146th Legislative Day

December 3, 1986

- Speaker Greiman: "The House will be in Session. Those not entitled to the floor, please withdraw. The Chaplain for today will be Father John Spreen, Pastor, Church of the Little Flower, Springfield. Father Spreen is a guest of Representative Karen Hasara. Will the guests in the gallery please join... join us in the invocation. Father Spreen."
- Father Spreen: "Let us place ourselves in a prayerful mood. Almighty God, we pause before we begin the business of the day to acknowledge You as our Creator. We thank You for sharing the gift of life with us and giving us another day to share in that gift. We praise You with our hearts, minds and our souls. We need you for our continued existence. We want to grow in our knowledge οf You. to please You by our actions of this day. patience, give us understanding. Counsel us , us, guide us through these activities in order that whatever we do will be for Your greater honor and glorv. Amen • "
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from McLean, Mr. Ropp, will lead us in the pledge to the flag."
- 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 Greiman: "Roll Call for Attendance. Mr. Piel, are there any excused absences on the Republican side?"
- Piel: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. Would the record show that Representative Davis is excused today?"
- Speaker Greiman: "Let the record so reflect. Ar. Preston, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"
- Preston: "I just wanted to inform the Chair that there are no

146th Legislative Day

December 3, 1986

excused absences on this side of the aisle."

- Speaker Greiman: "Thank you, Mr. Preston. Let the record show that Representative Shaw is an excused absence on the Democratic side. Mr. Clerk, take the record. 114 Members having answered to the call of the quorum, a quorum is present. Representative Stephens is again with us with a team of winners."
- Stephens: "It's my pleasure, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, to introduce to you, as they finish filing in here, the 1986 State of Illinois Soccer Champions from my alma mater, Collinsville High School, the Collinsville Kahoks and their fine coach, Jim Strans. Jim, would you like to introduce your team?"
- Jim Strans: "I want to thank everybody for... and Representative Stephens for having us here and supporting our school related functions, and we want to first congratulate all of the teams that played in the final, including St. Charles, New Trier and Libertyville of northern Chicago. our brothers to the north who had the title for three years until we fortunately brought it back home to Madison and Our fellows are state champions this St. Clair County. year and runners up last year with a 19, 4, and 2 record. our right, we have our managers, Pam Moon, Kris Jason Docter. Brian Rosenkrantz: players Hunt. Doug *Karsten *Tomlinson** Hassi*, Mark Krause. Jason Astrauskas, Scott Siegel, David Mueller, Matt Docter, Keith Brooke, Jason Mueller Paul Reiniger, Joe 'Shallert', Mark Ahlvers, Eric Massa, *patton*, Clint Tucker, Tim Johnson, Grant Highlander, Jeff Deuetsch, Robb Hartman, Matt Keller, Brian Krumm, and coaches Charles Suarez and Coach Andy 'Kosberg', and Marie and Michael. Thank you very much for recognizing us. appreciate it."

146th Legislative Day

- December 3, 1986
- Stephens: "Thank you, Coach. Congratulations. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker Greiman: "Thank you, Representative. Thank you, Representative. Hr. Daniels, the Gentleman from DuPage, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"
- Daniels: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, on occasion, we are blessed with the attendance of the Gentleman who we now have renamed 'Governor for Life.' May I present to you our Governor, your Governor, Governor James Thompson, Governor of the State of Illinois."
- Speaker Greiman: "Thank you, Mr.... Mr. Daniels, were you still seeking recognition?"
- Daniels: "Yes, Sir. I... I just wanted to say, without authority, without authorization he'll probably bop me after I say this those of you that want to file as delegates for the Thompson slate for President can come to my office, and we'll be happy to take your applications. See how he's running away?"
- Speaker Greiman: "Does he have a jacket? Could somebody get the Gentleman a jacket to wear? Ar. Hastert... Ar. Hastert. Well, but I know, but he's our Governor. Mr. Hastert, why don't you let him wear your jacket, there. Representative Ewing in the Chair."
- Ewing: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, it's a real pleasure distinct pleasure for me to introduce the Class A cross country championship team from Pontiac, Illinois, Pontiac High School. Mr. Clerk, I think we have a Resolution. Would you read that, please?"
- Clerk Leone: "House Resolution 1724. Whereas, the Members of this Body are pleased to recognize instances of athletic excellence throughout the state; and whereas, it has come to the attention of this Body that the Pontiac Township High School boys' cross country team won the Class A State

146th Legislative Day

December 3. 1986

Championship; and whereas, the undefeated in Class competition, the Indians of Pontiac have won the first team state title for Pontiac since 1904; whereas, driven by the inspiration and support of Head Coach Kevin Forney. Indians have been rated number one all season; whereas, with the final score of 85, the Pontiac team had three 25 finishes and all finished in the top half of the field of runners; whereas, the Pontiac Township High School boys! cross country team confirms our belief that hard work and dedication are effective when you set goals and strive to accomplish them; and whereas, resolved by the Representatives of the 84th General Assembly of the State of Illinois that we congratulate the Pontiac Township High School boys' cross country team on winning the Class A State Championship, that we commend Coach Forney and all the members of the team for their hard work and dedication and that we extend our best wishes for them for continued success in the future; and be it further resolved that suitable copies of this Preamble and Resolution presented to Coach Forney and each member of the Pontiac Township High School boys* cross country team as a formal indication of the respect and esteem in which they are held by this Body."

Ewing: "Mr. Clerk, could we have a vote on that? All in favor say "aye", opposed "no". In the opinion of the Chair, the "ayes" have it, and the Resolution is adopted. Thank you very much. Now, I'd like to introduce Coach Forney, Kevin Forney, who will introduce the members of his team."

Forney: "Thank you very much, Representative Ewing... Introduce our Pontiac contingency. Our Superindendent here is Or. Ron Yates. He's the President also. These boys were on the varsity squad: 'Craig Black', 'Scott McCutchen', Correy Simmons, and 'Brian McMillan'. These varsity boys won the

- 146th Legislative Day

 State championship: Britton Roth, Lane Ingram, Jack

 Lamphere, Frank Lamphere, Jim Cermak, Jim Ries; and second

 in the state, number one coming back next year, Todd
- Ewing: "Ladies and Gentlemen, I appreciate your attention, and you can see, since 1904, it's been a long time, and we're glad to have a state championship team. Thank you."

Lopeman. Thank you very much."

- Speaker Greiman: "Representative Greiman in the Chair. Mr. Ropp, the Gentleman from McLean, would you come forward? Mr. Ropp in the Chair."
- Ropp: "Okay* thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Members of the Hoving on from real athletes to Members of as you can well receive when we had our tennis House. outing back in June, sponsored for the 13th consecutive year by the Southwestern Illinois Industrial Commission. They have, in fact, presented these trophies, too. This we have winners, and I'd like Representative David Harris to come forward and... without the help of esteemed staffer, Bill Rodmann, he would not have won. Would these two Gentlemen kindly come forward and receive It's my pleasure to present them - Bill their trophies? Rodman and David Harris. Congratulations to both of Vou-We want to thank Bob Walters for his help in this, too. Super good. Thank you."
- Speaker Greiman: "Representative Matijevich on the floor... in the Chair."
- Speaker Matijevich: "The House will be at ease for a moment. The Chair will recognize here a former Member, 'Bus' Yourell, a very good friend of all of ours, right here in front, and a respected county official, also. The Chair recognizes the Minority Leader, the Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Lee Daniels."
- Daniels: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I wonder if we could

146th Legislative Day

December 3, 1986

indulge you for a moment to talk about two of our Members our distinguished Members - that will be leaving the House, and for one, he is already in Washington, and for the second Hember, he will be leaving this afternoon for Washington - two people that I have personally extremely close to - one serves in the position presently as Assistant Minority Leader of the House, Representative Jack Davis. and the other Gentleman serves as the Republican Spokesman for the Appropriation Committee, Representative Dennis Hastert. I can't think of two finer people to represent the citizens of Illinois in Washington, D.C. than these two individuals. They're your colleagues, been your supporters. At times you've fighting with them, and at times you've been on the but throughout it all, you know that Jack Davis and Denny Hastert have always and consistently done the best interests of their constituents. personal loss because when they leave Springfield, thev will be leaving to us, ves. their heritage of government and the experience that they brought to all but we won't see them as frequently as we did in the past, and for that reason, we're losing a friend here on consistent basis, but we're also sending to Washington, D.C., people that have learned from you, that have worked you, and that have been part of your present time and of your future dreams. I know that from all of us, we wish them the best of luck. To Jack Davis, who is Washington at the orientation program, we send our best wishes. To Denny Hastert, if we might for a second talk to him personally, because he's here with us today, he'll leaving this afternoon, and it is his last day as a Member of the Legislature in the State of Illinois, as he finishes out his term. He'll be sworn in as a Representative

146th Legislative Day

December 3, 1986

January 3rd. will Congress on He carry forth everv tradition of goodness in government, friendship. as representative of you and as a representative of his district when he is sworn in in Washington, D.C. We have a right to be proud of his future, and I know we will, and know that each and every one of us send with him, godspeed, of wishes, good health. And Denny, thanks for a terrific job done during the time you've served us. Thank VOU.

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Woods Bowman, we'll get two turns on this."

Bowman: "Thank you very much. Ar. Speaker, Ladies and Sentlemen the House, I just want to rise and echo the sentiments of Minority Leader Daniels. Representative Davis in the same class together, but it's probably Representative Hastert that I know the best, because Minority Spokesman on the House Appropriations II Committee which I share, and we spend many hours together in that Committee and in the Conference Committees over appropriation matters. And I must say, it's a verv nerve-wracking experience to be across the Conference Committee table from a former wrestling coach, because he's tough customer in those... those Committee meetings. He does a fine job representing his Party and his for one, salute him and say, 'God bless you. Godspeed. And we'll be coming to Washington with our hat in hand, too, to make the appropriations process back here go more smoothly. Thank you."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Adams, Representative Jeff Mays."

Mays: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Denny is the fourth or fifth seatmate that I've had the opportunity to train over my brief six years here in Springfield. I just... I just

146th Legislative Day

December 3, 1986

Anyway, he is now, believe can't keep them. it or to be a small fish in a big pond. Can you imagine Hastert as a small fish? I had thought about putting together a real extensive Resolution commemorating this day so Denny could hang it on a wall with all those other neat things he's going to get from these big powered there. But I figured we'd save that kind of stuff for his death. And now... now, there's two things that I felt were in order to present to Denny today. Number one is a dollar from a lunch that he bought me about six months that I forgot to give him back, so I want him to have that in remembrance of all of us. And then. I want you to know. I took up a collection on both sides of the aisle. and then, I made up the difference, and here's another dollar from... we know that you will wield your wizardry amonast congressional delegation. both in Illinois throughout the country, and probably pyramid that dollar sake, millions and millions and billions of Illinois* times over, and we know you'll cut the debt of a and forty some odd billion dollars and still help Illinois Denny, heartfelt thanks come out on top. So. for the learning and the sharing and everything. I'm going to miss We all will. Godspeed."

Speaker Matijevich: "The... The Gentleman From Madison, the Majority Leader, Jim McPike."

McPike: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. When Dennis arrived, I had no idea that we were related. I was sitting next to Dennis in the Revenue Committee one day, and he asked me what direction I drove home. I told him Route 16 through Shipman, and he was mentioning that he would occasionally come to Shipman because one of his relatives owns a farm in Shipman, and they visit there quite often. And I said, 'Hell, that's

146th Legislative Day

December 3, 1986

I said, 'My mother was born in surprising." Shipman.* He maiden name?" I said, 'It was 'Well. what*s her Irene Call. And he said, 'Well, my wife's name's Call. So, Dennis and I are relatives. Dennis told me that his... Dennis told me that his only disappointment that he's had since he was elected to the General Assembly was when had a contest between a number of people, but the finalists in the contest were Alan Greiman and Dennis Hastert for "Junk Food Czar", and Dennis was not elected, and it was his only disappointment. I've worked with Dennis probably more than I've worked with any Republican in Springfield. for his hard work and his flexibility, we wasn't never would have put together the utility package two years ago. I could probably name ten other things that WATVA worked on, and I would say the same thing. It's his honesty, his hard work, his dedication to professionalism, his commitment to do the best job for your side of the aisle that makes him someone that you will and certainly someone that I will miss as a good friend. Good luck to you. Dennis."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Jim Keane,"

Keane: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to support what Lee Daniels has said abut Jack Davis and Dennis Hastert. think all of us are... are missing or going to be saying goodbye to two outstanding Legislators. and for to two friends. There isn't much more that we personally. can say. We know that both Jack and Denny will do very well. They're both hard workers. They both know what a legislative agenda is about, and they're both going to do super well. However, for my own purposes and for a very jealous purpose. I'm very happy to see them go. I • ve always considered myself very slim, very much... very fit

146th Legislative Day

December 3. 1986

person, but I keep getting messages saying... they come up and they say, *Representative Hastert, would you please... someone is out to see you outside the please go out and talk to them.* And I've also Would you been mistaken for Jack Davis. So finally, with these leaving. will be my own I man. and I can go on believing that I am slim and fit. And good luck, guys. I know you're going to do well."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Kendall, Congressman

Dennis Hastert."

Hastert: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House and Lee Daniels and Jim McPike and Jim Keane seatmate, Jeff Mays, and all... sometime adversary Woods Bowman. You know, I really... The years I've been here, I never thought that I'd be... never think about the last day you spend in this House. that And of course, on the last day, you think of a lot things and a lot sometimes frustrations and sometimes victories, but most of all, on this last day, you think of the friendships you ve made, the pacts you've put together, and the time that you in friendship and hard work and just the realization spent that there's no real partisan side in working with working with the Members on this side of the aisle and that side of the aisle has certainly been an experience for me, an experience that I will never forget. And yes, guess I will be a small fish in a big pond, and that's kind of scary when you think about it, but to Jim Keane, you know, I guess if I was always a mirror, Jim, you'd have to... now you have to look at that shiny thing and you know. sometimes that's a bad realization, too. appreciate your However. Ι help, your openness, and certainly, the cooperation I've had with the Members of both sides of the aisle. And I remember once, an occasion

146th Legislative Day

December 3, 1986

too unlike this, that an old Powell, who was a Member of this House for a lot of years, stood up speech, and I'll always remember those words. said, 'Never be afraid to say that you're a politician, and tell your children to be proud of what you've done and what this House stands for, and the people who are politicians. who work with both sides of the aisle and represent, truly, the desires and the needs and the welfare of the people of this state. And so, I ask you to join with me as I start something new and a new endeavor and certainly a new era and a new challenge, that we do stand proud, we do stand what we stand for, we do stand proud of what the people elected us to do, and I want to also say that, door in Washington, I hope it can be open for a long, long time, and by the way, reapportionment is coming a few years, but beyond that, that... John, my door will be open, and I hope it will be open to you for a long, long time. Thank you very much."

- Speaker Matijevich: "Page two of your Calendar, Senate Bills

 Third Reading. Senate Bill 1699. The Clerk will read the

 Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1699, a 3ill for an Act to create the Comprehensive Health Insurance Plan Act. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Alan Greiman."
- Greiman: "Thank you, Speaker. We discussed this Bill yesterday on the floor of the House. It provides a comprehensive health insurance plan for people who are not able now to get insurance. It provides a security for people who must be the most insecure in our society. The statistics that we have seen are appalling at people who are suffering from serious disease and serious illness and have gone to the

146th Legislative Day

December 3, 1986

private market and have been unable to get the kind of coverage - any kind of coverage, in fact - necessary. system sets up a program of ... or a plan which creates authority of eleven persons, four non-voting Members of the Illinois General Assembly who would have constant oversight It provides that those who are insured pay of this agency. percent or up to 135 percent of the ... of the amount normally charged for persons obtaining insurance. I t provides for a pooling of those funds, and it provides for a state backup when the pools have been exhausted. It is a Bill which has received the support of every... every health care provider in our It has the state. miraculous support of both the bar associations and the Society, people not usually agreeing on matters. Medical It has been fought out and developed by Illinois* General, and his Office of Disabled Advocacy. I think that Bill. I think so many people everyone understands this have taken a position on it that it seems almost trivial for me to explain it any further. There are questions, questions of intent that are important and significant, and I would welcome those questions at this time."

- Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Greiman has moved for the passage of Senate 3ill 1699. On that, the Minority Leader, the Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Lee Daniels."
- Daniels: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I am pleased and proud to join as a Chief Cosponsor of this very important legislation, the Comprehensive Health Insurance Plan, that has been brought to us through the good offices and the hard work of our Attorney General, Neil Hartigan. This program represents a major breakthrough in the availability of health insurance for the less fortunate. The CHIPs Program will ensure that thousands of Illinoisans can obtain what most of us take for granted affordable

146th Legislative Day

December 3, 1986

The people this program is designed to insurance. help deserve our support. There are more than one million in this state with disabilities or disabling people diseases. In many cases, these less fortunate people themselves priced out of the health insurance market. without medical insurance, many of them are forced into personal bankruptcy. Thousands of disabled Illinoisans cannot obtain medical insurance whatsoever. Thousands of others are locked into dead-end jobs that, at best, offer only the barest and most limited of coverage. disabled persons join the welfare rolls as a means to obtain health insurance. This not only inflates the welfare rolls, it perpetuates the state's myth that disabled people cannot be productive members of society. Moreover. it underscores the need for a CHIPs Program in Illinois. Illinois is not the only considering CHIPs legislation. Eleven other states have similar programs on the books, and nineteen others are considering their adoption. Senate Bill 1699 represents an idea whose time has come. Ladies and Gentlemen. we congratulate the Attorney General of Illinois for our attention, for creating the initiative in the program for the comprehensive health insurance plan. It establishes an insurance pool, an eleven member board of directors. Benefits will be similar to most major medical and the plan would pay eighty percent of insurance plans. charges after deductible. Twenty percent of charges be paid by the individual. The plan would assume full cost over a stated ceiling. Premiums would be thirty-five percent over those charged by private or group insurance or insurors and the state's General Revenue Fund would cover any cost overruns. I could think of no program that we have done in recent history that more benefits and

146th Legislative Day

December 3. 1986

helps the disabled of Illinois than the Comprehensive Health Insurance Plan. For that, I'm proud to be a Chief Sponsor, I'm proud to join with Representative Greiman in the support of this Bill and offer my personal congratulations to Attorney General Hartigan and support... and urge your support of this provision."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Woods Bowman."

