36th Legislative Day

April 28, 1987

- Speaker Greiman: "The hour of 12:00 having arrived, the House will be in Session. The Chaplain for today will be the Reverend Paul Schwartz, Pastor of St. Matthew Evangelical Lutheran Church of Lemont. Reverend Schwartz is a guest of Representative Jane Barnes. The guests in the gallery may wish to rise and join us for the invocation. Reverend Schwartz."
- Reverend Schwartz: "Heavenly Father, You have given us this day as a gift, a trust, an opportunity to direct and manage Your resources for the health, safety and welfare of the people of this commonwealth. We ask for Your blessing today the men and the women, the staff, the upon Committees, that their debate. their labor. their legislation, would bring a better tomorrow for all the people in the State of Illinois. Through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Tazewell, Mr. Ackerman, will lead us in the pledge to the flag."
- Ackerman 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. Representative

 Matijevich, do you have excuses on the Democratic side?"
- Matijevich: "None on this side, Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Piel, are any excused absences on the Republican side?"
- Piel: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. Would the record show that Representative William Peterson is excused today?"
- Speaker Greiman: "Let the record so reflect. Mr. Clerk, take the record. 114 Members having answered to the call of the quorum, a quorum is present. Committee Reports."

36th Legislative Day

April 28, 1987

Clerk O'Brien: "Representative O'Connell, Chairman af the Committee on Judiciary II, to which the following Bills were referred, action taken April 23, 1987, reported the back with the following recommendations: 'do pass' House Bills 506, 653, 1132, 1350, 1502, 1526 and 1585; amended House Bills 205, 504, 600, 936 and 1040; *do pass Consent Calendar* House Bill 1507 and 1527; as amended Consent Calendar' House Bill 476: 'do pass Short Debate Calendar' House Bills 34, 349, 1601. 2013. 2328 and 2583; 'be adopted' House Resolution 133; House Resolution 135 and House Resolution 134; •Interim Calendar* House Bills 79, 185 and 258; *do pass as amended Short Debate* House Bill 525. Representative Rea, Chairman from the Select Committee on Economic Development, to which the following Bills were referred, action taken April 23. 1987 . reported the same back with the following 'do pass' House Bills 1003, 1564, recommendations: 1566, 1680, 1898, 1899, 2349, 2459 and 2744; 'do pass Short Debate Calendar* House Bill 1798. Representative Preston, Chairman of the Committee ... Select Committee on Children, to which the following Bills were referred, action taken April 23, 1987, reported the same back with the following recommendations: 'do pass' House Bill 389 and 2457; 'do pass Consent Calendar* House Bill 655; *do pass as amended Short Debate Calendar* House Bill 233."

Speaker Greiman: "Senate Bills First Reading."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 56."

Speaker Greiman: "Excuse me, Mr. Clerk. Mr. McCracken, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

McCracken: "A point of information, Mr. Speaker. We, on this side of the aisle, have been advised that there will be a request to collapse Bills into super Bills at the Committee levels, something similar to a Committee Bill, but not

36th Legislative Day

April 28. 1987

exactly a Committee Bill, a Bill the Chief Sponsor of which would be a Democrat, which would incorporate a number of other Bills that that Committee is handling. I'm here to inform you, Mr. Speaker, and the real Speaker that this side of the aisle is unalterably opposed to that method. We will not sit back and allow our Republican Members to be robbed of their Bills under the guise of some combined Bill system. We are absolutely opposed to it, and we are giving notice to the other side. We will not acquiesce in any request to be made along those lines."

Speaker Greiman: "Senate Bills First Reading."

- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 56, Hartke, a Bill for an Act to amend the Bingo License and Tax Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 161, Hartke, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Vehicle Code. First Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Bowman, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"
- Bowman: "To... to suspend the posting requirement, Mr. Speaker.

 This is with regard to House Bill 1813, which is presently pending in Human Services. It was posted last week. I appeared before the Committee. I asked to have it reposted for this week publicly, both the Minority Spokesman and the Chair agreed at that time. I have since checked with Representative Daniels and Representative McCracken. I understand there is no problem from the other side of the aisle. May we suspend the posting requirement with respect to that Bill?"

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. McCracken."

- McCracken: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Out of respect to the Sponsor, we agreed to do this although it's unfortunate the process has gotten to the point where even a Democratic Chairman can't get his own Bills posted."
- Speaker Greiman: "Leave to use the Attendance Roll Call to waive

36th Legislative Day

April 28, 1987

the posting requirements with respect to House Bill 1813.

The Gentleman has leave. For what purpose does the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Keane, seek recognition?

Keane: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would ask to waive the posting rules for House Bill 631 which had been assigned to Labor and Commerce for some reason, and it's been reassigned to Revenue. It was reassigned too late for posting. I would like to suspend the posting requirements to post for Wednesday, tomorrow, April 29th in the Revenue Committee so it can be assigned to an Income Tax Study Committee. We've discussed this with the Minority Leader on the... Minority Spokesman on the Revenue Committee and she has no problems."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Keane, asks leave of the House to use the Attendance Roll Call with respect to House Bill 631 to waive the posting requirements so the Bill may be heard tomorrow in Subcommittee. Mr. Keane."

Keane: "Yes, I'd like just to make an announcement."

Speaker Greiman: "Well, Mr. Keane, let's... let me get your matter taken care of, if I might."

Keane: "Oh. I'm sorry. Pardon me. Pardon me."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. McCracken, on the request for leave."

McCracken: "Representative Keane, if it goes to the Subcommittee tomorrow, will it be heard by the Full Committee next week?"

Keane: "It'll be double posted for Subcommittee. My understanding is it will be posted for Subcommittee next week, and also for Full Committee."

McCracken: "Well then, what's the point of having it in Subcommittee today?"

Keane: "We have to get..."

McCracken: "My point is..."

Keane: "We have to get it posted to the Full Committee today,

36th Legislative Day

April 28, 1987

before tomorrow, so it can be referred to Subcommittee next week."

McCracken: "Tomorrow... tomorrow it would be referred to Subcommittee."

Keane: "For the Full Committee. Dave, would you mind moving?"

McCracken: "Both the Subcommittee and the Full Committee?"

Keane: "No. Just so we can post it for the Full Committee tomorrow, and then tomorrow it will be referred to the Subcommittee."

McCracken: "And the next week will be the last week for Committees."

Keane: "Yeah, and it will be double posted. It will be posted for the Subcommittee and for the Full Committee as will all Bills that will be heard in Revenue next week."

McCracken: "Is it the Chairman's intention to hear all Bills in Subcommittee next week and also in the Full Committee next week?"

Keane: "That's correct."

McCracken: "Would it not be more efficient to hear them in the Full Committee next week?"

Keane: "No, we've done this for two years now and have not had any problem doing it that way."

McCracken: "Thank you."

Speaker Greiman: "And so, accordingly, leave will be granted to waive the posting requirements for House Bill 631 to be heard in Full Committee tomorrow. The Gentleman has leave.

The Gentleman from Macon, Mr. Dunn. For what purpose do you seek recognition. Sir?"

Dunn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House.

On today's Calendar, there are shown two postings for the

Judiciary I Subcommittee on Tort Reform. The first posting

is for tomorrow evening at 6:00 p.m., and the second

posting is the next day, Thursday, at 8:00 a.m. I would

36th Legislative Day

April 28, 1987

like to move to waive the appropriate rules and suspend the appropriate rules so that those Bills posted for Judiciary I Subcommittee on Tort Reform for Thursday morning, April 30th at 8:00 a.m. can be heard Wednesday evening, April 29 at 6:00 p.m. with the other Bills in that Subcommittee.

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Macon, Mr. Dunn, asks leave of the House to use the Attendance Roll Call to allow the posting for the Judiciary I Subcommittee on Tort Reform which was set up on... for Thursday to be heard also on Wednesday with other Bills in that same Subcommittee. And on that, Mr. McCracken."

McCracken: "Alright. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative

Dunn, what is the purpose of moving the Thursday morning

Subcommittee Bill to the Wednesday evening Subcommittee?"

Dunn: "The purpose is... is to conform with the original Committee intent. There was an error made in the Thursday. It will just mean that the Subcommittee Members will have the inconvenience of the second meeting. and I think we can take care of all business Wednesday evening when we have time to go until it's finish. Same of the Members who are on Judiciary II which will be meeting the same time Thursday morning, and if we suspend this rule, we can hear everything Wednesday night as a package. And I've cleared this with the Minority Spokesman on the Committee, and he has no objection."

