116th Legislative Day

June 15, 1988

Speaker Breslin: "Ladies Gentlemen, the hour of 12:00 o'clock having arrived the House will come to order. I would ask Members to be in their seats, the Chaplain for today will be the...will be Pastor John Warton from the Village Church of Barrington. Pastor Warton is the guest of Representative Pullen. I invite our guest in the gallery to rise for the invocation."

Pastor John Warton: "Before I pray, I would like to explain that I am coming first at your invitation, and by the provisions of the State of Illinois, also because the people of my church pray for you, and they pray often. And thirdly because God hears and answers prayer, and his prayers, our prayers receive such good and wise answers. And so I ask you now to join me in prayer. Great Eternal God, You who are a king of kings, You who give laws while men make laws, You we appeal this day for our State and we pray foremost that You would be gracious to send rain upon our State. And as we think of the consequences of this continued drought we pray for those who are suffering because of it. And pray again, Oh God, send rain. And we pray boldly that there might be peace in our State, among the races, peace between the affluent and the poor, peace between workers and managers, peace among factions within our State on all the issues and we pray for peace between husbands and wives, and within families in our State. And we pray perhaps most of all for peace within the heart. And I do pray for those who serve in this Body that they might experience deep peace within their heart, we pray for their work today and ask You to give them wisdom in what they do. We're thankful for the promise in Your word that you give liberally to all men and do not uprate us for asking for wisdom. And so we pray,

## 116th Legislative Day

June 15. 1988

oh, Lord grant wisdom today, and I pray that as these Legislators end their Session later this month and take time away during the summer that You would grant them enjoyment. Time with their families, time to refine their thoughts and values, and we thank You for the privilege of coming to You in prayer, and we seek Your blessing upon these proceedings today in the name of mans saviour, our living God. Amen."

- Speaker Breslin: "We'll be led in the Pledge by Representative Mautino."
- Mautino et al: "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United

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

  one Nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice
  for all."
- Speaker Breslin: "Roll Call for Attendance. Representative Mike

  Weaver is recognized for the purposes of a special
  introduction."
- Weaver: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the Assembly, we have visiting with us today, the acting Secretary of the Democratic Socialist Party of Japan, he comes to us by way of an International Exchange Program which brought him through my district, and brings him to Springfield today, please join with me in welcoming Mr. Hiroshi Kudo of the Socialist Democratic Party."
- Hiroshi Kudo: "I am here by the invitation of the U.S. Government, the State Department and the U.S. Information Agency. I'm here to study for one month the American Political System and its processes and I consider myself very lucky to have this opportunity. And again today of all places I am here standing in the hall of the House of the Representatives of the State of Illinois through the arrangement of the Representative Mr. Weaver, and I consider this again the most luckiest opportunity for me in

## 116th Legislative Day

June 15, 1988

my whole life. Unfortunately my english is not good, so I am relying on my interpreter, Mr. Yamagagi, that will cut my five minutes that I was allowed to three and a half. I am going to speak using that short minute. I am speaking about the part of Japan I'm from that is Hokkaido, it's one of the state's there and our state is the main state producing food, food stuff for Japan, just like your State of Illinois producing so many crops and I'm here today to learn about the agriculture activities of the state and I'm staying with Mr. Glen Fell who has a farming operation here. U.S., Japan relations today have some kind programs today, because of the so-called revitalization of the Japanese Market, for American agriculture products. Talking about my own Hokkaido Island, which is located, strategically closest to the Soviet Union, so from stand point of defense it is very important part of Japan. We have about sixty percent of our Japanese self defense air force is centered on our island. Now, Japanese people consider education as a most important peer for their country and the nation and they for the main finance of education...a tax for education is also a problem in Japan. I see so many people sitting in the public sector..public audience, section of this hall. I understand that you are faced with very difficult tax issue here for which I wish you good luck so that everyone would be satisfied by whatever solution you come up with. Thank you."

Speaker Breslin: "Are there any excused absences, Representative Piel."

Piel: "Yes, Madam Speaker, will the record show Representative Penny Pullen is excused today."

Speaker Breslin: "Very good. And Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Madam Speaker, let the record reflect the excused absence today of Representative Lee Preston, due to a death

116th Legislative Day

June 15, 1988

- in the family."
- Speaker Breslin: "Very good. Mr. Clerk take the record. On this question, there are 114 answering a Roll Call, a quorum is present. Representative Didrickson, for what reason do you seek recognition."
- Didrickson: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, for a point of personal privilege."
- Speaker Breslin: "State your point."
- Didrickson: "I would like to introduce this year's State Board of
  Education, teacher of the year, from Stagg High School,
  Gene Tello."
- Speaker Breslin: "Welcome Jane (sic Gene) and congratulations.

  Ladies and Gentlemen, our plan is to go to the Consent
  Calendars, both Consent Calendars, Second Reading. Second
  Day and the Consent Calendar, Third Reading. Second Day.

  It appears on page 12 on your Calendar, the first item to
  be called is the Consent Calendar, Second Reading, Second
  Day. Read the Bills, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Consent Calendar, Second Reading. Second Day.

  Senate Bill 1800, a Bill for an Act in relations to certain mortgages, loans, and contracts. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1869, a Bill for an Act concerning alien insurers, together with Committee Amendment #1. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 2011, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Insurance Code. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 2052, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Insurance Code, together with committee Amendment #1. Second Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Breslin: "You have heard the Bills read, these Bills will now move to Third Reading. On the Consent Calendar, Third Reading. Second Day. Read those Bills, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Consent Calendar, Third Reading, Second Day.

  Senate Bill 1611, a Bill for Act to amend the Probate Act.

## 116th Legislative Day

June 15, 1988

Third Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1642, a Bill for an Act to amend the Child Passenger Protection Act, together with committee Amendment #1. Sec...Third Reading of the Senate Bill 1655, a Bill for an Act relating to the call of a Constitutional Convention. Third Reading of the Senate Bill 1671, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act in relation to practice of clinical social work. Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1704, a Bill for an Act to amend the Local Records Act. Third Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1707, a Bill for an Act to amend certain Acts to require various State agencies to promogate rules in relation to specific matters. Third Reading of the Senate Bill 1709, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. Third Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1714, a Bill for an Act in relation to the abused and neglect of elderly persons. Third Reading of Senate Bill 1723, a Bill for an Act to amend the the Bill. Illinois Savings Association Banking Act. Third Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1789, a Bill for an Act to amend the Code of Criminal Procedure. Third Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1812, a Bill for an Act regarding mail order pharmacies, together with Committee Amendment #1. Third Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1827, a Bill for an Act to amend the Code of Civil Procedure. Third Reading of the Senate Bill 1830, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act in relation to rehabilitation of a disabled persons. Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1880, a Bill for an Act authorizing the Director of Central Management Services to convey the Singer Mansion in Cook County. Third Reading of the Bill. Correction that was Senate Bill 1888. Senate 1947, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Public Aid Code. Third Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1966, a Bill for an Act in relation to the authority to the

## 116th Legislative Day

June 15, 1988

Department of State Police. Third Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 2007, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act creating the Illinois Veterans' Home in Anna. Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 2009, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Health Facilities Authority Act. Third Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 2012, a Bill for an Act to amend the Fish Code. Third Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 2035, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act concerning State historic sites and State parks and other State property. Third Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 2040, a Bill for an Act to amend the State...a Bill for an Act in relation to health facilities. Third Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 2049, a Bill for an Act to amend the Life Care Facilities Act. Third Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 2051, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois State Auditing Act. Third Reading of the Bill. Bill 2124, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act in relation to security interest in crops. Third Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 2153, a Bill for an Act to amend the Barber, Cosmetology and Esthetics Act, together with Committee Amendment #1. Third Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 2197, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Clinical Laboratory Act. Third Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 2218, a Bill for an Act in relation to licensing of clinical phsychologist. Third Reading of the Bill. Bill 2238, a Bill for an Act to amend the Podiatric Medical Practice Act. Third Reading of the Bill. Senate 2243, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Act on the Aging. Third Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 2249. Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Marriage and Dissolution of Marriage Act. Third Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 2263, a Bill for an Act to change titles within certain Acts to conform with federal law. Third Reading of

## 116th Legislative Day

June 15, 1988

- the Bill. Senate Bill 2012, has been removed from the Consent Calendar. Senate Bill 2012, removed from the Consent Calendar. Senate Bill 1707, have been removed from the Consent Calendar. Senate Bill 1707, removed."
- Speaker Breslin: "You have heard the reading of the Bills. On Third Reading."
- Clerk O'Brien: "And Senate Bill 1714, has been removed from Consent Calendar. Senate Bill 1714, removed from the Consent Calendar."
- Speaker Breslin: "Okay, Ladies and Gentlemen, you have heard the Bills read on the Consent Calendar for a Third time, three have been removed. The question we vote on now is whether or not the House shall pass the Bills read on the Consent Calendar for a Third time. All those in favor vote all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Representative McGann for what reason do you seek recognition."
- McGann: "Yes, thank you, Madam Speaker, and Members of the Assembly. On Senate Bill 2040, it's on Third Reading now on the Consent Calendar, I'm wondering if we could ask to have it removed for a temporary time to except an Amendment which is being prepared, on Senate Bill 2040, and I'd ask the consent of the House to put it back on the Calendar."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative McGann, I am advised that since we started the Roll Call, you would have to move to suspend the appropriate rule to allow this Bill to be taken out during the middle of a Roll Call. Now before we move to that Representative McCracken has a comment. Is that the same comment? Okay. Representative McCracken."
- McCracken: "If we could have a minute to discuss it with him, if we can accommodate him we will."
- Speaker Breslin: "Okay, would you speak with Representative McCracken on the issue before you make the Motion. Is

## 116th Legislative Day

June 15, 1988

there anyone else who needs to make the same Motion. I hope not. Representative Braun for what reason do you seek recognition."

- Braun: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, apparently my key was not turned, I would like to be recorded as voting on the Third Reading, Consent Calendar... Thank you."
- Speaker Breslin: "Record the Lady voting 'aye'. Representative Flowers."
- Flowers: "I would also like to be recorded as voting 'ave'."
- Speaker Breslin: "Record Representative Flowers, voting 'aye'.