Bowman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. As Chairman of the Appropriations Committee, I have occasion to hear testimony from wany, many people on a variety of human service subjects, and we have, on number of occasions, heard testimony from individuals who are... come to us in the mistaken belief that there... situation is somehow covered by Medicaid and that they are coming to say to us that the State Medicaid Program inadequate, and I have to explain to them that, in fact, no. the... they don't fall within the federal guidelines for Medicaid, and there's nothing that we can do about that. These are the... the same people who would be benefitted by this particular program. This program is needed to take care of those people who fall through the those cracks are ever-widening, Ladies and Gentlemen. I can assure you of that. And it is high time we take this action. I am pleased to support this action, and I believe that the issues that have were raised yesterday with respect to the appropriations can be dealt with in the normal course of events. I see no problem in that regard, and I am pleased to add my to this legislation.

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Livingston, Representative Ewing - Representative Tom Ewing."

Ewing: "Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Sponsor would yield for a

146th Legislative Day

December 3, 1986

question?"

Speaker Matijevich: "He indicates he will."

Ewing: "Representative Greiman, can you tell me what, if any, provisions are in this Bill that would be the intent to keep insurance companies from saying to people or shuttling risks that they don't want to take that they would take now, off to this state program? Is there anything in there... what kind of a criteria is used to... is there any restrictions on the insurance..."

Greiman: "Well, the restriction is obvious in the marketplace itself, that one would have to charge... one would have to get... pay 135 percent of the average. Now, it's unlikely that an insurance carrier would reject an otherwise acceptable applicant. Why would they do that? Why would they want to lose that business? They would get no advantage, particularly. So, if I understand your question correctly, it serves no advantage for a carrier to do that."

Ewing: "No, I don't think... I probably didn't make my question clear. I think today that certainly most insurance companies are taking certain people that they might not take if they... if they had their druthers. Now, I know they can pick and choose but I can see this thing used to narrow the..."

Greiman: "I'm told, Tom... I understand what you mean. I'm told that the ... in other states where ... and we do have experience in that sense, insurance carriers have not taken that action. They have not broadened the criteria for acceptance, and so that we can only look to them. We still regulate those insurance carriers. Thev still in are business, and I can't... and they, by the way, are part of the insurance board as well... of this board... so that I can't... I'm not sure I understand why they would do that.

146th Legislative Day

December 3, 1936

I understand what you're saying, would insurance carriers limit their risk. When they limit their risk, they also limit the premiums that they receive, and they are in business, so I suspect they would not. My answer is that I think they would not."

Ewing: "So... and the answer to my question is there really isn't anything in the Bill that's aimed to prevent that, like having to be turned down by more than one insurance company, or what is the criteria."

Greiman: "... being rejected."

Ewing: "Being rejected?"

Greiman: "It's being rejected, right."

Ewing: "By one or more..."

Greiman: "We don't want to destroy their emotional well-being as well if we can get those..."

Ewing: "We don't want to turn them down, we are just going to reject them."

Greiman: "By one, Tom."

Ewing: "Just by one."

Greiman: "By one."

Ewing: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I am going to support this piece of legislation when it comes up for a vote, but I would say to all of you that I think that there are certain... I have certain reservations about this Bill. I am sorry that the Sponsor refused to accept any type of reasonable limitation on the cost. I think that would have been good legislative policy. And number two. I think I am also quite concerned, and I want the record to show that concern, that some day down the line, we may find the insurance companies are tightening up their underwriting policy and shuttling off to the Illinois, risks that they would have otherwise taken in past years. I don't want that policy set. I don't want to

146th Legislative Day

December 3, 1986

think that's that policy. I don*t be a part of good government. We're taking a chance when we vote for this Bill, and I have weighed that against the need of people who haven't been able to get insurance, and that is a very real need. I hope that the Sponsor of this Bill will object if we come back in later years and try and tighten up some of the loose ends that we're leaving with approval of this legislation. And with that thought in mind. I intend to support the Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Franklin, Representative Rea, Jim Rea."

Rea: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I, too, want to join with Representatives Greiman Representative Daniels in echoing the support for this most important legislation. I want to commend the Attorney General for his leadership for a program that is so badly needed and is long overdue. I know that where the... there are many people that come forth, and I see it each day in my district. I know it's going on throughout the state, people that are falling between the cracks, that are not covered, and as a result, I see them losing their losing their assets, and as a result, it's very difficult for them to ever rise up again. I think And that this legislation i s one of the most critical pieces legislation that we could be considering, and I would ask each and every one of us give great consideration to this and give it the fullest of support."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Parcells."

Parcells: "Thank you, Ar. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The first thing I would like clearly understood is that I am for a CHIPs program. I am trying to help those people who cannot otherwise get health insurance. It's a

146th Legislative Day

December 3, 1986

great idea, but this is not a good Bill. This Bill is not for the poor. We all know that. The poor are already This is an upper middle class and middle taken care of. class Bill for those who can afford premiums. Therefore. don*t need a fifteen hundred dollar stop loss. or a ten thousand dollar stop loss would be thrilling to They don't need us to pay to have their corns them. removed, they need us to help them pay when they have the big cancer surgery that's 50,000 dollars. That's one flaw in the Bill. Another flaw in the Bill is the residency requirement. This is a Cadillac piece of legislation. It is the best single health insurance policy - CHIPs policy in any state in the United States. Therefore, be flooding to this state to take advantage of it. only a 30 day residency requirement. If we made that six months or a year, that might be another idea. just two of the flaws. Now, you can say, 'Well, we'll adjust that later. The board will adjust it. But this Bill responsibility. Why is our do we send that responsibility to a board? We can do it here, and should do i t here. It's our responsibility. have... This Bill should have been discussed either it was entered on April 2nd. Never got discussed in the Spring Session, or let's put it over that's yet to come. There's no reason to rush this through in a Veto Session in two weeks* time when haven't had good hearings. We haven't spent the time on this, given it full debate and consideration. There many loose ends here that we should be tightening up, not somebody else. Why are we rushing it through in I would like to warn you that you better Session? And start thinking of what special tax you're going to put on, what way you're going to get the money to pay for it,

146th Legislative Day

December 3, 1986

because some of the bottom line figures are 50 It could be higher. Yes, it could be lower, but in either event, we don't have 50 million dollars sitting in the General Fund to pay for this. It won't happen next year, but it's going to happen in the years and we'd better figure out, and you better bite the bullet, get your head out of the sand, and realize going to have to raise taxes to pay for this. In closing, I'd like to say I am going to vote *present*, and I would encourage you to vote 'present' so that we can bring this Bill back for a full debate. I am voting 'present' because I want those people out there, those people in my and your district who need insurance, to know that I'm with them. and I want a CHIPs plan. but we don't have to give them this kind of coverage at this time. If we later find out we can give them this kind of coverage, fine, but let's at a reasonable, responsible figure. i t We'll pay for it if we don't, and I think vou are irresponsibly if we haven't figured out ahead of time how we're going to pay for this plan, and I urge you to vote *present*."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Coles, Representative Weaver, Mike Weaver."

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

Speaker Matijevich: "He indicates he will. Proceed."

Weaver: "Representative Greiman, in talking with a number of people over the past two days about this Bill, I've heard a lot of different figures on the projected number of participants and the projected cost to the State of Illinois. Can you give me a little clearer idea of how many people we think are going to take part in this program and what it's going to cost us?"

Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Greiman."

146th Legislative Day

December 3, 1986

Greiman: "Well, yes. In fiscal 1992, it appears that they project about 22,000 people will be participating in this program."

Weaver: "22,000."

Greiman: "That's correct."

Weaver: "At a total cost of how much?"

Greiman: "Well, in a total cost — and I give you this figure advisedly, because it is a figure which has been adjusted for medical inflation, which is extremely high. The percentage of medical inflation is higher than inflation than other inflation, so in inflated 1992 dollars, those would be 33 million dollars."

Weaver: "Thirty-three million..."

Greiman: "That's the estimate."

Weaver: "Over... above the pool... what the pool would contain at that point?"

Greiman: "That's correct. That's right."

Weaver: "Thank you. Mr. Speaker, to the Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "Proceed."

Weaver: "We have identified a lot of foggy information. The projections, even by some of the Sponsor's admissions, not clear. We don't know what it's going to cost for sure, and unfortunately, we have a couple of major problems with the Bill. One is the 30 day residency requirement. personally, it would benefit me probably quite a bit, because I've got a couple of family members who, because of some congenital birth defects, incur annual medical expenses in excess of ten to fifteen thousand dollars a year. All I would have to do is have them move in with me for a month, and the State of Illinois would then be subject to picking up the balance of their medical expenses above the fifteen hundred dollar stop loss limit. I don't think that's what the intention of the Bill is. I agree

146th Legislative Day

December 3, 1986

that the time has come for some type of medical support for major medical problems that people cannot afford to... to cure. And I really think that the Leadership on both sides of the aisle ought to be commended, and the Attorney General's Office ought to be commended for bringing this Bill to life, but I have to agree with the previous speaker that we have so many major flaws with this Bill, I don't think it is the responsibility of this House to pass out something that we know is in error or we know will cost us more money than we can afford, and then try and patch it up I suggest that we vote 'present' on this bring it back, cure those problems, take care of those faults, and then produce a package that we can... we can vote for with a clear conscience. Please. I don't ask vou to vote 'no', I ask you to vote 'present' to bring this Bill back for further consideration. Thank you."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from McLean, Representative Ropp, Gordon Ropp."

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

Speaker Matijevich: "He indicates he will. Proceed."

Ropp: "Representative Greiman, relative to one of the questions that one of the previous speakers asked, and I know there are a few states that have Bills of this type, have we found out that we have seen a number of people who have severe illnesses move into those states to take advantage of those kinds of legislations that are similar to this one that you are proposing?"

Greiman: "Well, let me first... before I answer your question, the answer, by the way, is no. There has been no... I did want to correct something that the previous speaker said.

I'm sure that Representative Weaver would not want to mislead this General Assembly for a moment, but there is a six-month waiting period if you have a pre-existing

146th Legislative Day

December 3, 1986

condition. So you do not just move in, zip zap, get on the rolls, after 30 days, although we do recognize some things like voting for 30 days, and we do... acknowledge that's appropriate for a domiciliary period of time. **But** have to wait for six months, so you can't just move into Illinois and... and go get your problem solved But the answer is 'no'. Also, the answer is that Bill. surrounding states that have adopted this have pretty the same kind of requirements and coverage that we are going to have. So that the unlikelihood of people moving to Illinois is really remote."

Ropp: "Okay, to the Bill then, Mr. Speaker. I think this is a laudable approach. Initially, a number of us were much concerned with the method of funding, but since it has changed, since it is now being funded more broadly state standpoint, I think from the that is and one that we can support. approach Even though there may be some changes that will be needed. those there are people who definitely need a kind of insurance protection that this will, in part, begin to support, and I'm going to support the Bill."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Pedersen, Bernie Pedersen."

Pedersen: #Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I think this Bill surely has a worthy goal. agree that something needs to be done, and I agree that the General Revenue Fund should pick up the excess cost. But the Bill is flawed. There are no adequate controls costs, and the history of medical costs in government, both in the states and at the national level, that history, frankly, is awful. For one thing, if... មកិខ្ម 2--an insured pays a premium, he creates a contractual obligation which requires the state to pay all valid claims, no matter

146th Legislative Day

December 3, 1986

what has been appropriated. So, when the excess costs come and we don't have the money, we're going to have to go back to the people of Illinois to pay for it. speakers have talked about the residency requirements, the tendency that will develop for insurance to transfer from the private sector, the Cadillac coverage. When you're talking about really good coverage and you are expecting the taxpayers of Illinois to pay for that, who don't have good coverage themselves, I of whom... think maybe we're overreaching. Further, I think the notion that 1991 or there... there approximately as the time when finally the State of Illinois will have to come with some money, is optimistic, is so optimistic that it's really almost absurd. You're really talking people that the normal lag time in a new program of having your claims outstrip your reserves and premiums, lifetime's going to be much shorter. And I agree with the other speakers that have cautioned us about this.. about this Bill. I think that it's much better to go in cautious approach and carefully outline the with coverages to control the costs, and so, I also urge that... a 'present' vote on this Bill."

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

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

Speaker Matijevich: "Yes, proceed."

Regan: "Representative Greiman, I'd like to get back to the residency explanation. I'm sure that you wouldn't like to lead anybody astray as well. In the breakdown here that we have in front of us, it indicates nothing whatsoever is said about residency. It says, "pre-existing diseases", the condition would have to wait six months. That would

- 146th Legislative Day

 December 3, 1986

 mean whether you are a resident or a non-resident of the

 state. Is that true?"
- Greiman: "Well, that's right. Indeed, you... there is a requirement that you be a resident of the state for 30 days, but if one doesn't have a... the fear is, I suspect, that someone with a pre—existing injury or illness will move into the state and will take advantage of this, and I pointed out, merely, that the six month requirement still operates as well as the 30 day. Now, I agree. I suppose if a healthy person said, 'By God, I can't wait to move into Illinois so I can be 135 percent of... of what the premium should be,' I suppose that would be possible, but not very intelligent... that person."
- Regan: "Well, one more question. The second line of that explanation where it says 'pre-existing condition, six months,' it says, 'however'. Somehow, you've left the 'however' out of your explanation that says participants can opt to pay an additional lifetime premium of 10 percent and cut that period to two months."
- Greiman: "Right, but it increases the premium so that there's a tradeoff for that. That's right. We do that. Now, you...
- Regan: "Is says a lifetime charge of ten percent. That's a one time charge."
- Greiman: "Yes. You're familiar... That's right. So, one would have to make the judgment that they want to trade off and get a coverage quicker for paying a higher premium for a very long time. Now, you know all about insurance, all about insurance, and you know that you get various options. Some are more expensive, some are cheaper. This provides you with an option to go with... with a quicker application for a higher premium. That's what it does."
- Regan: "Thank you. To the Bill. I, as well, will support this

146th Legislative Day

December 3. 1986

but there has to be some adjustments in it later. Bill. There's no question about that the cost of this will down the line and that the line's not very overwhelm us long, three to four years. You'll see people moving states with conditions that they can't get coverage there, moving to Illinois, and two months later, single one-time premium of ten percent, which it could be a hundred or two hundred dollars, be able to get coverage for serious medical conditions that run to 50 to 100 to 200,000 dollars coming to Illinois to yet coverage. I hope that you vote a 'present'. I intend to support it. nothing can be done about it now, but later, let's hope Thank you." that something can.

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Greiman, to close."

think I misheard him. He says, 'I intend to support Greiman: "I it. so vote *present*.* 3ut the truth of the matter this Bill is financed in an honest way. And we're not used We're used to some kind of tricky formulas. to that. other states where they say, *0h* in the insurance carriers, they're picking up the tab, what they've done is to give the insurance carriers tax relief. so thev*ve reduced the revenues that come into the... into the General Revenue Funds of that state and said, 'Look, no public Do you think when you reduce taxes somebody tax advantage, that that isn't public money а being spent? This Bill is honest. It tells you. veah... It says, 'We have a duty, a responsibility, and even to the middle class, if you will. Even to those poor, beleagured folks who pay much and take home little. Even to them, we could do something once in a while for those folks.* There are those who say this Bill has moved quickly through here, too fast. I say not fast enough. The truth of the matter 146th Legislative Day

December 3, 1986

 ζ_{x}

is that we, as Americans, should be concerned about health care for every American. We're doing it piecemeal in this country. Unemployed can continue their health insurance. That's a Bill we passed a few years ago. Sure, a couple of years ago, we allowed widows to continue medical coverage of their... of their former spouses. Poor can come in under Medicaid. So now, we're looking to people who cannot do for themselves, people who are faced with the most staggering, unimaginable expenses that one can dream of There is no casual illness in our society. our society. We must protect them. That's what we are here for, and that's why we're going to vote 'aye' today on this very significant milestone piece of legislation. I thank Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentleman from Cook. Representative Greiman, has moved for the passage of Senate Bill in favor signify by voting *aye*, those opposed by Have all voted? Have all voted? voting 'no'. a11 who wish? The Clerk will take the record. voted On this 'ayes', 2 'nays', 6 question, there are 106 voting 'present'. this Bill: having And received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared you Representative Greiman. want... do you celebrate that, Representative Greiman, by coming the Chair? On page two of the Calendar on Total Veto Motions appears Senate Bill 1516. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Keane."

