopt this Resolution?"

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of House Joint Resolution 127. And on that question, is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt House Joint Resolution 127?' All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And House Joint Resolution 127 is adopted. House Joint Resolution 164, Representative Pedersen. Clerk, read... Clerk, read the Resolution."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Joint Resolution 164 warns U. S. Congress
to beware Russian... of Russ... of Russian threat and to
adopt a National Strategy of Peace Through Strength.

Executive Committee recommends 'be adopted'."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Pedersen."

Pedersen: "Thank you, Madam Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is just a... the usual kind of Peace Through Strength Resolution that the Veterans Organization have asked us to approve. And I just recommend that we

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved that the House adopt

House Joint Resolution 164. And on that question,

Representative Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Yes, will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Breslin: "He indicates he will."

Cullerton: "Thank you. Representative, I don't have... I can't find my file on this Resolution. If it's not too long, could you read it in its entirety?"

Pedersen: "It's a couple of pages. Do you want me to read it?"

Cullerton: "Well, maybe you can get down to the... Does it have

a lot of "whereas's'?"

Pedersen: "Yeah."

Cullerton: "Does it have any resolves?"

136 Legislative Day

June 27, 1986

Pedersen: "Yes."

Cullerton: "Why don't you read the resolves?"

Pedersen: "Resolved, by the House of Representatives of the 84th General Assembly of State of Illinois, that the Senate concurring hearin, that we urge the Congress of the States to adopt a National Strategy of Peace Through Strength the general principles of which would be: 113 to inspire. focus, and unite the national will determination to achieve this goal of peace through (2) to achieve overall military and technological freedom: superiority over the Soviet Union; (3) to strategic defense and a civil defense which would protect the United States citizens against nuclear war at least well as the Soviets defend their citizens: (4) to accept no arms control agreement which, in any way, jeopardizes the security of the United States or its allies, or locks the United States into a position of military inferiority; (5) to re-establish effective security and intelligence capabilities; (6) to pursue positive non-military means to roll back the growth of communism; (7) to help our..."

Cullerton: "Mr.... Madam Speaker."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Cullerton."

Cullerton: "If... if the Gentleman wouldn't mind, I wonder if I

could just... if you just give me some time to find a copy

of the Resolution, we can come back to it. I..."

Pedersen: "I have a copy here, if you would like it?"

Cullerton: "If you could take it out of the record just for a second until I get a copy of it."

Pedersen: "Okay."

Speaker Breslin: "Out of the record. House Joint Resolution 171,
Representative Pangle. Out of the record. Representative
Kulas, with leave of the Body. we'll go back to House
Resolution 665 and ask you to present it on behalf of

136 Legislative Day

June 27. 1986

Speaker Madigan. House Resolution 665. Read the Resolution, Mr. Clerk"

Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 665..."

- Kulas: "Thank you, Madam ... Thank you, Madam Speaker. House
 Resolution 665, offered by Representative Madigan, urges
 the United States Congress either to strengthen the federal
 right-to-know regulations or to permit individual states to
 impose stricter laws as they see fit. And I would move for
 its adoption."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Kulas moves for the adoption of House Resolution 665. And on that question, the Lady from Marshall, Representative Koehler."
- Koehler: "Thank you, Madam Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Hould Representative Kulas please yield for a question?"

Speaker Breslin: "He will."

Koehler: "Representative Kulas, I understand from this... from... that you are introducing this Resolution that would strengthen the federal right-to-know regulations or to permit individual states to improve stricter laws than the federal rules and regulations. Is that correct?"

Kulas: "It urges the Congress to do so. Yes, Ma'am."

- Koehler: "Well, Representative Kulas, why would you want the
 State of Illinois to enact stricter guidelines than what
 the Federal Government is considering right now?"
- "Well. I'll tell you why. Representative Koehler. Kulas: Last in my district, there was a fire in a chemical plant. This fire brought to light that this chemical plant there for six months. It had a previous fire. The U.S. EPA, the City of Chicago knew about the dangerous chemicals that were in this plant, but none the o f This is in a residential area. residents. None of the residents knew that there were chemicals in this plant.

136 Legislative Day

June 27, 1986

There were children living there. There are families living there, and that's why I'm asking that these... that Congress do something about... to strengthen these laws or allow the states to do so."

Koehler: "Well, Representative Kulas, I can certainly empathize with your concern, and as you well know, we, here in the General Assembly, have passed legislation last year that... that dealt with the problem of community right-to-know in allowing individuals to know what is happening within their own area. However, I fail to see where this Resolution would, in effect, be an improvement over what we are doing right here in the State of Illinois. I . . . If remember correctly. your side of the aisle, you and Representative Madigan had a piece of legislation that actually dealt with the issue of community right-to-know, but yet, you failed it for a vote on the House floor, even though it did get out onto the House floor. So, I think that surprising that your commitment to this issue is just now showing up in the form of a Resolution that really is non-binding. It is only advisory in nature. And so, I would not support this legislation; however, I certainly do empathize with the concern of those individuals who dealing with this issue. However, I think the right way to approach that is through legislation that deals with response plans such as the response plans that we worked out in legislation last year and also deals with the issue right here in the State of Illinois where we better what is important for us. The federal people are certainly working on the issue of community right-to-know, and for us to enact legislation or to pass this Resolution in this manner, I think, is inappropriate, and I would... I would not support this Resolution."

Speaker Breslin: "Is there any further discussion? Hearing none,

136 Legislative Day

June 27, 1986

Representative Kulas to close."

"Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Kulas: House. This is a simple Resolution, and all we are asking... It's unfortunate, but a lot of times. our Congressmen and our Senators, once they get to Washington. they forget about what's going on. They re so busy with so many other things that once in a while they have to be And all we are doing then, here in this reminded. Resolution, is urging them to do something in this area, an area which concerns the health and welfare of the... of the the State of Illinois, and I would ask for the people of adoption of the Resolution."

Speaker Breslin: "The question is, "Shall the House adopt House Resolution 665?" All those in favor vote "aye", all those opposed vote "no". Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from Will, Representative Davis, one minute to explain your vote."

Davis: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise to explain my "yes" vote simply because some people may think that's peculiar. I can tell you the Federal Government right now is marking up a Bill in Conference Committee that will provide stricter regulations than Senate Bill... or House Bill 2117 or last year House Bill 300, that the Speaker was trying to enact in Illinois. much tougher standards than those. that Bill will pass the United States Congress and it will law of the land. So this Resolution inst effectively urges them to get on about the business in that Conference Committee, and that will be the Uniform Federal Community Right-to-Know Bill that, frankly, is my discussions with tougher. In the petro-chemical industries and people like that. thev know it's coming. They've had their input into it, and that's going to So, while this seems to meaningless happen. be а

136 Legislative Day

June 27. 1986

Resolution. I think we should urge Congress to do exactly that, and a 'yes' vote probably is a very good vote."

Speaker Breslin: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 95 voting 'aye', 19 voting 'no', and none voting 'present', and the House does adopt House Resolution 665. Representative Pangle. Representative Pangle's Bill is now ready. With leave of the Body, we'll go to House Joint Resolution 171, Representative Pangle."

Pangle: "Thank you. Madam Speaker."

Speaker Breslin: "Excuse me. Clerk... "

Pangle: "House Joint Resolution 171 deals with the problem of notch babies. Those are the folks that were born between the years of 1916 and 1921. There was a flaw in an Amendment that was added in 1972 to change the formula of compensation, and it has lowered the amount of money that, in fact, people that were born between those years now receive. This Resolution has asked Congress to change that formula."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Pangle has moved for the House Joint Resolution 171. And on that of any discussion? Hearing none, question, is there question is, 'Shall House Joint Resolution 171 be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and House Joint Resolution 171 is adopted. With leave of the Body. I would like now to go to Senate Joint Resolution 23 for Representative Piel. Representative Piel."

Piel: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Senate Joint Resolution 23 is put in on behalf of the veterans groups in Illinois, and basically what it does, it urges Congress to re-enact May 30th as Memorial Day. And that's all it does."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Piel, did you move for the

136 Legislative Day

June 27, 1986

adoption of the Resolution?"

Piel: "Yes, I would move for the adoption of Senate Joint Resolution #23."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Senate Joint Resolution 23. And on that question, is there any discussion? This Resolution re—establishes Hay 30th to be observed as Memorial Day. Is there any discussion? The Lady from Lake, Representative Stern."

Stern: "Madam Speaker, and... may I ask the Gentleman a question?

Will the Gentleman yield?"

Piel: "Yes."

Speaker Breslin: "He will yield."

Stern: "Representative, I apparently wasn't paying enough attention. Does this change the date in Illinois, or does this urge the Congress to change the date?"

Piel: "It urges Congress to re-establish May 30th. As you know.

it's about 10 years ago they went to..."

Stern: "I remember."

Piel: "... The fourth Monday in the month, and this... we had

Memorial Day as May 30th for over 110 years, and this

basically asks to re—enact May 30th."

Stern: "I would drink to your Motion, Sir."

Piel: "Thank you."

Speaker Breslin: "Is there any further discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall House... Shall Senate Joint Resolution 23 be adopted?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 109 voting 'aye', 6 voting 'no', and 1 voting 'present', and the House does adopt Senate Joint Resolution 23. Representative Shaw is recognized on a Motion."

Shaw: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Yes, having voted on the

136 Legislative Day

June 27, 1986

prevailing side, I would make a Motion that we consider the way the vote was taken on Senate Bill 2157.

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Shaw, the first thing you have to do is move to suspend Rule 73(a) to allow for immediate consideration of the Motion to reconsider the vote by which the..."

Shaw: "I so move."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Shaw moves to suspend Rule 73(a) to allow immediate consideration of a Motion to reconsider the vote by which Senate Bill 2157 lost. This Motion requires 60 votes. All those in favor... Is there any discussion on that question? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Piel."

Piel: "Nevermind, Madam Speaker."

Speaker Breslin: "Any further discussion? Hearing none, the question is, "Shall the House suspend Rule 73(a) to allow for immediate consideration of Representative Shaw's Motion to reconsider the vote by which Senate Bill 2157 lost?"

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

Voting is open. The Gentleman from Will, Representative Van Duyne, one minute to explain your vote."

Van Duyne: "Yes, Madam Speaker, this... I just want to recall to all the Members on the House floor that the Hotion that the Gentleman is presenting now has a direct effect on Senate Bill 2157 which we... was resoundingly defeated on this House floor just a couple of days ago. And if they pass his Motion to reconsider, they're going to all be forced again to vote on that Bill all over again, and that's the Bill that would have allowed the county boards to impose a 10 percent surcharge strictly for the circuit clerk's office added to the fine. Now, I went... we went through that before. The Bill was resoundingly defeated, and if you pass this... his Motion to reconsider the vote, why

136 Legislative Day

- June 27, 1986
- you're going to have to do this all over again, so naturally, I would... I would ask for a 'no' vote."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Piel, one minute to explain your vote."
- Piel: "Just to explain, Madam Speaker, that it's my understanding that this is agreed by both sides of the aisle, and I would ask for a 'yes' vote on this."
- Speaker Breslin: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this... excuse me, Representative Tate, did you wish to explain your vote?"
- Tate: "If this receives the requisite number of votes, I'm going to verify it."
- Speaker Breslin: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 75 voting 'aye', 35 voting 'no', and 1 voting 'present'. 60 votes are required for adoption. Do you persist in your request for a verification, Ar. Tate? You are within your rights, Sir. What do you wish?"
- Tate: "Okay. Madam Speaker, my arm just changed directions, and

 I withdraw from the verification."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman withdraws the request for the verification. On this question, there are 75 voting 'aye', 35 voting 'no', and 1 voting 'present', and the Motion is adopted. Representative Shaw now moves to reconsider the vote by which Senate Bill 257 (sic 2157) failed, to take that Bill from the table and place it on the Calendar, Order Third Reading and suspend Rule 37(g) on the Bill until June 30th, 1986. On that question, is there any discussion? Representative Van Duyne."
- Van Duyne: "Excuse me, Madam Speaker. I didn°t hear what you just said."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has made a Motion. The Motion is to reconsider the vote by which Senate Bill 250... 2157

136 Legislative Day

June 27, 1986

failed and to take that Bill from the table and place it on the Calendar, Order of Third Reading and suspend Rule 37(g) on the Bill until June 30th, 1986, meaning that we've suspended the deadline for it to be heard. That, of course, would have to be done for it to be heard at all, you understand."

Van Duyne: "Yes, well, if it's... if it takes... I object."

Speaker Breslin: "You may state your objections. He will have a vote on this..."

Van Duyne: "Well, I just consider... it an argument not worth its... worth doing, because of the fact we ve already went through this before. It seems that you should really Bill. I know it's probably against the rules to address the Bill when you're addressing his Motion. nevertheless, in order to... to state your reasons for... for opposing his Motion, you must tell the Members of the Body what you're objecting to, and that is, I object very specific to... specifically to adding 10 percent surcharge more for the circuit clerk's office on top of the 10 dollars and the three dollars that they already get. as I said before in my debate, I don't know who's in love with the circuit clerks' offices in the State of the circuit clerks, but I think the 50 dollar hit on a regular... if I can use the regular traffic fine as analogy for argument in this case, that's a 50 dollar hit, and I think it's... it's absurd to even charge 50 dollars when the circuit clerks get 13 dollars out of that, much less add another 10 percent surcharge to this, which would give the circuit clerk's office another five dollars. Now. I've also stated in my debate before that no one has proven to me yet that the circuit clerk even deserves 13 dollars out of a 15 dollar fine when the county also gets a 23 dollar portion of that 50 dollars. And evidently,

136 Legislative Day

June 27. 1986

doesn't believe me. but I think that the Members of this Body should understand that they are literally in a traffic fine, using that analogy again, are adding five dollars to the 50 dollar fine now in just a normal three or four mile traffic ticket. And it's even worse as the fines Now, some people say, well, they wouldn't do it's the position of the circuit clerk's office that but they do need this money, they want the money. used to charging the money, and they would. Take it from me, they would. Now, if you pass this Motion, you're going to have to go through the whole debate all over again. and just feel that the Members, when they do vote, that they should let the thing die. It was killed resoundingly, and they should do it one more time and get it over with."