  Your switch is open, Representative Flowers can you push
  your own switch. Very good. Okay. Representative
  McGann."
- McGann: "Thank you, Madam. Thank you, Madam Speaker and Members of the Assembly. I would ask to suspend and to move an appropriate rule to suspend the rules to and remove Senate Bill 2040 from the Consent Calendar."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative McGann has moved that we suspend the rules to allow House...Senate Bill 2040 to be taken out of the record at this time and returned to the Order of Third Reading, First Legislative Day of the Calendar. Okay, there is no agreement on the Consent Calendar, therefore, the Bill will then be removed from the Consent Calendar now and be put on the Order of Reading. Is that agreed? That is agreed. The question is 'Shall we except the Gentlemans Motion? All those in favor say 'aye' all those opposed 'nay' in the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it and the rule is suspended. Bill 2040 is removed from this Consent Calendar. 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' and none voting 'present' and these Bills having received the Constitutional Majority are

116th Legislative Day

- June 15, 1988
- hereby declared passed. Representative Younge, for what reason do you seek recognition?"
- Younge: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, will the record show, I would have voted 'yes' on the Consent Calendar."
- Speaker Breslin: "Let the record show that Representative Younge,
  wish to be recorded as 'aye' on the Consent Calendar,
  adopted this day. Representative Mulcahey for what reason
  do you seek recognition?"
- Mulcahey: "Madam Speaker, I would ask leave of the House, to, excuse me, ask leave of the House to discharge the Appropriations II Committee on House Bill 829, and put it in the Order of Second Reading, First Legislative Day."
- Speaker Breslin: "Has this Motion been cleared with both sides of the aisle."
- Mulcahey: "I don't think so."
- Speaker Breslin: "Could you give us the number again, please."
- Mulcahey: "Yes, it's House Bill 829."
- Speaker Breslin: "House Bill 829, and where does it appear on the Calendar?"
- Mulcahey: "I'm not sure where it appears right now, I don't think it's on the Calendar."
- Speaker Breslin: "It's not on the Calendar."
- Mulcahey: "I will suspend the appropriate rules who have the Bill discharged from the Appropriations II Committee. House Bill 829."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Mulcahey, I think maybe you should come to the podium and we'll find out the status of your Bill."
- Mulcahey: "Ma'am, the status of my Bill is that it is still in the Appropriations II Committee. I would like to discharge Committee."
- Speaker Breslin: "And was it tabled in that Committee perhaps?"
  Mulcahey: "No, I don't believe it was tabled. Not yet, not at

116th Legislative Day

June 15, 1988

- this time."
- Speaker Breslin: "Not yet. Our records reflect that the Bill has been tabled Representative Mulcahey."
- Mulcahey: "Then I would move to take from the table, House Bill 829 and put it on the Order of Second Reading, First Legislative Day."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentlemen has moved to take House Bill 829 from the table and put it on the Calendar, on the Order of Second Reading, First Legislative Day. And on that question, the Gentlemen from DuPage, Representative McCracken."
- McCracken: "I think it's a joke, so I'm not going to scream about this. You aren't serious about this are you Dick? Does Director Duffy want this by any change, I'm for it if Ed's for it."
- Mulcahey: "I think...I haven't talked to Director Duffy lately,

  but I'm sure if things were right there would be no
  objections."
- McCracken: "Or if Representative Leverenz were for it, I would defer to his wisdom. If Representative Mays were for it, I would defer to his wisdom."
- Mulcahey: "It would appear some of your friends are for it and some of your friends against it and I'm sure you'll probably be with your friends. So it's..."
- McCracken: "Custom forces me to be with my Republican friends on this one."
- Speaker Breslin: "You have heard the Gentlemen's Motion. It is that we suspend the rules, take this Bill from the table and put it on the Order of Second Reading, First Legislative Day. All those in favor say 'aye' all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'no's' have it and the Motion is lost. I think you need to work this Motion a little bit more, Representative Mulcahey.

116th Legislative Day

June 15, 1988

Representative Ropp, is recognized for an announcement.

Please give the Gentleman your attention."

- Ropp: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I would like to announce that tonight we will have a House softball practice game, at 5 p.m. two blocks west from the Stratton Building, and we'd like everyone that wants to play to come on out and practice because this might be the night that determines who will get a shirt. The game is June the 23, and we want to maintain that tradition of never having been beaten by the chamber across the hall. Five o'clock two blocks west of the Stratton Building tonight. Thank you."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Countryman for what reason do
   you seek recognition?"
- Countryman: "Well, since we are on the subject of baseball, Madam Speaker, I wondered if Representative Ropp, had gotten the broom back from Representative Cullerton because Representative Ropp needs that broom because the Cubs swept the Cardinals last week in St. Louis and I didn't know if Representative Ropp knew that and it might be important also that we send the Doorman out to find Representative Johnson, because I don't think he knows that the Cubs beat the Cardinals in three games in St. Louis and I thought that was important we let him know that."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Cullerton. With his broom in hand."
- Cullerton: "Yes, thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Apparently, Representative Ropp, left this broom over here and he got confused because he thought that the Cubs were swept by the Cardinals, which may have actually happened sometime earlier in the season. But last weekend I believe the opposite happened, so this by rights goes back to Representative Ropp so I'll be happy to come over and present it to him at the appropriate time."

116th Legislative Day

- June 15, 1988
- Speaker Breslin: "Wonderful. Representative Ewing, for what reason do you seek recognition?"
- Ewing: "Madam Speaker, just a little announcement, I think it shouldn't go unnoticed that Representative Larry Wennlund has his beautiful wife on the floor Ann and there celebrating their twenty—fifth wedding anniversary, I think we ought to give them all a hand."
- Speaker Breslin: "A great place to celebrate a wedding anniversary, isn't it? Representative Ropp."
- Ropp: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. This broom is a little bitty squirrely thing, I gave a nice big broom to Cullerton, I want to know what happened to the other part of it. Mine had a handle on it too. This one is a little bitty thing."
- Speaker Breslin: "It's easier to pass this way, I have a feeling that broom is going to go back and forth several times this season. Ladies and Gentlemen, we are now going to the Order of Senate Bills, Third Reading, Short Debate Calendar. It appears on page 3 on your Calendar. Senate Bills, Third Reading, Short Debate, the first Bill is Senate Bill 1593, Representative Hallock. Clerk, Read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1593, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act in relation to the regulation of savings and loan associations. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Hallock."
- Hallock: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Members of the House. What this Bill does is regulate foreign savings and loans and requires that foreign savings and loans that want to do business in this State file an application with the commissioner of savings and loan. It's an agreed Bill to and I would ask for your support."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage of House (sic. Senate) Bill 1593, this Bill is on the Short

# 116th Legislative Day

June 15, 1988

Debate Calendar, does anyone rise in opposition? Does anyone rise in opposition? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill...Representative who? Representative Jeff Mays rising in opposition."

Mays: "No, I would simply request that the Sponsor if he could take it out of the record, I have an Amendment that I'd like to talk to him about and see if he could bring it back for the purposes of an Amendment, and if he doesn't wish to then we can get back to this order a little later on. I haven't had a chance to talk to the Sponsor yet."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Hallock."

Speaker Breslin: "Out of the Record. Senate Bill 1603,
Representative Flinn. Monroe Flinn, Representative Flinn.

Is the Gentleman in the chamber? Out of the Record.

Senate Bill 1691, Representative Phelps, David Phelps. Is
the Gentleman in the chamber? Clerk, Read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1691, a Bill for an Act to Amend Sections of the Public Community College Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Phelps."

Phelps: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Bill is just the routine Bill that provides the grants for the formula for all the distribution formulas that goes to community college. And it's agreed Bill. We appreciate your support."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 1691, this Bill is on the Short Debate Calendar. Does anyone rise in opposition? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1691, pass.' All those in favor vote 'aye' all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. This is final action. Have all voted who wish?

116th Legislative Day

June 15, 1988

Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are lize voting 'aye' none voting 'no' and none voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1868, Representative Virginia Frederick. Clerk, Read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1868, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act in relation to the regulation of the rivers, lakes, and streams in the State of Illinois. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Frederick."

Frederick: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would like to take this Bill out of the record at this time. I would like to take this Bill out of the record."

Speaker Breslin: "Out of the Record. Senate Bill 1876,
Representative Wojcik. Representative Wojcik. Out of the
Record. Senate Bill 1955, Representative Ryder. Clerk,
Read the Bill. Out of the Record. Senate Bill 1958,
Representative Parke. Out of the Record. On page 4 of
your Calendar, appears Senate Bill 1979, Representative
Hensel. Clerk, Read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1979, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Insurance Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Hensel."

Hensel: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Members of the House. Senate Bill 1979, amends the motor vehicle theft motor insurance fraud, reporting and immunity provisions of the Insurance Code. Adds the Department of Professional Regulation to the list of governmental agencies which may obtain information from insurance companies regarding motor vehicle theft or motor vehicle insurance fraud. And I ask for a favorable vote."

116th Legislative Day

June 15. 1988

- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentlemen has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 1979, this Bill is on the Short Debate Calendar, does anyone rise in opposition? The Gentleman from Warren, Representative Hultgren."
- Hultgren: "Madam Speaker, because of the noise in the House Floor
  I couldn't hear a word that Representative Hensel said in
  explanation of his Bill. And if you could perhaps bring
  some order and then if Representative Hensel would be so
  kind as to repeat himself, I couldn't hear a word."
- Speaker Breslin: "Mr. Doorkeeper, would you remove all unauthorized persons from the floor. Representative Hensel, would you please repeat your explanation of this Bill."
- Hensel: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. It amends the motor vehicle theft, and motor insurance fraud reporting and immunity provisions of the Insurance Code. It adds the Department of Professional Regulation to the list governmental agencies which may obtain information from insurance companies regarding motor vehicle theft or motor vehicle insurance fraud. And I just ask for a favorable vote."
- Speaker Breslin: "You have heard the Gentlemans explanation.

  Does anyone rise in opposition? The Gentleman from Cook

  Representative Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Breslin: "He will yield for a question."