Keane: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to override the Governor's total veto of Senate Bill 1516. As many of you remember. Senate Bill 1516 requires that university systems to develop programs for professors who are... who can't understood by students. The ... Let me clarify ... Let me clarify what the Bill exactly does. The Bill as we passed it provides that each system where someone is not 146th Legislative Day

December 3, 1986

proficient in English in speaking ability and understandable to students, that the university system set up a program to remedy that problem and that deficiency the college or university teacher. This applies to the state system, the public system of higher The Governor, in his veto message, said that the Bill would sacrifice concepts and facts for clarity The Bill does not, in any way, punctuation and grammar. state anything about punctuation and grammar. message, the Governor also said that if someone had a major speech impediment, that it would affect him, also. T t would not. If someone stuttered or someone had another speech impediment but was οf understand... understandable, the program would not preclude not kick him out. The systems that he taught in would be asked... is asked or directed to set up a program overcome that. Another item on the... Another item on the Governor's veto was that he said people with accents That is wrong. would be affected. The Bill does not The Governor involve people with accents. also finally indicated that "Stephen Hawkins", who is a world-renowned physicist, can only be understood through the interpreter. He said the Bill would close the doors of Northern Illinois University to him. It would not. reason that the man uses an interpreter is so that people can understand him when he does teach, and if he did the thing at Northern Illinois that he does at fermi, bringing an interpreter with him, there would be for the Bill to become applicable. I also have received a letter from the Illinois Student Association which said... point that was made in the debate when we first makes the passed this Bill. One of the great... as the President of the Illinois Student Association pointed out, one of the

146th Legislative Day

December 3. 1986

great problems... one of the worst problems that faces a student in a university is to walk into a classroom and not understand a word or too many words that the professor is A number of the Members of this House and a Members of the Senate have come up to me and told me about their problems while they were attending college and that they sat through a full semester of classes and never understood what the professor was telling them. T+ was a... not only a problem in a loss of an educational opportunity, but it created a tremendous amount of... stress and frustration on their part. I have a number of petitions that some of the people who spoke against the Bill earlier in the... when we passed it before, indicated that there was not any outcry by students on university campuses about this item. I have a great number of who have signed... been signed by students petitions throughout the State of Illinois asking that we, indeed, override the Governor's veto, and I would ask the Members to join me and override the Governor's total veto of Senate Bill 1516."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Keane, has moved for the... has moved that the House override the Governor's veto of Senate Bill 1516. Representative Greiman And on that, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Bowman." "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen House. I did not speak on this Bill originally, but I must because this is the ... absolutely the final đ٥ so now. action on this measure. I want... would like to explain to this Body what is involved in teaching at a institution of education in this state or anywhere else. I spent nine years in institutions of higher education own education. Then I taught for six years at the University of Illinois in Chicago. And I can assure vou 146th Legislative Day

December 3, 1986

the phrase, 'publish or perish' is alive and well, that in order to be on a faculty, one must publish papers. if a large amount of the teaching is done by graduate teaching assistants, these people are in training to scholars. They, too, must publish or perish, and it is not uncommon for graduate students to publish papers while they are still pursuing their doctoral studies. They must all do theses and dissertations and be examined orally as well as in writing. Thus, every person who teaches at an institution of higher education in the United States must constantly, over and over again, demonstrate to his peers and others, proficiency in the English language. to say, they must... their grammar, their syntax, their spelling, their punctuation must all be, if you What is at issue in oral presentations, letter perfect. however, is something a bit different, because as we we sometimes tend to ramble and roam. sometimes tend to put sentences together awkwardly, and I assure you that that can be done just as awkwardly by someone who is a native English speaker as by someone who is a foreign born person. In fact, it is more likely that people will ramble and stumble if they are native born than if they are foreign born, because if they re foreign born, they learn the English language. It's drilled into them, drilled into them, Ladies and Gentlemen, by a very the likes of which we would do well to arduous process. emulate in our own country. Let me say that, in my experience, probably the most difficult person I ever had to listen to and to try and understand was a instructor, I had, in college who is Scottish. English very well. He had spoken English ever since he was a child. It was the language that he learned as a child, and it was the language he was most comfortable with.

146th Legislative Day

December 3, 1986

Indeed, his grammar, his syntax, his speech patterns were perfect, except he had an accent. He had a Scottish accent that was absolutely impenetrable, incomprehensible, and it was very difficult for me to understand what he was saying. Indeed. Ladies and Gentlemen. I think the issue here nothing more and nothing less than accents and the way, the fluidity with which someone speaks. And that, I submit, is not a proper test in an academic environment where the issue is precision of thought, precision of thought, Ladies and Gentlemen, accuracy. That is what the instructors are attempting to teach the students, is an appreciation for precision and accuracy, and that can be done in language and with any accent. Hany of us on this floor are generation Americans. Our parents Our grandparents spoke with accents. people would be precluded from teaching in a institution of higher education, if this Motion prevails. You might be able to teach someone grammar, you might be able to them punctuation and spelling, but you can't remove an accent from an adult after they have learned English following learning a foreign language or another language You cannot take that accent away from and Gentlemen, no matter how hard try. Ladies you Unfortunately, this legislation is very well-meaning, it is not going to remedy the problem, and unfortunately. it will be discriminatory against people whose only that they speak with an accent. I rise in opposition.

Speaker Greiman: "The Lady from DuPage, Ms. Cowlishaw."

Cowlishaw: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I stand in support of Representative Keane's override Motion. I would like to address briefly just three aspects of that Motion. The first is the extent of the problem. Professor Anderson of the University of

146th Legislative Day

December 3. 1986

written. I am sure, to all of us and said, Illinois has this is a very small problem. There are only number of instructors who cannot be understood. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, one instructor who cannot be understood by his or her students is too many. The next is a question of intolerance. He says we are intolerant differences if we think that oral proficiency in the English language should be required in the classrooms of state supported universities. It seems to me that standing in support of this Motion does not demonstrate intolerance for cultural differences, it demonstrates intolerance for insufficient communication skills classrooms of our universities. And finally, I think it is important for us now and then to stop and remember what universities exist to do. They do not exist to employ teachers. They do not exist to build prestige. They exist educate students, and whatever contributes worthy goal should be fostered, whatever detracts from should be eliminated. Representative Keane's Motion makes just plain good sense in good plain common English and deserves our support.

Speaker Greiman: "The Lady from Lake, Ms. Stern."

Stern: "Thank you, Ar. Speaker. Okay. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, it is not that often that I rise in agreement with the Governor. I think this is a very unfortunate I think it's an embarrassing Bill. I think it is Bill. bad enough that we in Illinois do not make a greater effort to teach our children foreign languages, we are now aoina to permit them not to make the effort to understand someone who is difficult to understand. I think this is a very important part of a person's education. Yesterday, I the opportunity to read a transcript of Senate debate on question of the CHIPs Bill. It was a verbatim the

146th Legislative Day

December 3, 1986

and impossible to understand. I suggest to transcription. you that the Members of this General Assembly could not a test requiring total comprehension by students of the University of Illinois. I believe that the effort and the debate on the subject has been pass this Bill healthy, however, and I think it will put the heads departments on notice that we care about having teachers understood by the students. I do not denigrate think that is a very important aspect, but I thought. I think when we talk about barring eminent scholars from our universities on the basis of their dialect, it is a very unfortunate discussion and very embarrassing to the State of Illinois. I hope you will support the Governor's veto."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Will, Mr. Regan."

Regan: "Thank you, Hr. Speaker, Members of the House. opponents of this Bill, one of the things they ve mentioned is it's ambiguous due to the lack of definition of the word *proficiency*. We leave most school matters up to the boards where they can set their own standards, and this is the same case. And in this case, it's extremely simple. get together and they say, *Can we understand Professor Johnson?* It's simple. They say the Bill interfere with traditional peer evaluations. very simple. The peers get together, and they say, *Can we understand Professor Johnson? Simple. The Bill is discriminatory. thev Ιt is. Ιt discriminates sav. against those teachers that cannot communicate in the English language. Simple. The Bill is not needed. Ombudsmen have not had many complaints. Students seldom report problems with their professors, due to the fear The Bill is needed. I sent out a survey to all reprisal. 750 students in the state universities in my districts. hundred and fifty of those were returned, and there was a

146th Legislative Day

December 3, 1986

hundred percent answered 'yes' to the communication question on the survey - a hundred percent said *yes*, they a problem with some teacher or TA or professor. They know there's a problem. We were lobbied by the President the Student Union of the University of Illinois. knows there is a problem. My son is a student the University of Illinois. He knows there's a problem. A few there was eight students that sued the vears *ODS prestigious University of Harvard, and they won in court. Their tuition was returned to them, because they could not understand their professor at Harvard. They know there was I don't care if I can't understand a problem. because they don't have time to talk to me anyway. All I want then to do is cure me. But those that are responsible to communicate to our students, they are in the business of communication. They must be able to communicate. I go for an override on this issue and go with it."

Speaker Greiman: "The Lady from Champaign, Ms. Satterthwaite." Satterthwaite: "Ar. Speaker and Members of the House, I rise in opposition to the Motion to override the Governor's veto of Bill. As we have learned from the discussion here on this the House floor, it is an emotional issue addressed by this piece of legislation, and unfortunately, the emotionalism has carried this Bill to the Governor's desk to is what begin with. It is, in... a fact, that there are some problems. în this area where there has not been enough diligence on the part of the universities to make sure that those who are teaching a class can be understood by all their students. It is, however, overkill for us to put in legislation such as this Bill that requires that all people who would appear before a class of students would have tο go through some kind of a screening process to assess their oral proficiency. It does• in fact, say, *All persons

146th Legislative Day

December 3, 1986

providing classroom instruction, and this could apply even to someone who was there only as a visitor for particular class. It is, in fact, an overkill Bill, and a method that we should not be imposing upon our universities to have to comply with to the complete letter of this better alternative, it seems to me, and the message has been given to the universities through the action this would be for us to provide for Bill. each of these universities and colleges to place before the Higher Education, a program by which they could meet the intent of this law. And yet, we would not have to have it in its current form, which I believe will be so inoperable we will find that it is not successful in meeting the ends that we desire. And so, I feel that a alternative than passing this override is by Resolution for to direct the universities and colleges of the State of Illinois to present a plan that is workable to the Board of Higher Education for their review and their comment. and then if we find that that is still not successful, we can begin to tighten the regulations. However, let's not start the process by taking a sledge hammer when a flv swatter do the job instead. I urge the Hembers to vote with the Governor on this issue to sustain his veto."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Preston. Mr. Preston. The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. As the father of four children who have gone through universities and have had the misfortune, each one of them, particularly in the area of math and science, to have had professors who obviously understood math, they understood the sciences, but they were in no position to communicate to the young people in that class what they knew, and the reason they couldnot is because they could

146th Legislative Day

December 3, 1986

not speak the language sufficiently, the common language sufficiently. the English language, i f vou will. sufficiently in order that the people in the class. the people in the class, could understand what they were trying to say. There is nothing more frustrating to be on the phone with their child who is in tears because they can't understand what an instructor is saying in a math class which they have to have, and they can't understand what that person is trying to say. You know. that is... that's robbery. That's robbery. Thev*re... They're cheating the child out of an education, and they're pocket. taking money out of mγ And that, Ladies is wrong. And this Bill, this veto, should be Gentlemen. overridden because the Governor. although I understand where he's coming from on this issue, is wrong."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from DeKalb, Mr. Countryman." Countryman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I think those of us who represent communities where the major state universities exist probably have felt more in this Bill than others. pressure It goes both ways. There are reasons why this is a good Bill and there's why it is not. I think it lacks some definition. I think it lacks some ability to carry it out subjects it to some of the criticism that some of the other speakers have given. But you have to តាake balance test when you're voting reasonable this on legislation, and I think that you have to bring that reasonable balance to support the override. I think the Governor misconceived a number of things when he wrote the veto message, and I think what he misconceived was the fact in the classroom, and they that the students are there desire to learn. There are some times when fellow the House speak in such a manner that we can*t of

146th Legislative Day

December 3, 1986

understand them, but we do believe that when it comes to education, that the ability to enunciate and the ability to is an important and very important matter. fluently There are also very many people - many of them constituents of mine who are intelligent, knowledgeable people that bring from foreign countries extremely valuable information which should be shared through the university process, but we must find the method to deliver that educational system to students intelligible fashion, and we must do it in some fashion. So that I think this Bill may be lacking in specificity. but I think that that can be overcome in future years if we it unworkable, and I'm going to support it and would urge you to do the same. Thank you."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Madison, Mr. Wolf."

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

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Madison moves that the previous question be put. Those in favor say "aye", opposed 'no". In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. Mr. Keane to close."

Keane: "Thank you, Ar. Speaker. Just to clarify what The Bill says to each of the systems - university systems — and each of the public systems that they. systems establish, the educators establish a program to assess the oral English language proficiency and to create to handle that. It doesn't have anything to do programs with *publish or perish*. It doesn*t have anything to do with accents. If you speak with an accent and you are understood, that is all that matters. If you speak with you have a speech deficiency but are able... but can be understood, that's fine. I don't think we can condemn or we can afford the thousands and thousands of hours, maybe even more than that, hundreds of thousands

146th Legislative Day

December 3, 1986

hours that are being lost in classrooms every year by students sitting there, completely at a loss as to what the professor is saying. With that, I think it's been aired very well. I'd ask for a favorable Roll Call."

- Speaker Greiman: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1516 pass, the veto of the Governor notwithstanding?' All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is now open, and this is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clark, take the record. On this question, there are 85 voting 'aye', 25 voting 'no', I voting 'present', and the Motion carries, and Senate Bill 1516 is hereby declared passed, the veto of the Governor notwithstanding. Speaker Madigan in the Chair."
- Speaker Madigan: "Ladies and... Ladies and Gentlemen, if we could have your attention. If the Nembers would please be in their chairs, we plan to... we plan to induct a new Member to the House of Representatives at this time. So, Lou Jones has been selected by the local Democratic Committee in Chicago to replace Representative Larry Bullock, who has resigned from the House, and to perform the ceremony, I will now call upon Judge Rhodes. Judge Rhodes."
- Judge Rhodes: "If you would please raise your right hand and repeat after me. I, Lovana S. Jones, do solemnly swear..."
- Jones: "I, Lovana S. Jones, do solemnly swear..."
- Judge Rhodes: "That I will support the Constitution of the United

 States..."
- Jones: "That I will support the Constitution of the United States..."
- Judge Rhodes: "And the Constitution of the State of Illinois..."
- Jones: "And the Constitution of the State of Illinois..."
- Judge Rhodes: "And that I will faithfully discharge the duties...

146th Legislative Day

December 3. 1986

Jones: "And that I will faithfully discharge the duties..."

Judge Rhodes: "Of the Office of State Representative..."

Jones: "Of the Office of State Representative..."

Judge Rhodes: "Of the 23rd Representative District..."

Jones: "Of the 23rd Representative District..."

Judge Rhodes: "To the best of my ability."

Jones: "To the best of my ability."

Judge Rhodes: "Congratulations."

- Jones: "Thank you. Thank you. I'm very happy to become a Member of this General Assembly. I'm looking forward to representing my constituency in the 23rd Legislative District in Chicago, and I'm really looking forward to becoming a great Legislator. Thank you."
- Speaker Greiman: "Page four of the Calendar, on the Order of Amendatory Veto Motions appears Senate Bill 522. Mr. Homer. Mr. Homer in the chamber? Well, we'll take that out of the record. On page four appears Senate Bill 1706. Mr. Hastert. Mr. Hastert gone to Washington? I think he has. Mr. McCracken, for what purpose do 'you seek recognition?"
- McCracken: "Ask be given leave to proceed with the Motion in Representative Hastert's absence."
- Speaker Greiman: "Does the Gentleman have leave to proceed on Motion #1 to Senate Bill 1706? Gentleman have leave? You have leave."
- McCracken: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move that we accept the Governor's amendatory veto. I don't know what it does."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. McCracken, moves
 that the House accept the Governor's amendatory veto for
 change. And on that, is there any discussion? The
 Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Cullerton."
- Cullerton: "Yes, I don't mean to offend anyone, but I wondered if the Gentleman would yield for a question?"

146th Legislative Day

December 3, 1986

Speaker Greiman: "He indicates he'll yield for questions."

Cullerton: "What does it do?"

McCracken: "Well, that's... you know, the reason I didn't explain

it was because it was conceivable that no one would have

asked that question."

Speaker Greiman: "Inconceivable, Mr. McCracken, inconceivable." Bill amends the Illinois Enterprise Zone Act to McCracken: "The allow the Department of Community... Commerce and Community Affairs to certify 13 zones in 1986 and provides other civic center Amendments, technical Amendments, I've been The Amendment to the Metropolitan Civic Center told. was made in an attempt to circumvent the Grant Fund Recovery Act and the Department of Commerce and Affairs awards grants to civic center authorities. To retain interest on state funds would undermine the fiscal integrity of these very valuable programs. So, for that reason, we move to accept the Governor's specific recommendations for change."

Cullerton: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Cullerton? Mr. O'Connell."

O'Connell: "Question of the Sponsor."

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

O'Connell: "Representative McCracken, would you represent to this Body that there are no changes in the net... the available taxation waivers that currently exist in the Enterprise Zone Act, specifically with regards to utility tax waivers, the requirements that are currently in the law?"

McCracken: "Yes, no... no change of that type was made by the Amendment... or by the Governor's recommendation for change."

O'Connell: "Thank you."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. HcCracken?"

McCracken: "That's it."