- Speaker Breslin: "There being no further discussion, the question is, 'Shall the House reconsider the vote by which Senate Bill 2157 failed and take that Bill from the table and place it on the Order of Third Reading and suspend Rule 37(g) on the Bill until June 30th, 1986? All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Representative Piel, one minute to explain his vote."
- Piel: "No, I'm sorry. I didn't have my light on, Madam Speaker."

 Speaker Breslin: "Representative Van Duyne, for what reason do you rise?"
- Van Duyne: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. If this gets a prerequisite amount of votes, I°d like to verify the Roll Call."
- Speaker Breslin: "Fine. Representative Cullerton, one minute to explain your vote."
- Cullerton: "Yes, I just wanted to indicate, in explaining my vote, that I understand that I, too, had some questions

136 Legislative Day

June 27, 1986

concerning this Bill which we tried to clear up through legislative intent when Representative Steczo and I first debated the Bill. I understand now that Representative Steczo has agreed to hold the Bill on Third Reading and perhaps take it back to Second for the purpose of some Amendments which would clear up any confusion concerning the Bill, and for that reason, I'm supporting the Motion so that we can get it on Third Reading and perhaps amend it to clean it up."

- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Steczo, one minute to explain your vote."
- Steczo: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Members of the House. concur with the remarks of Representative Cullerton. There debate as to what this Bill did, and we have some discussed with the Senate, over the last few days, the possibility of putting this legislation in good shape. They have agreed and; therefore, we have agreed to this Motion, so when the Bill is amended on Third Reading... on Second Reading sometime over the weekend or lst, that the Bill will before July the be as noncontroversial as possible. I would urge a 'yes' vote."
- Speaker Breslin: "Have all voted who wish? Vote only your own switches. There's a request for a verification. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 78 voting "aye", 36 voting "no", and 1 voting "present". Representative Van Duyne has requested a verification of the affirmative. Representative Van Duyne, do you persist in your request? Yes, he does. Poll the affirmative, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Poll of the Affirmative. Alexander. Barnes. Berrios. Black-Bowman. Braun. Breslin. Brookins Bullock. Capparelli. Churchill. Cowlishaw. Cullerton. Daley. Daniels. Davis. Curran. Currie. DeJaegher.

136 Legislative Day

June 27. 1986

DeLeo. Deuchler. Didrickson. Ewing. Farley. Flinn. Virginia Frederick. Giglio. Giorgi. Greiman. Hallock. Hensel. Hoffman."

Speaker Breslin: "Excuse me, Mr. Clerk. Representative Van

Duyne, Representative Brookins asks leave to be verified.

Representative Brookins. The Gentleman has leave. Others

are asking for leave to be verified. Representative Van

Duyne, let's record these names. Representative Nash.

Preston. Huff. Didrickson. Olson. Cowlishaw. Kirkland.

Piel. Black. Wait. Ryder. Stern. Proceed, Mr. Clerk.

Clerk O'Brien: "Continuing the Poll of the Affirmative. Huff. Keane. Kirkland. Klemm. Krska. Kubik. Kulas. Laurino. LeFlore. Levin-Martinez. Matijevich. Mays. McGanna McNamara. McPike. Nash. O'Connell. Olson. Panayotovich. Pangle. Parke. W. Peterson. Piel. Pullen. Regan. Rice. Richmond. Ronan-Ryder. Shaw. Slater. Stange. Steczo. Stern. Sutker. Terzich. Washington. White. Wojcik. Vinson-Wolf. Wyvetter Younge. Zwick. And Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Breslin: "Anthony Young wishes to change his vote from "no" to "aye"."

Van Duyne: "Andy. Tony."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Turner changes his vote from
"no" to "aye"."

Van Duyne: "It's mutiny, is what it is."

Speaker Breslin: "Do you wish to persist, Sir?"

Van Duyne: "I withdraw my request, Madam Speaker."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman withdraws his request for a verification. On this question, there are 80 voting 'aye', 34 voting 'no', and 1 voting 'present', and the House does adopt the Motion to reconsider the vote by which Senate Bill 2157 failed, take the Bill from the table and place it on the Order of Third Reading and suspends Rule 37(g) so

136 Legislative Day

June 27. 1986

that the Bill can be heard up until June 30th of *86.

Ladies and Gentlemen, on a Special Subject Natter Call on Education on the Order of Concurrence, page five on your Calendar appears House Bill 3187, Representative Cullerton.

Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3187, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code together with Senate Amendment #2."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Cullerton."

- Cullerton: "Yes, you, Madam Speaker and Ladies thank Gentlemen of the House. This... You may recall, this was up yesterday. We concurred with Senate Amendment #1. We were discussing Senate Amendment #2, and there were some questions that were raised. I took the Bill out the record in order for the people who were Amendment to take an opportunity to explain it, not only to me, but to Members of the General Assembly. The Amendment revises the punitive action Section of the Bill. It's an Amendment which was proposed by groups that have the initials IASA, IASB, and EDRED, which are educational interest groups. Some school officials believe that the threat of lowering... the threat of lowering of grades due to the excessive absences on the part of a truant is a viable option for school officials to use in encouraging school attendance, and so, this Amendment eliminates lowering of grades for non-academic reasons as a specific prohibitive action which the school district may take against a truant. I would appreciate your support on the Motion to concur."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman moves to concur in Senate

 Amendment #2 to House Bill 3187. And on that question, the

 Gentleman from McLean, Representative Ropp."
- Ropp: "Yeah, thank you, Madam Speaker. To the Body. That is about what the intent is to deal with truancy based on the

136 Legislative Day

June 27. 1986

fact that the threat, if you leave school or don't come to school, we're going to lower your grade. I think it's a bit unusual, but it's at least a way that some people are attempting to deal with truancy. I think that there are much and many better ways to deal with that rather than this soft kind of a glad hand across the report card as to trying to deal with truants."

Speaker Breslin: "The question is, "Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 3187?* **A11** those vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 97 voting 'aye', 18 voting 'no', and 1... Laurino votes 'aye'. There are 98 voting 'aye', 18 voting *no*, and 1 voting *present*, and the House does concur Senate Amendment \$1 to House Bill 3187. And this Bill. having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby Representative Cullerton moves that the declared passed. House stand in recess now until the hour of 5:00 p.m. Ladies and Gentlemen, it is the intent of the House to stand in recess until 5:00 p.m., when we will come back and have one important matter, among address. and that is the issue of insurance. We plan to go Order of Business, so on Representative... Representative Cullerton's Motion, the House... Are objections to recessing until 5:00? Hearing none, the House stands recessed until 5:00 p.m. today for further The House will come to order. Representative Terzich in the Chair for а very special announcement. Ladies and Gentlemen, Representative Terzich."

Terzich: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. It gives me a great honor to prove to you Members of the Illinois General Assembly that

136 Legislative Day

June 27. 1986

we come from a fine stock and there is a country known as Yugoslavia, which all of us Croatians are proud of, and it gives me a great deal of pleasure to have with us this afternoon, the Consul General of Yugoslavia, Bahrudin Bijedic, and he's here to visit us and say a few words. Consul General?

- Bahrudin Bijedic: "Thank you. I want to greet all of you, and I am here to build friendly... much more friendly relations
 United States and Yugoslavia, and epecially Illinois and
 Yugoslavia. I wish you a lot of happiness. In your business, I wish you a lot of success. Thank you."
- Panayotovich: "Thank you, Consul General, and this shows that

 Serbians and Croatians can get together, and I want to

 thank the Consul General for coming here for my birthday

 from Yugoslavia. Thank you, Consul General."
- Terzich: "Make sure you vote our way. It's 'aye' for Terzich and Panayotovich, and you'll be going home as a better person."

 Speaker Breslin: "Representative Vinson, for what reason do you rise?"
- Vinson: "Well, Madam Speaker, some two hours ago, you promised
 the House that at 5:00 we'd do something for the consumers
 of insurance. And the hour of 5:00 has come and passed,
 and I'm wondering when the Speaker's going to do something
 about insurance. Ever?"
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Vinson. Representative Vinson, you will recall that I said when we recessed that the plan was to come back and hopefully, we could pick up the Order of Insurance, and that is still the plan as far as I know. So, as soon as we can... "

Vinson: "You... I thought you said 5:00."

Speaker Breslin: "We recessed until 5:00."

Vinson: "This isn't a very effective train you've got running."

Speaker Breslin: "A lot better than you ever ran."

136 Legislative Day

June 27. 1986

Vinson: "Yeah, but we did it for the people."

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

- Kulas: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. It just amazes me that the Member from the other side of the aisle can tell time, because yesterday, when the Republicans asked for a Caucus, they said they were going to be in until 3:30, but they didn't come in until 5:00. And today, we went through the House's business fine when the Representative wasn't on the floor. There was no arguments. We did the work of the House, and I don't see any reason for this."
- Speaker Breslin: "Your point is well taken, Representative Kulas.

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

 Speaker Breslin: "Ladies and Gentlemen, we are going to go to the Order of Motions, which appear on Supplemental Calendar #1.

 The first Resolution on that Order... or the first Motion, I should say, on that Order of Call is House Resolution 1419, Representative Terzich. You have a Motion to discharge the Executive Committee on House Resolution 1419."
- Terzich:: "Yes, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, on House Resolution 1419 was to... was on the Calendar on the Executive Committee to be heard this morning. And unfortunately, either some of the Members were unaware that the time was changed, but it was... unfortunately, we didn't have a quorum to hear this Resolution, and I would appreciate support to discharge the Executive Committee. The House Resolution has to deal with the Clean Indoor Air Act being applicable to state buildings, and I would appreciate your support."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman moves pursuant to Rule 77(a) to discharge the Executive Committee and place House Resolution 1419 on the Order of the Speaker's Table. And

136 Legislative Day

June 27. 1986

on that question, the Gentleman from DeWitt, Representative

Vinson: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen in the House. I rise in opposition to the Gentleman's Motion. Me the last hours of a Legislative Session where several vital issues are being dealt with. I don*t Member of this Assembly can fail to understand the importance of the Speaker's unwillingness and failure to go to the Order of Insurance... tort reform. That's what ought to be dealing with. Instead, the Speaker goes to a Motion that deals with an issue that the House has defeated once this Session and that the Senate's defeated once Session - in both cases, by significant votes. And so, we go to a Resolution that deals with that matter rather issue of some significance for Illinois. like tort reform and the cost and availability of liability insurance. That alone is reason enough to reject this. The Gentleman has had his chance. He's had his and he's been defeated, and now his own Committee, shot. his own Committee, he can't even get a Resolution out of. reason enough to reject this... this issue, and I would urge a 'no' vote on the Gentleman's Motion. for a Roll Call vote, and I would ask for verification, should it appear to get a Majority."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Panayotovich, on the Motion."

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

Speaker Breslin: "Yes, he will."

Panayotovich: "Representative Terzich, could you explain again what this Motion is and what the substance is of this piece of legislation you have?"

Terzich: "Yes, this is not anything to do with the Bill. All I

136 Legislative Day

June 27, 1986

that the... the Committee be discharged. Unfortunately. there wasn't a sufficient number of Members in attendance. It wasn't the idea that I didn't get it out of Committee. We lacked a quorum, and the Resolution statement asking the Executive Branch Government and the elected officials to adopt Air Act for state office buildings. It has nothing to do with the Clean Indoor Air Act. It's a Resolution I think that should be brought forward to the Members of the General Assembly, and all I'm asking for is a discharge. I didnot have an opportunity to present it, and certainly that it should be presented to the Members of the General Assembly."

- Panayotovich: "Thank you. To the Motion. I also stand opposition to this Motion because Representative Terzich has had the Bill on the Indoor Clean... Air Act. discussed this on the House floor. It's been defeated here and in the Senate. We have talked together about this. about sitting down with all interested parties and try to work a piece of legislation up for this in the next year or think it's had its hearing. We have other, more important issues. The Indoor Clean Act... Air was killed once. I think we should not let this out. and I ask for your 'no' votes."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Marion, Representative Friedrich, on the Motion."
- Friedrich: "Madam Speaker, I have had a House Resolution on the Calendar for months, House Resolution 1026, and I have not pressed it because I thought the press of other business was probably more important. I want to leave it on the Calendar, and hopefully this fall, we'll have some extra time, but I don't believe this is time to revive this thing that's been kicked around here all Session, and I would

136 Legislative Day

June 27, 1986

have to oppose the Motion."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from McLean, Representative Ropp."

Ropp: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. In all due respects to those who are opposing it, it's... to the degree that this is the waning hours of the legislation (sic — Legislature), let me also remind you that for your life's sake, this could be the waning hours of the life and breath situation of your very health. And it certainly seems that the State of Illinois, by its example, should show to the state what we intend to do in terms of attempting to further improving our air and the quality and hoping that we can extend people's lives by allowing clean, wholesome, fresh air, and that's what this is attempting to do — provide that example to the rest of the state."

Speaker Breslin: "There being no further discussion,

Representative Terzich, to close."