- Leverenz: "I couldn't just hear the last sentence or two, could you just repeat that part. And why would they want access to what information?"
- Hensel: "It adds the Department of Professional Regulation to the list of other governmental agencies which include the Local Police, the State Police, County Sheriffs Office, States Attorney, Municipal and U.S. District Attorney, and a duly constituted U.S. Criminal Investigative Agency, the

116th Legislative Day

June 15, 1988

Department of Insurance, and the Secretary of State's Office, and all were asking is that the Department of Professional Regulation may obtain this information from the insurance companies if they so desire."

- Leverenz: "Could you give me a for instances where this might be beneficial for that agency to get that information?"
- Hensel: "Well, in case there is a in fraud in, you know these insurance companies, people try to fraud the insurance companies when they have insurance or accidents, rear ending, people go out there and do it deliberately to collect the insurance and they feel they would have a better chance of regulating that type of looking out for it and also under medical insurance under the same kind of conditions."

Leverenz: "Thank you."

- Speaker Breslin: "This Bill is on the Short Debate Calendar.

  Does anyone rise in opposition? Representative O'Connell."
- O'Connell: "Thank you Madam Speaker. I'm not certain whether I can be in opposition unless I ask a question."

Speaker Breslin: "Proceed."

- O'Connell: "Representative, does this Bill allow the individuals in the... what department is that the Professional Regulation?"
- O'Connell: "Alright, now these individuals in the department will now be able to go out and do what with vehicles?"

Hensel: "Not on the vehicles, no."

- O'Connell: "Well, what what...what are they doing?"
- Hensel: "All it does is allow the Department of Insurance,

  Professional Regulation the information that is available
  to these other agencies also."

116th Legislative Day

June 15, 1988

O'Connell: "Well, it must do something more than that

Representative. Let me ask you this pointed question.

Does this allow, members of that department that are

effected by this Bill to carry a weapon?"

Hensel: "No, no way."

O'Connell: "Alright then this is not the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1979 pass?'

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

Voting is open. This is final passage. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 112 voting 'aye' none voting 'no' and 4 voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1990, Representative Daley, Clerk, read the Bill.

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill. Senate Bill 1990, a Bill for an Act to amend the Unified Code of Corrections. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Daley."

Daley: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, and Members of the House. This Bill, Senate Bill 1990, would require a Judge to impose consecutive felony sentences, if the defendant charged or convicted of a felony commits another felony while in pre-trial or in post-trial custody in a county jail facility."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for passage of Senate Bill 1990, this Bill is on the Order of Short Debate. Does anyone rise in opposition? Hearing none. The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1990, pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye' all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. This is final passage. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 114, 115 voting 'aye' none voting 'no'

116th Legislative Day

June 15, 1988

and none voting 'present' this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1998, Representative Williams. Is the Gentleman in the chamber? Out of the Record. Senate Bill 2013, Representative Countryman. Clerk, Read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 2013, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Criminal Code. Third Reading of the Bill." Speaker Breslin: "Representative Countryman."

Countryman: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 2013, has been amended in the Judiciary Committee, I think to make it a better Bill. What it provides now is that a theft may be committed when a person obtains or exerts control over the property in the custody of any law enforcement agency, which is explicitly represented to him by any law enforcement officer or any individual acting on behalf of a law enforcement agency, as having been stolen. In addition to that it clarifies some language in the theft statute, dealing with the evaluation of the property which would be the subject matter of theft. It's my understanding that we passed this language last year, however, we need to clarify it in this Section of the statute, this would say then in this amendatory language that when a charge of theft of property exceeding a specified value is brought the value of the property involved is an element of the fence to be resolved by the trier of fact either as exceeding or not exceeding the specified value. That is to say if the theft were charged was exceeding ten thousand dollars and not exceeding a hundred thousand dollars the jury or the Judge whoever is the trier of fact would have to find out whether exceeded or did not exceed that amount of money. Likewise, the same thing would be true if the theft in were in excess of a hundred thousand dollars or whether the theft was less

## 116th Legislative Day

June 15, 1988

- than three hundred dollars, so forth and so on. I think the Bills in good shape and I recommend that everybody vote in favor of it. Thank you."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 2013, this Bill is on Short Debate, Representative Cullerton rises in opposition."
- Cullerton: "Well, maybe not. Representative could you explain to me how the defense of entrapment would work with in this particular offense."
- Countryman: "Well, the defense of entrapment would work here just the same as it would in any other instance in that you may be reading an older analysis."
- Cullerton: "Well, no I understand that there are entrapments there. But it sounds to me that the only difference is that that the crime, the new crime almost defines entrapment. And so I'd like for you to explain how the defense of entrapment would not work every time."
- Countryman: "Well, you know, entrapment is such a difficult defense that I've never used it because it always means that you admit the guilt. But I would assume that if somebody had no intention of purchasing stolen property, they had no intention of going anywhere to purchase stolen property and for whatever reason they are in some place where some fraudulent people represent, and they happen to be law enforcement authorities represent some property be stolen and they continue to refuse to even want to listen it but they continue to be enticed through other means to continue to listen to the request for purchasing the stolen property and so forth and so on and if it goes on for a great deal of time and argument on the part of the people who are representing this then I think that you can probably have raised at least the issue of entrapment and the question the defense of entrapped and that is whether

116th Legislative Day

June 15, 1988

or not the individual ever had an intent to commit the crime prior to the time they ever really walked in and started talking to the people about taking the stolen property. I think the defense of entrapment is applicable if the lawyer wants to choose to use it."

Cullerton: "But is it true that this change in the law would allow for someone to be convicted of theft?"

Countryman: "I'm sorry, I can't hear you."

Cullerton: "Is it true that this change in the law would allow for someone to be convicted of theft by obtaining control over property that's not even stolen? ...Let me read..."

Countryman: "Yes...if it's... but under certain circumstances.

Okay, it must be in the control of a law enforcement agency
and explicitly represented by the law enforcement officer
an individual acting on his behalf as being stolen. So."

Cullerton: "Do they have to tell the...?"

Countryman: "Yes."

Cullerton: "...offender that they are a undercover agent?"

Countryman: "No. They have to tell them the property is stolen property."

Cullerton: "They have to lie and tell them that the property is stolen. right?"

Countryman: "That's correct. So, I mean they have to say
Representative Cullerton, this Cubs mug I've got here I
stole it from Representative Johnson and you have to you
know. And I have to be a law enforcement agency or
somebody explicitly working on their behalf."

Cullerton: "Well, let me read to you the defense of entrapment and maybe you could further elaborate on your answer.

Entrapment means 'a person is not guilty of an offense if his conduct is insighted or induced by a public officer or employee or agent of either for the purpose of obtaining evidence for the prosecution of such person.' Now that."

116th Legislative Day

June 15, 1988

Countryman: "Are you reading that out of the Criminal Code?"

Cullerton: "I'm reading that from Chapter 38, Section 7-12.

if you read that it says someone's not guilty of an offense if his conduct in this case the purchase of property is insighted or induced by a public officer which would be, say a police officer or a state trooper. They're not guilty if their conduct is induced for the purpose of obtaining evidence for the prosecution of such person. The evidence is the non-stolen property."

Countryman: "I think... Yea, but I think the key words that may be missing there are induced or insighted into the action. And that is why in my discussion with you was talking about the fact that somebody had to really entice an individual into buying something he didn't otherwise want to buy. I mean if you start walking around saying I want to buy a gold necklace for my wife. Do you anybody who can buy one? And you end up going to some back trunk of a car out here in the parking lot and somebody's got all kinds of them in there and you say well this isn't quite the way things are done. And the fellow says this is stolen property and you say well if I can get it at a better price I'll buy it, you've committed a crime. And all were saying is if that's a police agency representing it to be stolen property then that is in fact a crime."

Cullerton: "Did you happen to mention why we need this?"

Countryman: "Why we need it?"

Cullerton: "Yea."

Countryman: "Well, the suggestion for this Bill came from police authorities who in essence want to be able to get at the major fencing operations that they can't get at otherwise in the State. And that's why we need the Bill so that they can take merchandise which is legitimately not stolen, and go to these fencing operations and represent it to be

116th Legislative Day

June 15, 1988

stolen and of course then sell it at some greatly discounted price and be able to break up these fencing operations."

Cullerton: "And who's the fine Senate sponsor of this Bill?"

Countryman: "It's Senator Geo-Karis."

Cullerton: "Okay, no further questions."

Speaker Breslin: "Ladies and Gentlemen this Bill is on the order of Short Debate if you wish to. Excuse me Representative Cullerton. The Bill is on the order of Short Debate. Representative Cullerton has asked questions does anyone else rise in opposition. Or wish to ask questions. Representative O'Connell wishes to ask questions. Proceed Representative O'Connell."

O'Connell: "Representative isn't it true that there was an Amendment that was placed on this Bill in committee?"

Countryman: "Yes, Representative when we first brought this Bill in the Senate from to the committee there was considerable amount of debate, considerable amount of controversy, some mentioned the entrapment defense, the other problem which I mentioned dealing with the proof of trier of fact, and the value of the property was pointed out to us and we held the Bill and came up with this Amendment, and my recollection is that everybody in the committee agreed with the Amendment and that's why it ended up on the Short Debate Calendar."

O'Connell: "Alright, now the Amendment in effect deleted the following language. It shall not be a defense to prosecution that the offense occurred at the result of a deception or strategy on the part of a law enforcement agency including the use of an undercover operative or law enforcement officer. Now, that language was deleted was it not."

Countryman: "That's correct. Yes it was."

116th Legislative Day

June 15, 1988

- O'Connell: "On this Amendment. And did I not raise the issue as to whether this eliminated the defense of entrapment at the time of the hearing there was some doubt as to whether it did that or not. When you introduced that Amendment, you testified that this did not in anyway eliminate the defense of entrapment."
- Countryman: "That's correct, it's my intention that the defense of entrapment fully applies to this offense."
- O'Connell: "And that the defense of entrapment necessarily implies that but for the action of the police agency that the intent to commit the theft would not have occurred.

  Isn't that basically the defense of entrapment?"
- Countryman: "Well, there was a considerable amount of debate on stating the defense of entrapment as it's been articulated in the case laws now codified in the statute. I don't know that the words but for are ones that I can incorporate into that but generally you've got the jest of it. Yes."

O'Connell: "Thank you."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Dunn to ask questions."