McCracken: "So, you propose that all of the Subcommittee Bills

currently set for 8:00 a.m. Thursday should be heard along

with the Wednesday evening Subcommittee Bills."

Dunn: "That's... that's correct."

McCracken: "And about how..."

Dunn: "That was the original..."

McCracken: "Given... given..."

Dunn: "That was the original intention and we can have two

36th Legislative Day

April 28, 1987

Subcommittee meetings if the Body insist, but it was for the convenience of everybody that we take care of this particular Subcommittee on Wednesday evening. And I would appreciate the accommodation."

- McCracken: "Okay. Are either of those Subcommittees Bills posted for the Full Committee this week?"
- Dunn: "These are all Bills assigned to Subcommittee, which were posted in the Full Committee last week or posted for tomorrow morning, double posting, in other words, and they will be... they're posted for the Full Committee tomorrow morning, some of them, and they will be assigned to Tort Reform Committee tomorrow for a hearing tomorrow evening.

 The ones that are posted for Committee this week have been double posted."
- McCracken: "And the ones that are double posted will have no chance of being heard by the Full Committee this week, because it will already have met."
- Dunn: "It is... I don't think any of them will be heard in the Full Committee this week, because we haven't had a Tort Reform Committee hearing. They'll be heard next week in Full Committee, all of them."
- McCracken: "Okay. That's... that's your representation that all of these Bills will be heard in the Full Committee next week."
- Dunn: "Yeah. Yeah. Yes, and I think to be... to be honest and candid about it, there is a lot of duplication and the issues will be heard and the Sponsor will be accommodated, I am hopeful that some Sponsors will combine Bills or consider amending one Bill into another, but, yes, we will accommodate the Sponsor. It is my commitment to call the Tort Reform Bills for a hearing next week. That's... that's correct."
- McCracken: "Now, in your request to amend together various Bills

36th Legislative Day

April 28, 1987

into a single Bill, do you propose to retain Republican Sponsorship Bills to be controlled by Republicans or do you propose to mix it between Republicans and Democrats?"

Dunn: "I am... I have a genuine representation for bipartisanship
in this Body, and I intend to adhere to that, but that's
not part of this discussion. I'll be happy to talk to you
about that off the microphone."

McCracken: "Well then, we don't agree if... if we can't get a decision from the Chairman on whether this telescoping of Bills is going to be for the benefit of the Democrats and the detriment of the Republicans. We don't agree. We object to the Gentleman's Motion."

Dunn: "This has nothing to do with... the issue before the Body this time is raised by me at whether to have one Subcommittee meeting on Wednesday evening and hear all the Bills when there is time or hear half of them on Wednesday evening and squeeze in the other half on Thursday morning when Members are racing back and forth hetween assignments and Judiciary II Committee. So... and this was simply a mix up over here about posting. So, there's no devious plot, and if you persist in your objection, we'll have two Subcommittee hearings."

McCracken: "Mr. Speaker, I've heard the Gentleman's answer."

Speaker Greiman: "Yes. Proceed. Sir."

McCracken: "And I object to the Motion."

Speaker Greiman: "Yeah. Alright. Mr. Dunn, do you wish... you may wish to make a Motion to that effect in writing and... which is your privilege as it is the Gentleman from DuPage's privilege not to agree. The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Keane. you had an announcement."

Keane: "Yeah, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just wanted to alert
those who might have Bills in the Real Estate Tax
Subcommittee and the House Revenue Committee. The meeting

36th Legislative Day

April 28, 1987

next week on House... of that Subcommittee has been set for Tuesday. So, in order to post those Bills, in order for Bills to be posted to that Subcommittee, you have to contact Ron Levin or the Republican staff and ask them to have it posted; otherwise, we will not be able to hear those Bills. Thank you."

Speaker Greiman: "Speaker Madigan in the Chair."

Speaker Madigan: "Ladies and Gentlemen, could 1 have your attention? We have with us today a very distinguished guest, the Australian Ambassador to the United States who plans to deliver some remarks. So, if the Members could please be in their chairs and would staff please leave the floor. Will staff leave the floor? Will Members please be in their chairs? Mr. Ronan, could you take your seat? Will staff please leave the floor? Will Members please be their chairs? The Ambassador will be introduced by the Australian Counsel General assigned to the City of Chicago, Terence McCarthy. So, Mr. McCarthy."

McCarthy: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the Legislature, it gives

me a great pleasure to be back again, but this time to
introduce the distinguished Australian Ambassador to the
United States, Mr. Rawdon Dalrymple. Mr. Dalrymple is a
career Australian diplomat and has been for some 30 years.

He has served most recently as our Ambassador to Indonesia
and prior to that our Ambassador to Israel, and he has been
in the United States for nearly the last two years and it
gives me very great pleasure on behalf of Speaker Madigan
to invite His Excellency to address this Assembly."

Rawdon Dalrymple: "Mr. Speaker, distinguished Members of the Assembly and my good friend and colleague, Counsel General McCarthy, thank you very much for those introductory remarks. I can see that this is a very healthy Assembly. There's an apple in front of every place and quite a few of

36th Legislative Day

April 28. 1987

you are obviously enjoying them. That's a... that's a. I'm sure. a good sign on a lovely day like this. I'm verv grateful for the honor and privilege of addressing this House. Pontius said, it was Abraham Lincoln served in this Legislature and from this City, Lincoln left to President of the United States of America. Lincoln. for Australians, has become, perhaps, the best known of all Americans. He's a symbol of leadership in bringing justice to all races and giving everyone the... of his experience for them in the Constitution. Illinois is an important state of the union, the fifth largest. It has produced many of this country's leaders. For example, the hirth place of both President and Mrs. Reagan. Next year, we have the bicentenary in Australia. By the time Australia first settled two hundred years ago, the United States had already become independent. And the links between mv country and yours started very early in our history. In fact. we owe our origins to the same set of circumstances. You know. the British used Georgia and the Carolinas as a place to send their convicted convicts for many years, and then in 1776, because some people felt that there should be no taxation without representation, the British found themselves without anywhere to send their convicts. short interval. I remembered that someone called Captain Cook had sent a favorable report about a place called Botany Bay on the other side of the world, and they decided that that might be an appropriate place to send the convicts who hadn't been... they were not longer able send to this country. So, really we owe our existence to the decision of the people of this country, in resist the imposition of taxation without representation to sever their links with England. I'm informed that in the current Session, this Legislature will be debating some new

36th Legislative Day

April 28, 1987

and increased taxation. It's been two hundred years that we have had a close association with the United States, culminating. I think. in the closest association Australia has with any country. We have verv close defense the strategic links with the United States. United States is our second largest trading partner. have many institutional links. The United States is one of our main sources of tourists, of immigrants. associated with the United States in the last four of the wars which this country has fought. We now have very close links between the Federal Legislature here and the Federal Legislature in Australia. Frequent visits by Senators and Congressmen to Australia and by our Legislators in this direction. In all of this. Illinois has played an important role as a trading partner for Australia and because of the numbers of people from this part of the United States who've been involved in Australia variety of ways. One of the most distinguished or the most prominent citizens of Illinois who have left their mark on Australia, is a man called Walter Burley Griffin, who was an architect who had worked with Frank Lloyd Wright. and who won an international competition to design Australia's national capitol, Canberra. There is also many houses in my hometown, Sidney, that were designed by Walter Burley Griffin during his time in Australia. He's better known. perhaps. In Australia than he is here, but he was a great and distinguished architect. As is very frequent with good friends, there are some disagreements between the United States and Australia, particularly on the trade This country has a favorable balance of trade with side. Australia of more than two to one. I find that people in the United States find it somewhat difficult to believe that the United States has a large trading surplus with any

36th Legislative Day

April 28, 1987

country, but you do with Australia. We have a big deficit In our trade with you. And we encounter in getting better access to your markets. Many of the same sorts of problems that you encounter with Japan. We encounter quotas on many of exports in United States and other areas. Me purchase nearly one and a half billion dollars worth of defense equipment every year in this country. And for that, we pay We don't get it on loan terms or anv other soft terms like some of vour other allies. we pay cash for There are that. several important Illinois based companies, such as, Borg Warner, Sara Lee, Motorola and Brunswick, which have good business with Australia. And I it's in the interest of Illinois as well as in the interest of Australia that that acting trading relationship continues. We provide a good market for a number o f important companies, and therefore, play our part in job creation and maintenance in this state. Our ability continue to be able to do this is affected, of course, by United States Policies on Agriculture which to our interest, and we very much hope that the tendency towards increased protectionism in this country won't be allowed to race away because that would do great not only to your trading relations with Australia, damage. of which you already have a huge surplus, but I think to, prosperity generally. T find enormous good will toward Australia and the United States. It's not in to policy decision favorable to us, but we are working on that, and I hope we can have your good will For the last two hundred years. in that regard. Australians have been as the close friends and allies with United States, and the Unites States has looked on the Australia and relied on Australia for support and help in difficult circumstances; for example, the Vietnam

36th Legislative Day

April 28, 1987

period, and before that, in Korea, and I'm sure that's going to continue. In a world that... where democracy is shrinking and under pressure, democracies like Australia and the United States need to stick together and to give each other all the help, the mutual help they can. And I'm very delighted to be able to be present today in this distinguished House which is one of the fountain heads of democracy in this country. Thank you very much for receiving me today."