Terzich: "Yes. Madam Speaker. in all fairness. all I want to do is discharge the Committee and place it on the Speaker's The issue before us, of course, is the Resolution Tables which deals with a Clean Indoor Air Act which does not apply to any private industry, offices or anything of that nature, simply asking the State Government to type of a policy to make a better quality of air that we breathe and where we work and where we participate the State Government. Not only is it for the public safety, but also for the many people who work for the State of Illinois. So, I think in all fairness, that I am not really wanting to discuss the Resolution in itself, but I did make an attempt to have it heard in the Executive Unfortunately. I was not able to do that. so Committee. therefore, I put in the Motion to discharge Committee, let me have my day on my Resolution the same as anybody

June 27. 1986

else, and so, in all fairness, I think that we should all vote 'aye' to put this on the Speaker's Table."

- Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall the House discharge Executive Committee from further consideration Resolution 1419, pursuant to Rule 77(a) and advance this Bill to the Order of the Speaker's Table? All those vote "ave", all those opposed vote "no". Voting is open. Representative Mautino, would you help me there? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 45 voting 'aye', 62 voting 'no', and 1 voting 'present', and the Motion fails. House Resolution 1520, Representative Out of the record. Oh, excuse me. Representative Pullen-Pullen."
- Pullen: "Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the appropriate rule to have House Resolution 1520 heard without reference to Committee."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Lady moves pursuant to Rule 43(a) to bypass

 Committee and place House Resolution 1520 on the Speaker's

 Table for immediate consideration. Is there any

 discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative

 Terzich, on the Motion."
- Terzich: "Well, I... I would assume Representative Vinson would have the same objection to the rest of these Motions, and I'm sure he'd speak for it."
- Speaker Breslin: "Is there any further discussion? Does the Lady have leave to bypass Committee on this Bill and immediate consideration? Okay. The question is, Ladies and Gentlemen, 'Shall the House, pursuant to Rule House Resolution 1520 and place this bypass Committee on Resolution ٥n the Speaker's Table for immediate consideration? All those in favor vote "aye", all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Representative Homer?

136 Legislative Day

June 27, 1986

Representative Homer? Would you vote me "aye", please?

The Lady from Cook, Representative Currie, to explain her vote. Please listen, Ladies and Gentlemen. This is an important matter. Listen to what the Lady has to say.

- Currie: "Thank you, Madam Speaker and Members of the House. did vote to bypass Committee on the previous Resolution, and I vote "ves" on this Motion on House Resolution 1520 as well. I've had a look at the subject of House Resolution 1520, and like the prior Resolution, it seems to me this is an important issue, one that should be discussed and o f debated and adopted on the floor of this House Representatives. Apparently, information has recently come to the attention of the Sponsors of this Resolution, information that I think should be important to us all, and I would encourage us to give the Lady the number of votes she needs to put this Motion... put this Resolution before us so that we can all participate in that discussion."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative

 Terzich. I believe you have already spoken on this

 question, and you may not speak in debate."
- Terzich: "All I want to know is what the Resolution is."
- Speaker Breslin: "Excuse me, Representative Terzich. For what reason do you rise?"
- Terzich: "I don't have a copy of the Resolution."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Terzich, the Motion indicates that the Resolution has been reproduced and has been distributed on the Members," desks. They will give you one here. Representative Mulcahey, on the question."
- Mulcahey: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I wonder if Representative
 Pullen... I was wondering if Representative Pullen... I
 was wondering if Representative Pullen, in the explanation
 of her vote, could explain what the Resolution is."
- Speaker Breslin: "I don't think that will be necessary,

136 Legislative Day

June 27, 1986

Representative Mulcahey... "

Mulcahev: "Well. I do. I... I'd like to... "

Speaker Breslin: "The Lady has the necessary votes so that she discuss the Resolution in a moment. Take the Roll Call. Mr. Clerk. On this question, there are 90 18 voting *no*, and 2 voting *present*, and the Motion carries. Representative Pullen, on the Resolution.* Pullen: "Thank you, Madam Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. It is with sadness that I have filed this Resolution together with two of my colleagues. offered the Resolution for the private consideration of the Gentleman to whom it is directed earlier this week. found that he apparently was not interested in giving a response, and so we have filed this Resolution after giving him ample time to consider it on his own. The Resolution calls upon the Secretary of State of Illinois to lift an order by which some of his employees have been suspended for their conscientious refusal to wear a button upon their uniform that promotes one of his programs. It is of great concern to me - and I think, should be to many Members of Body - when a Constitutional Officer takes his zeal for some of his programs so far as to suspend employees progressive suspension basis when thev conscientious objection to being asked to wear a button The Resolution states that state employees their uniform. are valued representatives of this state in serving the and that they ought to be judged on the basis of their service to the public, and that these suspensions result from no breach of service to the public, but from their own conscientious objection to being ordered to wear I know of at least two employees who a button to work. have been suspended for this. They were given written

notice after verbal warning that if they did not comply

136 Legislative Day

June 27, 1986

with the new uniform dress code order hy wearing the that they would be suspended for one day, and that if they returned to work after that day and still did not the button, they would be suspended for three days. And now, the suspension that they are facing a week is for five days, and I don't know where it ends, but I think it ought to end here. And so. with great sadness, because to... to some certainly do respect the Gentleman that this Resolution directed toward. but with great earnestness that I offer this Resolution on behalf of these employees and all of the employees of the Office of Secretary of State who feel that they should be able to make a decision if they do not want to wear a button on their uniform. And I urge its adoption."

Speaker Breslin: "You have heard the Lady's Resolution. Is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Would the Lady vield for a question?"

Speaker Breslin: "She indicates she will."

Matijevich: "I understand most of what you say, but I°d like to know, for my information, what type of program was this button endorsing? Was it I-Search or the literacy program or DUI program, or what... election program? What... What program?"

Pullen: "It is not a campaign button. I... in terms of a political campaign. It's a... It's an issue campaign, I guess. I'm happy to answer your question, but I would like to indicate first that that is irrelevant to my motives in introducing this because... "

Matijevich: "Well, it's relevant to my vote. I'd like to know."

Pullen: "Okay. I said, I am happy to answer it, but I would like

you to understand that it's the principle of the thing that

136 Legislative Day

June 27, 1986

is the reason I put this in."

Matijevich: "Sure. I understand."

Pullen: "It's a button that promotes the organ donor program."

Matijevich: "I see."

Pullen: "But I would put this in if it were a button that promotes the Statue of Liberty restoration project or any other kind of worthy project, as I'm sure that all of us feel the organ donor program is."

Matijevich: "Do you think possibly that these two employees may... they may refuse on their own convictions, or there may be some employees who might feel that by endorsing οf Edgar's... Secretary Edgar's programs, that translate to a political endorsement. In other agree with you, no matter what the issue is, because I think that sometimes if a Constitutional Officer, example, demands that somebody put on a endorsing a pet project of that ... that Constitutional Officer, that may endorse... that may tend to make feel that that's a campaign button. Did that enter... You may feel that may have entered their minds also."

Pullen: "Well, Sir, you are free to make that interpretation. I

don't happen to share that interpretation, but it is

certainly available to you if you desire it."

Matijevich: "Well... Well, I... I feel that some employees might... might feel that way. Your response leads me to believe that this... if this were some other campaign button... some other button, you may not have offered this Resolution, because of your response."

Pullen: "No, that's not the case."

Matijevich: "Alright, you've answered my questions, then. Thank
you."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Champaign, Representative

Johnson."

136 Legislative Day

June 27, 1986

Johnson: "I suppose you can only make temporary enemies hv OР an issue like this, but as one of the two... speaking well, I guess more than two, number of Sponsors this year effort to try to encourage, facilitate and promote organ donations based on the premise. so absolutely thousands and thousands of lives can and are being saved and can, if we do better in that regard, think that I can't let this time go by without addressing the issue. I understand it, the Secretary of State has said that employees oppose that program based on religious grounds. that they don't have to wear the buttons. but that the of State is, and I can tell you specifically is, Secretary because we negotiated with them extensively and their assistance on putting through an organ donation program, extensively involved in the effort to try to make Illinois citizens know about organ donations and the lifesaving tendency - and more than tendency - lifesaving realities of those things, I don't think it's unreasonable, in the absence of transgressing on somebody for religious grounds, and they're not, to make, as a reasonable requirement of the... of the job, that you promote and join in the efforts to promote the Secretary of State organ donations. certainly don't begrudge the Sponsor at all. I realize she has strong feelings on this subject, and I'm not, in any way disrespectful to her Motion, but I would further you only have to look around this chamber to see the reality or the potential reality of what organ for people who are born or who grow up with congenital heart or kidney or liver or corneal problems. and what... organ donations can potentially do in that regard. So, reluctantly and with all due respect tο the Sponsor, I think this is a reasonable requirement, and it's something that the Legislature ought to

136 Legislative Day

June 27, 1986

Secretary of State, and it ought to reconfirm our previously expressed intention to speak strongly in favor of a program that has the potential to save thousands and thousands and thousands of lives."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative

Terzich."

Terzich: "Representative Pullen, on this... did you mention that these were public service officers? Does this mean that they were Secretary of State Police?"

Pullen: "No, they're public service clerks."

Terzich: "Clerks? Do they belong to AFSCME or any union?"

Pullen: "I am not certain."

Terzich: "You don't really believe that the Secretary of State will suspend somebody because of not wearing a button. I'm sure that Secretary Edgar is a very admirable person. He runs a good agency, and that he doesn't do things like that unless there was some serious problems. Why would we get involved in a problem which you stipulate is buttons?

Don't these employees have a right or recourse, either through the union that they may belong to or a civil service review?"

Pullen: "I agree that Secretary of State... that the Secretary of State is an honorable man, but that is not necessarily related to his decision in this instance. There is, indeed, absolutely no other reasons for these suspensions. It is based solely on that order concerning his policy on this matter."

Terzich: "Well, that may be your assumption, but also then, maybe
we should put in Resolutions for every employee of the
State of Illinois that gets suspended or fired if we don't
agree with the... whoever is in charge, that these persons
should be suspended or fired or anything of that nature.
We should intervene on all the employees on their behalf

136 Legislative Day

- June 27, 1986
- and let us sit in judgment of whether or not they should be suspended. Do you think that's right?"
- Pullen: "I think that employees should be judged on the basis of their service to the public."
- Terzich: "Are you going to sit in judgment on that, or are you going to let the process of their... their review board take care of that?"
- Pullen: "What I am asking the House to do is to judge the wisdom of suspending employees on this basis, not asking the House to judge the service of these employees."
- Terzich: "Why don't you let the... the... you know. Personnel

 Review Board determine that? Why should the Legislature
 determine that?"
- Pullen: "You are free to vote 'no', if you would like to. Sir."
- Terzich: "Then, you don't trust Edgar's judgment. You... or the
 Personnel Board's judgment, then. You... You're saying you
 don't trust Secretary Edgar's judgment in this case?"
- Pullen: "Those are your words, Sir."
- Terzich: "Well, that's why you put in the Resolution, then. You
 don't trust your Secretary of State and the job that he's
 doing. That's terrible."
- Pullen: "I do not agree with his judgment in this situation.

 That doesn't mean I don't trust his judgment. I do not agree with it."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Marion, Representative Friedrich."
- Friedrich: "Madam Speaker and Members of the House, I certainly support the donor program. I am glad that Secretary Edgar supports it. What I don't support is his leaning on his employees to do something that has nothing to do with their job. If he can suspend people for this, then the Attorney General can suspend people because they don't wear a Red Cross button or something else. I don't think that has

136 Legislative Day

June 27, 1986

anything to do with State Government. T think it's an abuse of power on his part. and I think he should reconsider his position. He has been given an opportunity to do that voluntarily. I don't see anything wrong with the Secretary of State's employees wearing this voluntarily. I do see something wrong with his suspending if they're not willing to wear it. That's what's wrong. here, and I think he ought to realize what we're trying to get at."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from McLean, Representative Ropp."

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

Speaker Breslin: "She indicates she will."

Ropp: "Representative, I think this is certainly a worthy cause.

I guess I'm asking you, has the Secretary established a

policy that every employee in his agency shall wear one of
these buttons?"

Pullen: "His public service clerks who deal with the public."

Ropp: "Okay, is there a possibility, then, that we have other programs that this Body have endorsed such as I—Search, and I've noticed on State Police automobiles that says, 'If you see a drunken driver, call... ' such and such number. If those employees should, in fact, not choose to want to put those particular items on their automobiles, are we starting a precedence where those, too, might possibly fall in the same realm for suspension if that administrator chooses? Is that a possibility?"

Pullen: "Well. I don't think that a state—owned automobile is in quite the same situation as someone's person."

Ropp: "Well, okay. I guess that's partially true, except there's kind of the intent that the state has kind of a policy that has been established by this Body, and in some cases signed into law, which presumably would be a state policy. I...

136 Legislative Day

June 27. 1986

thank you."

- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative

 McNamara."
- McNamara: "Thank you. Madam Speaker. I rise in support of Lady's Motion. It seems to me that there is quite a bit of difference between forcing an employee to wear something that is not a specific function of their job. It is another thing to put a sign or something allowing people to know it on governmental property. That different situation. So, I think we should support this because people, as she says, should be supported or denied employment on the basis of what they do. You are away their individual freedom to think if you don't do it, in this case. So, I believe that the Lady's Motion should be supported. Thank you."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Coles, Representative Weaver."
- Weaver: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Members of the House, I + Ve aot the greatest respect for the Sponsor of this Resolution. However, the question appears to be whether or not this is an official program of the Secretary of State's Now. if you'll take your driver's license vour wallet and turn it over on the back side, that is a legal document for donation of human organs. This official program of the Secretary of State's Office. think he's well within his right to require his employees to help the public understand the implementation of one of their official programs. I don't think it's out of that, and I stand in opposition to this for him to do Resolution."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Winnebago, Representative Mulcahey."
- Mulcahey: "Madam Speaker, I move the previous question."