Dunn: "Yes, Madam Speaker, I have a question about the language on page 2 of the Amendment which says that the offense of theft is committed by someone who obtains or exerts control over property in the custody of any law enforcement agency and so on. It seems to me that if I'm a line officer on duty and I run into a situation were a crime has been committed and take possession of the fruits of the crime and bring them back to the police station routinely I'm going to deliver the fruits of that crime, the stolen property to someone who is in charge whose job is to be in charge of evidence and physically turn that property over to the evidence officer and if that happens I as an officer of a law enforcement agency will represent to the evidence officer that the property is stolen and I will turn it over

## 116th Legislative Day

June 15, 1988

to the evidence officer who will obtain or exert control over the property now in my custody delivered to him. And as I read this statute the evidence officer doing his job has then just committed a crime."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Countryman."

Dunn: "Seems to me to be on all fours with the statement of this

Amendment, how do you reconcile that situation, which I

know must happen."

Countryman: "My understanding of the theft statute Representative is that, that you must obtain or exert that control with the intent to fervently deprive the owner of the use or benefit of that property. And that that person would not have that intent."

Dunn: "Now, but the statute says knowingly, the evidence officer will knowingly receive that property and having received it he will obtain or exert control over it because that's his job. There's no exception in here about...about the internal operations of the law enforcement agency and so when the property goes from the officer who brings it in off the street to the person in charge of the evidence locker or whatever arrangement they have, the person in charge of the evidence locker as I read the statute knowingly obtains or exerts control over the property and commits a crime."

Countryman: "Well, in addition to what I just said though, they would also have to explicitly represent to that person that the property is being stolen, and I'm certain."

Dunn: "Well, of course they will, they'll say this is stolen property put it in the evidence locker. Were gonna try this defendant."

Countryman: "No, I beg to differ with you but I think he would say this is evidence, put it in the evidence locker. And in essence what your saying is the police don't have to

116th Legislative Day

June 15. 1988

steal property to represent something to be stolen property to use in these situations."

Dunn: "Well, they don't put much in the evidence locker that they think is not stolen they put it there because they think it is stolen, so anyway Madam Speaker, to the Bill as amended I think there may be some good intentions here but the strict reading of the language as I read it and I think it's clear will make everyone in charge of evidence at every law enforcement agency throughout this State commit a crime every time stolen property is delivered to that evidence officer for control and custody over the property during the course of an investigation and I think we need some additional language and in this Bill should be brought back and reworked and I would urge a 'no' vote on it in its present form and no."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Countryman to close."

Countryman: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. We've had a considerable debate over this matter. I think we've worked on this Bill hard in the Judiciary Committee, we've got its language in reasonably good order and it goes back to the Senate for their concurrence because we have amended it over hear. I'd ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Breslin: "The question is 'Shall Senate Bill 2013, pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye' all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. The On 95 voting 'aye' 15 voting 'no' and 5 question there are voting 'present'. This Bill having received Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Bill 2063, Representative Sutker. Clerk, read the Bill." Clerk Leone: "House (Senate) Bill 2063, a Bill for an Act to

amend the Illinois Health Facilities Planning Act. Third

116th Legislative Day

June 15, 1988

Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Sutker."

Sutker: "Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This amends the Health Facilities Planning Act. It provides for new thresholds for expenditures by health facilities and hospitals. The present threshold for the need of a certificate necessity is four hundred dollars, four hundred thousand dollars for major medical equipment and seven hundred and sixty thousand dollars for capital construction. These items are changed to one million dollars for major medical equipment and two million dollars for capital construction. This Bill which is being amended was initiated in 1974, when the dollar was of course a more expansive dollar. The dollar now is a thirty two cent dollar. What now is provided is that it meets the cost of living increases which have occurred and which will help the hospitals with respect to there programs. It will only update the procedure it will reduce the cost for hospital improvement and health facility expansion. I ask for a positive vote."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentlemen has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 2063. This Bill is on the order of Short Debate. Does anyone rise in opposition? Hearing none? The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 2063, pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye' all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. This is final passage. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 116 voting 'aye' none voting 'no' and none voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House (sic Senate) Bill,2102, Representative Black. Clerk, Read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2102 (sic. Senate Bill), a Bill for an

#### STATE OF ILLINOIS 85th GENERAL ASSEMBLY HOUSE TRANSCRIPTION DEBATE

116th Legislative Day

June 15, 1988

Act to amend an Act in relationship to vehicle warranties. Third Reading of the Bill.

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Black."

Black: "Thank you, very much, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 2102, merely, amends the New Car Buyer Protection Act. Commonly referred to as the 'lemon law' that this body passed in 1984, all this Bill does is to add pick up trucks, 8,000 pounds or less to the New Car Buyer Protection Act or the 'lemon law'. And it would give purchases of those vehicles the same rights under the law as the 'lemon law' currently is constituted. I would urge your support of Senate:Bill 2102."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentlemen has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 2102, this Bill is on the Order of Short Debate. Does anyone rise in opposition? Hearing none. The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 2102, pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye' all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. This is final passage. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 114 voting 'aye' none voting 'no' and none voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2228, Representative Piel. Clerk, Read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2228, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act in relationship to banking. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Piel."

Ţ.

Piel: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Bill is introduced for the commissioner of banks and trust. There is no opposition, basically what the Bill does it just says many technical and clarification changes dealing with the Illinois Banking Act, and I would answer any questions dealing with the piece of

27

116th Legislative Day

June 15, 1988

legislation."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentlemen has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 2228, this Bill is on the Order of Short Debate. Does anyone rise in opposition? Representative Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

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

Cullerton: "Representative Piel could you describe what is contained in House Amendment #1?"

Piel: "I'm sorry, my apology Representative, I forgot that we had House Amendment #1. House Amendment #1, basically picks up House Bill I believe it's 3166, Representative McGann's, basically stating that if a person is in default that when they approach an employer for help in repayment they can explain to the employer the reason for the default."

Cullerton: "Well, does it allow the bank to disclose the financial records of a customer,...bank."

Piel: "To the employer, if the person is in a deliquent status and they need help from the employer."

Cullerton: "Delinquent to whom?"

Piel: "If the person has a delinquent account at that institution, at the bank."

Cullerton: "So if the customer owes money to the bank, and the banks attempting to collect an obligation that's owed to it, then the bank can give information about the financial records of that customer to whom?"

Piel: "Only dealing with the delinquent debt."

Cullerton: "Who do they disclose it to?"

Piel: "No, if the...just to give you an example, it would probably be best to put it in example form. The person is delinquent let's say on whether it be an installment mortgage loan type of a deal and they go to the employer for help, presently they cannot give the employer any

116th Legislative Day

- June 15, 1988
- information with exception of that the person is delinquent and if the employer says well, before I do this I want to know exactly were the delinq...delinquency."
- Cullerton: "I'm sorry but I'm not following your example. As I understand this it only applies to when a bank is owed money by a customer. Is that correct? Now, are you talking about credit cards that are all credit cards that are First National Bank of Chicago issues, Visa Cards, you're talking about that situation?"
- Piel: "Is dealing with a person who is in default. If a person is in default."
- Cullerton: "So, someone owes someone has defaulted on there Visa Card."
- Piel: "That is technically a part of credit, yes that...I guess that would be covered under this type of a situation correct."
- Cullerton: "This Bill allows the banks to disclose the financial records of a customer to whom?"
- Piel: "To the customer's employer if requested by the employer.

  In otherwords if the employer says 'okay, you know why are you doing this', you know basically saying alright the person is ninety days delinquent and they have made an agreement to pay one hundred and twenty five dollars a month or this type of a situation."
- Cullerton: "I don't mean to belabor this but I don't understand how the employer, why the employer has anything to do with a customer and a bank that he has a credit card with that he owes money to. Where does the employer, is it garnishment of his wages, or something your talking about or."
- Piel: "Right, it's basically a situation where if you went to the employer and ask for help...the employer ask..."
- Cullerton: "Who would ask for help, the banks going to the

116th Legislative Day

June 15, 1988

- employer to ask for help?"
- Piel: "The person who had the...had the loan, who they had the loan out with. Whether it be the bank whether it be, a credit union, a savings and loan, but in this situation it is a bank, if the bank had a the customer had an obligation and they went to this customers employer, presently they cannot they can just say can you help us out and that's it, but this way they can verify, they can verify information with the employer or if the employer needs further information."
- Cullerton: "Maybe it would...Maybe it would help if you told me, is this Amendment that was given to you by the Commissioner of Banks."
- Piel: "I beg your pardon, I'm sorry."
- Cullerton: "Was this Amendment supported by the Commissioner of Banks."
- Piel: "The Commissioner of Banks had no problem Representative McGann came up an ask if we would be willing to except the Amendment on the Bill and I had no problem on it, and I don't see Andy here."
- Cullerton: "Do you know of any interest group that's specifically interested in this Amendment?"
- Piel: "I have now in all sincerity, I have not your questions is the first ones that has been brought up whether it be pro or con."
- Cullerton: "Now with regard to the...with regard to the main...With regard to the main Bill, you just described it as a technical change requested by the commissioner. Does it have anything to do with relaxing any of our rules with regard to a banks abilities to have branch offices?"
- Piel: "No. No."
- Cullerton: "Well, maybe you could describe for example the...that portion of the Bill which makes the limitation pertaining

116th Legislative Day

- June 15, 1988
- to the establishment of branch banks and municipalities of ten thousand or more applicable only to branches established before 1-1-89."
- Piel: "Basically, that's merely technical changes John, on the way the present law states."
- Cullerton: "There was a..."
- Piel: "The...the...All the Bill does is...it's as I say and I'm being very serious on this all they were were minor and technical changes dealing with the present law that the commissioner and his staff said these changes should be made to clarify the law in reference to other statutes."
- Cullerton: "Okay, let me ask you this. Then there is a Section here which in the current law which prohibits banks from conducting business outside of the main banking premises.