146th Legislative Day

December 3, 1986

- Speaker Greiman: "Question is, 'Shall the House accept the Governor's amendatory veto for change with respect.... I * m sorry, Mr. Nash, were you seeking recognition? with respect to the Governor's amendatory veto of Senate 3ill 1706?* All those in favor signify by voting *aye*, *no*. Voting is now open, and this is final opposed action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk... Okay. Okay. Okay. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 112 voting 'aye', none voting 'no', none voting 'present', the House does accept the Governor's amendatory veto for change. On the Order of Amendatory Veto Motions appears Senate Bill 1951. Mr. Clerk, read the Motion."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1951, an Act in relationship to municipal taxes. Motion to accept."
- Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. Giorgi, on Motion #1."
- Giorgi: "Ar. Speaker. I move for the adoption of the amandatory veto as signed by the Governor to Senate Bill 1951. There are a couple of technical changes that were made. Nothing substantive in the Bill."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Winnebago, Ar. Giorgi, moves the House adopt the Governor's amendatory veto for change... adopt the Governor's amendatory veto. that. is there any discussion? There being none, the question is. *Shall the House adopt the Governor*s amendatory veto for change with respect to Senate Bill 1951?* All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those vote 'no'. Voting is now open, and this is final opposed Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? action. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. Ωn question there are 109 voting 'aye', none voting 'no' this and none voting 'present', and the House does... and the

146th Legislative Day

December 3, 1986

Motion carries and the House does accept the Governor's amendatory veto for change. On the Order of Amendatory Veto Motions appears Senate Bill 2177. Mr. Clerk, read the Motion."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 2177, amends the Illinois Enterprise Zone Act. Motion to accept."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Terzich."

Terzich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I move that we accept the Governor's amendatory veto on Senate Bill 2177. Because of House Bill 2879, it already expanded a number of enterprise zones that were to be certified in 1986, several technical changes were needed to be made on this Bill. And what it simply did is, it changed the recommendations from a number of enterprise zones from two to four by changing on page two, line seven, by deleting two and inserting four, and I would move for its adoption."

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Terzich, moves that the House adopt the Governor's amendatory veto to Senate Bill 2177. And on that, the Gentleman from Cook, Ar. O'Connell."

O'Connell: "Question of the Sponsor."

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

O'Connell: "Will you represent to this Body that there are no changes in the current method of exempting utility taxes?"

Terzich: "There are no changes, from what I understand."

O'Connell: "Thank you."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman... the question is, 'Shall the House adopt the Governor's amendatory veto with respect to Senate Bill 2177?" All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is now open. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Ar. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 110 voting 'aye', none

- 146th Legislative Day

 December 3, 1986

 voting 'no' and none voting 'present', and the House does

 accept the Governor's amendatory veto to Senate Bill 2177.

 Representative Breslin in the Chair.
- Speaker Breslin: "Senate Bill 2255. Representative Richmond."

 Representative Richmond."
- Richmond: "Thank you, Madam Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move to accept the Governor's action on Senate Bill 2255."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman moves to accept the Governor's amendatory veto to Senate Bill 2255. And on that question, discussion? Hearing none, the question is, is there anv *Shall the House adopt the Governor*s amendatory veto Senate 3111 2255?* All 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 111 voting 'aye', 1 voting 'no' and I voting 'present' and the Gov... House does accept the Governor's recommendations for change on Senate Bill 2255. And this Bill, having recieved the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Excuse Representative Turner, did you make an error? me. Okav. the record show that Representative Turner intended to Let vote 'aye', although the record will reflect that he pushed the wrong switch voting *no*. Senate Is the Gentleman in the chamber? Representative Homer. Out of the record. Ladies and Gentlemen, we are going to the Order of Reduction and Item Veto Motions. They appear on page three on your Calendar. The first Bill is Bill 1738, Motion #1. Out of the record. Representative McAuliffe. Representative McAuliffe. Press your speak button, Roger,"
- McAuliffe: "Yeah, this... I would ask the Nembers to override the Governor's veto of Senate Bill 1738. This is a 300,000

146th Legislative Day

December 3, 1986

dollar appropriation for a New Horizons Center Legislative District and it benefits retarded children and handicapped children. And I don't think anybody in the state would be more deserving than this class of people. I don*t think 300,000 lot to these people. dollars is very much in a state budget that's So, I would ask all my friends on the billions of dollars. Republican side — this passed in the Senate 59 to 0. middle αf Legislative District. right in the mv Representative Capparelli and I had the district before it was cut in half, and he always had supported it. as I am on the board there, and we would certainly ask the Members... I'd ask the Members on to help me with my home district and to Republican side override the Governor's veto on 1738."

- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved to restore funds mentioned on Senate Bill 1738. And on that question, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Capparelli."
- Capparelli: "Thank you. Mr. (sic Madam) Speaker. I rise in support of this Motion. These children can't see, can't hear, and can't talk. All we're asking for a connection of the building so they can travel from building to building in the wintertime and I would ask that we override this reduction veto. Thank you."
- Speaker Breslin: "There being no... The Lady from Cook.

 Representative Braun."
- Braun: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise in support of this

 Motion. This is a needed facility in this district. It

 serves all the children in the City of Chicago and outside

 of the City of Chicago, and I encourage your support."
- Speaker Breslin: "Let me restate the Motion. The Motion is to override an item veto. The question is, 'Shall the House override the Governor's veto of line 33 to 35 on Senate

146th Legislative Day

December 3, 1986

1738?* All those in favor vote 'aye', all those Voting is open. 71 votes are opposed vote 'no'. required Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who override. The Clerk will take the record. wish? On this **auestion** there are 110 voting 'aye', I voting 'no' and I voting 'present', and the House does override the Governor's Senate Bill 1738. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority. is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1749, Representative Bowman, Motion #1.™

Bowman: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move to restore to the full amount the lines and 18 of Senate Bill 1749. Lines... excuse me, page 17, line 33, page 18, line 4. Page 17, line 33 is the community service program line. The restoration would be for 1,549,600 dollars which includes a 1.1 million dollar add-on which the Legislature approved in the spring. the comprehensive community-based is vouth services for an amount of 1,685,000 dollars, which includes million dollar add-on approved by the General a 1.16 Assembly in the spring. These two lines. Ladies and serve the youth of the state. Gentlemen. In the first case, the comprehensive community-based youth serve approximately 4,710 additional youth than with the original budget, a total of 21,836 youth would then be in Fiscal '87 at this funding level. Comprehensive community-based youth services programs support the development of community—based youth services networks, which provide a variety of services to troubled youth. These services include crisis intervention, counseling, shelter care and other programs designed to reunite the These programs provide an efficient network of family. youth services throughout the state. It is important to restore these funds because we have made changes in the law

146th Legislative Day

December 3, 1986

which have placed additional demands on the system. The demands that the system has tried to respond to our responsibility, Ladies and Gentlemen. These are, in many cases, minors requiring adult intervention. These children who have been caught up in the juvenile court system, many of them, however, have not been adjudicated delinquent, but for whom services are required, and it is imperative that we provide the resources to this purpose. Community services line would restore approximately 5,900 additional youth to the original budget for a total of 14,000 youth who would be served in Fiscal *87 at this funding level. And these programs organize community groups for delinquency prevention and neighborhood development using the model of youth services pioneered by Clifford Shaw in the Chicago Area Project. Ladies and Gentlemen, we're all troubled with the problem of teenage This particular line gets the runaways and delinguency. the throwaways and the kids who are in trouble before they become delinquent to try and divert them and deflect them from the court system. We must begin, at that point, before the children get into the court system. This is an effort to prevent delinguency and I think that it would money well spent. So, I am pleased to offer this Motion to restore to their full levels the two lines on pages 17 and 18 in Senate Bill 1749."

Speaker Breslin: "You have heard the Gentleman's Motion to restore. On that Motion, the Gentleman from DuPage, Representative McCracken."

McCracken: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, to the Bill. I rise in opposition to the Gentleman's Motion to restore. I understand that this Motion takes 60 votes to prevail, but I would like to bring some facts to the attention of the Body. As you can see from the Motion itself on page three

146th Legislative Day

December 3, 1986

of our Calendar, there is left in each line, or I should say in the first line 1,470,000 dollars. There is left second line of the reduction veto Motion over six million dollars. I point out to you that this is reduction issue, not a line item veto. And as I understand these items, or these excess amounts which are the subject of the reduction veto were not originally at any time requested. I am told. by the requested, nor Department of Children and Family Services. The increased amounts were the result of a Senate Amendment put on at the request of a number of youth service agencies and approved. and the House then concurred in that Amendment. I quess the point is this: DCFS had already provided a substantial amount of money for these efforts. They did not money. They are not in favor of the reduction... or the restoration of the reduced items. are the result of lobbying groups which have contractual relationships with DCFS. That is, they are typically the outreach parties responsible for the implementation of these programs in the communities, not the parties, of course, which are responsible for the appropriations, that with the Department. So, in light of the fact that there is a substantial line item left in here, and in light of the fact that it was not requested in the OCFS in light of the fact thát it was requested bν the contractors to DCFS and frankly, in light of the fact that no demonstrated need for the greater amount there's requested, I would ask that the others join me in opposing this restoration Motion. Thank you."

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

Friedrich: "Hould the... Would the... Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Breslin: "He indicates he will."

146th Legislative Day

December 3, 1986

- Friedrich: "Representative Bowman. I keep hearing from the Comptroller that the State Treasury is in pretty dire circumstances. Is it your opinion that there's enough money available with current revenues to take on another item like this?"
- Bowman: "Well, let me just point out that we have received requests from the Governor for supplemental appropriations totaling 186 million dollars, including 30 million of General Revenue. And I think there's money enough for this, yes, Sir."
- Friedrich: "Well, that's a request. Have we passed it? Have you voted for those 180 million dollars you're talking about? I'm trying to put this thing in perspective. You say he's asked for it. You're asking for three. Have you voted or have we voted for the 180 million dollars that you say the Governor's asking for? I'm just going back to the Comptroller's statement that we're broke."
- Bowman: "Well, let me tell you, I think the Conference Committee Report that will be on your desks in the near future will make all things clear in due time but... and you will have an opportunity to express yourself at this point. But, I believe that we will be able to deal with this in a responsible way. I can assure you that this particular override will, in no way, jeopardize the fiscal integrity of the state."
- Friedrich: "But if it would, I assume you'd be willing to vote for a tax increase."
- Speaker Breslin: "Is there any further discussion? Hearing none, Representative Bowman, to close."
- Bowman: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would just like to clear up one error in earlier comments by the opposition. These two lines do include monies that were originally requested by DCFS. In the case

146th Legislative Day

December 3, 1986

of the community youth services program, 449,600 dollars was included in the original budget that the Governor then subsequently vetoed out. The legislative add-on was million. In the line... page 18, line 4, the comprehensive community-based youth services line, the Department asked for approximately 525,700 dollars in its original So that, indeed, we do have monies in here, request. significant monies that the Department requested. And I want to reiterate the core of my argument, is that we have adopted legislation, Senate Bill 1500, for example, all of you are familiar with. legislation that is requiring the services to be delivered if we do not provide adequate to the children. And resources and we have clear, demonstrable evidence and testimony before the Committees of both chambers that the services are in short supply, that these monies are needed to comply with the additional strains being placed on the system by the legislation that we have passed, that we must pass this override Motion or we will be breaking faith with the children of this state. I move to... I renew my Motion to override these two lines."

Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall the House restore items reduced mentioned in Motion #1 on Senate Bill 1749? All those in favor vote "aye", all those opposed vote "no". Voting is open. 60 votes are required for the passage... restoration of these funds. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the On this question there are 89 voting 'aye', 22 record. voting 'no', 2 voting 'present', and the House does restore the items mentioned in Motion #1 on Senate Bi 11 1749. Motion #2. out of the record. Senate Bill 1752, Representative Tuerk."

Tuerk: "Madam Speaker, Members of the House, I have filed a

146th Legislative Day

December 3, 1986

50,000 dollars out of Motion to override on restoring General Revenue funds and what this would be used for is a but beyond that, an implementation of some plans to study. address some problems particularly on the Illinois around Peoria, but also embracing six or seven counties to the north and surrounding which is on the Illinois One of the real problems of the Illinois River has been the siltation, the filling of the river UP and it's particularly acute around Peoria at what is known as Peoria Lake. And what these funds would be used for, going to the Tri-County Regional Planning Commission, to pull all the elements. the factions together relative to all the Illinois River problem in trying to address a solution would be salutary in the future. I would move for the adoption of the Motion, the passage and the veto of the Governor notwithstanding, because I feel it's an important forward. The Senate overrode by unanimous vote. And I would ask the House do the same."

- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved to override the item veto in Senate Bill 1752. And on that question, the Gentleman from Knox, Representative Hawkinson."
- Hawkinson: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise in support of this Motion. We have a serious problem with the Illinois River and siltation and it's an important economic and recreational asset that demands our attention as a state. This 50,000 dollars will go but a short way and a small way, but it's a start and the money is desperately needed if we're to get moving on solving this tremendous problem."

 Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from... The Lady from Marshall,
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from... The Lady from Marshall, Representative Koehler."
- Koehler: "Thank you, Madam Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I, too, rise in support of this, of Representative Tuerk's veto Motion, veto override Motion.

146th Legislative Day

December 3, 1986

that state. It is important we. as а demonstrate our commitment toward the problems of the siltation of the Illinois River. The federal study is currently being done and Representative Bob Michel worked very hard for a large federal appropriation that will complete a federal study of the problem of the Illinois River Valley siltation. is imperative that we, as a state, do our part to help with this problem that is certainly needed not only for barge but also for recreation on the Illinois River. traffic. Thank you."

Speaker Breslin: "There being no further discussion, the question is, 'Shall this item pass, the veto of notwithstanding? All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. 71 votes are required to override. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will On this question there are 101 voting take the record. *aye*, 10 voting *no* and none voting *present*. This Motion, having received the required Three-Fifths Majority, prevails, and this item is declared passed, the veto of the Governor notwithstanding. Ωn page two on your Calendar, under Reduction Veto Motions appears Senate Bill 1759+ Representative Curran."

Curran: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I move to restore the 215,000 dollars on page two, line 12 of the Department of Veterans' Affairs budget for the specific purpose of funding the Vietnam Veterans' Act. Through the Vietnam Veterans' Act, we have established five outreach centers throughout the state, many of these centers having multiple offices. At these offices, we have... the pattern of veterans helping veterans, and much of this help is done on a voluntary basis. Not only do these offices find jobs for veterans, but they also perform other services such as legal assistance, family counseling, assistance with VA claims,

146th Legislative Day

December 3, 1986

discharge upgrades and alcohol abuse and drug abuse programs. The Senate had the wisdom to override this Governor's veto by an overwhelming margin of 45 to 4. We should restore these funds by an even greater margin. We created this program two years ago. He were wise in doing so. It has worked out well for veterans and for the taxpayers of the State of Illinois. He should stand behind it now. I ask for a positive vote.

- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved to restore the item to its original amount. Is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Bowman."
- Bowman: "I'm pleased to rise in support of the Gentleman's Motion. I believe he stated the issue very well. And this is... this is the one veterans vote that we have in this Fall Veto Session and I urge us to make a good one. Let's vote for it."
- Speaker Breslin: "The question is, "Shall this item be... in House Bill... in Senate Bill 1759 be restored to its original amount, notwithstanding the reduction of Governor?* All those in favor vote *aye*, all opposed vote *no*. Voting is open. 60 votes are required to restore. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 114 voting 'aye', none voting 'no' this Motion, *present*, and having received the Constitutional Majority, prevails and the House votes to over... and the House votes to override or restore this item to its original amount. Ladies and Gentlemen, we are go to the Order of Speaker's Table. It now going to appears on page four on your Calendar. Page four Calendar. The first item on the Speaker's Table is House Resolution A-638, Bowman - Kirkland. Representative Bowman•™

146th Legislative Day

December 3, 1986

Bowman: "Thank you. Madam Speaker, since the Resolution was reported out of Committee, events have rendered the resolved clauses untimely and so I need to table Amendment 1 and offer Amendment 2. So, at this time, I move to table Amendment #1 to House Resolution 638."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved to table Amendment #1 to House Resolution 638. Is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall the House table Amendment #1 to House Resolution 638?' All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And Amendment #1 is tabled. Are there further Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"

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

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #2 duplicates all of the "whereas" clauses, but observes that in the interim the U.S. Senate approved House Joint Resolution 3. And so, both chambers of the United States Congress have adopted House Joint Resolution 3 which is contained in the "whereas" clauses of this Amendment and then goes on to... merely to urge that the President of the United States accede to the terms of that Resolution. So, basically, what we would be doing with this Amendment is supporting an action of the Federal Congress. I move its adoption."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #2. And on that question, is there discussion? Hearing none. the question 1 S * Amendment #2 be adopted?* All those in favor sav all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"

146th Legislative Day

December 3, 1986

Clerk Leone: "There are no furtner Amendments."

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

Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Bowman: "Thank you, House. House Resolution 638 was introduced because at time the House of Representatives of the United States Congress was grappling with the issue of a nuclear test Now the reason this particular issue is important and timelv is, number one, it is widely regarded that a test ban is the easiest way to stop an escalating arms because new weapons, of course, would have to be tested before their power and characteristics were known to make them useful in an actual battle situation. Furthermore, it viewed that test bans can be monitored with existing technology and so, this is a proposal in which no side And, lastly, the five preceding administrations in Washington have all worked towards a comprehensive test ban treaty and the House of Representatives and now the United States Senate has gone on record urging the President to And I would just point out that this continue that work. Resolution passed the United States Senate by 64 to 35. So, this is not a partisan issue, Ladies and Gentlemen. Ιt is a people issue, and I would hope that we would equally lopsided support for this Resolution So, I am pleased to move for the adoption chamber. House Resolution 638 and I'd like to ask the Chair if, when time comes to close, if the Chair could call on one of my Representative Kirkland, to make Chief Sponsors, the closing argument."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of House Resolution 638. And on that question, is there any discussion? Hearing none, Representative Kirk... Excuse me. The Lady from Koehler.... The Lady from Marhsall, Representative Koehler, on the Resolution."