136 Legislative Day

June 27. 1986

- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman moves the previous question. The is. 'Shall the main question be put?' All those question in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say *no*• T n the opinion of the Chair. the 'ayes' have it, and the main question is put. Representative Pullen. to close."
- Pullen: "Madam Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. if the Secretary of State had recommended this to his emplayees. had asked them to do it. I'm certain that as many people would be wearing those buttons, if for no other reason than to impress their supervisors, as are wearing them It is only those who have a conscientious objection who would not be likely to wear them under that situation. And if the buttons were to give people information that is worthy for them, then certainly that is something that would be understandable, but it is a button that urges, not a button that informs, and it is an order under which employees are now living under suspension. think that that is unfair, and I think that it goes ton far, and I think that this House has the right to tell them that. Obviously, we cannot order him to do this, but we can call upon him and urge him to do that. that action. the suspension, and that is what this Resolution lift does."
- Speaker Breslin: "The question is, "Shall the House adopt House Resolution 1520?" All those in favor vote "aye", all those opposed vote "no". Voting is open. Representative Homer.

 Representative Giorgi, one minute to explain your vote."
- Giorgi: "Madam Speaker, in retaliation to some remarks made by
 Representative Vinson last week, let's let the Republicans
 embarrass Jim Edgar instead of the Democrats. Let's let
 the Republicans hang a noose on him."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from DeWitt, Representative

 Vinon, one minute to explain your vote."

136 Legislative Day

June 27, 1986

- Vinson: "Yes. I'm glad Mr. Giorgi awakened me on this matter. think that Jim Edgar has been the finest Secretary of State this state's had in my period of observing that But I have serious problems office. with---T can understand firing an employee because he doesn't work precinct. and I can understand firing an employee... I can understand firing an employee because he's incompetent his job, but I have a hard time firing an employee who does work his precinct and is competent on his job. because he's got a different point of view. And that's the reason I'm voting for this Resolution."
- Speaker Breslin: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 25 voting 'aye', 34 voting 'no', and 49 voting 'present', and the Resolution fails. House Joint Resolution 232, Representative Braun. Is the Lady in the chamber? Read the... Read the Resolution, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "A Motion on House Joint Resolution 232, pursuant to Rule 43(a), 'I move to bypass Committee and place on the Speaker's Table for immediate consideration.'"

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Braun."

Braun: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the I move to bypass Committee and for consideration of House Joint Resolution 232have discussed this issue with Members on both sides the aisle. Essentially, what the Resolution is about is to allow the State Superintendent of Education to put together a group so that... I don't like that description. T t doesn*t have to... It's not 'no pass, specifically. It does have to do. however. with the relationship between education and athletic activities. To the... Superintendent is called upon to consult with coaches, teachers, principals and sports activists as well.

136 Legislative Day

June 27, 1986

Again, it is not a specific Resolution, and quite frankly, it tracks, in large part, what the Senate has already done. We hope to get some Resolution between the House and the Senate on this issue, but I think if you take a look, for those of you that are interested in this area, if you take a look at the language of the actual Resolution, you will see that it is a sensible approach to creating a dialogue about this issue in the State of Illinois. I encourage your support of the Motion."

- Speaker Breslin: "The Lady... The Lady moves, pursuant to Rule 43(a), to bypass Committee on House Joint Resolution 232 and to place that on the Speaker's Table for immediate consideration. On that question, the Gentleman from Rock Island, Representative Brunsvold."
- Brunsvold: "Thank you. Madam Speaker. I stand in support House Joint Resolution 232 with Representative Braun. We're working towards an agreement with Senate Members. House Members, private members, the Board of Education and the Illinois High School Association. This Joint Resolution is set up to study the problems we've had with eligibility in the state. We've discussed it on the floor many times this spring with Representative Mulcahey's 'no pass, no play. I've been over in the Senate, talked with Marovitz and Senator Topinka working on some sort of an agreement, a Committee to meet, and this It doesn't specify any particular number. We left it open ended so that we could come up with a group of Senators and House Members and private members that were interested in the problem. So, I stand in support of House Joint Resolution 232."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative

 Hoffman."
- Hoffman: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the

136 Legislative Day

June 27. 1986

Houses During the discussions on the legislation on "no pass, no play, in the House Education Committee, there at least a agreement among the Illinois... between the Illinois High School Association and the proponents and the opponents of this legislation to take a look at this issue. personally believe that... that the issue of deciding this ought not be in the hands of the Legislature but ought to be in the hands of ... of school officials. that this task force is important because that is certainly one of the conclusions that this task force could arrive at after they look at all issues. This is task force that would bе under the direction οf the Superintendent of Education. It's an appropriate place for it to be considered, and I would move, not immediate consideration of this House Joint Resolution, but its adoption as well."

Speaker Breslin: "The Lady from DuPage, Representative

Cowlishaw."

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

Speaker Breslin: "She indicates she will."

Cowlishaw: "Thank you. Representative, your Resolution states that the State Board of Education, which I gather is going to be in charge of this. is to consult with coaches, and principals. It does not mention the NHSA, teachers presently the body. as vou well know. that which is establishes rules for participation in athletics by high school students. I would assume, even though that is specifically stated in your Resolution, that it is your intent that the NHSA would be taking part in all of discussion and in what the ultimate result of this, as it were, task force, may be. Is that correct?"

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Braun."

136 Legislative Day

June 27, 1986

Braun: "Thank you. Absolutely, Representative Cowlishaw. Ťη fact, not only is it intended that the Superintendent would have the input and participation and consult with the NHSA. also Legislators who will be... who have been and will be involved with this issue and the general public as well. public participation being a central part of this dialogue. this discussion. So, the answer to your question is yes•" Cowlishaw: "Thank you. Representative. vou. Thank Madam

Speaker Breslin: "Proceed."

Speaker, to this Resolution."

Cowlishaw: "I think we are all aware that for the last few years narticular there have been small fires that have occurred here and there throughout Illinois that have. think, somewhat burned the reputation of the NHSA, and the NHSA, It seems to me, for the last two or three years, going around putting out brush fires and has been so busy doing that, it has not had, perhaps, sufficient to pay attention to what should be its major purpose. Τn fact, I think it is time that we look into this subject, something that either accuses or forgives the NHSA not as for anything, but rather, that we look the at bigger picture which this Resolution proposes that we do. It's a good Resolution. I think we should pass it."

Speaker Breslin: "The question is, "Shall the House discharge, or rather, bypass Committee and place House Joint Resolution 232 on the Speaker's Table for immediate consideration?" All those in favor say "aye", all those opposed say "nay". In the opinion of the Chair, the "ayes" have it, by a.. by use of the Attendance Roll Call. And this Bill is placed before us for immediate consideration. Representative Braun, on the Resolution."

Braun: "Thank you very much, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The substance of the Resolution has been

136 Legislative Day

June 27, 1986

discussed in the previous Motion. I would encourage your vote and support of House Joint Resolution 232.

Speaker Breslin: "You have heard the Lady's Resolution. Is there any further discussion? Hearing none, the question is, *Shall House Joint Resolution 232 be adopted?* favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'no'. In the Chair. the "ayes" have it. opinion of the the Resolution is adopted. House Joint Resolution 233, Representative Braun."

Braun: "Thank you. Madam Speaker. I move to bypass Committee and for immediate... and for immediate consideration of Joint Resolution 233. The substance of this Resolution is the... is a discussion and a dialogue, again, in education to reconcile specifically the Urban School Improvement Act which this General Assembly overwhelmingly passed last chamber... in the last Session and those provisions of... House Bill 730, they have... there are overlapping sections of the law, there are overlapping sections that sometimes seems as though they may be in conflict. He think that it would be appropriate, rather than fooling with both of them or none of them, that the disparities the conflict. such as they may be, be resolved into a language. And so, we are, with this Resolution. expand... creating a task force relative to citizen involvement in urban education consisting of State Superintendent, the General Superintendent of Schools the public schools in Chicago and appointments by the leadership in the General Assembly - again, recommendations to this General Assembly to establish the appropriate relationship and resolve any conflicts between the two programs and to promote maximum parental participation in the public school system. So ... Amendment... well, an Amendment to this... this

136 Legislative Day

June 27, 1986

Resolution which will be considered if this Motion passes, which will sunset the task force that is so established."

Speaker Breslin: "The Lady has moved to bypass Committee on House

Joint Resolution 233 and place it on the Speaker's Table

for immediate consideration. Are there any objections?

Hearing no objections, the Lady has leave by use of the

Attendance Roll Call. Present your Resolution. Excuse me.

Read the Resolution. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Joint Resolution 233."

Speaker Breslin: "Are there any Amendments filed?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment \$1, offered by Representative
Braun."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Braun, on the Amendment #1."

Braun: "Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen
of the House, Amendment 1 is the sunset provision as
requested by Representative Hoffman and with which I
concur, and I urge its adoption."

Speaker Breslin: "The question is, "Shall Amendment #1 be adopted?" Is there any further 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: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Braun, on the Resolution as amended."

Braun: "Again, the substance of the Resolution has been discussed in the discussion of the Motions preceding, and I would encourage your support for HJR 233 and welcome whatever questions you may have."

Speaker Breslin: "The Lady moves the adoption of the Resolution.

Is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is,

Shall the House adopt House Joint Resolution 233? All

June 27, 1986

those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the Resolution is adopted. House (sic — Senate) Joint Resolution 159, Representative White. Representative White on the Motion."

White: "Madam Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this morning I appeared before the Executive Committee to present Senate Joint Resolution 159, and as it turned out, only the Democratic Members were there. The Republican Members were absent. It did not have a quorum, and I have now placed a Motion before this House so that this Bill will be discharged from the Executive Committee and be... and there will be a Motion thereafter."

Speaker Breslin: "Excuse me, Mr. Clerk. Is this a House Joint Resolution or a Senate Joint Resolution?"

White: "This is a discharge Motion."

Speaker Breslin: "Yes, but, Mr. Clerk? It's a Senate Joint Ladies and Gentlemen, your Supplemental Resolution Calendar is incorrect. This is a Senate Joint Resolution. Representative White has moved pursuant to Rule 77(a) to discharge the Executive Committee on Senate Joint Resolution 159 and to advance that Resolution to the Order of the Speaker's Table. Is there any discussion? Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Klemm."

you, Madam Speaker. I just wanted to correct the Klemm: "Thank He had indicated that all the Democrat speaker. were there and not Republican Members and there, therefore, It's quite clear that if all the a guorum. Democrat Members were there, he would have had since the Majority of Members of any Committee in this House are Democratic. So, therefore, I don't think the fault or the onus falls on the Republicans, it's just that he didn't have enough of his own Members, and I would

June 27, 1986

like to clarify the record on that."

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

 Representative Klemm is correct and I apologize to you for

 that statement, Sir."
- Speaker Breslin: "The... The Gentleman from Cook, Representative

 Terzich."
- Terzich: "Well, yes, as the Chairman of the Executive Committee. which I previously stated, apparently the Republicans were not for good government, because none of them showed We had 8 Democrats that were there, and that's the reason why we didn't have a quorum. We were missing 1 individual. We had 8 out of 9. We had 0 out of 8 from the Republican So, I think it's all fair that Representative White Partv. should have his Resolution discharged thought I should have my Resolution discharged. The Republicans should be for good government and vote for this discharge."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative
 Daniels. Representative Daniels."
- Daniels: "Yes, Madam Speaker, I'm sorry to interrupt, but I'm

 being badgered by the Governor's Office. I wanted to go

 back to my office for a moment, and they won't let me go

 back to my office until I make a most important

 announcement, so with leave of the Chair?"

Speaker Breslin: "Surely."

Daniels: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, if you look outside, you'll see that the party's still on. The Governor says the party is still on, on the Mansion lawn after we finish our work. Is that what I was supposed to say, Kurt? Oh, indoors. The party's been moved indoors. Now, I don't want to... Madam Speaker, I'm going to resist the effort to talk about the rain inside and how that's applicable to what's happening inside, and I won't make that comment."

136 Legislative Day

June 27, 1986

Speaker Breslin: "Thank you, Representative Daniels."

Daniels: "But, I... I now am able to go back to my office. The

Governor will let me go back. I've made the announcement

he's requested I make."

Speaker Breslin: "Great. I didn't know the Governor had so much

Daniels: "He has unbelievable power over all of us."

Speaker Breslin: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Wojcik, on the Motion pending before the Body."

Wojcik: "Yes, Madam Speaker and Members of the House, just to bring the subject back and what we are questioning, I wish to advise the Membership here that without the precise language in the Resolution, the cost cannot be estimated accurately. What we're looking at, quite possibly, is tens or hundreds of millions of dollars per year to be able to institute this. There's no restrictions on the type of insurance or the limits of the coverage. There already is an insurance factor in the current cost of living formula..."

Speaker Breslin: "Excuse me, Representative Wojcik."

Wojcik: "Yes."

Speaker Breslin: "The Motion before us is whether or not the Resolution should be discharged and placed before us for immediate consideration. Confine your remarks to that, and we won't even get to the Resolution unless the Resolution is discharged."

Wojcik: "I am in opposition to the Motion to discharge."

Speaker Breslin: "Fine. The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Churchill."

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

Speaker Breslin: "He indicates he will."

Churchill: "Is the subject matter of this Joint Resolution something to do with insurance?"