  And this Bill strikes that, do you know the reason why?"
- Piel: "Yeah, could you give me the page and line number on there John?"
- Cullerton: "I will attempt to find it, I don't have the page and line right here. I have a summary of the Bill, which makes this point. So it would be somewhere where it strikes current law."
- Piel: "Give me a second, I found the Section, let me just take a quick glance at it."
- Cullerton: "Look at page 12 of the Senate Bill line 31. Do you know what that...do you see where I'm, that language that's struck?"
- Piel: "I see...I see what your asking John, and in all sincerity,

  I do not have the explanation of that part. Why don't you

  go on with another if you have other questions and let us
  look that up in the mean time."
- Cullerton: "Okay, it permits a state bank to merge into a national bank without obtaining approval by the commissioners and I just wonder why the commissioners would

116th Legislative Day

June 15, 1988

not...wanted to give up that right."

Piel: "I didn't catch the last sentence of your...of your."

Cullerton: "The Bill that your attempting to pass permits a state bank to merge into a national bank without obtaining approval by the commissioners."

Piel: "Right, the commissioner had no problem with that."

Cullerton: "Do you know why?"

Piel: "No. No, I do not."

Cullerton: "Okay, well that's..."

Piel: "I would think that anybody in all sincerity if anybody would have a problem with that it would be the commissioner. He said he had no problem with that language."

Cullerton: "Right...Okay, well, I would be I was wondering, if since we don't have that heavy a load if maybe we could just..."

Piel: "Madam Speaker, I'm sorry I can't hear a word he is saying."

Cullerton: "I was just going to suggest Madam Speaker, that since
we we may have some time to come back to this if we
could...there is one question that I asked that
Representative Piel was unclear of the answer, I thought
maybe if he could provide that for me we could take it out
of the record briefly and he could then..."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Piel, the Gentlemen is asking that you hold this Bill so that he can get an answer to the one question."

Piel: "I would be more than happy to take it out of the record

Madam Speaker and get the answer for him if we could get
back to that once we had that clarified."

Speaker Breslin: "Out of the Record. Senate Bill 2260,
Representative Wojcik, Representative Wojcik. Clerk, Read
the Bill. 2260."

116th Legislative Day

June 15, 1988

- Clerk Leone: "House (sic. Senate) Bill 2260, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Public Aid Code. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Wojcik, ask leave to return this
  Bill to the order of Second Reading for the purposes of an
  Amendment. Does she have leave? Hearing no objection.
  The Lady has leave. Read the Amendment, Mr. Clerk. Are
  there any Motions?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #1, is being offered by Representative Wojcik."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Wojcik."
- Wojcik: "Yes, Madam Speaker, and Members of the House. House Amendment #1, to Senate Bill 2260, represents an agreement between the Department of Public Aid and Advocacy Groups over non-cost item issues which were originally introduced in the work welfare and families legislative package. What the Amendment would do, it would provide that if an AFDC client fails to cooperate in child support enforcement activity by missing a court appearance this failure can be cured one time by signing a statement of willingness to cooperate and by promising to attend a later court hearing. This Amendment has been agreed to and I ask its favorable passage."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Lady moves for the adoption of Amendment #1, to House (sic. Senate) Bill 2260, on that question is there any discussion? Hearing none. The question is 'Shall Amendment #1, be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye' opposed 'nay' in the opinion of the chair the 'ayes' have it and the Amendments adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "There are no further Amendments."
- Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. Representative Wojcik now asks leave for immediate consideration of House (Senate) Bill

116th Legislative Day

June 15, 1988

2260 as amended. Are there any objections? Hearing none.

The Lady has leave. Read the Bill. By use of the Attendance Roll Call. Read the Bill on Third, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "House (sic. Senate) Bill 2260, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Public Aid Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Wojcik."

Wojcik: "Yes, Madam Speaker, I have spoken to the Bill and I can only ask that it be passed favorably. Thank you."

Speaker Breslin: "The Lady has moved for the adoption, the passage of Senate Bill 2260, and on that question the Gentlemen from Fulton, Representative Homer. Remember, this Bill is on Short Debate."

Homer: "Thank you, will the Lady yield?"

Speaker Breslin: "She will."

Homer: "Representative Wojcik, you explained the Amendment. Is the...did the Amendment gut the Bill?"

Wojcik: "No."

Homer: "Well, why don't you explain the Bill then. What does the Bill do?"

Wojcik: "The original Bill was our staff clarification that the personnel office does not do staff recruiting."

Homer: "What's that all about, what's the reason for that? It's a deletion of current law."

Wojcik: "Internal Audit at the Department of Public Aid."

Homer: "They don't wish to participate in the Department's recruitment of persons."

Wojcik: "It is not appropriate it's CMS' responsibility."

Homer: "Thank you."

Wojcik: "Your welcome."

Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 2260, pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye' all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. This is final passage. This

116th Legislative Day

June 15, 1988

is final passage. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are lll voting 'aye' none voting 'no' and none voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Ladies and Gentlemen the House is joined today by an Executive Officer, the Attorney General of the State of Illinois, Attorney General Hartigan. General Hartigan welcome. On page 4 of the calendar appears Senate Bill 2264, Representative Slater. Clerk, Read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House (sic. Senate) Bill 2264, a Bill for an Act to amend the Criminal Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Slater."

Slater: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the In the Criminal Code of the State of Illinois, we have the Bill, or whether we have a law which defines the crime of abuse and gross neglect of a long term care resident there have been facility some interpretations to the effect that State employees were not subject to that particular Criminal Code, Section. So as a result this Bill makes it clear that an employee of the State of Illinois could be quilty of this violation. I would move its passage."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentlemen has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 2264, this Bill is on the Order of Short Debate. Does anyone rise in opposition? Hearing none. The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 2264, pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye' all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. This is final passage. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the Record. On this question there are 115 voting 'aye' none voting 'no' and none voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Going back under Senate Bills, Third Reading, Short Debate

116th Legislative Day

June 15, 1988

Calendar we'll pick up two Bills that Members were out of the Chamber at the time. They appear on page 3, the first Bill, Senate Bill 1603, Representative Flinn. Clerk, Read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1603, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Credit Union Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Flinn."

Flinn: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Bill was proposed by the Illinois Credit Union League and it's designed to balance the rights and privileges of state chartered credit unions, with those of the federal charter, it does a few other things, I...it passed a Senate unanimously, it passed out of Financial Institutions Committee unanimously, and I know of no opposition. I would ask for the adoption of the Bill. Vote 'aye'."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentlemen has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 1603, and on that question is there any discussion? This Bill is on the Order of Short Debate. Does anyone rise in opposition? Hearing none. The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1603, pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye' all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is This is final passage. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 115 voting 'aye' none voting 'no' and none voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. On page 3 appears Senate Bill 1958. Excuse me 1998, that's on page 4 of your calendar. Representative Williams. read the Bill. "

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1998, a Bill for an Act to regulate credit service organizations. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Williams."

116th Legislative Day

June 15, 1988

Williams: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Senate Bill 1998, creates the Credit Service Organization Act. What it does is that it regulates companies that represent that they can improve a bias credit rating or obtain extensions of credit for such individuals it more or less provides penalties when there's been false swearing and other things of that nature. This Bill was supported by State's Attorney Daley and I would move for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentlemen has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 1998, this Bill is on the Order of Short Debate. Does anyone rise in opposition? Hearing none. The question is 'Shall Senate Bill 1998, pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye' all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is Representative Christensen for what reason do you seek recognition. The Gentlemen has decided not to seek Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who recognition. wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this there are 112 voting 'aye' none voting 'no' and none voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Ladies and Gentlemen we are now going to the Order of Speaker's Table. Special Call dealing with House Resolutions on the Amendatory Veto. On page 16 of your Calendar appears House Resolution 14, excuse me Representative McCracken for what reason do you seek recognition?"

McCracken: "To compliment the Chair on the creation of a very, very, wide ranging broadened scope, general subject matter, subject matter. Madam Speaker. You did such a fine job in jumping over all of the other House Resolutions on the Speaker's Table, I just wanted to commend you on an excellent imagination."

Speaker Breslin: "Thank you, House Resolution 1495,

Representative Cullerton. Are there any Motions or

116th Legislative Day

June 15, 1988

- Amendments filed, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #1 is being offered by Representative Cullerton."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Cullerton."
- Cullerton: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would move for the adoption of Amendment #1.

  It's technical in nature. It strikes the word 'the' and inserts the word 'and' so that the sentence would read both inside and outside State Government."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 1495. On that question, the Gentleman from DuPage, Representative McCracken."
- McCracken: "Parliamentary inquiry. If the Amendment is adopted, can it be returned for immediate consideration to the Speaker's Table? I believe if it were a Bill returned to Second Reading for an Amendment, it could not be considered for that day and I believe the rules would treat the Resolution for this purpose as a Bill. I'd like a ruling from the Chair."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Chair's ruling is that a Resolution is not a Bill. It does not need to be read three times. Therefore, if the Gentleman wishes, the Bill...the Resolution can be amended and we can vote on it immediately. Representative McCracken."
- McCracken: "Would the vote on it immediately require a Motion or can that be done in the Chair's discretion?"
- Speaker Breslin: "I think it can be done at the Chair's discretion."
- McCracken: "Well, let me ask a question. Would it be the Chair's discretion to vote on this immediately after the Amendment?"
- Speaker Breslin: "Yes."
- McCracken: "I suppose if we don't pass this today, western

116th Legislative Day

- June 15, 1988
- civilization will come to an end?"
- Speaker Breslin: "Maybe not. Representative Cullerton, did you have comments on this question?"
- Cullerton: "Well, yes. I thought that being the Sponsor of the

  Resolution it would be at my discretion as to whether or

  not to call it today, not the Speaker's res...discretion."

  Speaker Breslin: "Good point."
- Cullerton: "So I haven't decided yet, whether or not I'm going to call and I'd like to see if I can get this Amendment on."