146th Legislative Day

December 3, 1986

very much, Madam Speaker Koehler: "Thank you and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in opposition to this House While I • m certain that Representative Resolution. Bowman... that his motives are certainly none but the best and we would all certainly like to see the... prevention of the proliferation of nuclear armament, I do not think that this Resolution contributes significantly to that effort. First of all, I would point out that if the President and the Congress were to do this, this would severely cramp our ability as a nation to continue research on the strategic defense initiative. And we all know that in order to provide that shield from the threat of nuclear holocaust, not only from the Soviets, but also from the crazies of this world. such as the Ayatollah, such as Khadafy, that we need to have that shield as a prevention from that nuclear threat of holocaust to our young people and to our future generations. So, I think that this would severely hamper our ability for the research and deployment that we need in order to eventually have a nuclear shield. The other point I would make on this is that Representative Bowman has stated that there is the technology to verify the... verify a type of resolution that this would bring However, we all know that only on-site inspection about. is the way that you can have an iron-clad verification what is going on in the Soviet Union and this does not call and we also know that the Soviets have that. So violated almost every treaty that they have ever signed. I stand in opposition to this and certainly would urge others to vote 'no'. Thank you."

Speaker Breslin: "There being no further discussion,

Representative Kirkland, to close."

Kirkland: "Thank you... thank you, Madam Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen. I'd just like to stress a couple of things

ı

146th Legislative Day

December 3, 1986

Woody stressed and then add kind of a gut a . . . reaction. I think he*s correct that verification measures have improved to where we can begin to methods trust our findings and confirm or refute Soviet claims stopped underground testing, which they say they have done and we haven't said otherwise as of August 6, 1985, of nuclear warheads. Besides over 1000 seismatic monitoring stations operating worldwide to detect such explosions, many run by the U.S. and bordering the Soviet Union, last July the Soviet Union allowed U.S. scientists to set up monitoring equipment near their testing site and to on-site inspection of their weapons testing there. allow I think there's progress being made there and verification is now, in fact, a legitimate capability, and really, it's no surprise that this capability has eventually develop. It's also important to remember that banning the testing of nuclear weapons with the goal to make it more difficult to develop new such weapons is neither new nor an unacceptable sign of weakness. The 1963 ban treaty did ban atmospheric. limited test underwater and outerspace testing and left only underground That, as well as the 1968 nonproliferation treaty with a stated goal to discontinue all test explosions nuclear weapons, were ratified by the Senate. House Resolution 638 simply seeks to advise the President seek ratification the Senate of ЬV later treaties addressing underground testing; that is, in 1974 and address and ratify them. Finally, it's very important that we policy leaders tell this President, as again, Woody mentioned, Congress has in House Joint Resolution 3, to resume negotiations toward a comprehensive test ban He has markedly, the President, that is, departed from the precedent of five administrations before

146th Legislative Day

December 3, 1986

off these negotiations and our children grandchildren deserve better. In the end. I can⁵t asking the question, again, for me and for my children and your children and grandchildren, of, where does it all end? It's lunacy, I think, because of the dire consequences because of human nature to think and to not acknowledge that every advancement make Мe in weapon development will not be followed by a Soviet response and vice versa; that we're always going to disagree about is ahead in this crazy arms race; and that racing for nuclear supremacy in weaponry is going... is going in the exact opposite direction of where we, as a country, should be leading. So, I say that we should lead. Our timina isn't too bad to tell the Executive Branch to administer Congress* policy as expressed in House Resolution 3 and I Thank support for our House Resolution 638. vou."

- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Marion, Representative Friedrich."
- Friedrich: "Madam Speaker, just in case this passes and some Congressman should, by chance, read it, which I doubt they will, I would not like them to think it was unanimous vote, so I'd like to ask for a Roll Call."
- Speaker Breslin: "Are you joined by four others, Sir? there further discussion? anv Hearing further no discussion. the question is, *Shall House Resolution 638 pass?* All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Bowman."
- Bowman: "In explanation of my vote, I would just like to point out that the United States Congress, the House and the Senate, has already passed the identical language that's in this Resolution. What we are doing is supporting that

146th Legislative Day

December 3. 1986

effort and asking the President to take the... the views of the United States Congress to heart in this matter. And that is the sum and substance of this Resolution. So, if... in Representative Friedrich's remarks suggested to me that he thought we were memorializing Congress to do something, and I want to make it clear that we're not memorializing Congress to do anything. They have already acted and they have improved the language that is in this Resolution.**

Speaker Breslin: "The Lady from Kane, Representative Zwick."

Zwick: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Members of the House, I think as we've all followed in the newspapers. public opinion polls and what's going on in the recent meetings in Iceland, it has become very clear to us that the public opinion in this country is such that they want continued negotiations on peace and an end to nuclear weapons That is basically all that this Resolution says. testing. If you will read the language of the Rasolution, it simply says that we will propose to the President that he continue negotiations towards peace. There are several treaties sitting out there which are awalting his signature. This been passed by both the House and the Senate. Representative Kirkland made some excellent points what will happen if we continue with this constant back and forth with nuclear arms testing, continuation of this growth, more nuclear weapons and more and more. This country is going to go bankrupt over it and possibly destroy ourselves and everyone else on the face earth along with it. I would urge your support of this Resolution. I don't think it's nearly as controversial of this House are making it. some Members It simply condones what the U.S. House and Senate have already and I would urge your support for it. Thank you.

- 146th Legislative Day December 3, 1986
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from St. Clair, Representative Stephens."
- Stephens: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. As to the remarks about the United States Congress already passing this Resolution, as much as they are out of touch with America and America's direction, I think that's reason enough to vote 'no'.

 Thank you."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Koehler, for what reason do you rise?"
- Koehler: "Madam Speaker, if this should receive the required number of votes, I would like to verify it."
- Speaker Breslin: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 53 voting 'aye', 46 voting 'no' and none voting 'present'. Representative Koehler has requested a verification. Representative... Excuse me. Mr. Clerk, poll the affirmative, please."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Bowman. Braun. Breslin. Brookins. Brunsvold. Jones. Cullerton. Curran. Currie. Daley. DeJaegher. Del eo-Dunn. Farley. Flinn. Flowers. Giglio. Giorgi. Huff. Greiman. Hartke. Hicks. Keane. Kirkland. LeFlore. Leverenz. Levin. Matijevich. McPike. Morrow. Mulcahev. McNamara. Nash. Pangle. Richmond. Phelps. Preston. Rice. Ronan. Saltsman. Satterthwaite. Steczo. Stern. Sutker. Turner. Van Washington. Duyne. White. Anthony Young. Wyvetter Zwick. Mr. Speaker." Younge.
- Speaker Breslin: "Do you have any questions of the Affirmative Roll Call, Representative Koehler? Representative Greiman requests leave to be verified, Representative Koehler. You have leave, Sir. Do you have any questions of the Affirmative Roll?"
- Koehler: "Yes. Representative Leverenz."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Leverenz. Representative Ted

146th Legislative Day

December 3, 1986

Leverenz. Is the Gentleman in the chamber? He is not.

Remove him from the Roll Call.

Koehler: "Representative Washington."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Washington, Jerry Washington.

Is the Gentleman in the chamber? He is not. Remove him

from the Roll Call."

Koehler: "Representative Hartke."

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

Koehler: "Representative Keane."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Keane, Jim Keane. Is the Gentleman in the chamber? He is not. Remove him from the Roll Call."

Koehler: "Representative LeFlore."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative LeFlore is in the chamber.

Representative Keane has returned to the chamber. Add him
to the Roll Call voting *aye*."

Koehler: "Alright. Representative Farley."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Farley is in his chair."

Koehler: "Okay. Representative Curran."

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

Koehler: "Representative Cullerton."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Cullerton. [*m sure the Gentleman is around. Representative John Cullerton. Representative Cullerton."

Koehler: "What is the count, Madam Speaker."

Speaker Breslin: "The count is recorded on the board automatically. So it is 51 to 46. Representative Cullerton is not in the chamber at the moment. So, return... remove his vote until he returns."

Koehler: "Representative Steczo."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Steczo is in his chair. Excuse

me. Representative McCracken, for what reason do you

rise?"

146th Legislative Day

December 3, 1986

Koehler: "Representative Christensen."

Speaker Breslin: "McCracken, Representative McCracken."

McCracken: "Parliamentary inquiry, Madam Speaker,"

Speaker Breslin: "State your inquiry."

AcCracken: "I believe this type of Resolution is treated as a

Bill. It was considered by a Committee and reported favorably therefrom, and I think it requires a Constitutional Majority, not just a Simple Majority of those voting."

Speaker Breslin: "We will check into that. That was not the Chair's reading of the rules at the time. But we will check into it. Do you have any further questions? Excuse me. Representative Levin, for what reason do you rise?"

Levin: "Could I have leave to be verified?"

Speaker Breslin: "Does the Gentleman have leave, Representative Koehler?"

Koehler: "Yes."

Speaker Breslin: "Yes. Representative Turner. Representative

Turner and Representative Young also ask leave, as well as

Representative Brookins."

Koehler: "Yes, they may have leave. Representative Curran and Christensen. I can't recall whether you said they were here or not."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Curran was here at the time.

Representative Christensen was not challenged before.

Representative Christensen is not voting. Representative

Rea wishes to change his vote from 'no' to 'aye'.

Representative Krska votes 'no'."

Koehler: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, and I would ask for an opinion on Representative McCracken's inquiry."

Speaker Breslin: "Have you finished with your..."

Koehler: "Yes, I have finished with my questions."

Speaker Breslin: "Very good. Representative McCracken and

146th Legislative Day

December 3, 1986

Representative Koehler, Representative Cullerton has returned to the chamber. Add him to the Roll Call voting *aye*. Representative Terzich votes *no*. Representative Capparelli votes *no* -Representative Koehler and Representative McCracken, with regard to your parliamentary inquiry, there are only certain Resolutions required the rules, under Rule 43, that require 60 votes. This is not one of those Resolutions. Therefore, a Hajority Vote Those Resolutions that require 60 votes are carries. listed as those creating special Committees or special Joint Committees, those calling for the expenditure of funds, those directing investigations and those audits by the Auditor General. On this question there are 52 voting 'aye', 48 voting 'no', none voting 'present', and the Resolution is adopted. Ladies and Gentlemen. going to the Order of Amendatory Veto Motions. They appear page four on your Calendar. The only one on that Order that has not yet been called is Senate 3i11 522. Representative Homer, on Motion #1. Turn on Representative Homer."

Homer: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. This Senate Bill is the one that changed the name of murder and voluntary manslaughter to first degree murder and second degree murder. The Governor's amendatory veto made technical changes, references in the statute that did not change the terminology and also noted that the original Bill. Bill 522, was introduced in 1985 and had an effective date of January 1 of '86. So the amendatory veto changed that effective date correctly to January 1, 1987. I would move, Madam Speaker, that the House accept the amendatory veto of the Governor."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved to accept the Governor's amendatory veto on Senate Bill 522. And on that

146th Legislative Day

December 3, 1986

question, is there any discussion? Hearing none, question is, 'Shall the House adopt the Governor's specific recommendations for change in Senate Bill 522? All those in favor vote "aye", all those opposed vote "no". 60 votes are required for the acceptance of the amendatory veto. Have all voted who wish? Have all The Clerk will take the record. who wish? question there are 106 voting *aye*, none voting *no* none voting 'present', and the House does accept the Governor's specific recommendations for change in Senate Bi 11 522. And this 3ill. having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared Supplemental Calendar announcement. Representative Kulas, for what reason do you rise?"

Kulas: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. For the purpose of the record,

I'd like the Journal to reflect that on Senate Bill 1749 I

had voted 'yes' on the Bill and the Roll Call shows me as

being absent. For the Journal I'd like it to be

journalized that I did vote 'yes' on that Eill."

Speaker Breslin: "Very good."

Clerk Leone: "Supplemental Calendar #1 is now being distributed."

Speaker Breslin: "Ladies and Gentlemen, Supplemental #1 has been distributed. On Supplemental #1 under the Order of Motions appears House Bill 2804, Representative Saltsman. Excuse me. Representative McCracken, for what reason do you rise?"

McCracken: "Point of Order, Madam Speaker."

Speaker Breslin: "State your point."

McCracken: "I believe that pursuant to Rule 74(a), the Motion to take from the table must appear on the Calendar of the next Legislative Day from which it was filed. And has it... and it was filed today, I understand."

Speaker Breslin: "I will check that. The Sponsor says the Motion

146th Legislative Day

December 3, 1986

was filed last week, Mr. Clerk. Representative McCracken, you are correct. Representative Saltsman is recognized for a Motion."

Saltsman: "Yes, Madam Speaker, I ask for the permission to remove Rule 74(a) so this Bill can be heard immediately."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman moves to suspend Rule 74(a) so that the Motion can be heard immediately. On that question, is there any discussion? The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative McCracken."

McCracken: "Parliamentary inquiry, Madam."

Speaker Breslin: "State your inquiry."

McCracken: "Pursuant to Section... Subsection (b) of that

Section, am I correct that this Motion requires 71 votes?"

Speaker Breslin: "You are correct."

McCracken: "And I believe it has to be in writing. Is it in writing?"

Speaker Breslin: "It's being written, I understand."

McCracken: "Alright. I'll address myself to the Motion. It will be in writing and filed by the time we're ready to vote. This Bill to be considered immediately is one which has previously been considered on Third Reading. As a matter of fact, if the Gentleman's Motion prevails and this next Motion to take from the table prevails, the Bill will be placed on Third Reading Consideration Postponed. We've already had a vote on this Bill. We know what the issues are. This is the successor clause Bill. This is the Bill that requires a party buying a business to be bound by previous union contracts."

Speaker Breslin: "Excuse me•"

McCracken: "That binding nature of ..."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative McCracken, you're going to have to confine your remarks to the Motion."

McCracken: "Well, the Motion requires 71 votes, and I would ask

- 146th Legislative Day

 Our side of the aisle to vote 'no' on the Motion and hold

 this Bill until tomorrow."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Motion is in writing and before the Body.

 Representative Saltsman, do you wish to close? Do you wish to close on your Motion?"
- Saltsman: "Yes, Madam Speaker, this Motion takes 71 votes and so does the Bill, and this Bill is a very important piece of legislation. I don't know why they don't want this to be heard, looking at what happened to Illinois in the last four months. since this Bill was turned down then. We've had a problem here. We've had a problem in Springfield, Peoria, Chicago. We had our ladies down here from TNA airlines that's our latest effects of not having this type of a program. They have told the merger with the women and men from Ozark Airlines that you no longer have a contract, that we've reduced your salaries without..."
- Speaker Breslin: "Excuse me, Representative Saltsman."
- Saltsman: "Without even speaking and this is why this Bill is important."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Saltsman, you are required to speak to your Motion. Excuse me, Repres... Proceed."
- Saltsman: "Yes, I ask that this Motion be taken from the table and we give it a vote on the floor today."
- Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall the House Rule be suspended so that there can be immediate consideration of House Bill 2804?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. 21 votes... 71 votes are required for the adoption of this Motion. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? 71 votes are required for the adoption of this Motion. Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative McCracken, for what reason do you rise?"
- McCracken: "To seek a verification if it appears to get the

146th Legislative Day

December 3, 1986

requisite number of votes.**

Speaker Breslin: "Very good. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 66 voting "aye", 45 voting "no" and none voting "present", and the Motion fails. Representative Saltsman."

Saltsman: "Poll the absentees, please."

Speaker Breslin: "Unfortunately, I already announced the Roll Call. I was... was I covering up your light? Under the Order of Motions on Supplemental #1 is House Bill Bill Representative Giorgi. Representative Giorgi, House Bill 3162."

Giorgi: "Yeah, Madam Speaker, I'd like to move that the... to table House Bill 3162, the Motion to take from the table because the Bill did not die because of any effort to pass the Bill. The Bill died at the last days of the Session because so many people wanted to put some of their municipal problems on the Bill. I'd like to resurrect the Bill so that I can put my original stuff on it and try to pass it. I'm going to need 71 votes to pass the Bill. If I can get 71 to suspend the rule, I'll wait an hour. I know I'll get my 60. But some of the Republican Members and House Members have asked me to put my Jill up because it's a Bill that deals with municipalities and there are so few Bills dealing with municipalities that we need this Bill. That's the only reason."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved to suspend Rule 79(e) on House Bill 3162. And on that question, is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall the House suspend Rule 79(e) on House Bill 3162?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Representative McCracken, for what reason do you rise?"

McCracken: "I would like to explain my vote, please. This had

146th Legislative Day

December 3, 1986

been consulted on both sides of the aisle and was seen as a necessary Bill for the purpose of having it in a position in case agreement is reached at a later date. So, I was under the impression this would be done by a voice vote. And there's no agreement yet, but this Bill... on the White Sox. No agreement, Zeke will kill the Bill. So, I'd ask for a couple more votes."

Speaker Breslin: "71 votes are required for the adoption of this Motion so that we can hear the Bill at a later time. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. 0n this question there are 70 voting this question... 0n *ave*• 36 voting *no* + 4 voting *present*. And Representative Giorgi asks for a Poll of the Absentees."

Clerk Leone: "Poll of those not voting. Daniels. Hastert.

Klemm. Leverenz. And Ropp."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Klemm votes "no".

Representative Rea, for what reason do you rise?"

Rea: "Please change my vote from 'no' to 'aye'."

Speaker Breslin: "Change Representative Rea from 'no' to 'aye'.

On this question there are now 71 voting 'aye', 36 voting 'no', 4 voting 'present' and the Motion carries. The next Resolution is House Resolution 1593, Representative Brookins."

Brookins: "Yes."

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

Brookins: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Madam Speaker, in pursuant to Rule 77, I move to discharge Revenue Committee from further consideration and advance to the Order of the Speaker's Table."