136 Legislative Day

June 27. 1986

- White: "Yes, it does. Representative Vinson indicated earlier that he was concerned about an insurance matter, and that matter is before this Body right now."
- Churchill: "Okay. Madam Speaker, I, too, rise in opposition to this Senate Joint Resolution. I don't think that it should be immediately discharged, because I think that the Speaker has complete control of the insurance issue at this point, and I don't think that any of his Members would want to rise and put something dealing with insurance out on the floor."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative White, to close."
- white: "Madam Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we're talking right now about fairness, and we're talking about discharging a Bill from a Committee. I took the time to appear before the Executive Committee this morning and as it turned out, there was not a quorum, and I ask this Body at this time to join me in my effort to discharge SJR 59 (sic 159) from the Executive Committee."
- Speaker Breslin: "The question is, "Shall the House discharge the Executive Committee from the consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 159 and advance that Resolution to the Order of the Speaker's Table?" All those in favor vote "aye", all those opposed vote "no". Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Representative White, one minute to explain your vote."
- White: "Madam Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I neglected to indicate to you why this Bill is so important.

 I indicated earlier that we were talking about insurance.

 We were talking about liability insurance for agencies that contract out from the State of Illinois services to those who can... those who cannot take care of themselves."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Churchill, you spoke in debate.

 For what reason do you rise?"

136 Legislative Day

- June 27, 1986
- Churchill: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Should this Motion receive
 the requisite number of votes to pass, I would ask for a
 verification."
- Speaker Breslin: "Have all voted who wish? Ladies and Gentlemen, push your own switches. There will... There is a request for a verification on this Roll Call. The Gentleman from DeWitt, Representative Vinson, one minute to explain your vote. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question... Representative Piel, for what reason do you rise?"
- Piel: "Correct me if I'm wrong, but this does take 71 votes.

 Correct?"
- Speaker Breslin: "No, Sir, it takes 60 votes."
- Piel: "I'm sorry, Madam Speaker. According to the rules, this can be... the Motion's got to be in writing. It will be carried the next... the next Legislative Day. This was... We got the Calendar today, so technically, for it to be heard today, it would have to be 71 votes. 60 votes tomorrow, 71 votes today, if you'll check the rules."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman is not asking that the Resolution be heard today. He's only making the Motion to discharge the Committee."
- Piel: "The Motion has got to be on the Calendar for one Legislative Day. It's got to be in writing and it's got to be on the Calendar for one Legislative Day. For us to hear that today, it takes 71 votes, Madam Speaker."
- Speaker Breslin: "Okay, we'll check the record. The Motion requires 71 votes. On this question, there are 60 voting "aye", 47 voting "no", and 1 voting "present", and the Motion fails. Representative... Excuse me. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Terzich, for what reason do you rise?"
- Terzich: "Yeah, Madam Speaker, since that was supposed to be on

136 Legislative Day

June 27, 1986

the desk for... or the table for one day, does that mean that the Resolution is still going to be brought up for tomorrow's Motions?"

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Terzich, if you are speaking with regard to your own Motion, you could... you could file again the Motion today. It would be carried on the Calendar, the regular Calendar tomorrow, and then require only 60 votes for passage. Representative Terzich."

Terzich: "How many votes, now?"

Speaker Breslin: "60 votes if you file it today and hear it tomorrow."

Terzich: "Thank you. I'll be back. Thank you."

Speaker Breslin: "Speaker Madigan in the Chair."

Speaker Madigan: "On Supplemental Calendar #1, there appears, under the Order of Conference Committee Reports, House Bill 3549. The Chair recognizes Mr. Farley."

Young: "Mr. Speaker."

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

Young: "Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. We recessed and we adjourned at 5:00. According to House Rule 79(d), we have to have three hours to evaluate this Report before it could be called. Therefore, this Bill should not be called until 8:00."

Speaker Madigan: "Your point is well taken. However, a Motion has been filed by Mr. Farley to move to suspend Rule 79 relating to the First Conference Committee Report on House Bill 3549. And on that Motion, the Chair recognizes Mr. Farley."

Farley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. As you stated, I did make a written Motion to suspend Rule 79(d) and have this matter heard immediately. I think that with the explanation of the Bill and... or the Conference Committee Report, that everybody will understand

136 Legislative Day

- June 27, 1986
- it, and I think that there won't be any problem, so I would move now, Ar. Chairman... or Mr. Speaker, that we now suspend the appropriate rule."
- Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman has moved to suspend the rules to permit immediate consideration of the Report. The Chair recognizes Mr. Young."
- Young: "Mr. Speaker, a question of the Chair. Does this vote require 71 votes?"
- Speaker Madigan: "This requires 60 votes."
- Young: "According to House Rule 79(a), that Subsection 79 can only be suspended upon the affirmative vote of 71 Members."
- Parliamentarian Pollak: "Under Rule 71(a) which refers to typing the names of the Conferees, that takes 71 votes. However, 79(d) takes 60 votes to suspend."
- Young: "Well, Mr. Speaker, 71(a) refers to Motions. We're suspending Rule 79(d) here, and according to this Subsection in 79(d), it would require 71 votes."
- Parliamentarian Pollak: "The 71 vote requirement refers to Rule 71(a). What's being suspended here is Rule 71(d)."
- Young: "So the Chair is ruling that the... in our rules under

 Subsection 79 that says 71 votes, that really refers to

 Subsection 71. To Section 71?"
- Parliamentarian Pollak: "Section 71(a), the rule requires 60 votes to suspend. 79, I am sorry."
- Speaker Madigan: "Representative Braun."
- Braun: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. With regard to the issue of the vote required for immediate consideration of House... the First Conference Committee Report on House Bill 3549, I'd like to call the Parliamentarian's attention to Rule 79(a) which refers to 71 votes for suspension. And it refers to the entire Subsection and not just a portion of the Subsection that refers to signature lines."
- Parliamentarian Pollack: "Rule 79(a) provides that Conference

136 Legislative Day

June 27, 1986

Committee Reports shall be reproduced and be on the Members desks as well as signature lines. That Subsection requires 71 votes to suspend. The Rule that is being suspended is Subsection D, and that rule requires 60 votes to suspend.

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Braun."

- Braun: "Thank you. Mr. Speaker, I would suggest also that the distribution of this Conference Committee Report is not in accordance with the rule and that it has not been available for review by the Membership in sufficient time to comport with the requirements of the rules."
- Speaker Madigan: "Representative Braun, I believe that was the essence of the point made by Representative Young where the Parliamentarian has already responded to the parliamentary question."
- Braun: "Does the... Do we have any record of when this Conference

 Committee Report was distributed from the Clerk?"
- Speaker Madigan: "The Clerk tells me 5:00, and so the Motion is

 to suspend that Section of the rules. Mr. Huff? Mr.

 Huff."
- Huff: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, a point of order. Isn't there a rule that provides that all Conference Reports should be on... on the desk one day before it can be taken up and that the Motion to suspend should be in writing, otherwise, it will require 71 votes?"
- Parliamentarian Pollak: "The rule provides that between June 16th and June 27th, Conference Committee Reports are... must be on Members' desks three hours prior to being voted on.

 That rule is... a Motion to suspend that rule is currently under consideration by the House."
- Huff: "Well, I think, without referring to the rules, that the precedent was already set by the Speaker in the Chair previously when she acceded to an objection raised by

June 27, 1986

another Member on the other side of the aisle against a Motion that Representative White advanced.

Parliamentarian Pollak: "That was a Motion to discharge."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Braun. Representative Braun."

Braun: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, has the Gentleman addressed his Motion at this point?"

Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman has moved the Motion."

"He has made his move. In that case, I rise in opposition the Matian for immediate consideration tο suspension of the rules applicable to the consideration of Conference Committee Reports. This Conference Committee Report is no more and no less than an attempt to effect coup d'etat in favor of the machine in the City of Chicago. Given that fact. it seems to me that the Hembers of this chamber ought to have an opportunity to review Committee Report and understand fully the Conference ramifications and the meaning of this Conference Committee Report insofar as it is befitting only the actions of a Marcos government or a coup detat in some foreign country and not an action by a deliberative Body - a Legislative Body such as this one. The substance of the Conference Committee Report is essentially to grab a power grab in the City of Chicago with regard to its park district. The first part of the Report starts off laudably enough effort to cure certain deficiencies in certain villages in this state which are in financial distress. The of the Conference Committee Report, however, is a that essentially makes the Park grab Superintendent, the Chairman of the Board and the CEO of the Chicago Park District. It is a power grab. It is the essence of unfairness. It is the equivalent of changing the rules in the middle of the game, particularly so since the matter addressed by this Conference Committee Report is

June 27, 1986

presently before the courts of this state. bfuow encourage the Members of this Body that we give ourselves adequate time to review this issue, that we not move pell-mell to strip away what reform efforts have attempted in the City of Chicago to return the Park District to the bad old days when we paid three times more to run OUT when our parks were filled with patronage, when our parks were run on a system... a buddy system of influence buying and selling. Consider very clearly, Ladies and Gentlemen, this vote is a vote for or against the machine and the vestiges of it in the City of Chicago, and I encourage your opposition to the Gentleman's Motion."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Farley, to close."

- Farley: "Well, I certainly disagree with the previous speaker's

 last remarks, and I would just move that my Motion be

 considered, and that we have immediate consideration."
- Speaker Madigan: "The Gentleman has moved to suspend Rule 79 relating to the First Conference Committee Report on House Bill 3549. On that question, those in favor of the Motion will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 63 'aye', 41 'no'. The Motion carries. Now, to the main question, Conference Committee Report on House Bill 3549. The Chair recognizes Mr. Farley. The Chair recognizes Mr. Steczo."
- Steczo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I would move for the adoption of Conference Committee Report #1 to House Bill 3549. The underlying Bill remains the same with regard to competitive bid thresholds for forest preserve districts, for park districts and for fire protection districts. In addition, language which embodies House Bill 2796 dealing with municipal fiscal emergencies was added to

136 Legislative Day

June 27, 1986

the Conference, and, Mr. Speaker, at this time, I would defer to Representative Farley to explain the final portion of the Bill.

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

Farlev: "Thank vou. Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The portion of the Bill that talks about the Chicago Park District does the following: It spells out the duties of the General Superintendent of the Chicago District that were ordinances or bylaws of the Park It spells those duties out in statute. Board. T+ also states that the General Superintendent is the Chief Executive Officer of the Park District and by definition. in any corporation, would be the day-to-day manager of the Chicago Park District. These duties have traditionally been the General Superintendent's duties. more except spelling them out in statute form. nothing also. in this part of the Conference Committee Report. take those employees that are not covered by the Civil Service... Civil Service Code of the Chicago Park District and place them under that Code. As we all know. struggle between two powerhouses, political or otherwise, it's always the little guv that gets hurt. this Conference Committee Report, those people that are not covered by Civil Service will so be, if it's the As far as those employees, let's consider chamber. what we're actually doing when we do that. We are out οf politics. We're talking about government. We're talking about anti-machine. vou place employees that are now not under Civil Service, they cannot be affected by administration. anv hv anv there, committeeman. but are relatively secure in their iob. which they have worked hard for to provide a means of support for themselves and their families. And I think

June 27, 1986

it's all-important because this is a big part of the Bill.

I am eliminating patronage in the Chicago Park District.

There won't be any favoritism in the Chicago Park District.

I think it's a good proposal, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, and I think that an 'aye' vote is a correct vote, and I would move for the adoption of Conference Committee Report #1 on House Bill 3549."

Speaker Madigan: "The Chair recognizes Representative Braun."

Braun: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the I'm trying to be calm about this. The fact of the House. matter is. this is an outrage. This is an Take a look at it. Get rid of patronage? outrage. You're talking about making precinct captains Civil Service employees. You're talking about taking temporary precinct captains and making them Civil Service employees, and then you're turning around and giving the General Superintendent control of the Board and letting him set the salaries, compensation, the duties, the responsibilities of everybody including the Secretary, the Treasurer of the Park District. If this isn't machine politics. I don't know And what's even more outrageous about it is that 15they come down to this General Assembly and get this to put a stamp of approval on this kind of a changing of the rules. I said changing the rules in the middle of That's exactly right. The fact of the matter is the people of the City of Chicago spoke when they elected Harold Washington its Mayor. The people of the City of Chicago have been fed up and frustrated with the horrible conditions, the discriminatory conditions, the conditions. the overpriced conditions at the Chicago Park District. Come to our town. See оиг parks. Discover that we spend more money than any other city in this country per acre for park services in the City of Chicago.

June 27, 1986

You know about the corruption already. You know about the investigations that's been in the newspapers. Come and look at the parks and see what's happened to them. The people in the City of Chicago want it changed. The change was done during an orderly process according to the rules as they have always been written and the way been respected by the political forces in the always City of Chicago. You talk about two powerhouses. That may be right, but the fact of the matter is that when powerhouses were in office, nobody did those kinds... the kind of end runs in this General Assembly that thevere What makes this reform administration subject doing now. to this kind of subterfuge, this kind of going around the coming up and sidewinding them grab... in a power grab such as we have not recently in the State of Illinois? T say to you. Ladies and Gentlemen, again, take a look at what you*re doing with this Conference Committee Report. 1 t * s not for dood government. It's for business as usual. It's not for It's for a continuation of the corruption and the incompetence at the city... at the Park District City of Chicago. Take a look at what you're doing to the people of the City of Chicago with this Conference Committee Report and join us in defeating the Conference Committee Report to House Bill 3549."