  Speaker Breslin: "Very good. Representative McCracken."
- McCracken: "Point of order. I don't believe the Amendment's been printed and distributed. Now, certainly that rule would apply to a Resolution."
- Speaker Breslin: "Yes, it certainly would."
- McCracken: "Could I have it for a moment? Could we take a look at it? I don't have it."
- Speaker Breslin: "It has been...okay, it has been printed and distributed. Could someone get a copy of the Amendment to Mr. McCracken, please. Representative Cullerton."
- Cullerton: "Yes, I can assist Representative McCracken. If he has a copy of the House Resolution, on page 20 of the House Resolution, there appears the phrase 'both inside the outside State Government.' The purpose of this Amendment is to change the word 'the' to 'and' so that it reads 'both inside and outside State Government.' It's no hidden agenda. It's simply a technical Amendment."
- Speaker Breslin: "Is there any further discussion on the Amendment? Representative McCracken."
- McCracken: "Why do you want to use the conjunctive where you had an article in its place? Surely if you're using a conjunctive, aren't you doing something more than making a mere technical change?"
- Cullerton: "Well, we're not ending the sentence with a

# 116th Legislative Day

June 15, 1988

proposition, first of all, which is a rule...which is a...should normally be followed. The phrase 'both inside and outside of State Government', I think, is clear. I think the phrase 'both inside the outside State Government' raises some questions and I wanted to clarify that we didn't mean both inside the outside State Government. rather both inside and outside State Government. we didn't change it, one...might imply that there was something that would...would be referred to as 'the outside State Government' as opposed to an inside State Government which, I think implies something secretive and I certainly didn't want that to be in this Resolution. If you look the whole WHEREAS, what we're saying here is that the use of the Amendatory Veto by the Governor...Governors who have served since the adoption of the 1970 Illinois Constitution has often been controversial and has caused many respected individuals, namely the Speaker, both inside and outside State Government, to allege that the Governors have abused the Amendatory Veto power. So, that's what the WHEREAS clause is saying. So, right after having referred to respected individuals, they want to make sure that it's not just respected individuals inside State Government, but also respected individuals outside State Government."

- McCracken: "Well, I find that reasoning hard to argue with. I apologize for taking up the time of the Body. I was interested in determining whether, in fact, it was more than a technical change. Thank you."
- Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #1 be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it and the Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "There are no....There are no further Amendments."

116th Legislative Day

June 15, 1988

Speaker Breslin: "Very good. Representative Cullerton, what is
 your pleasure on this Resolution?"

Cullerton: "I haven't decided yet."

Speaker Breslin: "Very good. We'll go to another Order of Business."

Cullerton: "Fine."

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

Cullerton: "Yes, I've...decided that I think it would be a good idea to pass this Resolution today and I'll...I'll tell you why. The Resolution calls for guidelines with respect to the use and the scope of the Amendatory Veto and shall report its findings to this House and the Governor prior to July 31st, 1988. So, we have to get going on this right away."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Cullerton, it should be noted that while you have the discretion to call the Bill, it is within the Chair's discretion to go to that Order of Business."

Cullerton: "What Order are we on?"

Speaker Breslin: "We're...We left that Order of Business. We just haven't gone to another Order of Business."

Cullerton: "What Order are we on now?"

Speaker Breslin: "We're standing at ease at the moment, trying to decide where to go."

Cullerton: "Okay, I'll wait. Let me know what Order you're on."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Cullerton, you're in luck.

We're going to the Order of Speaker's Table, Special Call,
dealing with Amendatory Vetoes. On page 16 of your
Calendar appears House Resolution 1495, Representative
Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Cullerton: "Can we take this out of the record, now?"

116th Legislative Day

June 15, 1988

Speaker Breslin: "You certainly may."

Cullerton: "I don't want to. This Resolution creates a special committee on the Amendatory Veto. The charge is to issue a report prior to July 31st, 1988 containing findings and suggested quidelines for use of Gubernatorial Amendatorial The Resolution would create a 15 member Veto Authority. special committee which would consist οf Representatives appointed by the House Speaker and seven appointed by the Minority Leader with the Chairman to be from and by the committee members so the Chairman could, theoretically, be a Republican. The Resolution requires the committee to conduct public hearings, to review the use and scope and limitations of the Amendatory Veto. And members of the public, of course, are allowed to render advise and opinions to committee members concerning the Amendatory Veto process. The committee's report that contains these quidelines with respect to the use and limitations of the Amendatory Veto must be, as I indicated, submitted by July 31st, 1988. The purpose of that, of course, is so that the Governor will have these guidelines in his possession so that we can promote harmony between the functions of the Legislative and Executive Branches. The use of the Amendatory Veto has...has been indicated as been controversial. The purpose of this Resolution is to try to resolve the problem rather than having to come to a confrontation by having...the Speaker have to rule that certain Amendatory Vetoes lie outside the Governor's privilege which could only lead to possible litigation. The use of the Amendatory Veto, if anyone's interested, has increased since the Session that began in 1973, fairly dramatically. And I think it was only in the last Session, in 85/86, where the Governor started to cut back on the use of the Amendatory Veto, perhaps in response to some of the

116th Legislative Day

June 15, 1988

criticism. I would be happy to answer any questions and I would appreciate a favorable vote."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of House Resolution 1495 and on that question, the Gentleman from Dupage, Representative McCracken."

"Before I get to the Bill, I'd like to make a point of McCracken: Order. Madam Speaker. I think we've discussed similar issues before, but I'd like the Parliamentarian and to consider carefully what I yourself have say. Apparently this Bill was considered by Rules, this or Resolution was considered by Rules Committee, it was never assigned nor did it go to, nor has it been voted out Substantive Committee. Our position is, and if you read Rule 43(a), you will see that all Resolutions, except those specified, which...does not apply to this, have to be to committee, voted upon in a committee, reported out of a committee. consistent with those particular rules as specified which...which concern themselves with the procedure for the assignment, vote, and reporting out of substantive Bills. This Bill is not one of the exceptions enumerated anywhere in Rule 43 and, in particular, I direct the court's, or the Chair's attention to Rule 43(f) which specifies that this particular type of Resolution must pass by 60 votes. Now, that in and of itself is something which think the Chair is probably willing to agree, but my point is this. This has to be treated in accordance the rules of this House, many of which, although I don't need to point them out at this time, can be suspended by a vote of 71 affirmative votes. None of those rules has been followed in this case. Rather than going to a Substantive Committee, the Resolution went to Rules. Ιt went to Rules only for the purpose of complying with the second year requirements of the Constitution and our

116th Legislative Day

June 15, 1988

otherwise applicable House rules. There was nο consideration in a committee. There was no reporting out...there was no vote in a committee, there was no reporting out of a committee. In fact, the only way this could have gotten directly to the Speaker's Table under all those rules, is for a suspension of the various rules requiring a 71 affirmative votes, none of which has taken place in this case. My point of Order, Madam Speaker, is that you should rule this out of order on the Speaker's Table at this time for the reasons stated."

- Speaker Breslin: "Representative McCracken, I would ask you to refer to Rule 14. Rule 14(a) specifies that certain Resolutions should be referred to the Rules Committee. The first one is those which provide for the creation of a special House Committee. This Bill...this Resolution was sent to the Rules Committee because it created a special House committee, not because it was sent there in the second year of a substantive Session. It was, therefore, considered by the Rules Committee as the Substantive Committee that approved the Bill for consideration by this House. It is therefore the ruling of the Chair that the Bill has been properly through the committee process and is properly before this House. Representative McCracken."
- McCracken: "Madam Speaker, I wish to move, to appeal the ruling of the Chair and I'd like to address that when you're ready."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman moves to appeal the ruling of the Chair and on that question, Representative McCracken."
- McCracken: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I won't belabor the point.

  But let me say this: your reference to rule 14, I believe,
  is not well founded. Rule 14 specifies that a Bill should
  go to Rules for consideration. It does not specify nor by
  implication could it be read to accept from what is

116th Legislative Day

June 15, 1988

otherwise required by the many various rules I referred to. In particular, Rule 43 which concerns itself, and I quote, 'with all Resolutions, except those concerning Death, Congratulations, Adjournment, the Joint Rules, or House and the disapproval or reduction of a report of the Compensation Review Board.' Then the rule, Madam, goes on require that all such Bills covered by Rule 43 of which this is clearly one, must go to Substantive Committees, must be voted upon, must be reported out, must be put on the Calendar and treated, in those respects, the same as a No Bill could go through Rules and only Rules and Bill. reach the floor without the suspension of various rules that are applicable. I...I submit to you that in fact the proper reading is that 43 governs this type of Bill, governs this type of Resolution and 14 does not serve the purpose to which you ascribe it, that is consideration on the merits of a particular Resolution. That is clearly not the case and I...I think it's clear beyond any reasonable argument that Rule 43(a) by specificity requires that its provisions be followed in considering this Resolution."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative McCracken has moved that the Chair be overruled. Rule 81 requires that he be joined by six Members. Are you joined by six Members? The Gentleman is joined by six Members, the Motion is properly put and on the question, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Yes, will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Breslin: "He will."

Cullerton: "Representative McCracken, your...comments indicated that you think that Rule 43 should govern the manner in which this Resolution is handled. In reading Rule 43, is it your opinion that...in 43(A) it says 'all Resolutions, with certain exceptions, shall be read once by number and

116th Legislative Day

June 15, 1988

assigned to committee in the manner provided in Rule 33.'
Is that the Section of Rule 43 that you're relying upon in
terms of saying that this should have gone to a committee
other than Rules?"

McCracken: "Yes."

- Cullerton: "Okay, now, then Rule 14 specifically says, 'the following types of Bills and Resolutions shall be referred to the Rules Committee.' And, it specifically says, 'those which provide for the creation of a special House committee.' So, there's no question in your mind, I guess, that this Resolution should have first gone to the Rules Committee. Then...then you think that it should have come out of the Rules Committee and been assigned to a Substantive Committee."
- McCracken: "Yes. And, as a matter of fact, I'm glad you brought up the point for this reason. One of the rules referred to in Rule 43 with which compliance is required is Rule 33. And if you'll look at Rule 33, the Rules Committee may supersede a Substantive Committee. However, if it does so, it can only do so by requiring that a committee of the whole be adjourned...be convened for the purpose of considering the Bill on its merits, another option open to you in order to properly have this Bill at this place at this time, one which you did not follow."
- Cullerton: "And, let me ask you this question. What happens if someone wants to amend the rules, itself, if someone want to put a Bill in to amend the rules?"
- McCracken: "That may be a different case. I believe it is, but I don't know off hand."
- Cullerton: "Well, clearly, in that case, it would be assigned to
  the Rules Committee and the Rules Committee is the
  Substantive Committee which would consider that."
- McCracken: "Yes, You're right. However, the reason you're right

116th Legislative Day

June 15, 1988

is because creation of rules or affecting rules is the type of Resolution specifically accepted by Rule 43, so therefore, there is no inconsistency between the application of 14 and 43 for a Rules Resolution. This is not a Rules Resolution."