Speaker Breslin: "The Sentleman has moved pursuant to rule to discharge the Revenue Committee from further consideration of this Bill in order... and advance it to the Order of the Speaker's Table. On that question, is there any

146th Legislative Day

December 3, 1986

discussion? Is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall the House move to discharge the Revenue Committee and advance this Bill to the Order of the Speaker's Table?' All those in favor... This Resolution to the Speaker's Table. All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'nay'. In... All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. 71 votes are required for the... 71 votes are required for a Hotion to discharge. Representative McCracken, for what reason do you rise?"

McCracken: "Parliamentary inquiry. Does this require 71 votes to prevail?"

Speaker Breslin: "Yes."

McCracken: "Okay. Was it properly in writing yesterday?"

Speaker Breslin: "Yes. Yesterday?"

McCracken: "I believe it has to be carried on the next daily Calendar after filing."

Speaker Breslin: "The Speaker... Sponsor says that it was. it doesn't make any difference, Representative AcCracken. That's the reason that it needs 71 votes in the first place. So, if it gets 71 votes that matter is taken care the suspension of with the rule. Representative McCracken is correct... Representative Brookins is correct, it would only have taken 60 votes. So, on this Bill... on this Resolution there were 71 votes. Representative Brookins, for what reason do you rise?"

Brookins: "Hit it. Roll it. Roll it."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Brookins, I think you better explain your vote. Tell them it's your last Bill."

Brookins: "This is the last Bill and the last Resolution that I will be putting in in this House. And with that, if you could see fit in your heart to give me a 'yes' vote, I'd appreciate it."

146th Legislative Day

December 3, 1986

Speaker Breslin: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Braun.

Representative Braun."

Braun: "Thank you, Madam Speaker,"

Speaker Breslin: "Can you appeal to our hearts, Representative Braun?"

"Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'm going to wait till Braun: I guess on a day like today we all deserve a finishes. good 'yuck'. However, Ladies and Gentlemen, take a look at the Resolution that Representative Brookins has put before It's a simple, straightforward Resolution. It does us. not call for an awful lot. It calls for the Department of Lottery to examine the impact of its activities on the poor and needy in this state, whether or not poor people disproportionately spend dollars on the Lottery, whether or not that hurts those communities. That's not a proposition to support. In fact. it seems to proposition that all of us ought to support and we ought to have close to unanimous vote on this Kesolution and certainly on Representative Brookins Motion. He can debate the merits or demerits of the Lottery at some other time. That's not what this Resolution is about. The Resolution simply says that the Lottery Department ought to take a look at its own house and take a look at what doing, what poor people are doing with the Lottery, what is happening, what impact the Lottery has had. I encourage your support, both sides of the aisle, for this Resolution. It is a Resolution that I think this entire Body can proud of and certainly one that Representative Brookins deserves to have passed in the waning days of this Session. I encourage your support and the votes sufficient to pass Thank you." the Motion.

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

146th Legislative Day

December 3, 1986

- McCracken: "Seek a verification if it appears to receive the required number of votes."
- Speaker Breslin: "This Motion requires 71 votes for adoption.

 Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 69 voting 'aye', 40 voting 'no' and 1 voting 'present'. Representative Brookins asks for a Poll of the Absentees."
- Clerk Leone: "Poll of those not voting. Barger. Hastert.

 Leverenz. O'Connell. And Bernard Pedersen."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Barger votes 'no'. On this question there are 69 voting 'yes', 41 voting 'no' and 1 voting 'present', and the Motion fails. Ladies and Gentlemen, we are waiting for Supplemental 2 to be printed and distributed. We expect it to be out shortly. So, if you will be patient, it would be appreciated. Supplemental Calendar announcement."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Supplemental Calendar ©2 is being distributed."

 Speaker Breslin: "Ladies and Gentlemen, we are prepared now to go
 to the Order of Motions on Supplemental #2. That's

 Supplemental #2. The first Bill is House Bill 2630. Is

 Representative Greiman on the floor? Representative

 Greiman. Representative Friedrich, for what reason do you
 rise?"
- Friedrich: "That Calendar has not been distributed back here."

 Speaker Breslin: "Where are the Pages? Has it been distributed on the Democratic side? Yes. Has anyone on the Republican side gotten the Supplemental Calendar? Yes, many have.

 Okay. Representative Greiman, on a Motion for House Bill 2630."
- Greiman: "Yes, this is the pension Bill, and I would ask that it be... that rule be waived to place on the Calendar, the Order of Speaker's Table, Conference Committee Reports."

146th Legislative Day

December 3, 1986

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman moves to suspend Rule 79(e) and place this Bill on the Order of the Speaker's Table. Conference Committee Reports. Is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall the appropriate rule be suspended so that this Bill can be put on the Order of Speaker's Table, Conference Committee Reports. All favor vote "aye", all those opposed vote "no". Votina is open. 71 votes are required. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 99 voting 'aye', 12 voting 'no' and none voting 'present', and the rule... and the Motion carries. Do you wish to proceed immediately, Sir? Representative... Okay. House Bill 3200, Representative Ropp. Representative Richmond."

Richmond: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Representative Ropp had to be off the floor and asked that I handle this Motion for him and I do move that... to suspend Rule 79(e) as it pertains to House Bill 3200."

Speaker Breslin: "Does the Gentleman have leave to handle this Bill for Representative Ropp? Hearing no objections, the Gentleman has leave. The Gentleman now moves to take this Bill from the table, to suspend the appropriate rule and place it on the Calendar on the Order of Concurrences. I s there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, *Shall the Motion be adopted?* All those in 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. 71 votes are required. On this question there are 106 voting 'aye'. 1.. 108... 110... Take the record. Mr. Clerk. are 110 voting "aye", 1 voting 'no" and *present* and the Motion is adopted. Representative Richmond now moves for immediate consideration of this Bill. Does the Gentleman have leave? Hearing nο objections, the Gentleman has leave. Representative

146th Legislative Day

December 3, 1986

Richmond."

- Richmond: "Thank you, Madam Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is an agreed type of thing that passed unanimously in the Senate, the Amendment to House Bill 3200. And very briefly, it would... it clarifies the state commitment to the original 30 million dollar Loss Reserve Fund and states that the 30 million will be considered a general obligation of the state. The state will not be committed to any more exposure than the 30 million and this Amendment should be considered a technical change which clarifies the General Assembly and Governor's original commitment to the program of 30 million dollars. And I would move that we concur with this action."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved to concur with the Senate Amendments on House Bill 3200. Is there any discussion? Hearing no discussion, the question is, 'Shall the House concur with Senate Amendments to House Bill 3200? All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Okay, take the record. On this question there are 109 voting 'aye', 1 voting 'no', none voting 'present' and the House does concur with Senate Amendments to House Bill 3200 and this Bill, received the necessary Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 416, Representative Dunn. Excuse me. Representative Giorgi."
- Giorgi: "Madam Speaker, it seems that Senate Bill 416 might be needed to clear up some problems of the divorce laws. So, I move to suspend temporary rule 79(e) so that the Bill can be taken from the table."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman moves to suspend the appropriate rule to take this Bill from the table. Is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall the Rule be suspended?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those

146th Legislative Day

December 3, 1986

opposed vote "no". Voting is open."

Giorgi: "*Aye! votes."

Speaker Breslin: "71... excuse me, 60 votes are required. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 94 voting 'aye', 15 voting 'no' and none voting 'present', and the rule is suspended. Senate Bill 1004. Excuse me. Senate Bill 1004, Representative Homer, on the Motion."

Homer: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I would like to yield to Representative McGann."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative McGann."

McGann: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Members of the Assembly. I move to take from the table and place on the Order of the Speaker's Table, pursuant to Rule 74(a) on the Order of Nonconcurrence."

Speaker Breslin: "You have heard the Gentleman's Motion. there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, Shall the House take this Bill from the table and place it on the Order of Nonconcurrence? All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. 71 votes are required. Have all voted who wish? Have a11 voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 109 voting 'aye', none voting none voting 'present', and the House takes Senate Bill 1004 from the table. Representative... Representative Stange votes 'ave'. I'm in the middle of announcing this Roll The House declares that the Bill is taken from the Call. table and placed on the Order of Nonconcurrence. Representative McGann, on a Motion..."

McGann: "Thank you... Thank you, Madam Speaker, Members of the Assembly. I would ask leave of the House to take action on Senate Bill 1004 presently, as much as I'd like to refuse to recede House Amendment 1 and request the appointment of

146th Legislative Day

December 3. 1986

a Conference Committee."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman moves to refuse to recede from House Amendment ⊉1 to Senate Bill 1004-And on that question, is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall the House refuse to recede Amendment \$1 to Senate Bill 1004? All those in favor say *aye*, all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the Motion carries. And the Gentleman has requested a Conference Committee Repor... a Conference Committee. It will be created. Sir. 1164, Representative Pangle. Representative Pangle, on the Motion."

Pangle: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I move to nonconcur and ask for a Conference Committee Report."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved to suspend Rule 79(e) and place this Bill on the Order of Nonconcurrence. any discussion? Hearing no discussion, the question is, 'Shall the House suspend the rule and place this on the Order of Nonconcurrence? All those in favor vote *aye*, all those opposed vote *no*. Voting is open. 60 Have all voted who wish? The Clerk votes are required. will take the record. On this question there 113 voting *aye*, none voting *no* and none voting *present*, places this Bill and the House on Nonconcurrence. Representative Pangle. Representative Pangle now moves to refuse to recede from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1164 and requests a Conference Committee. Is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall the House refuse to recede from House Amendment #1 Senate Bill 1164?* All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, *aves* have it. and the House refuses to recede from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1164 and a Conference Committee

- 146th Legislative Day

 will be report... will be created. Senate Bill 1398,

 Representative Terzich."
- Terzich: "This, Madam Speaker, Senate Bill 1398 is a revisionary

 Bill and I would move that we a suspend Rule 74(a) or a...

 and take from the table and suspend Rule 37(g) and return

 to the Order of Third Reading."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman, has moved to take this Bill from the table and return to the Order of Third Reading. Is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall the House take Senate Bill 1398 from the table and put it on the Order of Third Reading?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. 71 votes are required. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 112 voting 'aye', none voting 'no' and none voting 'present', and the House takes this Bill from the Table and places it on the Order of Third Reading. Representative Terzich, what is your pleasure?"
- Terzich: "I would like to a...to have a Motion to return the Bill to Second Reading for Amendments."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman asks leave to return this Bill to the Order of Second Reading. Does he have leave? Hearing no objection, he has leave. Mr. Clerk, are there any... are there any Motions filed, Mr. Clerk? Representative Terzich, would you like to make a voice Motion?"
- Terzich: "Yes, I would. Madam Speaker, there are two Amendments.

 House Amendment #1 is the second 1986, Revisionary Act

 prepared by the Reference Bureau and it combines into a

 single version, 38 Sections that were amended two or more

 times in 1986...."
- Speaker Breslin: "Excuse me, Representative Terzich the Bills have not... the Amendments have not been printed and distributed. So you need..."

146th Legislative Day

December 3. 1986

Terzich: "Well, yes, I would like a Motion to waive the posting or the distribution of Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman asks leave to waive the requirement that the Bills be printed and distributed... the Amendments, rather, are very voluminous."

Terzich: Yes, Madam. Amendment #1 is 321 payes and Amendment #2
is 81 pages.**

Speaker Breslin: "Is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Marion, Representative Friedrich."

Friedrich: "would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Breslin: "He indicates he will."

Friedrich: "Is this Legislative Reference Bureau cleanup bill?"

Terzich: "Yes."

Friedrich: "Thank you."

Speaker Breslin: "Hearing no further discussion... as you can see, Ladies and Gentleman, the Bills are very voluminous. They are considered technical in nature, drafted the Legislative Reference Bureau. Do we have leave to proceed on the passage of these two Amendments, without having them printed and distributed? Do we have leave? Hearing no objections, the Gentleman has leave on Amendment #1.

Terzich: "Madam Speaker, on Amendment #1, a....it consists of 321 pages. As I mentioned Amendment @1 is 321 pages and is the Second 1986 Revisionary Act prepared by the Reference Bureau. It combines, into single versions, 38 Sections that were amended two or more times in 1986. It renumbers 37 Sections added in 1986 to achieve numerical order within specific Acts, and it corrects obsolete cross references and makes technical corrections in various Acts, and I would move for its adoption."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1398. And on that question, is there any discussion? Hearing no discussion, the question

146th Legislative Day

- December 3, 1986
- 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 Leone: "Floor Amendment 32, offered by Representative Terzich."
- Terzich: "Amendment #2 is 81 pages. It amends the Bill as amended to add several Sections to correct spalling and punctuation errors and to make other technical corrections, and I would move for adoption of Amendment #2.
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment &2 to Senate Bill 1398. And on that question, is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall the Amendment &2 be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye' all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "There are no further Amendments."
- Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. Representative Terzich."
- Terzich: "I would move for immediate consideration on Third Reading."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Terzich asks leave for immediate consideration of this Bill on Third Reading as amended."

 Does he have leave? Hearing no objection, he has leave.

 Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk, on Third."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1398, the Illinois Revisory Act. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Terzich."
- Terzich: "Yes, Madam Speaker and Ladies and Gentleman of the House, Senate Bill 1398 is the Revisionary Act. It's the Second 1986 Revisionary Act. And what it does is, it makes revisions in the Statutes. It became a Public Act in 84-0082 (sic) and our plan is to amend... with these

146th Legislative Day

December 3, 1986

Amendments it's simply nonsubstantive changes, and I would urge your favorable support."

- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 1398. And on that question, is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall Senate 'All those in favor vote 'aye', all those Bill 1398 pass?* opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. 71 votes are required passage of this Bill. Have all voted who wish? for the Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 110 voting 'aye', none voting 'no' and 3 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Three-Fifths Majority vote, is hereby declared passed. Supplemental Calendar announcement."
- Clerk Leone: "Supplemental Calendar #3 is now being distributed."

 Speaker Breslin: "Senate Bill 1442. Representative Homer on a Motion. Representative Homer, would you ... would you push your speak button to present this Motion?"
- Homer: "Madam Speaker, an inquiry of the Chair. May I inquire as to who filed the Motion?"
- Speaker Breslin: "Mr. Clerk, can you tell us wno filed this Motion? Representative Homer."
- Homer: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I would move at this time to discharge Judiciary Committee II, suspend Rule 37(g) and place Senate Bill 1442 on the Order of Second Reading, Second Legislative Day."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Homer has moved to discharge the Judiciary II Committee, and place this Bill on the Order Second of Reading. Is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall the House discharge the Judiciary II Committee and place this Bill on the Order of Second Reading?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. 71 votes are required. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk

146th Legislative Day

December 3, 1986

will take the record. On this question, there are 107 voting 'aye', none voting 'no', and none voting 'present'.

And the House does suspend the Judiciary Committee and place this Bill on the Order of Second Reading. Read the Bill a second time, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Senate 3ill 1442, a Bill for an Act to amend the Code of Criminal Procedure. Second Reading of the 3ill.

No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Are there any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "There are none."

Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1565.

Representative O'Connell, on a Motion."

- O'Connell: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Pursuant to Rule 74(a), I move to take from the table suspend Rule 79(e), and place on the Calendar on the Order of Conference Committee Reports."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved to take Senate Bill 1565 from the table and place it on the Calendar on the Order of Conference Committee Reports. Is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall the House take this Bill from the table and place it on the Order Conference Committee Reports? All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting are required. Have all voted MOO wish? Representative O'Connell. for what reason do vou seek recognition?"
- O'Connell: "Madam Speaker, on this Motion that's just been announced..."
- Speaker Breslin: "I haven't announced it. I haven't taken the Roll Call yet. Okay. On this question, there are 106 voting 'aye', none voting 'no', and none voting 'present', and the House adopts the Motion. Representative O'Connell."

146th Legislative Day

December 3, 1986

- O'Connell: "Madam Speaker, on that Motion just announced, I would now ask leave to reject the... refuse to adopt the First Conference Committee Report and appoint a Second Conference Committee."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved to refuse to accept the First Conference Committee Report on Senate 3ill 1565. discussion? Hearing none, the question *Shall the House refuse to accept the First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1565? 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 accept the First Conference Committee Report on this Senate Bill 1825. Out of the record. Senate Bill 2116, Representative Piel."
- Piel: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Pursuant to Rule 33(b), I move to advance to the Order of Second Reading, Second Legislative Day, without reference to Committee and suspend Rule 39 or 37(g)."
- Speaker Breslin: "You have heard the Gentleman's Motion. Is there any discussion? Hearing no discussion, the question is. 'Shall the House move Senate Bill 2116 to Reading, Second Legislative Day, without reference to Committee and suspend Rule 37(g)?* All those in vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. 71 votes are required for adoption. Have all voted who The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 108 voting 'aye', I voting 'no', and 3 voting *present*, and the House advances Senate Bill 2116 to the Order of Second Reading, Second Legislative Day, without reference to Committee and suspends Rule 37(q). Senate Bill 2116. Read the Bill a second time, Mr. Clerk, please."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 2116, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Banking Act. Second Reading of the Bill. No

146th Legislative Day

December 3, 1986

- Committee Amendments."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Flinn, for what reason do you rise?"
- Flinn: "Madam Speaker, I would like to have... see if we could have immediate consideration for Senate Blll 2116, for the purposes of an Amendment."
- Speaker Breslin: "There are...there's only one Amendment filed.

 We're checking now to see if that is the only one that is necessary. Just a moment."
- flinn: "I can't hear you."
- Speaker Breslin: "I said, we're checking now to see if only one Amendment is necessary. There is only one Amendment filed."
- Flinn: "Madam Speaker, I might be able to straighten that out.