- Speaker Madigan: "Thank you very much, Mr. Ambassador and Mr. McCarthy. Both the Ambassador and Mr. McCarthy will be available for a short time if there are any of you who wish to talk with them privately about any of the concerns that may exist between our state and the government of Australia. Thank you very much."
- Speaker Greiman: "Representative Greiman in the Chair. Ms.

 Hasara, you were seeking recognition? For what purpose, Ma
 am?"
- Hasara: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. With the permission of Representative Van Duyne, I'd like to move to suspend the posting requirement for House Bill 230 which was inadvertently left off the Calendar for tomorrow."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Van Duyne."

Van Duyne: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. And also in the same light, House Bills 1945 and 621 were treated the same way, so I have no objection if we waive the posting rules. Mr... Mr. Chairman... I mean, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Greiman: "Yes. Mr. Van Duvne."

Van Duyne: "House Bill 230 and also House Bill 621 have already had testimony given by the Sponsors and their witnesses, and we held them in Committee waiting for another Bill of like quality by Representative Curran. Now, Mr. Curran's Bill has now been settled in our Committee and we're ready

36th Legislative Day

April 28, 1987

to hear it and take a vote on all three Bills. So, I don't know how it got taken off. We were... the Bill was just being continued in Committee. And then there is another Bill, 1945, that we would like to waive the posting regulation for today."

Speaker Greiman: "Let's take these in some orderly series before you add on. It is Ms. Hasara's Motion, or request, to waive the posting rule. Now, you have added a fill."

Van Duyne: "Mr. Kirkland's Bill is in the same category as hers."

Speaker Greiman: "Why don't we take this out of the record for a

little while, and we'll get back to you if that's alright

with you, Ms. Hasara."

Hasara: "Thank you."

Speaker Greiman: "Thank you. Mr. Hoffman, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. With the permission of the Chairman of Elementary and Secondary Education Committee, I'd like to waive the requirement for House Bill 398 which was not posted for this week, but which we had previously heard just waiting for an Amendment."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Hoffman, why don't you just hold that for a second, we'll be with you in a minute?"

Hoffman: "I get it."

Speaker Greiman: "Pullen, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Pullen: "To make an introduction, please, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Greiman: "Within our rules. Alright, proceed Ma'am."

Pullen: "I would like to introduce to the House the eighth grade class of Judah Christian High School in Champaign, Illinois. Their teacher is Mrs. Burton, and an outstanding member of the class is Annette Johnson, who is the daughter of our colleague Tim Johnson."

Speaker Greiman: "Thank you. ... Now, Sir, we're prepared if you

36th Legislative Day

April 28, 1987

wish to put your request. Mr. Hoffman."

- Hoffman: "Yes. I'd like to renew my request to waive the posting requirements for House Bill 398 so it could be heard in Elementary and Secondary Education Committee tomorrow after discussion with the Chairman."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman asks leave of the House to use the Attendance Roll Call to waive the posting requirements on House Bill 3... is that 398, so the Bill may be heard in Committee on Elementary Education tomorrow. Gentleman has leave. You have leave, Sir. Now, Mr. Leverenz, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"
- Leverenz: "Mr. Speaker, I would move to use the Attendance Roll
 Call to hear three Bills in the Appropriations I Committee
 tomorrow evening at 6:00 p.m. That would be House Bills
 784, 773 and 416. That is the first Motion of two."
- Speaker Greiman: "So, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Leverenz, asks
 leave of the House to waive the posting requirements with
 respect to House Bill 784... 784 and what are those other
 numbers, Mr..."

Leverenz: "773."

Speaker Greiman: "773."

Leverenz: "416."

Speaker Greiman: "And 416."

Leverenz: "416. Those are the pick three."

Speaker Greiman: "So that they may be heard tomorrow at 6:00 in the Appropriations number one."

Leverenz: "That's correct."

Speaker Greiman: "We have leave to use the Attendance Roll Call.

Leave is granted, Sir. And now, Ms. Hasara, back to your

desk. Ms. Hasara asks leave of the House to waive the
posting requirements to the House Bill 230 so the Bill may

be heard in the Committee on Counties and Townships. Lady
have leave to use the Attendance Roll Call? She has leave.

36th Legislative Day

April 28, 1987

Mr. Van Duyne, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Van Duyne: "Mr. Speaker, all I was going to do is agree with

Representative Hasara and Kirkland and not object to

waiving the posting rules for House Bill 230 and 621."

Speaker Greiman: "No one has made a Motion with respect to 621."

Van Duyne: "Well, I did."

Speaker Greiman: "Alright. The Gentleman..."

Van Duyne: "And also... and also..."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentlemen from Will, Mr. Van Duyne, asks
leave of the House to use the Attendance Roll Call to waive
the posting requirements on House Bills 621 and..."

Van Duyne: "1945 and 230"

Speaker Greiman: "...and 1945 so that the matter may be heard in the Committee on Counties and Towns. Is there any objection? Mr. McCracken. 230 has already been waived."

McCracken: "Right. My question of the maker of the Motion is, are House Bills 621 and 1945 similar subject matter of House Bill 230? These are unrelated?"

Van Duyne: "No. Representative, one of the Bills is sponsored by Representative Kirkland and it's for some another, it got dropped off of our list. I have no knowledge of why it was taken off. We haven't heard the Bill vet. And 1946... 1945 was given to me by our staffer In fact, all three of these Bills was given to todav. by the staffer."

McCracken: "And which is 1945? Who is the Sponsor?"

Van Duyne: "I have no knowledge"

McCracken: "That's fine. Thank you."

Speaker Greiman: "Alright. The Gentleman asks leave to use the
Attendance Roll Call to waive the posting requirements with
respect to those two Bills. Mr. Leverenz, for what purpose
do you now seek recognition?"

Leverenz: "Yes. That was... the other Motion was my first of

36th Legislative Day

April 28, 1987

two. The second Motion would be to suspend the posting requirement on House Bill 2736 so that the Appropriations I Subcommittee on Transportation could hear it this evening at 6:00 p.m. in the Speaker's Conference Room."

- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman asks leave of the House to use the Attendance Roll Call to waive the posting requirements with respect to House Bill 2736 so that Bill may be heard in the Subcommittee of Appropriations I. Gentleman have leave? You have leave, Sir. Mr. Kulas, the Gentleman from Cook."
- Kulas: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill #918 in Energy and Environment was inadvertently not posted. It's Representative... I would ask leave to have this Bill posted for Energy and Environment tomorrow. House Bill 918."
- Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman asks leave of the House to waive the posting requirements with respect to House Bill 918 so that Bill may be heard in the Committee on Energy and Environment at its meeting tomorrow. Mr. McCracken."
- McCracken: "I don't even know who asked that."
- Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Kulas, the Chairman of the Committee on Energy and Environment."
- McCracken: "And you spoke to Mr. Klemm? Thank you, Mr. Kulas."

 Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman asks leave to use the Attendance Roll

 Call to waive the posting requirements with respect to

 House Bill 918. Mr. Brunsvold, the Gentleman from Rock

 Island."
- Brunsvold: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just to make everybody again aware of the Legislators' Fitness Day tomorrow in Room 114.

 There will be seven tests done as indicated on your sheet on your desks. I'd like to see everybody there. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Peoria, Mr. Tuerk. For what

36th Legislative Day

April 28, 1987

purpose do you seek recognition, Mr. Tuerk?"