Cullerton: "Alright. Thank you."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Madam Speaker, on the Motion to overrule the ruling of the Chair, I support the Chair and I base my...action as Chairman of the Rules Committee under Rule 14 where it says that 'Bills or Resolutions which are governed by Subsection (A),' which is one of the...the Resolution that we're speaking of, 'shall be considered upon receiving affirmative vote of a majority of the Members appointed to the Rules Committee.' That, Mr....Madam Speaker, gives the authority to the Rules Committee to vote out a Resolution. We've done it in the past. And, in fact, I did ask the Minority Spokesman of the committee because I knew this was a political Resolution that we do this, take particular action. There was no objection to it at all so I would ask the Members to...to withhold the ruling of the Chair."

Breslin: "The question 'Shall the Chair Speaker is, overruled?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 47 voting 'aye', 66 voting 'no' and the Motion fails. Representative Cullerton on the Resolution. Excuse me, as I recall, you had already presented the Resolution. Representative McCracken, do you wish to speak to the Resolution now? Proceed, Sir."

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

# 116th Legislative Day

June 15, 1988

House. Representative Matijevich is correct when he tells you that this is a political issue. Unfortunately, it's a political issue because one side of the aisle in this chamber doesn't like the way it's been treated on Amendatory Vetoes. I submit to you that a simple the Constitution and a comparison of that or application of that language to the scope of a...various Amendatory Vetoes which have been objected to by the other side will show that it is only a political issue. It isn't a sound legal issue. You know, when you want to dicker around with the Constitution by means of a rule or when you want to call out a special witch hunt by means of a Resolution to toy with the Constitution, you know, you...it cuts both ways. This probably won't happen in our times, but it is conceivable that some day there may be a Now, Democrat in the executive branch. i f that the unlikely event that were to occur, we would probably find ourselves on opposite sides of the fence. quess the issue is whose ox is being gored. And I don't think that's a good enough reason to tinker around with a...something as fundamental as our Constitution. You know, in...the next six months or so, we're going to out whether the voters of this State want us to have another Constitutional Convention. I submit to you the proper place for a consideration of this issue is not by some politically charged special commission, but by the people. Let you...let your leader take his position to the people. Let him tell the people how the Amendatory Veto has been used. Let him tell the people why he thinks there's been an abuse of the process. But, the process is not abused as long as the Amendatory Veto powers exercised are within the scope of the powers conferred by the Constitution. They're not abused because you don't like

# 116th Legislative Day

June 15, 1988

the result or the way in which they're used. As a matter of fact, Illinois is a very progressive State in its use of the Amendatory Veto. It serves as an important check on the Legislature, something we could use a lot more of in Congress, something which your Senator, Alan Dixon, is most in favor for in...in Congress. He feels Washington has gone overboard and that it needs strong Amendatory Veto powers of a kind similar to those in Illinois which have served us so well. So, don't make any...any protestations to the contrary, don't bother. This is not an issue of somebody abusing his constitutional authority. In fact, by vour aoina around the people. going around the constitution, you precipitate a constitutional crisis. This political witch hunt is going to come back to haunt I suggest that everybody vote 'no' and defeat awful Resolution."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Kubik."
Kubik: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Would the Sponsor yield?"
Speaker Breslin: "He will."

Kubik: "Representative Cullerton, I want to make sure I understand this Resolution. The...the Resolution would set up a special commission of 15 Members and this particular commission would hold public hearings and develop guidelines for the Amendatory Veto. Is that correct?"

Cullerton: "Well, with the exception of the term 'commission', you're correct."

Kubik: "Okay. Now, these recommendations would be made to the Governor and the Legislature?"

Cullerton: "That's correct."

Kubik: "Okay. Now, what...would this be...this is not going to be on the ballot? It's not part of a move to change the Constitution? It's a...a commission that would just make some recommendations to the Governor."

116th Legislative Day

June 15, 1988

Cullerton: "That's correct...committee. It would make recommendations."

Kubik: "And...and if the Governor has decided...that he didn't
 particularly care for these particular..."

Cullerton: "Guidelines."

Kubik: "Resolutions...or guidelines, or whatever you want to call them, he could ignore them."

Cullerton: "He could."

Kubik: "He would have no legal basis for having to have to follow them?"

Cullerton: "That's correct."

Kubik: "So this is...it's actually an advisory kind of..."

Cullerton: "Right, and we would be calling upon people who...we would have public hearings and solicit testimony from people who have studied this very complicated issue and...and develop something that is advisory in nature and yet has some substance and, hopefully, the Governor would be impressed with it so that it would have some weight."

- Kubik: "And would the Senate have any input into this matter? Are there any Senators on this committee or don't they seem to be as concerned about this matter?"
- Cullerton: "Well, that certainly is up to them if they wish to pass a Resolution on it for the same type of hearings, they could certainly do the same."
- Kubik: "I see, so... Now, these hearings...we're going to be out of here, hopefully, by July 1st so we'd have about a month not only to have the hearings, but also to put together a report and some guidelines. How many...how many hearings do you envision here?"
- Cullerton: "Well, we do have a month when we're not in Session to have some hearings and, again, this is something which has been studied for...at great length, for...you know, we have maybe 20 year's history of experience with...the Amendatory

116th Legislative Day

June 15, 1988

Veto and certain court decisions and there's been recommendations that have been made in the past, so I think that we would have enough time. The reason, of course, for the 'rush', as you call it, a rush...would be so that we have these...guidelines before the Governor starts Amendatory Vetoing Bills."

Kubik: "Madam Speaker, to the Bill. I think that, perhaps, Rep...Representative Matijevich described it best when he said this is a political Resolution. It does have no legal effect. It is really, basically, going to be used as a...a hammer with which to beat the Governor when he considers these Amendatory...considers any Amendatory Motions or Amendatory Messages. So, I think that we ought to...look at it in that light and defeat the Resolution."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Matijevich."

"Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Matijevich: when I characterized this issue as chairman of the Rules Committee as being political, what I meant by that was that I knew that the Republican Members of that Rules Committee were going to vote against it and...to support Governor Thompson. That didn't mean that I felt that this issue political issue. The fact of the matter is that since the adoption of our Constitution we have had We have had two Republican Governors and one Democratic Governor. All of those Governors abused the Amendatory Veto process. It has been abused more than the rest under Governor Thompson, there's no question about that, but this issue is one that cuts across Party lines. I remember when the Constitution was presented to the voters and after the adoption of the Constitution in my area, Senator Karl Berning, who was a Republican and myself a Democrat were most vocal in the fact that that provision

# 116th Legislative Day

June 15, 1988

could be abused by Governors. What happens, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, and everybody should be for study of it because we ought to be in a position as Legislators really protecting the legislative process. of us know how...how the whole legislative process has changed with the...with the special interests groups around is really changed from what it has been. Ιt what happens after a Bill is passed...the, in fact, before a Bill is passed, the special interests groups know that they have a open door to the Governor's Office. Now that is whether the Governor's Democrat or Republican. And don't think that's what the Amendatory Veto process or provision was intended for. Everybody, and all of who were part of the Constitutional Convention know, that the intent of the Amendatory...Veto process was to really make changes, very grammatical changes only. That was the whole purpose for it. Now we have seen governors completely rewrite a Bill. Completely, where a Bill has...has no...no bearing to what its initial introduction was or its passage was. I think this is an abuse to the process and I don't...you know, even though understand that...you know, on that side of the aisle, you're under pressure to support your Governor. You know, what's going to happen if there's a Democratic Governor and he abuses...he or she abuses the process? You will be screaming, too. But we shouldn't take it from...from view point. We should take it from the view point that nobody...nobody should abuse the intent of the Amendatory If we do, then we are going to see more and more...it's been a mushroom. It's been rolling downhill and creating steam and I quess, maybe if Pat Quinn's next...his next Amendment ought to be, rather than reduce the Legislature, eliminate it because if we allow the

116th Legislative Day

June 15, 1988

Amendatory Veto process to extend to what it could be, it's in, the way it's being abused, we might as well let the Governor be the supreme lawmaker. They don't need us. The Governor is now the supreme lawmaker in Illinois and I don't think that should be the intent of that provision. And, therefore, I urge the Members to vote for this Resolution."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Cullerton, for what reason do you seek recognition? Others are seeking recognition.

Okay, the Lady from Cook, Representative Parcells on the question."

Parcells: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Repre...would the Representative yield for a question?"

Cullerton: "Yes, yes I will."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Cullerton."

Parcells: "If you're really in earnest on this, why would this be a Joint Resolution with the Senate? They are as affected by this as we are."

Cullerton: "Who's your Senator, Senator Keats?"

Parcells: "Yes."

Cullerton: "Well, there's a good example right there."

Parcells: "I don't know what your sarcasm means, but I think that the Senate should have been consulted on this."

Cullerton: "The Senate...The Senate doesn't even read most of the Bills that they pass. You know that. The House is...the House is the one under the Leadership of the Speaker that's been...the one's that's been...the person that's raised this issue and I think that if the Senate wants to join us, they could pass a Resolution as well."

Parcells: "Well, but in an ordinary situation such as this, we would ask the Senate to join us in this because he is the same Governor that governs this House and governs the Senate. So it is clearly just a political move, here.

116th Legislative Day

June 15, 1988

Where is the citizen input? This committee is going to have eight Democrats, seven Republicans, obviously a tilt there, and no citizen input at all. Is that correct, or am I reading this incorrectly?"

Cullerton: "Well, you're right on the numbers, eight and seven.

The Chairman is chosen from among those members, so that certainly could be a Republican, and the citizens, of course, I assume that those 15 members are citizens because you have to be a citizen to be a State Representative, but the citizens would have input in...in testifying in front of the committee."

Parcells: "That...that is their only input."

Cullerton: "Well, what else would you want them to do?"

Parcells: "Mostly, or very often, when we have such a committee, we get citizen input by putting them on these committees, one, two, four. Have some citizen input on this."

Cullerton: "That's how we pass Bills, too. We have citizens come in and testify and that's what we're doing with regard to this..."