 There's been a...two or three copies of an Amendment, but I have the final copy of one filed. And it's already been printed and distributed, Amendment #1."
- Speaker Breslin: "Would you read the LRB number for us, of the one you wish to present to us?"
- Flinn: "LR38409966 by JS-"
- Speaker Breslin: "Very good. What are the last digits?

 Representative Flinn, what are the last digits."
- Flinn: "The last digit is 04."
- Speaker Breslin: "Very good. Are there any Motions or Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #1 is being offered by Representative Flinn Piel and Keane."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Flinn, on Amendment \$1."
- Flinn: "Thank you. Madam Speaker. Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 2116 gives the Banking Commissioner the right to exercise authority and in order to have buyers for... holding company buyers for banks that are in trouble. There are four different requirements in the Amendment which the bank

146th Legislative Day

December 3, 1986

commissioner must follow. This is a stopgap measure. It will sunset itself, but in the meantime, the bank commissioner's promised he will come back next year with permanent legislation to solve this problem. And this is a one issue Amendment to take care of this Bill and this Bill only. I move for the adoption."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of this Amendment &1 to Senate Bill 2116. And on that question, is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall Amendment #1 be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"

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

Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. Ladies and Gentlemen, we are going to the Order of Supplemental #3, Motions. On Supplemental #3, under the Order of Motions, appears Senate Bill 553. Representative McPike."

McPike: "Thank Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the VOU. House. I move to take Senate Bill 553 from the table and suspend Rule 37(g) and return it to Third Reading. The purpose of the Bill is to have a vehicle for an that we've reached dealing with the Fire and Burglar Alarm Industry. The agreement reached was between the Department the electrical contractors and the IBEW and R and E. that's it. So, I would hope that you would put this on the House floor•"

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved to take Senate Bill 553 from the table and place it on the Order of Third Reading. Is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall the House take Senate Bill 553 from the table and return it... and put it on the Order of Third Reading?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'.

146th Legislative Day

December 3, 1986

Voting is open. 71 votes are required. Have all voted who Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 100 voting voting 'no', and none voting 'present'. And the House takes Senate Bill 553 from the table and puts it on the Order of Third Reading. Representative AcPike, Amendment #1 on Senate Bill 553 that you filed is printed distributed, i f wish proceed immediately. you to Representative McPike asks leave for immediate consideration of Senate Bill 553. Does he have leave? The Gentleman has leave. There is an objection to returning this Bill to the Order of Third... excuse me, the Motion is to return the Bill to the Order of Second Reading for the purposes of an Amendment. Is there any objection to Representative McCracken."

McCracken: "Are we objecting? We object."

Speaker Breslin: "Okay, there is an objection. The Gentleman now moves to return this Bill, Senate Bill 553, to the Order of Second Reading for the purposes of an Amendment. All those in favor vote "aye", all opposed vote "no". Voting is open. 60 votes are required for returning this Bill to the Order of Second Reading for the purposes of an Amendment. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 69 voting "aye", 38 voting "no", and none voting "present". And the Motion carries. The Bill is on... The Bill is on the Order of Second Reading. Mr. Clerk, are there any Motions or Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #1, being offered by Representatives

McPike and Hastert."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative McPike."

McPike: "Thank you, Madam Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #1 deletes everything in Senate Bill 553, and then becomes the Bill. We have met with the... with

146th Legislative Day

December 3, 1986

everyone that had an interest in the Fire Alarm and Burglar Alarm Regulation... State Regulations and have come up with as an agreement. It was agreed to by the IBEW. was agreed to by the electrical contractors and it was to by the Department of R and E. For some years now, we have regulated both fire and burglar alarms. was the decision to only regulate burglar alarm contractors in the future and to remove the regulation of fire alarm contractors from the legislation. In the future, anyone that works for a burglar alarm contractor would have to be fingerprinted and registered with the Department. added to the Bill a clear definition of a burglar also alarm system, so that it's clear that it includes a access system which triggers an audible, visible or remote ⇒ signal that requires a response. It is designed for the prevention or detention of an intrusion, entry, theft, vandalism or trespass. I would be glad to answer questions on the Amendment."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of the Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 553. And on that question, the Gentleman from Lee, Representative Olson."

Olson: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Breslin: "He indicates he will."

Olson: "Just a general question, Representative. As I understand this now, this codifies what we had done a couple of years ago, and basically permits people who are non-private detective service fire alarms, but locks us in for people who have private detective licenses to service burglar alarms. Is that correct?"

McPike: "Would you repeat that? I couldn't hear it. I'm sorry."

Olson: "Okay. What we basically are doing here is codifying the
earlier Act of a couple years ago."

McPike: "I don't know what you mean by that. The Act has been on

146th Legislative Day

December 3, 1986

the books for a few years. And we have amended it a couple of times and created nothing but problems every time, we've amended it, so it's not a codification of anything."

Olson: "Okay. Well, specifically, I have a telephone contractor who has installed burglar alarms, but now is prevented from servicing the burglar alarm. And what this does is says, that's the way it is."

McPike: "That is correct. If... Regardless of what type of contractor it is, if it's an electrical contractor or whatever you said, "a telephone contractor."

Olson: "Yes."

McPike: "Whatever it is. If they wish to install burglar alarms, then they are going to have to register and fingerprint everyone in their company in order to install burglar alarms. But, in the last few years they would have had to do that also for fire alarms. We've removed fire alarms from the Act."

Olson: "So, now it just is applicable to the burglar alarms."

McPike: "That is correct."

Olson: "Thank you very much."

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

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

Speaker Breslin: "He will."

Cowlishaw: "Representative, could you please tell me whether, under the provisions of this Amendment, there are any persons who, if this becomes law in Illinois, might be installing burglar alarms systems, who would be exempt from the requirement of background checks and fingerprinting?"

McPike: "No, not to my knowledge. We are require anyone...
anyone that works for a burglar alarm contractor must

146th Legislative Day

December 3, 1986

register with the state, pay a fee and be fingerprinted.

The state would then do a background check on that individual.

Cowlishaw: "Alright, and there are no people exempt from that?"

McPike: "That is correct. That is correct."

Cowlishaw: "That is... even the people presently working in those businesses?"

McPike: "That is correct."

Cowlishaw: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Breslin: "The Lady from Kane, Representative Deuchler."

Deuchler: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Breslin: "He indicates he will."

Deuchler: "Representative McPike, I'm wondering about the fire alarms. I had a very concerned call from an alarm installer in my district who is very concerned about taking the fire alarm installers and fire alarm companies out of this Act. Is that the intent of the Act?"

McPike: "That is the intent. Yes, that is what we are doing. Ιt the rationale that there is good reason to was do background checks on those individuals that install burglar alarms. It is quite a bit different than to have to do background checks on anyone that installs telephones or fire alarms or a variety of other things. Those are regulated at the local level and was the Department's decision and was the agreement reached that Me. should return that to the local level."

Deuchler: "Well, I wonder about the whole category of, for example, arson for profit. It would seem as though some ratner questionable types are involved also in the fire alarm category and that background checks might be very advantageous. That certainly was the concern of the company that's located in my district."

McPike: "Well, certainly arson for profit is a problem, but that

146th Legislative Day

December 3, 1936

has nothing to do with the people that install fire alarms. I don't think you hire someone to put in a fire alarm, planning, then, to set your building on fire. I don't think he would even put the fire alarm in."

Deuchler: "Well, but isn't it true, without a background check that you really don't know who you are dealing with. Can you think of, for example, of some individuals in the city who are perhaps in this line of work, who you would recommend?"

McPike: "I don't know any fire alarm contractors, so I couldn't help you."

Deuchler: "Thank you."

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

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

Speaker Breslin: "He Will."

Young: "What is the state of the law right now? I'm kind of confused as to whether we're passing something for burglar alarms or passing something to remove people in the fire alarm field."

McPike: "The present law says that if you install fire or burglar alarms, you must register with the state. We received nothing but complaints about that for the last two years. There's also a requirements in the law that in order to become a contractor, either a fire alarm contractor or a burglar alarm contractor, you must have worked for such a contractor for a year. We passed a one year exemption for that, extended it to December 31 of this year, because most people weren't even aware of it. So, in effect, we had closed the industry to a number of people that had been in that industry for fifty years. Trying to deal with that problem and at the same time recognizing that there's not really a legitimate need to fingerprint everybody that puts in fire alarms, we decided to remove fire alarm, from the

146th Lagislative Day

December 3. 1986

Act, period."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative McPike, to close."

McPike: "Well, I think it has been adequately discussed, and I move for the adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of the Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 553. And on that question... that is the question. All those in favor say "aye". all those opposed say "no". 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 93 voting "aye", 19 voting "no", and none voting "present". And the Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "There are no further Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. Representative McPike now asks for leave for immediate consideration of this 3ill on Third Reading. Does he have leave? Hearing no objections the Gentleman... Representative Pullen objects. Therefore, all those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 90 voting 'aye', 20 voting 'no', and none voting 'present'. The Gentleman may proceed on Third Reading on this Bill. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk. Oh, it's already been read once. Representative McPike."

McPike: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I think the Bill has been adequately discussed, I would just like to thank the Governor's Staff that works for the Department of R and E for their cooperations in working through this. He probably had three different agreements in the last year. Hopefully, this is a good resolution of the problem. I move for the passage of Senate Bill 553."

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

146th Legislative Day

December 3, 1986

Senate Bill 553. And that question. is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, *Shall Senate 553 pass?* All those in favor vote *aye*, all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who votes are required for passage. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. there are 98 voting "aye", 14 voting "no", and question, none voting *present*. This Bill, having received the necessary Majority, is hereby declared passed. Show that Senate Bill 553 received an Extraordinary Majority vote and is declared passed. Gentleman, we are waiting for a another Supplemental. Believe it or not, there is still a We expect to have another Supplemental as work to do. quickly as possible. Representative Greiman in the Chair."

- Speaker Greiman: "The Chair notes that Rep... former Representative Woodyard has returned to a place of his original crimes and he has come back apparently so that we can extend to him a happy birthday, and we do that. For what purpose does the Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich, seek recognition?"
- Matijevich: "Speaker, I would ask leave of the House to use the Attendance Roll Call for that purpose, to suspend the posting notice on House Bill 401 and House Bill 1103 and also suspend the rule whereby a Committee cannot meet while the House is in Session for the purpose of those two Bills being heard in the Rules Committee immediately, in the Speaker's Conference Room. Those are two Bills that have come over from the Senate and have to be cleared in the Rules Committee."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Lake asked unanimous consent to waive the rules regarding the posting of Bills for rules as well... those Eills for rules as well as waiver of the rule that Committees not be allowed to meet while the House

146th Legislative Day

December 3, 1986

is in Session. Does the Gentleman have unanimous consent? Unanimous consent is granted. Let the record so reflect. Now, Mr. Matijevich, did you wish to call that meeting right now? Alright, so Members of the Rules Committee then would please retire to the Conference Room, in the Speaker's hallway. Right, the Speaker Conference Room. Do it now. Let's retire now, Members of the Rules Committee, please. Messages from the Senate."

Clerk "Message from the Sanate. bу O'Brien: Hr. Hright. Secretary. 'Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House that the Senate has concurred with the Representatives House in passage of the following Bills. together Bills 132, 313, 401, 2760, and 2815, Amendments. House passed by the Senate as amended, December 3, 1986. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A Message from the Senate, by Mr. Wright, Secretary. *Ar. Speaker, I am directed to of Representatives the Senate has refused to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendments Senate Bill 2123. Action taken by the Senate, December to 3, 1986 Kenneth Wright, Secretary. A Message from the Senate, by Mr. Wright, Secretary. "Hr. Speaker. I am directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate adopted the following Senate Joint Resolution, the adoption which I am instructed ask the concurrence Representatives, towit; Senate Joint Resolution #188, adopted by the Senate, December 3, 1986. Kenneth Wright, Secretary. **

Speaker Greiman: "Committee Reports."

Clerk O'Brien: "The Committee on Rules has met, and pursuant to Rule 29(c)3, the following 3ills have been ruled exempt on December 3, 1936; House Bills 401 and 1103. Signed, John Matijevich, Chairman."

Speaker Greiman: "Agreed Resolutions. Agreed Resolutions."

146th Legislative Day

December 3, 1986

- Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolutions 1709, offered by Representative Cullerton: 1712, Flinn - and Richmond; 1713, Hasara; 1716. Daniels and Republican 1715. Curran: McGann: Leadership; 1717, Daniels; 1718, Daniels; 1720, Daniels: 1719, Daniels; 1721, Daniels; 1722, Daniels; 1723, Daniels; 1726, Daniels; 1727, McCracken; 1728, Ryder; 1729, Capparelli; 1730, Klemm and Wait; 1732. ndoL Dunn: John Dunn; 1736, Hartke; 1737. 1733. Brookins: 1738. Hartke; 1739, Hannig - et al; 1740, W. Peterson; 1741. McGann; 1742, McGann; 1743, McGann; 1744, McGann; 1745, Tate; and 1747, Braun."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Lake, Ar. Matijevich, on the Agreed Resolutions."
- Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentleman of the these are all agreed and I would move the adoption of the But also make note of the fact that I went through Agreed. them hurriedly, but the ... those introduced the Republican Leadership. I might make note of the fact that they congratulate all the retiring Members of the House and with... particularly, I would like to note the... that we do congratulate our good friends and colleagues who ve served here a long, long time. Tom McMaster and Dwight Friedrich and also Jill Zwick and those who are going from the House to the Senate, but, those three, I particularly that we have enjoyed having them in the House. That's a lot of years of experience that we've had and we wish them well in whatever they do and God bless them. With that I would move for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich, moves for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. Those in favor say 'aye' opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it and the Agreed Resolutions are adopted.

146th Legislative Day

December 3, 1986

Mr. Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Someone back here said I missed Judy, and I didn't do that intentionally, Judy. I just went through these so quickly. I want to add Judy's name. I may have missed some others. Those came in my mind as I was thumbing through these. Thank you."

Speaker Greiman: "Sure. Death Resolutions."

- Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 1710, offered by Representative Bowman, with respect to the memory of Betty Harper. House Resolution 1731, offered by Representative Tuerk et al, with respect to the memory of Paul A. Haberkorn. House Resolution 1734, offered by Representative Johnson, with the respect to the memory of George Bigham, Jr. House Resolution 1735, offered by Representative Flowers, with respect to the memory of Willie Jack Pittman."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich, moves for the adoption of the Death Resolutions. Those in favor say 'aye', 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 Resolution 1711, offered by Representatives

 Satterthwaite Flowers and Shaw. And House Resolution

 1746, offered by Representative Saltsman."
- Speaker Greiman: "Committee on Assignment. The Chair would note that Treasurer Elect Consentino is here at the well. And we welcome you. Ar. Treasurer and congratulate you on your election. Supplemental Calendar Announcement."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Supplemental Calendar #4 is being distributed."
- Speaker Greiman: "Supplemental Calendar &4. On the Order of Conference Committee Reports appears House Bill 1103. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1103, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Vehicle Code. Second Conference Committee

146th Legislative Day

December 3, 1986

Report."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. O'Connell."

O'Connell: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to have leave to consider

House Bill 1103, the Second Conference Committee Report. If

I may explain the Bill?"

Speaker Greiman: "Proceed."

"The Conference Committee Report provides for the O'Connell: staggered terms of directors on life insurance companies. Apparently, there is a movement to take over certain Illinois domicile life insurance companies from out of state interests, whereby they move in and elect en masse, the board of directors and thereby facilitate to taking over of various life insurance companies. This provide for staggered terms, it would set up three classes of directors. Each class of which would elected staggered years and thereby; would make it much more for a takeover. It has a bipartisan difficult therefore, agreement and I would ask for favorable adoption of the Second Conference Committee Report for House Bill 1103."

Speaker Graiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. D'Connell, has moved for the adoption of the Second Conference Committee Report to House Bill 1103. And on that, is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Madison. Mr. Wolf."

Wolf: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Would the Sponsor yield to a question?"

Speaker Greiman: "He indicates he will."

Wolf: "Representative O'Connell, on page two, line £10, eight through 10, it says, 'in lieu of electing the membership of the whole board of directors annually, the articles of incorporations 'may' provide." Is this an elective provision, rather than a mandatory provision?"

O'Connell: "That is correct."

Wolf: "Thank you."

146th Legislative Day

December 3, 1986

Speaker Greiman: "The Gantleman from Macon, Mr. Tate."

Tate: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker...

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Hallock, could you... could you move out of the way, so I can have eye contact with Mr. Tate. Proceed, Mr. Tate."

Tate: "Could you have the Clerk move out of the way, so I can see you, Speaker? Thank you. Okay. Thank you, Mr. Speaker? Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in support of Conference Committee Report 1103. As the previous speaker, Representative O'Connell, has already indicated, this Conference Committee Report has bipartisan support from the insurance industry perspective. The companies have all sat down and all participants in this process and people... interested parties in this process have agreed and signed off on this measure and I ask for a positive Roll Call."

Speaker Greiman: "Further discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt the Second Conference Committee Report to House Bill 1103?" All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by vote 'no'. Voting is open and this is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Hr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 114 voting 'aye', and none voting 'no', none voting 'present'. And the House does adopt the Second Conference Committee Report to House Bill 1103. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Nash, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Nash: "Mr. Speaker. I would like to know what Representative
Charlie Morrow is doing up in the Speaker's gallery?"

Speaker Graiman: "Hard to tell whether he is blushing. Calendar
Announcements."

Clerk O'Brien: "Supplemental Calendar #5 is being distributed."

Speaker Greiman: "Supplemental Calendar #5. On the Order of

146th Legislative Day

December 3, 1986

Concurrence appears House Bill 401, Mr. Clerk. Mr. Stezco, for what purpose do you seek recognition?