- Tuerk: "Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the House not to print... to be able not to print House Bill 2051. It's a revisory Bill. It's a hundred and sum odd pages. I think we can save about 1,500 dollars if we don't print it. I don't think there's any useful purpose involved in printing the Bill. I would ask that we get unanimous consent to do so."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Peoria has asked unanimous consent to waive the requirement of printing with respect to House Bill 2051. Is there leave to use the Attendance Roll Call? Leave is granted. You have leave, Sir. The... on page 16... on page 16 of the Calendar, on the Order of Concurrence appears House Joint Resolution 1. Mr. McPike moves that the House do nonconcur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Resolution 1. All those in favor... Mr. McCracken, ves."

McCracken: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

- Speaker Greiman: "Mr. McPike. Mr... you've made a Motion to nonconcur... Mr... in this... in Senate Joint Resolution 1 and Mr. McCracken asks that you yield for questions. The Gentleman indicates he will yield for questions."
- McCracken: "Thank you. Representative, what is it about Senate

 Amendment 1 that you do not agree with?"
- Speaker Greiman: "Do you want to take it out of the record for a few moments?"

McPike: "Yeah, I guess so."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Shaw, for what purpose..."

Shaw: "Yes... yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. It's a pleasure to see that we have a shoe shine person in the men's washroom. We've been needing that here for a long time. So, we can get ourselves a shine now."

36th Legislative Day

April 28, 1987

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Shaw, thank you for that announcement. I'm advised that the Chief of Staff has not... is not the doing that work himself, nor has he placed anybody on the state payroll to do that work. So, that whoever that party may be will have to work certainly without state employment, Mr. Shaw. So, that's made very clear. Alright. On page 15 of the Calendar, on the Order of Consent Calendar Second Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bills."

Second Reading. Second Day. Clerk O'Brien: "Consent Calendar House Bill 367, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill Insurance Code. 404 (sic - House Bill 404), a Bill for an Act tο certain Acts in relation to sale and use of human body parts. Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 407. a Bill for an Act in relation to anatomical gifts, together with Committee Amendment #1. Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 465, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 632, a Bill for in relation to revise the law in relation to counties. Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 640. a Bill for Act to amend Hearing Aid Consumer Protection Act. Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 642, a Bill for an Act amend the Illinois Municipal Code. Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 674, a Bill for an Act tο amend the Illinois Public Aid Code, together with Committee Amendment Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 714. a Bill for an Act to amend the Uniform Commercial Code. Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 730, a Bill for an Act to amend the Vital Records Act, together with Committee Amendment #1. Second Reading of the Bill. House Bill 803. Bill for an Act to amend the Park District Code. Second Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Greiman: "Third Reading. On page 13 of the Calendar, on

36th Legislative Day

April 28, 1987

the Order of House Bills Third Reading, Short Debate, appears House Bill 35. Ms. Stern, do you wish to proceed. House Bill 35. Out of the record. On that Order of Business appears House Bill 439, Ms. Currie. 439."

- Currie: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. House
- Speaker Greiman: "Did you wish... Excuse me, Ms. Currie, do you wish to proceed? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 439, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act in relation to Chicago Park District. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Greiman: "The Lady from Cook, Ms. Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. House Bill 439 is a simple conveyance Bill. It would convey land under the water of Lake Michigan at the northeast corner by the Shedd Aquarium so that the Shedd... from the Department of Transportation to the parks so that the Shedd Aquarium could proceed with its new sea mammal aquarium activity. The Legislature has already supported that program through the Build Illinois funding, and the Department of Transportation, the Governor's office supports this simple land transfer. I'd be happy to answer questions and I would appreciate your support."

Speaker Greiman: "The Lady from Cook moves for the passage of House Bill 439. And on that, does anyone stand in opposition? The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. McCracken."

McCracken: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to remove this Bill from Short

Debate. I'm joined by the requisite number of colleagues."

Speaker Greiman: "Indeed, proceed, Sir. Do you wish to address the Bill?"

McCracken: "Please."

Speaker Greiman: "Proceed."

McCracken: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

36th Legislative Day

April 28, 1987

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

McCracken: "Representative, how much land is involved in this conveyance?"

Currie: "I believe it's less than..."

McCracken: "It's approximately two acres, right?"

Currie: "Yeah, 2.01 acres."

McCracken: "And is the land to be improved in any way. Is it to be drained and used for Shedd Aquarium purposes?"

Currie: "It is... it is... what the Shedd Aquarium is doing is building around that chunk of land at its northeast corner a new ocean by the Lake so that sea mammals can be viewed at the Aquarium as well as the fish that are presently there."

McCracken: "So, it will be an outdoor aquarium as an adjunct to the indoor aquarium."

Currie: "That's exactly right."

McCracken: "And is there any funding necessary to build that or is... is there any contemplation for funding?"

Currie: "My understanding is that the project will cost 38,000,000 dollars. The Governor allocated 5,000,000 dollars in Build Illinois funding to help support that project. The rest of the money, as I understand it, will be raised by the Aquarium."

McCracken: "That will be general obligation bonds of the Aquarium, Chicago Park District Museum matched fund bonds."

Currie: "That's my understanding, Representative."

McCracken: "On those matched fund bonds, is any State of Illinois
appropriation or money used in order to come up with the
matching part?"

Currie: "I do not believe for this purpose there is any matching fund from the state."

McCracken: "Alright. Now..."

Currie: "We do have a separate program of direct support to

36th Legislative Day

- April 28, 1987
- museums on park district land, and that would include the Shedd Aquarium, but I believe that is operation support, not building or capital expansion support.
- McCracken: "Has the Corps of Engineers conducted any impact study
 to determine whether this is a compatible use?"
- Currie: "Yes, it has, Representative."
- McCracken: "What was the result of that study?"
- Currie: "My understanding is that the Corps of Engineers plans to give final approval to the project as soon as we pass House Bill 439."
- McCracken: "Has a... an appraisal been made of this land for purposes of conveyance?"
- Currie: "The Department of Transportation in encouraging support for this Bill did not suggest that an appraisal had been organized."
- McCracken: "However, we have a requirement for conveyances that
 an appraisal accompany a bill to convey. Has an opinion
 been passed upon whether or not that appraisal for purposes
 of our rules is necessary?"
- Currie: "I think that that requirement doesn't apply for intergovernmental transfers. I don't know how you would appraise the value of the beach bottom that itself is under water. I'm not quite sure what valuation procedure would be appropriate."
- McCracken: "Well, surely the appraisal requirement relates to intergovernmental conveyances. We've had that experience all the time of attempts of local municipalities to convey to either the state or vice versa."
- Currie: "Representative, I would expect that the Illinois

 Department of Transportation, the Governor's road, highway

 and lake front bottom agency, would surely have done all

 that was required for them to decide to support House Bill

 439."

36th Legislative Day

April 28, 1987

McCracken: "All that was required of them, I'm talking about a

House rule which requires an appraisal before a land

conveyance can be made. I have nothing further, Mr.

Speaker."

Speaker Greiman: "Pardon? The Lady from Cook, Ms. Pullen. The Gentleman from Winnebago, Mr. Hallock."

Hallock: "Thank you. Will the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Greiman: "Indicates she will."

Hallock: "With the legendary lake levels of recent years, especially within the last couple of years, I think we've all witnessed erosion of the shore lines, not only in Chicago, but also other parts of Illinois, Michigan and also Wisconsin. What will reclaiming two more acres of water over land do to that issue?"

Currie: "I think that's a very good question, Representative. question was asked in Committee, and I'm sure that the Department of Transportation and the Army Corps Engineers considered that issue before deciding to support this project. My understanding is that if this this Aquarium were even larger than it will displacement would amount to three one thousands of inch-So, less than three one thousands and an inch. And I think for that reason neither the Army Corps of Engineers nor the State Department of Transportation thought there was a problem with this project."

Hallock: "Well, two acres of submerged land, it seems like the Shedd Aquarium area now, if you walk on the east side, is partially under water. That area, of course, at one time was a bike trail and now is almost completely submerged. It seems to me that when you displace two acres of water, submerged land, that you actually eventually talk about more than just two acres. It would seems to me overall that a two acre tract... I suppose you talk in terms of

36th Legislative Day

April 28, 1987

inches, but the overall impact on the Chicago area vicinity itself, would you know what that would be?"

Currie: "I'm sorry, I didn't hear."