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

Shaw: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. You know, I am somewhat amazed, and then again, I'm not, that this side of the aisle would bring this type of Conference Committee Report and ask the people of this Assembly, the Members of this Assembly, to vote on this Report. You know, a long time ago — and I've served as a precinct captain, and I always thought that Democrats were

June 27. 1986

I could expect it or would expect it from other side of the aisle. but back in 19 ... but back in 19... but back in 1983... but back in 1983. the people They said what they wanted in Chicago elected a Mayor. overwhelming numbers, but today that reform that we that has been talked about here, there seem to be some obstructionists attempting to come to the Legislature to circumvent the Mayor and the people's will of the City of Chicago. But I think that there is Democrats side of the aisle is the culprits in this case. They are the ones that's doing it. I was elected as а Democrat. Harold Washington is a Democrat. But we are attempting to get shystered by our own Party Members, here. And said two years ago that we would not bring the fight of the City of Chicago to the Legislature. That's where it have wind up, in the Legislature. And there's no need for that. And no other city, in DuPage County or wherever vou ao . Will County, East St. Louis or wherever, would you attempt to do this to any mayor, to any mayor. And I can say... stand here and say, Harold Washington happened to be man of And I think this is why it's being done. color. of the Members of this General Assembly are here because of Many of the people who signed this Report people of color. wouldnot be here if those people of color had not made sure that they got here. We have to be mindful of that. And the newspapers and the media of this hopeful that state, when this vote is cast tonight, will print the names of those people that voted for this Conference Committee Report. because it's unfair; it's absolutely insane. could understand that if we was in Philipines somewhere, or in South Africa. I could understand it. But we are in America, and because a man has been elected Mayor Chicago happened to be black, we going to strip him of

June 27. 1986

the powers and his duties the law of this state give him. going to change the law to fit our own needs. That is unfortunate, Ladies and Gentlemen, and I appeal to the good side of the Democrats on this aisle and Republicans on the other side of the aisle - think about what you're doing. Think about what you're doing. might be Harold Washington, but tomorrow it might be your mayor in your city, or county board president. You should stand up for what's right, and what's right is to defeat this Conference Committee Report, because it stop here, Ladies and Gentlemen. It will go on, and this is not the ... probably the last that you will hear of thing. If they get this through, they might come up with a Bill to make... change some other law where that the mayor is not the mayor of the city. There are some those people, and especially on this side of the aisle. who... those of us who sit and truly Democrats vote for Democratic Bills, some Republican Bills, those that are good, but where does it stop? And I think that this. maybe my speech will not change a vote here, but the Session is not over. All of the Bills is not gone, and the fat lady have not sing. And you might remember vour casting your vote. We need this Report defeated, and I urge you to vote 'no' on this Report."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Ronan."

Ronan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. You're going to hear a lot of rhetoric on this Conference Committee Report. Let's look at the facts. Number one, what we're trying to do is codify into the state statute something that should have been done a long time ago. We've got a Superintendent of the Chicago Park District who gets paid over \$70,000 a year. His duties should be very accurately lined out. Some day, Ed Kelly's not going to be

June 27, 1986

in that position. There's going to bе another General Superintendent as there's been many before him. Let's make very clear, the Chicago Park District is a creation of the State of Illinois. We've had numerous Bills eight years here dealing with the Chicago Park District. This is just another piece of legislation that addresses that public body. When you pay somebody \$70,000 a year and you call them General Superintendent, whoever that is, his duties and responsibilities should be clearly laid out. let's look at the issue of Civil Secondly. Service protection, and let's talk about the opportunity to protect people who work in public employment and public service. thought that's what we're all about. The issue is, if don't think that there has been manipulation of the Civil Service System in the City of Chicago, let me bring down my friends and associates who have been fired for one reason - they re precinct captains who deliver their precinct for candidates that the Mavor of the City I can bring down Jerry Shudnow. Chicago doesn't like. Jerry Shudnow is a good friend of mine. He was an Assistant General Superintendent in the Department Streets and Sanitation. Jerry Shudnow carried last special aldermanic election, the number one precinct in the ward. Before we had the special run-off. fired from his job after 12 years of service. That's how the administration operates. I understand the but my attitude is that if you really want to ball game. have good government, let's give the individuals who government something more than a political sponsorship or a negative political operation to either have gainful employment lose their job. Civil Service protection ٥r does that. It's been instituted at the federal level for a long time; it's been instituted at the state level

136 Legislative Day

June 27, 1986

long time. It's now instituted at the City of Chicago, and I supported that move when it was done up there. We should have it at the Chicago Park District. You're going to hear rhetoric. The basic issue is - and I want the downstaters and the suburban people to pay attention to when you elect a mayor in any other municipality in this state. he does not immediately expect to be able to run his local park district. It doesn't happen. When the Mayor of Glen Ellyn is elected, does he go over to the park district your contracts. give me your and sav. *Give me drivers. give me everything you've got, because it's now mine.* No, that's not the way the process operates. The process operates is that you've got independent park boards over this state, and they have their responsibilities spelled out very clearly. The same situation should exist the City of Chicago. I feel the mistake that was made in the City of Chicago is that Mayor Washington should have had his appointments given a long time ago to the Park Board. I feel the City Council acted improperly in holding up those appointments, but now they're there. Thoca appointments have been established. The Mayor can policy for that institution as he has the right under the existing statute. But what this Conference Committee does is. one. clarify what the reponsibilities of what the General Superintendent are, and that should have been done and number two, time ago; grant civil service protection to public employees, and that makes because we have it at the state level and every other level of government. I support the Conference Committee Report."

Speaker Madigan: "Ar. Young."

Young: "First, Mr. Speaker, a point of order. I would ask the Parliamentarian to rule that this Bill requires 71 votes

June 27, 1986

the fact that it preempts home rule in several I would point out Sections 8.816 and 8.817 the general Bill where they put a fiscal emergency board in over lawfully elected authorities and officials, control thereby preempting home rule. I would also suggest that in the Section dealing with the Park District, ī t preempts home rule. Also, Mr. Speaker, while I'm on the microphone, like to request an Oral Verified Motion on this Bill... Oral Verified Roll Call. To the Bill, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Ţ would just particularly the people on the other side of the aisle, who talk about the orderly process of government, to take a look at what this Bill actually does. Board was created partly by the statutes exacted in this Body some 40 or 50 years ago; but. if you look the section of the statute that this Bill will preempt, you will see that it did not go in effect until it was passed by a vote of the people within that district. right. Chapter 105-33.3.1. 2. 3. 4 and 5. Before it went into effect, this Body had the foresight and wisdom to ask the people within the city to vote, and the people voted that the Park District should be run by a Park Board, and Board should be appointed by the Mayor. other reason, I would think that people who arenot caught up in the city hall politics, people who want to vote based government. people who want to vote based on the dood tradition in this House of trying to give people the chance to govern themselves, people who always oppose what is called a back-door referendum when we talk about a tax issue - well. Ladies and Gentlemen of this House. When this House enacted this statute. certainly back door. it was done by a vote of the people. I think some of the comments made by the previous speaker were laughable. He

136 Legislative Day

June 27, 1986

talks about mavor coming in and assuming immediate control; whereas, all of you know that this control hasn't been assumed in almost four years. He talks about the Civil Service for all the good precinct captains. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, there are 4,000 non-Civil Service employees at the Park District right that this Bill would make automatic Civil Service. ask you. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, since these precinct captains were put in under the powers to be at that time, why weren't they put in under Civil Service? They could have been made Civil Service a long time ago. except for little things like passing Civil Service exams. having qualifications for the job other than being an outstanding precinct captain. If these 4,000 employees deserving of Civil Service stature, don't you think their friends who gave them the job would have made Civil Service when they gave them to them, and they would have went through the normal procedures of becoming Service that anyone else goes through? We talk about the current Superintendent. I would just remind you, Ladies and Gentlemen, that he's operating under a contract, a long term contract that was given to him by a lame duck Board. The Board that granted him the contract was not appointed by the Mayor of the City of Chicago and, therefore, was not supported by the majority of the citizens in the City of again to look Chicago. Task you at the Aill. this Conference Committee Report. Chapter 105 right now, anyone who cares to look at it, the powers of the Superintendent are given in a paragraph that's one, two, three, four. six. seven. eight. nine... nine lines in our current statute outline the powers and duties of Superintendent. And other than those nine lines, his job is to report to the Park District Board. This has been in

June 27 • 1986

effect since 1934. T ask you to look at the Conference Committee Report. A11 41 lines on page 23. and approximately 25 or 28 of the lines on page 22 deal with the new powers. The people in the City of Chicago, when they voted to pass the Act regarding the Chicago Park District. thought the Superintendent should have the powers he currently has. In closing, Ladies and Gentlemen, I urge those not caught up in the partisan fight of Chicago give a vote for good government, and I would think that it's appropriate that the weather outside is what it is thundering and lightning. If this Bill pass, we may have thunder and lightning in this chamber for the remaining of the Session."

Speaker Madigan: "The Parliamentarian will respond to the points of order raised by Mr. Young."

Parliamentarian Pollak: "On behalf of the Speaker, this Bill does not preempt home rule units and, therefore, require 60 votes. Rule 42 of the House provides that whenever a Bill does deny or limit home rule units, it be specifically set forth in the Bill. There is no place in this Bill where that is specifically set forth."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Young. Mr. Young."

Young: "It's my understanding, I do not see anything in the first part of the Bill that limits the emergency — what is it? — the Emergency Fiscal Board to non-home rule units. This Bill would require the Governor... or would allow the Governor or the Auditor General to go into any municipality in this city and create a Fiscal Emergency Board, and that Board would take control... I mean, any municipality in the state to... put in effect an Emergency Board, and that Board would have control over bonds, accounts receivables, the way bills would be paid, what taxes could and could not be authorized. And that certainly is a preemption of home

136 Legislative Day

June 27. 1986

rule authority, unless there is something in this Bill, in the first part, that says it does not apply to home rule, which I haven't been able to find."

Parliamentarian Pollak: "On behalf of the Speaker, the provisions of the statutes and Rule 42 provide that if a Bill limit or deny home rule units' powers, it be specifically stated. Since it does not so specifically state, this Bill does not limit or deny home rule units and; therefore, it takes 60 votes for passage."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Young."

Young: "Then, is it the ruling of the Chair and the intent of the
Body that if this Bill should pass, the Emergency Board
Control requirements could not be imposed on a home rule
unit without that home rule's permission?"

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Braun."

Braun: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I refer you, in response to Representative Young's parliamentary inquiry and the Parliamentarian's last statement, Section 8-81-2(b) sets out the intention of the General Assembly, which is t a enact procedures, provide powers and impose restrictions to assure fiscal integrity of municipalities. And then it goes on to say in Sub... in Section (c), *Unless otherwise indicated, the provisions of this division are supplemental provisions of law consistent with this division. The provisions of this division prevail (prevail) over such other provisions of law and the ordinance and resolutions the municipality to the extent of any conflict or inconsistency between this division and such ordinances, or resolutions.* Mr. Parliamentarian, that seems to me to be a fairly specific preemption of home rule under the provisions of the Constitution and; therefore, this Conference Committee Report should require 71 votes for passage."

136 Legislative Day

June 27, 1986

Parliamentarian Pollak: "On behalf of the Speaker, the statutes and the rules which follow up that statute provide that no Bill limits or denies any power or function of the home rule unit unless there is specific language limiting or denying that power, and further that the language set forth in what manner and to what extent it is a limitation or a denial on a home rule unit. This Bill does not do so and; therefore, it takes 60 votes to pass."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Braun."

Braun: "Mr. Parliamentarian, insofar as the... as the... the Conference Committee Report is specific that it prevails in cases of inconsistency, then to the extent that that is a limitation on the authority of municipalities under the Constitution, it is a preemption. And, therefore, it would seem to me, again, it's a specific preemption as... as the language of this Section says. I mean. there's you can get around that. The wav provisions of this division prevail over such other provisions. Ιt is not a... across the board blanket preemption of all authority in this situation. But certainly with regard to those instances where there's a conflict between municipal local law and the provisions of this Conference Committee Report. the Report makes it clear that these provisions prevail, therefore, preempt home rule,"

Speaker Madigan: "Mr..."

- Parliamentarian Pollack: "The... The Bills may provide... The
 Bill may provide limitations on certain municipalities, but
 because it does not follow the statute, nor our rules, it
 does not provide for a preemption or limitation of home
 rule units."
- Speaker Madigan: "Ladies and Gentlemen, if the Chair might suggest that we have pretty well discussed the question of the number of votes required to pass the Bill, I'd only

June 27, 1986

offer my long ago experience as a delegate to the Constitutional Convention to say that the Park District is a special district, and it was never intended that special districts would be home rule units. Mr. Young."

- Young: "The Parliamentarian never answered my request as to the preemption. Chicago is certainly a home rule authority, and this preempts home rule in that it turns control of the park district away from the duly appointed Board and gives them to... whoever it gives them to in this statute. So it certainly does change Chicago's home rule power."
- Speaker Madigan: "But, Mr. Young, the Bill only deals with the legal entity, the Park District. I'm sorry."
- Parliamentarian Pollak: "This Bill does not specifically limit or deny home rule units in accordance with our rules or the statutes, and accordingly, requires 60 votes."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Braun."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Huff. Mr. Huff."

Braun: "Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just for the record, it would be different if this Bill didn't just apply solely to the Chicago Park District. It clearly does not. There are two distinct, discreet Sections of this Conference Committee Report. After the first Section the Committee Report, the Section to Conference previously referred you is a preemption of home rule of municipality. It talks about fiscal emergencies; and. where there is conflict between this Conference Committee Report and local governments, rules regarding fiscal the state law will prevail. emergencies. That's or it sounds like one to me, and I think that if you cannot divide... unless we are going to divide two Sections of this Conference Committee Report into two Committee separate Conference Reports. the Parliamentarian's ruling has to apply to the entire Bill."