Steczo: "On 401."

- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 401, a Bill for an Act to amend the

 Illinois Library Systems Act, together with Senate

 Amendment #1."
- Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Keane... Mr. Steczo, are you going to handle that? Alright. Mr. Steczo."
- Steczo: "Thank you, Ar. Speaker and Members of the House. I move to concur with the Senate Amendment to House Bill 401. This Bill in its original form dealt with the Illinois Library That language has been completely deleted by System Act. the Senate, and in its place, the Senate has adopted by vote of 48 to 1, a 3500 dollar annual stipend to be paid to 21 county recorders for the additional duties required of them by the Department of Revenue. The additional I think were discussed last year, include policing of mortgage declarations, the responsibility for billing recording fees to all state agencies and the requirements from the Department of Transportation regarding plats, et cetera. I should also make it clear, Mr. Speaker, that there is no appropriation for this Bill for this year. any appropriations or stipend would occur next year, and in fact, the Amendment has no immediate effective Therefore, the Bill, if passed and approved by this General Assembly, would be effective next July L. So I would answer any questions, Ar. Speaker, or in lieu of that, for concurrence in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 401.
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Steczo... The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Steczo, moves that the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 401. And on that, the Gentleman from McHenry, Mr. Klemm."

Klemm: "Yes. Would the Speaker (sic - Sponsor) yield for a

146th Legislative Day

December 3, 1986

question?"

Speaker Greiman: "He indicates he will."

Klemm: "Let me just ask one question if I could. It pertains to this Bill, but it also pertains to the other stipends that we've allowed, and I've noticed the language that is that the awards will be distributed in annual lump sum payments. When do we give that lump sum payment, iust out of curiosity? Is it as soon as they sworn in? Is it sometime during the course of their term? Is it at the end of a year after they've done the work? Since it is monthly payment. I was concerned that somebody gets sworn in, gets 3500 dollars and then resigns for some reason, we used to do with the General Assembly when we gave lump sums payments for our services. I was wondering if you know how that is handled? That's all. opposed to the legislation."

Steczo: "Representative Klemm, I would have... I would have to double check that for you. I don't have the information right at hand."

Klemm: "Alright, thank you. No other questions."

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

Countryman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I stand in opposition to this Bill. This is a 3500 dollar stipend to county recorders. My opposition has been consistent to all of these stipends, going back to the days in which I served in the State Board of Elections, and they initially went to the county clerks. In essence, we're subsidizing the counties, and in many counties, what they effectively do is to reduce the salary by the amount of the stipend and keep the pay equal with other offices. In addition to that, I think the Gentleman from McHenry, who just spoke, raised a good question, one which I have seen consistently a problem, and that is, that you could have

146th Legislative Day

December 3. 1986

someone vacate the office during the course of the year after they've received the stipend, and in essence be able retain the whole thing. I think it is bad public policy. I think it was a mistake to do it first instance. I think it is a mistake to do it now. This is a mistake particularly because it applies to only 41 counties in the state and not uniformly across the state. This is a question of, let's catch up, somebody else has got it, so we ought to come in and get it. I know we did it a few weeks ago for the treasurers, but that doesn't make it right. I think this is wrong and I ask you for a 'no' vote."

Speaker Greiman: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Marion.

Mr. Friedrich."

Friedrich: "Would the Sponsor yield, please?"

Speaker Greiman: "He indicates he will yield for questions."

Friedrich: "Well, I can see the rationale. We forced the consolidation of election on the counties and the county clerk, and I think maybe it is justified that we should pay but for the life of me I can't that additional expense, understand why the state should pick up the tab for the county recorder. That's a county office. It should be paid for by the county. They serve the people in the county. And I can't understand what your rationale is for the state paying 3500 bucks a year to these counties for a that they should be performing."

Speaker Grieman: "Mr. Steczo."

Steczo: "Thank you, Ar. Speaker. In response to the Gentleman, I would just indicate that, first, the state... the reason for the stipend is that the state has required these recorders to provide... to do certain tasks, be it mortage declarations, or billing of state agencies or work for the Department of Transportation, but in fact, the state is requiring these county officers to do their work. Number

146th Legislative Day

December 3, 1986

two, the... the recorders are just the latest in a number of county officials that we have agreed to pay stipends to. County clerks, sheriffs, circuit court clerks, the treasurers, which just passed recently, all because the state has required those County officials to do work over and above what their normal course of duties might be. And for the duties that we require them to do, 3500 dollars certainly is not an overwhelming amount of money."

- Friedrich: "Well, I don't think you answered the question,

 Representative. What did the State require the Recorder to

 do that we should be paying 3500 bucks to get it done?"
- Steczo: "Representative Friedrich, in the opening remarks, I mentioned the three additional duties that the recorders are required to do. Number one is to police mortgage declarations to the green sheets required by the Department of Revenue. They have to make sure all the information is correct and must determine that the form is correct in all details. The responsibility... They are responsible. rather, for billing of recording fees to all state agencies and they*re required to inform the Department Transportation regarding plats lying within and flood plains and they have to ascertain that those plats comply with the flood plain regulations. And so, little by little, we have... we have mandated that these county officials on the state's behalf and by the stipend with these county officials, and with other county officials we saying that we will provide reiteration for you for doing that."

friedrich: "Why do you limit it to one population group, 60,000 to 200,000 thousand? What about all the other counties?"

Steczo: "That, for the most part, Representative Friedrich, was the consensus among the recorders, group itself."

Friedrich: "Well, I can't understand. On the Bill, Mr Speaker...

146th Legislative Day

December 3, 1986

on the Amendment. I can't understand why a county with 201,000 or a county with 59,000 should be entitled to it, if the other one is. I don't think any of them are, but if they, are let's go all the way and give them all 3500 hundred bucks. It's a bad bill and it's a bad precedent. Just because the we did treasurers doesn't want this, it doesn't make this anymore right."

Steczo: "Just a response."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Macon, Mr. Dunn."

Dunn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in support of the Concurrence Motion on House Bill 401. In... somewhat in response to the last speaker. and I will stand corrected if I am wrong, but, I think this essentially. Statewide legislation, because I think this legislation applies every place across the where there is a recorder who is not also the county clerk. have a number of counties in the state where there is combination clerk-recorder and in every case where that is not the situation, this legislation would apply. That is my understanding. This is good legislation to provide modest stipend to elected officials who, by and large, are not excessively paid. Their responsibilities are increasing every day and every year. We are becoming more data conscience all throughout the State of Illinois and nation. Recorders are becoming this more and the transition from years back, hand kept responsible for records to filming on microfiche to computerized data and I think it's only reasonable to expect them to keep up the times, and if they're expected to keep up with the times, they should be compensated accordingly. This modest stipend is a good thing, and I would certainly recommend it an 'aye' vote by everyone on behalf of this good piece legislation."

146th Legislative Day December 3, 1986

Speaker Greiman: "The Lady from Sangamon, Ms. Hasara."

Hasara: "Mr. Chairman, will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Greiman: "Excuse me, would the Gentleman standing in the aisle... Proceed."

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

Speaker Greiman: "He indicates that he will."

Hasara: "How many recorders are there right now in the State of Illinois?"

Steczo: "Recorders? Recorders only or recorders-clerks combined?"

Hasara: "Aren't there only about fourteen?"

Steczo: "There would be about twenty-one affected by this Bill."

Hasara: "Twenty-one, okay. Having been a recipient of the 3500 dollar stipend, I can tell you it is not paid in advance. It is prorated, and when I left the county it was prorated. I received an amount equal to the amount of days I had served, and my predecessor then received the amount from then on. It was paid, I believe, after July 1 each year. Thank you."

Speaker Greiman: "Further discussion? There being none, Mr. Steczo to close."

Steczo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I would reiterate to the Members of this House that there only twenty—one recorders that would be affected by this stipend. As Representative Dunn, explained the remainder, with the exception of Cook County that is not covered by this Bill, are clerks and recorders combined, they would not... they would not be granted the additional stipend. This is a modest, modest attempt to try to compensate these county officials for work that is required them of the state. I should also reiterate to you that there is no appropriation for this year, that any appropriation under House Bill 401 would take place in the fiscal year

146th Legislative Day

December 3, 1986

beginning next July, and in fact, the effective date of the Bill is such that the Bi 11 would become effective July. I think it's an attempt to try to provide for those county officials as Representative Dunn said, again, are not well paid but are still required to do the work that the state requires them to do. I would encourage the concurrence to Senate Amendment #1 by approval of ... the Members of this House and would encourage 'aye' votes." Speaker Greiman: "Thank you. Before considering the Roll Call on this Bill, the Chair would entertain a Wotion for to waive Rule 79(d) with respect to H3 401, HB 2760 and HB 2815. which would allow consideration of these Bills. Ыe Leave is granted to use the Attendance leave? Leave• Roll Call. And now, the question is, 'Shall the concur in Senate Amendment &1 to House Bill 401? favor signify by voting *aye*, those opposed vote *no*. Voting is open. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? This Bill has an immediate effective date and requires 71 votes. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this 71 voting *aye* 34 voting "no", there are *present*. And the House does concur... Hr. Preston. and Mr. Wait 'no'. This Bill... Mr. Wait, Preston *no* 'aye'. On this Bill there are 72 voting 'aye', 35 voting *no*, and 1 voting *present*. And the House does concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 401. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On Supplemental Calendar #5 on the Order of Concurrence appears House Bill 2760. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2760, a Bill for an Act to amend Act in relation to Child Abuse Prevention Fund, together with

146th Legislative Day

December 3, 1986

Senate Amendment #1.ª

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Ronan."

- Ronan: "Okay. Thank you. Mr. Speaker. What are we doing? We're a.o. on 2760. We're are asking for concurrence to some Amendments to... Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2760. This took a good idea and made it better. I move for the passage of House Bill 2760."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Ronan, moves that the House does concur in Senate Amendment \$1 to House Bill And on that, is there any discussion? There being 2760. none, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2760?* All those in favor signify by voting 'aye' those opposed vote 'no'. Voting This is final action. It has an immediate effective date, and requires 71 votes. Have all voted who Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the On this question, there are 98 voting 'aye', record. voting 'no', sorry... 99 voting 'aye' 11, voting 'no', none voting 'present'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2760. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order...Supplemental Calendar #5 on the Order of Concurrences appears House Bill 2815. Ar. Clerk. read the Bill. Mr. Giorgi."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House 3ill 2815, a Bill for an Act to amend the Physical Fitness Service Act, together with Senate Amendment #1 and 2."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. Giorgi. Mr.
 Young, if you could just move over a little bit. Thank
- Giorgi: "Senate Amendment #1 is... by deleting the 5,000 for the size of the contract and making it in an average of 2,500 per year a for maximum of two years. That's Amendment #1.

146th Legislative Day

- December 3, 1986
- I move for the adoption of Amendment #1. I move that we...

 I move that we concur in Amendment #1."
- Speaker Greiman: "Were you going to also move as to respect to 2.

 Mr. Giorgi?"
- Giorgi: "Yes, Sir, and I also move to concur with Amendment #2.

 Speaker Greiman: Alright. "The Gentleman from Winnebago, Mr.

 Giorgi, moves the House does concur in Senate Amendments #1

 and 2 to House Bill 2815. And on that is there any

 discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Preston."
- Preston: "Mr. Speaker, I just have a question of the chair. Does that legislation we passed requiring English proficiency test, apply to Members of the House?"
- Speaker Greiman: "Further discussion? There being none. the question is. 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 2815? All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is is final action. This Bill does not have an immediate effective date and it requires 60 votes. Have all who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 70 voting 'aye', 34 voting 'no', 5 voting 'present'. And the House does concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 House Bill 2815. And this Bill. having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Stephens, the Gentleman from St. Clair, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"
- Stephens: "Well, Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of an inquiry, Sir. Something we should know? Seems to be some activity in the back hall... an alarm or something? Is there... does this have anything to do with that burglar alarm Bill that we passed?"
- Speaker Greiman: "We'll let you know if you are in peril, Mr. Stephens."

146th Legislative Day

- December 3, 1986
- Stephens: "If we're in danger, you'll let us know. God bless
 you."
- Speaker Greiman: "I knew we should to do something though, yes.

 The Gentleman from Madison, Majority Leader McPike, moves that the House stand adjourned until the hour of 12... Yes, Mr. Mulcahey, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"
- Mulcahey: "Mr. Speaker, on Supplemental Calendar 35, there's a Motion I would like to move, if I may?"
- Speaker Greiman: "Alright. Yes, Mr. Mulcahey, we will take that then. On Supplemental Calendar #5, on the Order of Motions appears Senate Joint Resolution 188. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "A Motion pursuant to Rule 43(a). I move to bypass Committee and place Senate Joint Resolution 188 on the Speaker's Table for immediate consideration. Signed, Representative Mulcahey."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. Mulcahey, moves that the House waive the provisions of Rule 43(a) with respect to Senate Joint Resolution 188. Yes, Sir. Mr. Mulcahey."

Mulcahey: "Yes, proceed."

Speaker Greiman: "On the Motion."

- Mulcahey: "On the Motion... On the Motion, I move for the adoption of a Motion. It simply states that the reporting date of January 14th, 1987 of the Joint Committee on Secondary and Elementary Sports be extended until April 1st, 1987."
- Speaker Greiman: "Does the Gentleman have unanimous consent to waive Rule 43(a) with respect to his Motion? You have unanimous consent. Now on the Resolution itself, Mr. Mulcahey."

Mulcahey: "I so move the adoption of the Resolution."

Speaker Greiman: "The question is, "Shall the House adopt SJR 188?" All those in favor signify by voting "ave", those

146th Legislative Day

December 3, 1986

oppose vote "no". Voting is now open. Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 103 voting 'aye' voting 'no', none voting 'present'. And the Resolution is adopted. And now the Gentleman from Madison, Majority Leader McPike, moves that the House stand adjourned until the hour of 12:00 noon tomorrow. All in favor signify saving *ave*. those opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it. And the House stand adjourned. We are adjourning until... we are not coming into Session, Ladies and Gentleman, until 12:00 because the Senate will not be in Session until that time or thereafter. why we are not coming in early. Now, the Gentleman from... the Third Special Session of the 84th General Assembly The Gentleman from Madison, Mr. McPike, now in Session. moves that we adopt as the Roll Call... the Attendance Roll Call for this Section of the Third Special Session Attendance Roll Call of the Regular Session. Do we have leave to adopt that? Leave is granted. Mr. McPike, the Madison, moves that the House stand Gentleman from adjourned for the Third Special Session of the 84th General Assembly until the hour of 12:30 tomorrow. All in favor signify by say "aye", opposed "no". In the opinion of the Chair the "ayes" have it, and the Third Special Session of 84th General Assembly is hereby adjourned until tomorrow at the hour of 12:30 p-m-#

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

PAGE 1

DECEMBER 03. 1986

HB-0401	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	94
HB-1103	CONFERENCE	PAGE	91
HB-2630	MOTION	PAGE	69
HB-2760	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	100
HB-2804	MOTION	PAGE	62
HB-2815	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	101
HB-3162	MOTION	PAGE	65
HB-3200	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	71
HB-3200	MOTION	PAGE	70
SB-0416	MOTION	PAGE	71
SB-0522	MOTION	PAGE	61
SB-0553	RECALLED	PAGE	82
SB-0553	THIRD READING	PAGE	87
SB-0553	MOTION	PAGE	81
SB-1004	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	72
SB-1004	MOTION	PAGE	72
SB-1164	MOTION	PAGE	73
SB-1398	RECALLED	PAGE	74
SB-1398	THIRD READING	PAGE	76
SB-1398	MOTION	PAGE	74
SB-1442	SECOND READING	PAGE	78
SB-1442	MOTION	PAGE	77
SB-1516	MOTION	PAGE	26
SB-1565	MOTION	PAGE	78
SB-1699	THIRD READING	PAGE	11
SB-1706	MOTION	PAGE	38
SB-1738	MOTION	PAGE	42
SB-1749	MOTION	PAGE	44
SB-1752	MOTION	PAGE	48
SB-1759	MOTION	PAGE	50
SB-1951	MOTION	PAGE	40
\$8-2116	SECOND READING	PAGE	79
SB-2116	MOTION	PAGE	79
SB-2177	MOTION	PAGE	41
SB-2255	MOTION	PAGE	42
HR-0638	RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	51
HR-1593	MOTION	PAGE	66
HR-1724	RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	3
SJR-0188	MOTION	PAGE	103
SJR-0188	RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	103

SUBJECT MATTER

HOUSE TO ORDER - REPRESENTATIVE GREIMAN PAGE	1	
PRAYER - FATHER JOHN SPREEN PAGE	1	
PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE PAGE	1	
ROLL CALL FOR ATTENDANCE PAGE	1	
REPRESENTATIVE MATIJEVICH IN CHAIR PAGE	5	
HOUSE AT EASE PAGE	5	
REPRESENTATIVE GREIMAN IN CHAIR PAGE	28	
SPEAKER MADIGAN IN CHAIR PAGE	37	
REPRESENTATIVE GREIMAN IN CHAIR PAGE	38	
REPRESENTATIVE BRESLIN IN CHAIR PAGE	42	
REPRESENTATIVE GREIMAN IN CHAIR PAGE	88	
MESSAGES FROM SENATE PAGE	89	
COMMITTEE REPORTS PAGE	89	
AGREED RESOLUTIONS PAGE	89	
DEATH RESOLUTIONS PAGE	91	
GENERAL RESOLUTIONS PAGE	91	
ADJOURNMENT PAGE	104	
THIRD SPECIAL SESSION TO ORDER PAG		
THIRD SPECIAL SESSION ADJOURNMENT PAGE	104	