- Hallock: "Well, the question was on the direct impact, for example, on the Lake Shore Drive area, which, you know, Lake Shore Drive, during the past couple of years, has frequently been closed because of high water, especially during storms and so on. To replace that would cost billions. Are we, in essence, here establishing a program which will set up that in process as well?"
- Currie: "No, and there is no risk to Lake Shore Drive by virtue of this aquarium proposal. Maybe I could answer also a prior question that I was not able to answer when it was addressed, and that is the issue of real estate appraisals and House rules. House Rule 34(g), which describes our actions in respect to land tranfers, exempts from a filing requirement any conveyance other than a governmental unit or agency as the transferee."
- Hallock: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, I think I, like most Members on this side of the aisle, take great pride in the tremendous facility... the Shedd Aquarium, in fact, is. But at this point in time, I have great reservation about this issue. To take back from the lake two acres of submerged land, I'm not really sure what the impact of that will be on Lake Shore... the Lake Shore itself and the Illinois... Chicago area and the rest of Illinois. So, I would urge this be defeated at this point in time."

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Livingston, Mr. Ewing."

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

if the Sponsor would yield? The Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Greiman: "Indicates she'll for questions."

Ewing: "Representative, I'm sure this question has been asked,

36th Legislative Day

- April 28, 1987
- but there's so little order in here that I can't... I couldn't hear. What effect does this have if they fill this ground on the level of the lake?"
- Currie: "Virtually, none. If the project were 250 times its proposed size, it would raise the level of the lake by about the depth of one side of one plastic baggie. I think you might call that negligible..."
- Ewing: "You mean... you mean, it would raise it several inches?"
- Currie: "No. I said, if the project were 250 times larger than its proposed size, it would raise the lake level as much as one side of a plastic baggie."
- Ewing: "Alright. Do they intend to..."
- Currie: "It's an imprecise definition. How about if I said less than three one thousands of an inch."
- Ewing: "Of course, you know every little rain drop makes for the flood."
- Currie: "Right."
- Ewing: "Yes. Are they planning on filling the entire area and building on it?"
- Currie: "I'm sorry."
- Ewing: "Are they going to fill the entire area and use it for a building site in addition?"
- Currie: "No. My understanding is, there is a really quite nice book, and maybe you'd like to come and have a look at it.

 My understanding is that it's really the externals so that all the little sea animals will have an opportunity to splash about and be viewed by the assembled tourists, downstaters, city residents, and all of us who are interested in aquatic life."
- Ewing: "Does this aquarium museum get funds through the legislation we passed last year to allocate, I believe it was some of the race horse money?"
- Currie: "Which monies... my understanding is that the Governor

36th Legislative Day

April 28. 1987

allocated 5.000.000 dollars in Build Illinois funds for help in this capital construction project. Additionally. through the State Department of Energy and Natural Resources, there is a small program of operational, not capital development support, for museums in this among them the museums on park district land. that total is around 3,000,000, and there are some 21 of 25 museums that participate in that funding, but that monev. as I understand it. is operational money and is not involved in this capital construction project."

Ewing: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'm this is a very worthwhile project and I can tell one that has the very deep interest of this Body because of the and attention that it amount of order seems to he receiving, but I think there are several things about this Bill that make it somewhat untolerable to me. First of all, everything that we do to the lake as far as filling on the lake, increases the problem of the high Second, we're using money for this that comes from the race horse industry and none of that money is going to downstate museums. only to museums and in the City of Chicago. think that's unfair. I think it's an unfair way to fund And for those reasons, I would suggest that we give this a 'no' vote and send it back to the Committee. also think there would be some serious ecology problems here with dumping all that waste in the lake to use as fill."

Speaker Greiman: "Lady from Cook, Ms. Parcells."

Parcells: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I also rise in opposition to this Bill. I represent many miles of lakeshore up north of this area. And my constituents are aware, as I think every Member of this House is, that any time you fill in the lake, you're going to have an adverse effect up stream and

36th Legislative Day

April 28, 1987

down stream, one or both. At the time, we were talking about filling for the World's Fair, as you may remember, there were threats from other states, Wisconsin, Indiana, Michigan, that they would file a lawsuit against us for tampering with the lake. I have heard it on rather good authority that if this goes through and we fill at this site, they will initiate a lawsuit against the State of Illinois for doing this. And for those reasons, I am opposed to this Bill."

Speaker Greiman: "Ms. Currie, to close."

Currie: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I think the discussion of this Bill has gone far beyond its There is no money involved in this Bill at all. contents. It is merely a land transfer, 2.01 acres of lake from the Illinois Department of Transportation to the Shedd Aguarium for purposes of a construction project not effectively raise lake levels. The Bill has the support of the environmental community, the Chicago Park the Governor of the State of District. Illinois, the of the Shedd Aquarium, environmental operators across the state and the Army Corps of Engineers. appreciate your support for House Bill 439 so this project And the additional 40,000,000 dollars in tourist money that will be spent because this aquatic museum is available can begin to fill the state treasury coffers in Illinois."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Terzich, were you seeking recognition on this Bill or..."

Terzich: "Yes, I would like to speak on the Bill."

Speaker Greiman: "Well, I didn't see your light. With leave,
we'll let you speak. Gentleman have leave? Proceed, Sir."

Terzich: "Well, yes, Mr. Speaker. No... this particular Bill,
which received favorable support in the Committee, simply

36th Legislative Day

April 28. 1987

deeds over some land which is a bottom land in lake Michigan, which we did hear testimony which wouldn't make a difference one way or another. If they're trying to figure this is going to have some problem with Lake Michigan erosion or diversion of water. this is an absolutely ridiculous statement that all of sudden that we become part of the Army Corps of Engineers. This Bill has received favorable support from everybody that 1 know to allow one of the finest attractions in the entire State of Illinois, which is the Shedd Aguarium, which the largest aquarium within the United States, which has drawn many, many people from all, not only different of the United States, from all over the world as one of the great attraction in the midwest. And for us not to support this type of legislation is really sort of ridiculous and especially those people who are concerned about diversion. We've supported many, many programs that cost substantial more money whether it's with the 2005 downstate agriculture or fairgrounds, or whatever you have. but this is one great attraction for the City of Chicago in the entire State of Illinois, and all it does is just to allow the land transfer. And I would urge your support of this Bill."

Speaker Greiman: "The question is, "Shall this pass?" All those in 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? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 69 voting 'aye', 43 voting 'no', 4 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of House Bills Third Reading, Short Debate, appears House Bill 441. Mr. Dunn, did you wish proceed? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

36th Legislative Day

April 28, 1987

- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 441, a Bill for an Act in relation to tax exemptions from certain businesses, enterprises and amending certain Acts herein named. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Dunn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House.

 House Bill 441 is essentially a piece of clean up
 legislation. I don't know of any opposition. It removes
 what is called the 'but for' clause from one aspect of the
 enterprise zone legislation to enable those who plan to
 make investments to do so in such a way it will be
 advantageous to them and to the taxpayers of the State of
 Illinois. And I request an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Macon has moved for the passage of House Bill 441. And on that, is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed Voting is open. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have a11 Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this voted who wish? question there are one hundred and... Mr. Mulcahev On this question there are 110 voting 'aye', none voting and none voting 'present'. This Bill. having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared Representative Breslin in the Chair." passed.
- Speaker Breslin: "Ladies and Gentlemen, we are going to the Order of Concurrences. It appears on page 16 on your Calendar. Representative Hallock, for what reason do you rise?
- Hallock: "Madam Speaker, on the Order of Short Debate, we went through three Democratic Bills. We're now on House Bill 579, Larry Wennlund. It seems only proper that, having done three Democratic Bills, it will be logical and proper that we proceed on that Order of Business and call his Bill

36th Legislative Day

April 28. 1987

which is next."

- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Hallock, we have housekeeping chores to do, et cetera, and so, it is time to move from that Order of Business."
- Hallock: "Well, Madam Speaker, I'm all in order of... in favor of keeping the House in order, but the last Bill took thirty second."
- Speaker Breslin: "It is certainly not... Representative Hallock.

 Representative Hallock, it is not intended to disadvantage

 Representative Wennlund or anyone else, but we must take

 care of this Order of Business, plus other Orders of

 Business. We are going to the Order of Concurrence. House

 Joint Resolution #1. And on that question...

 Representative Hallock, for what reason do you rise?"
- Hallock: "Well, no matter what the intention is, it's very clear that you're skipping his Bill. There were three Bills you called. The last Bill took thirty seconds. You could probably be done with his Bill in another thirty seconds, and you can be done with that Order of Business and move on."
- Hallock: "Representative Hallock, as I recall, you participated in a large discussion on another Bill just prior to that that took a lot more than thirty minutes... thirty seconds, I should say."

Hallock: "It was a good discussion, too, wasn't it?"

Speaker Breslin: "Oh, it was a great discussion."

Hallock: "It was a good discussion and a bad Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "As a consequence, we have run out of time. We are on the Order of Concurrence. House Joint Resolution #1. Do you wish to speak to this Joint Resolution, Representative Churchill. For what reason do you rise, Representative Churchill?"