136 Legislative Day

June 27. 1986

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of Huff: the Houses We may happle over the legalities and the niceties of these Bills, but I want to address myself to the mundane and perhaps more base implications in this measure. I don't believe, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, that any amount of rationale or solipsism ic going to make this provision any less odious to the sensitivities of those whose sensitivities for fair play has been maligned. This is nothing more than a thinly veiled Machiavellian attempt to change the rules in the middle of the game, Mr. Speaker. And to you, young yonder prince. would admonish that you may find yourself in a very nasty internecine affair, which will be mutually harmful for all parties involved. I don't understand what it does to profit a man or a Party to gain the whole his soul. for that is what is about to happen And for that million and a half people who have faithfully and slavishly provided the underpinning for the Democratic Party, may look at the Democratic ticket fall with a particularly jaundiced eye. And who's to say that they might not make themselves willing planktons the appetite of the whale. And I say, "Hail to the whale." Okay? All goodbyes don't mean gone, however. But just let me end by quoting the raven, 'Nevermore, Ar. Speaker, nevermore. **

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Rice."

Rice: "First, I want to thank all the folks around here who sent me cards when I had a heart attack, because I'm about to have another one, so get your cards out. I am... I am... I'm going back in a little history. We'll let the legal minds do the legal things. For in 1964, when the late Richard J. Daley recognized that the Park District wasn't dealing totally fairly with the new folks who moved south

June 27. 1986

of 67th Street, who left the ghetto between 12th Street and 67th. who had been used to Washington Park and Jackson Park and getting what they can, we moved into areas where we had the beautiful green trees in Foster Park or 'Halleran', Kennedy, Brainard. And yet, a series of parks out where the good Irish folks rather move the damn Marquette Bank from 79th and Halsted Street West. and they decided we were taxpayers, but we couldn't benefit from the extra services that we had seen the other folks use for So he created a department called the vears and years. Commission on Youth Welfare, who yours truly served, ten wards. including yours, Mr. Speaker, the 13th. And we saw the services diminished from that of prince to vagabonds. they decided that these were gang problems. Meantime, the green shubberies turned brown. The fertilizer get around to clean out the trees so the ... cleaning and feed the trees so they could continue to as prosperous. The ponds, the... where the fish were, if you will, died. The local track meets that used to be held, the tennis courts that were kept up became places from play for folks to do wrong such as they did on Beverly The park districts who sustained were Avenue. that in Hills where Kennedy and over on Longwood Drive. because we couldn't get over there. We could houses but they wouldn't allow us. They sent extra vanguards, extra policemen. Graver Park who wrote sians across the middle of the street. *Niggers are Not Allowed.* He own those houses now. Kelly knew this darn day was And we're not talking about Harold Hashington Mayor. Things have changed. Things have changed. They sold us those houses. We are paying those taxes. We are entitled to the services. If you could take this Conference Committee Report back and sit down and deal fair

June 27, 1986

and square and say since the locals have arrived, give them a part of the pie. Because that's what all this is you folks that don't live in Chicago think Harold And all is doing this and Harold is doing the other. I might shot through the "grease", but Harold is a politician. of you are about. all Yesterday, we sat and listened to folks talk about good government and we a pay raise. Today, you need a pay raise because you want to solidify the position of the General Superintendent so he can tell the man who's coming in to try to straighten it out what to do. So, it's double standards. Years the Chicago Park District had its own police I wasn't old enough to go, but my dad said they raised hell about that. And they were automatically turned the City of Chicago's Police Department and they began to patrol those grounds. If we're agod enough protect the property of the Park District, why aren't we good enough to run the darn Park District? The problem is, we trying to take care our own. Now, I heard you talk about 4,000 precinct captains. T f into some of those wards, it's not the precinct VOU captains; it's the felons from the penal institutions and I'm not telling you hearsay. I'm telling you because I worked in the first ward. I've worked wards down there where those guys work. I*m 53 years old. I've been in the game. This is not something brand that these young folks are talking about. It's a haven for whoever the politician wants to send in from the certain select wards. At Ada Park in my district, which is... in the White Park... that's the name of it. not an ethnic name. It's called 'White'. Those particular parks, old line parks, know what's going on. Three Weeks ago. I asked the florist people at Marquette Park, could

June 27. 1986

they send some palms out to set up last Saturday for community affair. Forgive me, Brother Speaker. They told me I had to see you. That was in Marguette Park. I still didn*t get the palms. Long's Florists, left here last Thursday night, had to go by a funeral after they man to get the palms to be out there Saturday. Brookins and the Catholics... wasn*t for the Catholic cemetery at 85th and Pulaski gave me the green. The point is the game that's being played is new. Give us a chance. Thank vou."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Brookins."

Brookins: "Thank you. Mr. Speaker. In baseball, in business, in any well-run organizations, when something go wrong, the person responsible is the man at the top, in this case, the Park Superintendent. And I know that there was a change in the guard last week or two weeks ago, and I know that there must have been a mistake made because they did not fire the Superintendent as they should have. That should have been the first move was that he got his walking papers. So. that was a mistake. But we felt, in my area, south side of the City of Chicago, that we would have a fair chance clean up our parks, to have good parks, places that the young people can go and play or the senior citizens can and relax. and here we're back in the same situation. we're talking about taking these incompetent people who's been running the Park District for 30 vears and shortchanging the neighborhood parks for the sake of the downtown parks, taking from the poor and giving to the rich and making these people Civil Service and keeping them in It's wrong, it's wrong, it's wrong, the game. We're talking about changing the entire rules of the game because it has been discovered that their game plan or that the present game plan will not work. This is wrong.

June 27, 1986

wrong. And you should not do that in this Body. This is a high and noble Body. We have prevented from three years from these wars to come here to Springfield. Ladies and Gentlemen, they have now arrived on this day. They have now arrived. Do not do this. Do not change the rules of the game in the middle of the game.

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Alexander."

Alexander: "Thank you very much, Ar. Speaker. To my fellow colleagues, and especially to the Sponsor of that portion of the Conference Committee that is offensive to the speakers, in making all employees of the Park District Civil Service at this time, should this legislation pass, I am curious and I wonder, why haven't they became Civil of years? If they were Service all these such highly-qualified, duly-needed employees, why haven't been made classified Civil Service employees? Why does it take this kind of legislation to all of a sudden. now, all persons now become Civil Service? This is a ruse. And I want to say to those of you who don't believe in this kind of action to vote 'no'. And to all others who believe that this is a just kind of act, that this will destroy the Democratic Party in the City of Chicago."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Levin."

Levin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. My district is on the north lakefront of Chicago. The people in my district were the swing vote in the last mayoral election. The people in my district, I ve got to say, are tired of the infighting in the City Council, the noise, the din. But we have been able to keep that noise and that din out of this Body for three years, and it should stay out of this Body. The newspapers in Chicago editorialized for three years that it was unfair to keep the appointments of the Mayor of the City of Chicago

June 27, 1986

bottled up, and we finally got those appointments out. And it is unfair at this point in time to change the rules. There will be an opportunity next spring for the people of the City of Chicago to make the determination, if they think that the changes that have occurred with respect to the Park District and the other changes are fair or not. Leave it to the people of the City of Chicago. Keep the politics of Chicago out of Springfield. I urge a *no* vote on this Conference Committee Report."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Harris."

Harris: "Thank you. Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, logic, as we all know, is not the operative force in this chamber. Politics is the operative force, and there's nothing inherently wrong with that. So. apparently. the political arrangements have been made and maybe the skids are greased on this particular Bill. But nonetheless, it's appropriate. I think, to make a couple of remarks. from the suburbs of Chicago and I'm involved, at least in going into the City of Chicago, enjoying what is world-class city and the benefits that it has. And three years ago, the people in the City of Chicago held election and they elected Harold Washington Mayor. Now. I happen to think they made a mistake. I happen to think they chose the wrong person, but nonetheless, they elected Harold Washington Mayor and Harold Washington deserves just as much a chance to fall flat on his face hecause is mismanaging the City, if you believe that's what he is doing, as every other Mayor in the history of the City He deserves the opportunity to make mistakes and Chicago. for the people in the City of Chicago to recognize that he's making mistakes and to throw him out of office at the first possible opportunity, which is my estimation what should do. This removes the opportunity, it seems to they

June 27, 1986

me. for the people to judge him fairly. to recognize is doing good or ill for the City and to judge whether he how they are going to vote for him in the next election. a matter of fact, in my opinion, if we pass this, you are virtually assuring that Harold Washington is next election. Several years ago, the City of Cleveland elected a young punk alderman. 29 year-old young fellow as their mayor. He did a disastrous job in the management of that city. Its bond rating plummeted. T + terrible. You know something? The people out there recognized that he was making a mistake. The people out there recognized that what he was doing was ruining their city. And do you know what they did? They recalled him. They had a special election and they threw him out of office. I'm willing to bet that if we give the current of the City of Chicago the fair opportunity to run the City the way we have given that opportunity to Mayor, he's going to make those mistakes. longer going to be the type of city, world-class city that was when he took office and the people are going to recognize that and they are going to turn him out οf Now, that's somewhat convoluted logic, perhaps, Bill, but it's logic and I think it's accurate. think he deserves that opportunity. This inappropriate forum to bring this matter before at this Injecting this highly-charged. political time. situation in the last closing minutes of the Session down here in Springfield is wrong, absolutely wrong. You know it well as I do. But that's logical and logic isn't the operative force. All I can say is the right vote is a *no* vote."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Braun."

Braun: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. You know, there are times when

June 27, 1986

conscience follows logic and I think I can't say any more than Representative Harris and some of the previous other Everybody in this room knows that this speakers have said. Everybody in this room knows that it is a is a power grab. the warfare that we have seen in the City continuation of of Chicago and, frankly, that to the credit of this Speaker and the Members of this House, hasn't really infected our operation down here that much in the past three years. Rut to take away from this Mayor, to hold up the symbol and the flag of unfairness, to hold up the symbol and the flag that this General Assembly has no problem with terrorist tactics, has no problem with a coup d'etat, has no taking sides in a fight that I think the people of the City of Chicago thought they resolved three years ago, would be a real travesty. I urge your "no" vote on this... on this Conference Committee Report without regard to the politics, without regard to whether or not the flag is going up to tell not only the black citizens in the City of Chicago. the Hispanic citizens in the City of Chicago and the white citizens in the City of Chicago who elected Harold Washington, but reform-minded people throughout this State of Illinois to walk away from the Democratic Party, to say to the Democratic Party. 'This time is one time too many. and we will no longer continue to sit idly by and continue to be taken advantage of, disrespected and stripped of that ours by the operation of the which thought was we Democratic rules of the game. I encourage your "no" vote on this Conference Committee Report."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Farley, to close."

Farley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. We have been on this Conference Committee Report approximately two hours. I don't want to take up any more time of the House. The points that I have made should be

136 Legislative Day

June 27, 1986

taken to heart when you vote. I know that it's good for those people that are not protected by Civil Service. the traditional duties that are... the also know that general superintendents will now be identified by statute because the Park District is a product of this Legislature. We are... We are doing something to take a power struggle away from a disastrous situation that happened in the City We are clarifying what our intentions is, what Council. the intentions of the people of the State of Illinois and I'm not interfering or this Conference Committee Report does not interfere with the Mayor, his appointment power. It just clarifies what I have indicated earlier and I would appreciate an 'aye' vote."

- Speaker Madigan: "The question is, 'Shall the House adopt the First Conference Committee Report on House Bill 3549?* Those in favor of the adoption of the Report will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. Mr. Young, if you wish the Oral Verified Roll Call, you can have it. I can assure you that if you simply request a verification. you'll get your verification. Whatever your choice is, Mr. Young. Gentleman requests an Oral Verified Roll Call and he is supported by the requisite number. Mr. Clerk. Oral Verified Roll Call. For what purpose does Mr. Johnson ... thank you. Mr. Clerk, take the Roll Call.
- Clerk O'Brien: "Alexander Alexander votes 'no'. Barger.

 Barger votes 'no'. Barnes. Barnes, pass. Berrios."

 Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Berrios."
- Berrios: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Assembly, there have been a lot of discussion here tonight over this Conference Committee Report, but the one thing that we are overlooking is that there are over 2000 minorities that work for the Park Districts and we are giving them the opportunity to be safeguarded under the Civil Service

136 Legislative Day

June 27, 1986

procedures and that's the reason I'm voting 'aye'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Berrios, 'ave'. Black. Black. 'no'. Bowman. Breslin. Bowman, pass. Braun. Braun, "no". Breslin. *present*. Brookins. Brookins. *no*. Brunsvold. Brunsvold. *ave*. Bullock. Bullock. pass. Capparelli. *ave*. Christensen. Christensen. *present*. Capparelli. Churchill, 'aye'. Countryman. Countryman. Churchill. "no". Cowlishaw. Cowlishaw. "no". Cullerton. Cullerton. Curran. Curran. pass. Currie. Currie. 'no'. Daley. Daley, 'aye'. Daniels. Daniels, 'aye'. Davis. Davis. 'no'. DeJaegher."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. DeJaegher."

- DeJaegher: "Explanation of my vote, Mr. Speaker. I came to this General Assembly a few short years ago. This is probably going to be my most difficult vote that I have made in this General Assembly, but when I arrived and attended various Sessions, most of those people that had been here a long time before I basically said, when you extend your word to an individual, that word should be paramount on what you vote for. I gave my assurance that I would be voting for, and I have always been a firm believer that my word is my bond, and due to the commitments I made beforehand, I vote
- Clerk O'Brien: "DeJaegher, 'aye'. DeLeo. DeLeo. *aye*. Deuchler, 'no'. Didrickson. Didrickson, *no*. Deuchler. Dunn-Dunn, pass. Ewing. Ewing, "aye". Farley. Farley, 'aye'. Flinn, Flinn, 'aye'. Flowers. Virginia Frederick. Virginia Frederick, Dwight..."
- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Clerk. Mr. Clerk. Mr. Clerk, the Chair recognizes Mr. Bowman."