Churchill: "Madam Speaker, I concur with Representative Hallock's

36th Legislative Day

April 28, 1987

feelings on this, and I question the Sponsor of the next
Bill that was up, and he said it will only take thirty
seconds. Just thirty seconds."

- Speaker Breslin: "Representative... Representative Churchill.

 Representative Churchill, the Chair has the right to change
 the Order of Business at any time."
- Churchill: "I understand. Right, but the... "
- Speaker Breslin: "We have done so in an effort to move the Business of this House. We are going to the Order of Concurrences. House Joint Resolution #1. And on that question... Representative McCracken, for what reason do you rise?"
- McCracken: "A point of Order, Madam Speaker, I'd ask the Chair to reconsider its decision to move. Whether it makes move in good faith or not, it's not really material. create the impression, the Chair creates the impression that it is discriminating against this Membership. You*ve created Subcommittees discriminate to against this Membership. You are proposing Committee Bills which will be controlled only by Democrats in detriment to this of the aisle, and now, when we come to a Republican Member's Bill after having had three Bills of Democrats called and then you go to another Democrat Resolution, you create the appearance which leaves you vulnerable to these charges. Madam Speaker. And I ask you and the real Speaker to consider that."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative McCracken."

- McCracken: "When the time comes when you'll need our cooperation."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative McCracken... Representative McCracken, we'll consider that. Representative Greiman, on House Joint Resolution #1."
- Greiman: "Thank you, Speaker. I would that the House do

36th Legislative Day

April 28. 1987

nonconcur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Joint Resolution

- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved to nonconcur in Senate

 Amendment #1 to House Joint Resolution #1. And on that

 question, the Gentleman from DuPage, Representative

 McCracken."
- McCracken: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Senate Amendment... I rise in opposition to the Gentleman's Motion to it fails. we'll make a Motion to concur. Senate Amendment \$1 would restore the Committee Size. as originally proposed, to 13 Members. Four Legislators from each chamber, four public members, who are to be appointed by the four House and Senate leaders, and one Member by the Governor's designee. That Member from the Governor will be a voting Member. That is necessary to retain the political balance which the Amendment seeks to enforce upon Mr. Madigan's Select Joint Committee. I encourage all of my to vote against this Motion to concur... to colleagues nonconcur. And if it fails, we'll be making that Motion. I also demand a... an electrical Roll Call."
- Speaker Breslin: "Is there any further discussion? Hearing none,

 Representative Greiman, to close."
- Greiman: "Thank you. Well, the Amendment is patently unfair and patently disregards equity. The notion was originally, when we began this in a prior year, that there would equity between the two parties. And so, the Democrats Republicans had the same number. The Republicans chose not The Committee never met. A quorum was never to show up. had. Now, the Democrats come and say, 'Well, let's give it a Democratic balance then. We send the Resolution across with a Democratic Majority. It comes back not even equi ty or parity, it's come back with a Republican Majority. The Governor of this state is a Republican. So.

36th Legislative Day

April 28, 1987

we find, then, that we have responsibilities of the House of Representatives and the Senate of this state to redo the health care regulations of this state. 67 Democrats and 31 Democrats in the Senate are to be essentially put in a Minority position on this Committee. That makes no sense. We would be willing indeed to go back to the rule of the previous Session and have an equal number of Democrats and Republicans, but to expect a Democrat... 67 Democrats, 68 Democrats, that's right, I'm sorry, 68 Democrats to vote away their Majority is insane. Therefore, I ask that we nonconcur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Joint Resolution 1."

Speaker Breslin: "The question is, *Shall the House nonconcur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Joint Resolution #1?* 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 67 voting 'aye', 48 voting 'no', none voting 'present'. and the House does nonconcur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Joint Resolution #1. have five minutes left, we're going to go back to House Bills Third Reading Short Debate Calendar. Representative Wennlund. Clerk, read the Bill. House Bill 579."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 579"

Speaker Breslin: "Excuse me. Excuse me. Representative

McCracken, for what reason do you rise?"

McCracken: "Just to thank the Chair for seeing the light of our argument."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative... Mr. Clerk, continue, please."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 579, a Bill for an Act to amend the

Township Law. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Wennlund."

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

36th Legislative Day

April 28, 1987

Bill amends the Township Act by extending the power townships to make public improvements and infrastructure improvements, like sidewalks and street lights unincorporated of townships in areas counties population of 300,000 or more instead of 400,000. The current Act only permits these types of improvements in counties with a population in excess of 400,000. would merely amend that provision to three counties of 300,000 or more."

Speaker Breslin: "This Bill is on the Order of Short Debate. Does anyone rise in opposition? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 579 pass?' All those in favor vote Voting is 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. open. Representative Parke, for what reason do you rise? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The will take the record. On this question there are 110 voting 'aye', 4 voting 'no', and 1 voting 'present', and passes House Bill 579. House House Bill Representative Homer. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 615, a Bill for an Act to amend the Criminal Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Homer."

Homer: "Thank vou. Madam Speaker. Under present law individual charged with theft under 300 dollars ordinarily have a misdemeanor charge. Although the statute provides that on a second or subsequent offense, that it is enhanced to a Class 4 Felony. This Bill clarifies what is... created some confusion in practice. that being, number one, whether the occurrence of the prior offense needs to be alleged in the indictment or complaint, and secondly, whether the prior offense need to be proved as an element of the offense. The Bill says, yes, it has to be alleged in the indictment. No, it does not have to

36th Legislative Day

April 28. 1987

passage."

be proved and any other result would have defendant subjected to introduction of testimony of prior convictions which certainly could be prejudicial to the defendant's The second part of the Bill addresses a proposition set forth in People versus Jackson, an 1984 Illinois Supreme Court case concerning the charge of theft over 300 dollars. The Supreme Court in that case said that the element of the value of the property stolen is not to be a requirement to be proven as an element of the offense the prosecution, but rather is to be consider only by the Judge in determining at sentencing whether this is a felony or misdemeanor. This case... this House Bills says that... that the value would, in fact, be an element of the offense and must be proved as an element beyond a reasonable doubt.

I would entertain any questions and move for its Breslin: "This Bill is on the Order of Short Debate. Speaker

Does anyone rise in opposition? Representative Young. "Yes, thank you, Madam Speaker. Will the Sponsor Young: yield?"

Speaker Breslin: "He indicates he will."

Young: "I'd just like a clarification. Does the... did you state that the prior offense does not have to be proved?"

Homer: "That's correct, Representative Young, and., because the statute is currently silent. In practice. I understand it varies according to the Judge's interpretation. Same require that the prior offense be proven and.; of course. if that's the ruling of the court, it's highly prejudicial to a defendant. So. this Bill says that it's not element of the offense. It must be alleged, but it's not an element of the offense."

"Representative Homer, isn't the underlying or the purpose Young: of the Bill to make the second conviction a felony rather than a misdemeanor?"

Homer: "Well, that's current law. The second conviction is a

36th Legislative Day

April 28, 1987

felony under current law, so the Bill doesn't change that.

It just deals with the manner in which the prosecution goes about establishing that element.

- Young: "Well, this Bill would make it possible for a prior conviction to be alledged and then someone to be sentenced, as if he had a prior conviction, without proving the prior conviction. So, if, in fact, there was no prior conviction under this Bill, somebody would still be charged and convicted of a felony if, in fact, it should be a misdemeanor."
- "Well. I don't believe Homer: that is the intent nor the Bill. accomplishment of the I don*t Representative Young. It would still be incumbent on the prosecution to establish at the time of sentencina validity of the prior conviction so that there would be an ample opportunity for the defendant to object to the allegation if, in fact, there's no basis for it. But. the purpose again is to keep this highly prejudicial information away from the trier fact, away from the jury so as to not taint the jury in these cases against the defendant."

Young: "Is the indictment read to the jury in this Bill?"

Homer: "It should not be. The indictment should not, under any circumstances, in my view, be read to the jury, and I would certainly think that would be a highly improper thing for the court to do."

Young: "Thank you."

Speaker Breslin: "If there is no further discussion, the question is, *Shall House Bill 615 pass?* All those in favor Vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have a11 voted who wish? Representative... Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will On this question there are 114 voting take the record.

36th Legislative Day

April 28, 1987

aye, none voting *no*, and 1 voting *present*. And the House does adopt House Bill 615. Ladies and Gentlemen. we're going to the Order of Speaker's Table. And on Order. House joint Resolutions only. The first one that appears is House Joint Resolution 18. Out of the House Joint Resolution 43. Out of the record. House Joint Resolution 56. Representative Madigan - Currie. Read the Resolution, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Joint Resolution 56, creates a Joint
Committee on Welfare Reform. Rules Committee recommends
'be adopted'."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Members of the House. This creates a Joint Committee, a Senate/House Committee, to look at issues involved in welfare reform. A strong initiative, one supported by Democrats and Republicans alike, and strong initiative recommended by the Governor for serious consideration by the Legislature this Session.

I'd be happy to answer questions, and I'd appreciate your support."

Speaker Breslin: "The Lady has moved for the adoption of House

Joint Resolution 56. And on that question, the Gentleman

from DuPage, Representative McCracken."

McCracken: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Would you tell me,

Representative, the composition of the Membership?"

Currie: "I don't have a copy of the Resolution right here. My recollection is that there are three Legislative Members appointed by the Speaker of the House and the President of the Senate, two public members appointed again by each, two Legislative Members, appointed by the Minority Leader in the House and the Minority Leader in the Senate, and one public member appointed by each of those."

McCracken: "Okay. I didn't quite catch that. What is the break

36th Legislative Day

April 28, 1987

down?"

Currie: "I'm sorry. It's five Legislators by each of the
Majority Party Leaders and two public members, three
Legislative Members by each of the Minority Leaders and two
public... and one public member a piece."

McCracken: "And what is the purpose of this Commission?"

Currie: "The purpose of the Committee is to help review the Governor's welfare proposals, review welfare proposals that have come from others, report the General Assembly by June 1, 1987. The Resolution was offered by Representatives Rock... Representative Madigan and Senator Rock, because there is, I believe, a lot of bipartisan support for the Governor's welfare initiatives."

McCracken: "And..."

Currie: "The Joint Committee offers us an opportunity to look at the issue conjointly with the chamber on the other side of the rotunda, to do so in a bipartisan manner, to permit public participation so that what we finally do this Session, and perhaps next year as well, in the area of reforming the public welfare system, is action that will be understood... well understood by everybody."

McCracken: "It is correct that there are a lot of welfare reform

Bills pending in various Committees of the Legislature at
this time. Is that right?"

Currie: "That is right."

McCracken: "Are you Chairman of Human Services, Ha'am?"

Currie: "No, I'm not."

McCracken: "But you serve on It."

Currie: "Pardon me?"

McCracken: "Do you serve on it?"

Currie: "No."

McCracken: "Okay. Do you happen to know how many Bills are in on that issue?"

36th Legislative Day

April 28, 1987

- Currie: "I would guess upwards of thirty in this chamber... in this chamber, and I don't know what the numbers are in the
- McCracken: "Oh, I... Yeah, I'm sorry. I said Human Services, I

 meant State Government Administration."
- Currie: "I am the Chairman of State Government Administration."

 McCracken: "And is that where they're located?"
- Currie: "There are several welfare reform proposals in State
 Government Administration. There are several in the Human
 Services Committee. I would not be surprised if there are
 other pieces of programs in the Special Committee on
 Children in other Committees as well."
- McCracken: "Okay. What do you plan to do as Chairman of your

 Committee while this Commission conducts its investigation?

 Are you going to be hearing and reporting out these Bills?"
- Currie: "That is my present plan, but I... It is certainly possible, with a June 1st reporting date, that the full Assembly might decide to defer action on... final action on welfare proposals until that time, but I think that decision, were it made, would be made as a bipartisan decision and with the support, not the opposition, of the Governor and his Department of Public Aid."
- McCracken: "What if the Minority were in opposition to holding up those Bills, is it your position that you would have those Bills voted upon and move them through the process?"
- Currie: "It is my position that the establishment of this Joint House/Senate Committee, as proposed in House Joint Resolution 56, will enable us to reach bipartisan consensus on the best way to approach welfare reform in Illinois in 1987. And it is my position that a bipartisan, by House, by chamber program will enable us to do the best job with the least amount of friction and fractiousness."
- McCracken: "The Governor has already had a task force on welfare

36th Legislative Day

April 28, 1987

reform which is already reported. Are you aware of that?"

Currie: "I have seen the report of the Governor's task force on welfare reform."

McCracken: "Are you aware of the fact that that welfare reform has been introduced in the form of legislation in House Bill 2853?"

Currie: "And House Bill 2862. Those two Bills embody the Governor's proposals. As I say..."

McCracken: "And are the Sponsors of each Bill a Republican?"

Currie: "Pardon me, Representative?"

McCracken: "Are the Sponsors, the Chief Sponsors of each of those
Bills, Republican?"

Currie: "I believe they are."

McCracken: "And assuming that the other side of the aisle chooses not to proceed with those Bills, it's your position that this Joint Committee should be looking for a bipartisan consensus. Is that right?"

Currie: "Representative, you're making assumptions about decisions will be made. My point is that if we want a bipartisan, bichamber process, if the Legislature wants to do anything other than rubber stamp the Governor's proposals, an activity that I never known you to looks, careful investigation without careful Governor's plan, then supporting House Resolution 56 is the best way that we can... that we can do that."

McCracken: "Touche'. Okay. To the Resolution, Madam Speaker."

Speaker Breslin: "Proceed."

McCracken: "I believe that really the Resolution is, in fact, what I implied that it was. It was an attempt to co-opt the work that the Governor's task force has already done on this subject and co-oped it for purely political partisan reasons. There is no intimation by any person that the Governor's task force did an inadequate job. If people

36th Legislative Day

April 28, 1987

want to vote against the particular part of that proposal, they are free to do so. If they want to get on as cosponsors of that proposal, they are free to do so. submit to you that this Resolution is nothing more than guise for co-opting and using, for the Democrats purposes, good ideas from the Governor's task force. dood embodied in Republican legislation that the other side of the aisle does not want to have credited to the Republican We have sought long and hard to come to grips with Partv. this issue. The Governor's task force should be commended. Representative Daniels and the other Sponsors should be commended. To allow us to be co-opted at this point, under the guise a bipartisan commission, is only that, а is no intention to use this Bill or to use this Resolution to do anything but control the issue of It's unnecessary. Be satisfied with Use it properly. Don 't abuse it. I ask all of my fellow Republicans to vote against this Resolution."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Livingston, Representative Ewing."

Ewing: "Yes. Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think that the last speaker adequately set forth a number of the reasons that we shouldn't be voting for this Bill, but I'd like to speak just a minute about the way the Speaker, and yes, the Sponsor of this Motion, has used the Committee system to develop an issue. And yet, for this issue, one that there are many Bills in on, she doesn't want to use that because it doesn't fit into the Speaker's plan or to hers."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative... Representative Ewing."

Ewing: "Yes."

Speaker Breslin: "You must confine your remarks to the Resolution at hand."

36th Legislative Day

April 28, 1987

Ewing: "I am. I'm confining my remarks to why this is such a terrible Resolution, and why we should beat it, because we are again playing into the Speaker's plan to consolidate his power when this Sponsor uses her Committee and her fancy Subcommittees to subvert the activities of the Minority, I think we've gone too far. We only have dog and pony shows when she wants to put her Bill up. And she fills the room, everybody else goes to Subcommittee. She needs to learn the fairness of a bipartisan approach to legislation, and I suggest, Madam Speaker, that we vote 'no' on this. Thank you."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Ewing. Representative Hallock,
do you wish to speak to this Resolution?"

Hallock: "Well, yes, Madam Speaker, I do, and I appreciate you calling on me. I have a question, first of all."

Speaker Breslin: "Proceed."

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

Speaker Breslin: "She will."

Hallock: "I think enough can't be said, really, about what's going on here today, and it has gone on here in the last couple of weeks regarding the Committees and Subcommittees processes. I think my question has to be said, again, it has been said before, and that is, first of all, why can't this be done by the Committee that normally would handle this issue?"

Currie: "My answer, Representative, would be that, for whatever reason, the Committee on Assignment chose not to send all welfare reform proposals to a single Standing Committee of this chamber. Secondly, I think in an area as important as this, one where the Governor has certainly made worthwhile proposals, it behooves us in the short time remaining to us through the rest of this Session, to work in conjunction with our colleagues in the Senate. If we can work in a

36th Legislative Day

April 28, 1987

bipartisan, bichamber fashion to assess the value of a variety of welfare reform proposals, I think that we will find we will not be so fractious. We will end up with a better work product and one that is better understood by the Members of both chambers and by the public as well."