Bowman: "I wish to be recorded as 'no' on this Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Proceed, Mr. Clerk."

136 Legislative Day

June 27, 1986

O'Brien: "Dwight Friedrich. Dwight Friedrich, "aye". Giglio. Giglio, 'aye'. Giorgi. Giorgi, 'aye'. Goforth. Greiman, 'present'. Goforth. 'ave'. Greiman. Hallock. Hannig. Hannig, *aye. Harris. Hallock, 'aye'. Harris, Hartke. Hartke, pass. Hasara. Hasara. Hastert. Hastert. *no*. Hawkinson. Hawkinson, *no*. Hensel. Hensel. *no*• Hicks. Hicks, 'ave'. Hoffman. Hoffman, 'aye'. Homer, Homer, 'aye'. Huff, Huff, *no*. Johnson. Johnson, 'aye'. Keane. Keane, "aye". Kirkland. Kirkland, 'no'. Klemm. Klemm, 'aye'. Koehler. "no". Krska. Krska, 'aye'. Kubik. Kubik, *no*. Kulas. Kulas. "ave". Laurino. Laurino. ave. LeFlore. LeFlore. 'no'. Leverenz, Leverenz, pass. Levin. levin. Martinez. Martinez. 'aye'. Matijevich. Matijevich, 'aye'. Mautino. Mautino, 'aye'. Mays. McAuliffe, *no*. HcCracken, excused. McAuliffe. McGann. McGann, 'aye'. McMaster. McMaster, McNamara, McPike. McNamara. 'no'. McPike, pass. Mulcahey. Mulcahey, pass."

Speaker Madigan: "Chair recognizes Mr. McPike."

Clerk O'Brien: "McPike, 'aye'. Nash. Nash. pass. O*Connell. Olson• Olson, 'no'. O'Connell, 'aye'. Panayotovich. Panayotovich, 'aye'. Pangle. Pangle. pass. Parcells. Parcells. *no*-Parke. Parke, 'no'. В• Pedersen. 'aye'. W. Peterson. W. Peterson. Phelps. Phelps, pass. Piel. Piel, 'ave'. Preston."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Preston."

Preston: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. In explaining my vote, one of the previous speakers during debate talked about a... that some time ago there was a machine in City Hall politics and today there is reform in City Hall politics. I want to point out, and I think it has to be said, that there... no administration,

June 27, 1986

past or present, had a monopoly on corruption. No city administration. past or present, has a monopoly or had a monopoly on reform and no administration, past or has... had or has a monopoly on power grabs. have seen examples of that in previous administrations and certainly seen examples of that in the present administration. What this is about is where a second in command was put in, not as Superintendent to the Park District, but as second in command and given all the powers of the Superintendent. That's wrong. That's wrong at Park District. That would be wrong at other entities. have seen that tried elsewhere in the City of Chicago. Α at one time, was put in in the Law number two person. Department at the Chicago Transit Authority. outcry from City Hall and from elsewhere. That was wrong and it was reversed. It would be wrong if the City Council in Chicago made an attempt to put in a Deputy Mayor of City of Chicago and give that Deputy Mayor the powers of the Mayor of the City of Chicago. That would be wrong and that ought not happen. It is also wrong to put in someone in second in command at any park district and to give second in command the powers of the person who, by law, is first in command. Representative Brookins was correct. T F you didn't want Mr. Kelly as the Superintendent οf the Chicago Park District, he should have been fired. That was not done. That was not what the Board saw fit to do. should. if he's not going to be fired, he is the Superintendent, under a lawful contract, If you... You can't have it both wavs and Superintendent. you can't separate the Chicago Park District from every other entity of government in this state. Finally, the ludicrous issue of the Civil Service employees. All sudden, it is now reform government to not want Civil

June 27, 1986

Service employees. Every government in this country waving the flag of reform by saying we're making all our employees Civil Service. The Mayor of the City of Chicago. before he was Mayor of the City of Chicago, waved that same flag. We don't want patronage employees. We want Civil Service employees. We don't want hiring and firing and promotions under a patronage system. It ought to be a Civil Service System. That is what this Conference Committee Report does. Yes, it's changing the rules. That's what we do every time we pass any legislation here is we change the rules. But this isn't unfair. unfair is why this Conference Committee Report came about; that it came about because the number two man was in Dut without a single day's experience in recreation. Keep that Without mind. one single day's experience i n recreation, he was put in and given the powers to the largest park districts in the world and that's reform. I submit that's not reform and I'm voting

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

Leverenz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to be recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Clerk, proceed with the Roll Call."

Clerk O'Brien: "Preston votes 'aye'. Pullen. Pullen. Rea. Rea. "ave". Regan. Regan. "no". Rice. Rice. "no". Richmond. 'ave'. Ronan. Ronan. *ave*. Richmond. RODDA Ryder, *ave*. Ropp. 'aye'. Ryder. Saltsman. Saltsman. Satterthwaite, 'no'. Shaw. Satterthwaite. Shaw. *00** Slater. Slater, 'aye'. Stange. Stange, 'aye'. Steczo-Steczo. *aye *. Stephens. Stephens, 'aye'. Stern. 'no'. Sutker. Sutker. *no*. Tate. Stern. Tate. 'ave'. Terzich. Terzich. 'ave'. Tuerk. Tuerk. *ave*. Turner. Turner. *no*. Van Duyne. Van Duyne, 'aye'. 'aye'. Wait. Wait, 'aye'. Washington. Vinson. Vinson.

136 Legislative Day

June 27, 1986

Washington, 'no'. Weaver. Weaver, 'aye'. White. White, 'no'. Williamson. Williamson, 'no'. Wojcik. Wojcik, 'no'. Wolf. Wolf, 'aye'. Anthony Young. Anthony Young, 'no'. Wyvetter Younge. Wyvetter Younge, 'no'. Zwick."

Speaker Madigan: "Recognize Mrs. Zwick."

Zwick: "Thank vou. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to vote 'no'."

Clerk O'Brien: "Zwick, 'no', Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Madigan: "'Present'. Chair recognizes Ar. Curran."

Curran: "Mr. Speaker, when all this started, I wasn't sure how I was going to vote. As I see it, there are two parts to the decision here. One is the part in terms of practicality is the part in terms of principle. When you look one at practicality, you look at who you can afford to be with and who you can afford to have be against you for the rest of this Session and maybe some other Sessions. When the side on principle, I have one basic problem with this Report. My basic problem with this Report am a human being who walks in this door with self-esteem, and this Report and the arguments presented in favor of it deny me, I think, and deny the people who are green up there, I think, of their self-esteem. I think we have been insulted by this Report. I want to tell you something, however - don't smile, speaking now to Representative Braun - I think Harold Washington deserves this. I don't think the guy understands how to play ball at all, but Report is an insult and I vote "no"."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Mulcahey."

Mulcahey: "Record me as voting 'aye', Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Madigan: "Record Mr. Mulcahey as "aye". As...

Representative Barnes."

Barnes: "I'd like to be recorded 'no'."

Speaker Madigan: "Record Representative Barnes as *no*. Mr.
Phelps."

136 Legislative Day

June 27, 1986

Phelps: "Mr. Speaker, vote me "no", please."

Speaker Madigan: "Record Mr. Phelps as 'no'. Representative

McMaster."

McMaster: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and all of you Ladies Gentlemen of the House. I think one thing that we are considering here tonight is patronage versus Civil Service. to know that patronage has worked well for I happen politicians in the past. I happen to also believe that Civil Service is perhaps the fairest method of having employees, whether it be state employees or park district employees. I happen to know Harold Washington very well. I consider Harold a very good friend of mine. The question that we have here is not necessarily who is in favor of patronage versus Civil Service or who isn't. that if Harold Washington had all of his employees in the Park District, he would, in all probability support making them Civil Service employees. So. really, the problem becomes who has the employees at the time vou switch from patronage to Civil Service. This is what the problem is. And I guess I would not have to vote tonight. I know you all understand that. The votes are there. This but I think that I am not going to be making very many more votes down here, but I think in this case, I want to make one. And I want to make my vote. support of any individual's employees in the City of I want to make my vote because I favor the Chicago. Civil Service type of employment. That is why I am voting 'yes', and I am voting 'yes'."

Speaker Madigan: "Yes, Mr. Hartke."

Hartke: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. This afternoon, I was approached on this issue early, and I told the Sponsors of the issue that we have discussed all evening that I would give it very careful consideration and that I would listen

136 Legislative Day

June 27 • 1986

to the debate and I felt that his presentation of the issue was very good and I could go along with that. Then later on this afternoon, I was approached by the other side. And too, have some very deep concerns, very good issues. After listening to the debate this evening. I think both sides are right and both sides are wrong. The timing is had. We have heard horror stories from both cidac what's going to happen. The issue is not one that affects me directly downstate. It's a Chicago issue, was sent down here to make decisions. In agreeing with Ar. Dejaegher, we go on principle and I said I would listen. And I do believe that the Civil Service System is aood but yet I believe that the timing is not the best. but the Civil Service System is still good. So, I'm to have to vote *ves . "

Speaker "Does anyone else seek recognition? Mr. Clerk. There are 62 *aves*. 47 "nos". take the record. Conference Committee Report. having received is hereby Constitutional Majority. adopted and the underlying Bill is hereby declared passed. The Chair Greiman for the Adjournment Motion to 10:00 recognizes Mr. Does the Clerk tomorrow morning. require any time? Mr. Clerk, do you require perfunctory time? Okay. The Motion is House stand adjourned until 10:00 a.m. tomorrow morning. Those in favor say 'aye', those opposed say 'no'. The have it, the Motion is adopted. The Chair recognizes Representative Braun."

Braun: "Thank you very much..."

09/26/86 15:33

STATE OF ILLINOIS 84TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES DAILY TRANSCRIPTION OF DEBATE INDEX

PAGE 1

JUNE 27, 1986

HB-2976	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	10
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	ii
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	12
	CONCURRENCE		
		PAGE	13
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	13
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	14
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	15
HB-2984	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	15
HB-2986	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	16
H3-2987	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	17
HB-2988	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	17
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	18
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	19
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	19
	CONCURRENCE		
		PAGE	20
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	20
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	21
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	22
HB-2997	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	23
HB-2998	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	23
HB-2999	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	24
HB-3000	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	24
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	25
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	26
	CONCURRENCE		
		PAGE	27
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	28
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	30
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	30
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	31
HB-3090	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	32
HB-3091	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	39
HB-3092	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	49
HB-3093	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	50
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	50
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	102
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	51
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	
			52
	CONFERENCE	PAGE	135
	MOTION	PAGE	131
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	67
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	5
\$B-1565	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	68
SB-1666	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	9
SB-1698	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	53
SB-1709	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	69
SB-1737	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	54
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	55
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	56
_	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	59
	CONCURRENCE		
		PAGE	60
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	60
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	61
SB-1759	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	62
SB-1763	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	63
SB-1765	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	63
SB-1770	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	64
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	65
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	65
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	66
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	
	CONCURRENCE		66
		PAGE	7
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	8
	MOTION	PAGE	95
	RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	91
HK-1419	MOTION	PAGE	105

09/26/86 15:33

STATE OF ILLINOIS 84TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES DAILY TRANSCRIPTION OF DEBATE INDEX

PAGE 2

JUNE 27, 1986

HOTION		PAGE	109
RESOLUTION	OFFERED	PAGE	111
RESOLUTION (OFFERED	PAGE	88
RESOLUTION (OFFERED	PAGE	89
OUT OF RECO	RD	PAGE	90
RESOLUTION	OFFERED	PAGE	94
MOTION		PAGE	120
RESOLUTION (OFFERED	PAGE	123
MOTION		PAGE	124
RESOLUTION	OFFERED	PAGE	125
RESOLUTION (OFFERED	PAGE	94
RESOLUTION (OFFERED	PAGE	70
MOTION		PAGE	126
	RESOLUTION RESOLUTION OUT OF RECOLUTION MOTION RESOLUTION RESOLUTION RESOLUTION RESOLUTION RESOLUTION RESOLUTION	RESOLUTION OFFERED RESOLUTION OFFERED RESOLUTION OFFERED OUT OF RECORD RESOLUTION OFFERED MOTION RESOLUTION OFFERED MOTION RESOLUTION OFFERED RESOLUTION OFFERED RESOLUTION OFFERED RESOLUTION OFFERED RESOLUTION OFFERED	RESOLUTION OFFERED PAGE RESOLUTION OFFERED PAGE RESOLUTION OFFERED PAGE OUT OF RECORD PAGE RESOLUTION OFFERED PAGE MOTION PAGE MOTION PAGE MOTION PAGE MOTION PAGE RESOLUTION OFFERED PAGE RESOLUTION OFFERED PAGE RESOLUTION OFFERED PAGE RESOLUTION OFFERED PAGE

SUBJECT MATTER

HOUSE TO ORDER - REPRESENTATIVE BRESLIN	PAGE	1
PRAYER - REVEREND ALVIN N. RODECK	PAGE	1
PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE	PAGE	1
ROLL CALL FOR ATTENDANCE	PAGE	1
AGREED RESOLUTIONS	PAGE	2
DEATH RESOLUTIONS	PAGE	3
GENERAL RESOLUTIONS	PAGE	3
HOUSE IN RECESS	PAGE	103
HOUSE RECONVENES	PAGE	103
SPEAKER MADIGAN IN CHAIR	PAGE	131
ADJOURNMENT	PAGE	164