- Hallock: "Well, then secondly, why couldn't this be handled if
 you want to have that kind of scrutiny and that kind of
 input by one of your pseudo Subcommittees which have been
 established recently."
- Currie: "But I think I explained already, in answer to your question, that for whatever reason, I'm not a Member of the Committee on Assignments, so I don't know what the reason might be, but for whatever reason all the welfare reform proposals did not end up in my Committee, nor did they end up in any other individual Committee. Even have they, the issue of working conjointly with the Senate cannot be handled by the standing Committee structure of this House of Representatives."
- Hallock: "Well. Madam Speaker. Members of the unfortunately, is the continuing pattern of truly trying to obfuscate the entire General Assembly processes. We have too many Committees. We have too many Subcommittees. Now. the Majority Party's again trying to bring back the commission process. We. in the General Assembly. here couple of years ago took a strong stand to, first of all, save money for the people of this state; second of the process more easily to understand by abolishing Commissions and Committees. We have here, in another proposal to bring back the Commission system. but really what we have here is an attempt to. not only take process we've established here, but also to over the abolish all Commissions and really make it more confusing for all of us. The tragedy here today, I suppose, is that

36th Legislative Day

April 28, 1987

not enough people are really paying attention of what's going on. We have a record number of Committees in this We have a record number of Subcommittees. chamber. Now. we're going to have some Commissions as well, and hope the media pay attention to that fact. It's getting to become virtually impossible to track legislation in this chamber because of all the Committees. Subcommittees and Commissions which are being created by the Majority Party. We all know that this issue, of course, is one in which have traditionally been divided. Republicans have stood for legends on behalf of welfare reform. The President. Lee Daniels and others have always said, •We need to reform welfare process to ensure that those who need the help will get it, but those who don't will not. We're clear issue. We don't have to have another Committee to say we're for welfare reform. This is a sham.

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Currie, to close."

Currie: "Thank you, Madam Speaker and Members of the House. don't understand the partisan paranoia that has involved itself in the discussion of House Joint Resolution 56. Representative Daniels, a Republican, has introduced some of the administration's reform proposals in the House Senator Rock, I believe a Democrat, has introduced some of those same proposals in the Senate. There partisan about House Joint Resolution 56. The Governor's welfare reform task force was comprised of agencies of the State Government. There were no legislative members of that task force. There were no members of the public. either. House Joint Resolution 56 would enable the Members House and of the Senate, together in a bipartisan of the fashion, with the help of public members to assess all welfare reform initiatives introduced in this Session of the Assembly. The Committee will report June 1, 1987. - 1

36th Legislative Day

April 28, 1987

think if we want to do this job in a bipartisan fashion, with the concern for the public, then passage of House Joint Resolution 56 is the way to go. I'd appreciate your support."

- Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall the House adopt House Joint Resolution 56? All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. 60 votes are required for adoption of this Resolution. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who The Clerk will take the record. On this question wish? there are 67 voting 'aye', 47 voting 'no', and none voting *present*, and the House does adopt House Joint Resolution Ladies and Gentlemen, we are preparing to adjourn. announcement have an announcement about a former Member. Former Representative Gail Schisler brain aneurysm yesterday. He is in St. Francis hospital in Peoria. His condition is listed as serious. If you wish to contact him or his family, you can probably reach at St. Francis hospital. Representative Currie, for what reason do you rise?"
- Currie: "For a request to waive the posting requirements so House Bill 1918 may be heard in the Subcommittee on Equality and Delivery of State Services and State Government Administration, Wednesday at 6:00. It was posted last week. The Committee adjourned before the It was inadvertently not reposted this week. This request has been cleared with the Minority Spokesman the State Government Administration Committee. Representative Parcells."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Currie has asked for leave to walve the posting rules on House Bill 1918. Is there any objections? Hearing none, the posting rules are waived, Representative Currie. Representative Terzich, for what

36th Legislative Day

April 28, 1987

reason do you rise?"

- Terzich: "Yes, Madam Speaker, just a reminder for the Members of the Executive Committee, that the Executive Committee will not be meeting in Room 114. They will be meeting on the House floor at 8:00 a.m. tomorrow morning. That's the Executive and Veteran's Affair Committee at 8:00 a.m. on the House floor."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Wait, for what reason do you rise?"
- Wait: "Thank you, Madam Chairman. I make a Motion to waive the posting requirements on House Bill 2377. It's suppose to be for the Agriculture Committee. I've cleared this with the Chairman of that Committee, and he said it's fine with him."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Wait has asked that the posting rules he waived for House Bill 2377, so that it can be the Agriculture Committee. heard in Is there objection? Hearing no objection, the rule is Representative Wait. Representative Flinn, for what reason do you rise?"
- Flinn: "Madam Speaker, the purpose of my arising is to clear up some confusion about the Financial Institutions Committee meeting today. Normally, we meet at 4:00. Today the Subcommittee will meet at 4:00 and the regular Full Committee will meet at 4:40. Both meetings is in Room 118."
- Speaker Breslin: "Thank you, Representative Flinn.

 Representative Giglio, for an announcement. Representative

 Giglio."
- Giglio: "Hello. Thank you, Madam Speaker. The Democrats would

 like permission to have a 15 or 20 minute Caucus
 immediately following adjournment in Room 114."
- Speaker Breslin: "Democratic Members, there will be a Caucus

36th Legislative Day

April 28. 1987

immediately following adjournment in Room 114. It will be short Caucus, so please be prompt. Representative McPike moves that this House stand adjourned until 12:30, 12:30 tomorrow afternoon. Before we adjourn, the Clerk will read the Agreed Resolutions."

- Clerk O'Brien: "House Joint Resolution 61, offered by Speaker Madigan and Representative Daniels. House Resolutions 299, Slater; 300, Panayotovich; 301, Hensel; 303, Barnes; 304, Parke; 305, Wennlund; 306, Rea; 307, Krska; 308, Preston; and 311, Hensel and Ronan."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Matijevich. Representative Matijevich. Representative Matijevich moves the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the Agreed Resolutions are adopted. General Resolutions."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Joint Resolution 10, offered by Representative Christensen and Van Duyne. House Resolution 309, by Currie. And 310, by Pangle."
- Speaker Breslin: "Committee on Assignments and Death
 Resolutions."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 302, offered by Representative

 Wyvetter Younge, with respect to the memory of Mr. Clyde

 Jordan."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Matijevich moves the adoption of the Death Resolutions. All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Death Resolution is adopted. Senate Bill First Reading."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 52, Leverenz, a Bill for an Act
 making appropriation to various state agencies. First
 Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Breslin: "Now, Representative Greiman moves that the

36th Legislative Day

April 28, 1987

House stand adjourned until 12:30 tomorrow. All those in favor say "aye", all those opposed say "no". In the opinion of the Chair, the "ayes" have it. And this House stands adjourned until 12:30 tomorrow."

05/28/87 15:38

STATE OF ILLINOIS 85TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES DAILY TRANSCRIPTION OF DEBATE INDEX

PAGE

1

APRIL 28, 1987

HB-0367	SECOND READING	PAGE	19
HB-0404	SECOND READING	PAGE	19
HB-0407	SECOND READING	PAGE	19
HB-0439	THIRD READING	PAGE	20
HB-0441	THIRD READING	PAGE	29
HB-0465	SECOND READING	PAGE	19
HB-0579	THIRD READING	PAGE	33
HB-0615	THIRD READING	PAGE	34
HB-0632	SECOND READING	PAGE	19
HB-0640	SECOND READING	PAGE	19
HB-0642	SECOND READING	PAGE	19
HB-0674	SECOND READING	PAGE	19
HB-0714	SECOND READING	PAGE	19
HB-0730	SECOND READING	PAGE	19
HB-0803	SECOND READING	PAGE	19
SB-0052	FIRST READING	PAGE	47
SB-0056	FIRST READING	PAGE	3
SB-0161	FIRST READING	PAGE	3
HJR-0001	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	31
HJR-0056	ADOPTED	PAGE	37

SUBJECT MATTER

HOUSE TO ORDER - REPRESENTATIVE GREIMAN	PAGE	1
PRAYER - REVERAND PAUL SCHWARTZ	PAGE	1
PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE	PAGE	1
ROLL CALL FOR ATTENDANCE	PAGE	1
COMMITTEE REPORTS	PAGE	1
AGREED RESOLUTIONS	PAGE	47
GENERAL RESOLUTIONS	PAGE	47
DEATH RESOLUTIONS	PAGE	47
ADJOURNMENT	PAGE	48