Parcells: "Yes, but we have a lot of committees where we have citizens, too. I think this is a bad Resolution and I'm one of those that is not going to vote in favor of it. I noticed that last year when we were discussing this whole issue, we took House Bill 1867 as the example. The Speaker took that as an example and that Bill died because of that. He also said that we were going to work on ten other Bills to override the Amendatory Veto. Of those ten, we only overrode three which proves that the Members of this House actually, in fact, agreed with the Governor. Therefore, this is a kneejerk reaction. It is not fair. It's very political. We're not including the Senate, we're not including citizens, and we don't have an even committee here. We have seven and eight instead of having an even

116th Legislative Day

June 15, 1988

commission, therefore, it's strictly political and I would encourage a 'no' vote."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Cullerton to close."

Cullerton: "Well, first of all, I'd like to address some of the issues that were raised by the opponents. There was a suggestion that this be done at а Constitutional Ι think we all know that we're only going to decide in November whether we're even to have Constitutional Convention. It certainly is not a given. In fact, it's likely that we may not have one. If there was a Constitutional Convention about to meet in the next few months, I would suggest that perhaps this would not be But, that's not the case. With regard to the necessary. issue of citizen involvement, obviously, the citizens' suggestions and opinions will be solicited and they will certainly play a role in developing the guidelines. would also suggest to you this is not a political issue. believe that the Speaker is very convinced that this particular Amendatory Veto process has been abused and it is a bipartisan abuse, if you will. It's been both Democrat and Republican Governors who perhaps have exceeded what the Constitutional Convention had in mind. think we all know it's very likely that the next Governor we have is more likely not going to be a Democrat. that's pretty obvious. In fact, the person who is the next Governor may be here right now. May be here right in this room. And if that next Governor certainly has the Amendatory Veto power, would probably welcome to have guidelines that were set down by a committee that recommended what should be done. And to give you an example, the Governor, last year, took a Bill and, after we passed the Bill, a court decision came down and the

116th Legislative Day

June 15, 1988

Governor, in the Amendatory Veto, addressed the court decision. That is like just making up a new Bill on his own without the Legislature's approval, without without the citizens coming committee approval, and testifying before the committee to give their input. that is clearly an abuse of this process. No one is suggesting we eliminate the Amendatory Veto. No one saying that it's not...doesn't come in handy. That the Legislators sometimes go to the Governor and ask that a Bill be Amendatorily Vetoed. We're not saying that. And we're not saying that the Governor, necessarily even has abused his power. That's what the committee's for. The committee will be set up to study the issue and then make recommendations and then make guidelines. For that reason, I think that your...to say it's partisan, is not accurate and I would ask for your nonpartisan 'aye' vote."

Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall House Resolution 1495

be adopted?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those
opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. 60 votes are required

for the adoption of this Resolution. Representative

McCracken, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

McCracken: "To verify it."

- Speaker Breslin: "Only vote your own switches. There will be a request for verification. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 66 voting 'aye', 47 voting 'no', one voting 'present'.

  Representative McCracken, do you persist in your request?

  He does. Poll the Affirmative, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "Poll of the Affirmative. Berrios. Bowman. Braun.

  Breslin. Brunsvold. Bugielski. Capparelli. Christensen.

  Cullerton. Curran. Currie. Daley. Davis. DeJaegher.

  DeLeo. Dunn. Farley. Flinn. Flowers..."
- Speaker Breslin: "Excuse me. Representative McCracken,

116th Legislative Day

June 15, 1988

Representative Novak asks leave to be verified. He has leave. As does Representative Dunn, Representative Hicks, Representative Shaw...Representative Shaw, Representative Daley, Representative Curran, Representative Jones. We're writing all the names down. And Representative Bowman. Representative Bowman is right here, Mr. McCracken. He has leave. Okay, proceed, Mr. Clerk."

- Clerk Leone: "Continuing with the Poll of the Affirmative. Giglio. Giorgi. Granberg. Hannig. Harris. Hartke. Hicks. Homer. Jones. Keane. Krska. Kulas. Lang. LeFlore. Leverenz. Levin. Martinez. Matijevich. Mautino. McGann. McNamara. McPike. Morrow. Mulcahey..."
- Speaker Breslin: "Excuse me. Representative Keane asks leave to be verified. Representative Braun, for what reason do you seek recognition?"
- Braun: "I'm sorry to interrupt, but I would like to be verified for..."
- Speaker Breslin: "Okay, Representative Braun. Representative Klemm requests leave to vote 'no'. Record the Gentleman as voting 'no'. Proceed, Mr. Clerk. Excuse me, Representative Leverenz now asks leave to be verified. You have leave."

Clerk Leone: "Continuing with the Poll of the...Affirmative."

Speaker Breslin: "Proceed, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Krska. Kulas. Lang. Laurino. LeFlore. Matijevich. Leverenz. Levin. Martinez. Mautino. McGann. McNamara. McPike. Morrow. Mulcahey. Novak. O'Connell. Rice. Richmond. Phelps. Rea. Ronan. Satterthwaite. Shaw. Steczo. Stern. Saltsman. Sutker. Terzich. Turner. Van Duyne. White. Williams. Anthony Young. Wyvetter Younge and Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Breslin: "Any questions of the Affirmative?"

116th Legislative Day

June 15, 1988

McCracken: "Yes, thank you. Representative Farley?"

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Farley. Bruce Farley. How is the Gentleman recorded?"

McCracken: "He's voting 'ave'."

Clerk Leone: "The Gentleman's recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Breslin: "Remove him from the Roll Call."

McCracken: "Representative Hanniq?"

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

McCracken: "Representative McNamara?"

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

McCracken: "Representative Christensen?"

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Christensen. Ray Christensen.

Is the Gentleman in the chamber? He is not. Remove him from the Roll Call."

McCracken: "Representative Van Duyne?"

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Van Duyne. Leroy Van Duyne. Is the Gentleman in the chamber? He is not. Remove him from the Roll Call. Representative John McNamara has returned to the chamber. Add him to the Roll Call voting 'aye'."

McCracken: "Representative Steczo?"

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

McCracken: "Representative Hartke?"

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

McCracken: "Representative DeJaegher?"

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

116th Legislative Day

June 15, 1988

McCracken: "Representative Brunsvold?"

Speaker Breslin: "Representative...excuse me, Representative

Huff, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

Huff: "Yes, Madam Speaker. How am I recorded?"

Speaker Breslin: "You are recorded as voting 'present'."

Huff: "Change my vote to 'aye'."

Speaker Breslin: "Change Representative Huff to 'aye'.

Representative Van Duyne has returned to the chamber. Add him to the Roll Call voting 'aye'. Your request, I believe, was of Representative Brunsvold. Joel Brunsvold. Is the Gentleman in the chamber? He is not. Remove him from the Roll Call. Representative Hartke has returned to the chamber. Add him to the Roll Call voting 'aye'."

McCracken: "Representative Morrow?"

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

McCracken: "Okay. Rep...Representative Giorgi?"

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

McCracken: "Oh. Alright. Representative White?"

Speaker Breslin: "Representative White is in his seat."

McCracken: "Representative...DeLeo?"

Speaker Breslin: "Representative DeLeo. Jim DeLeo. The
Gentleman's not in the chamber. Remove him from the Roll
Call. Representative DeJaegher has returned to the
chamber. Add him to the Roll Call voting 'aye'."

McCracken: "Represenative Daley?"

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Daley. John Daley. Had leave to be verified."

McCracken: "Representative Terzich?"

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

McCracken: "Representative Krska?"

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Krska. Representative Krska.

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

116th Legislative Day

June 15, 1988

Roll Call. Representative Brunsvold has returned to the chamber. Add him to the Roll Call voting 'aye'."

McCracken: "Represen....Representative Capparelli?"

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Capparelli is in his chair.

Representative...excuse me, Representative Hannig has returned to the chamber. Add him to the Roll Call voting 'ave'."

McCracken: "Representative Williams?"

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

McCracken: "Rep...Representative Davis?"

Speaker Breslin: "The Lady's in her chair."

McCracken: "Representative Turner?"

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Turner. Art Turner. Is the Gentleman in the chamber? He is."

McCracken: "Alright, I see him. Nothing further."

Speaker Breslin: "On this question there are 63 voting 'aye', 48 voting 'no', none voting 'present' and the Resolution is adopted. Representative John Dunn is recognized for a Motion."

Dunn: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I move to reconsider the vote by which Senate Bill 2124 passed. Senate Bill 2124 is a noncontroversial Bill. As a matter of fact, it was on that group of Consent Calendar Bills which passed earlier this afternoon. And a noncontroversial Amendment has been suggested which we would like to get on the Bill. So, to do that, I'll have to bring it back in here. I've cleared it with both sides of the aisle, know of no opposition, so I request a favorable vote on this Motion."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved to reconsider the vote by which House Bill (sic Senate Bill) 2124 passed earlier today. All those favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who whish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 115

116th Legislative Day

- June 15, 1988
- voting 'aye', none voting 'no', and none voting 'present'.

  This Bill...this Motion carries. So we have moved...you have permission to reconsider the vote, Representative Dunn. Representative Dunn."
- Dunn: "Madam Speaker, at this point, does this Bill remain on...it's on Third Reading right now?"
- Speaker Breslin: "It's...that's correct."
- Dunn: "Let's leave it right there, if we can and then we'll do this...do the Amendment at another time. Thank you."
- Speaker Breslin: "Very good. Is Representative Leverenz in the chamber? Representative Leverenz? Representative Levin and Leverenz. Representative Levin is recognized for a Motion."
- Levin: "Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would move to ask...I would ask leave to take back to Second Reading Senate Bill 1707 which is a JCAR Bill which was on the Consent Calendar for purposes of an Agreed Amendment."
- Speaker Breslin: "Mr. Clerk, where is this Bill on the Calendar?"

  Clerk O'Brien: "The Bill was removed from Consent Calendar so it

  would appear tomorrow on the Calendar on Second Reading,

  Second Day, Short Debate."
- Speaker Breslin: "Very good. Are there...so the Bill shall be called, then, on Second Reading, Senate Bill 1707. Are there any Amendments filed or Motions?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1707, this Bill has been read a second time previously. There were no Committee Amendments."
- Speaker Breslin: "Are there any Floor Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Levin and Myron Olson."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Levin."
- Levin: "Alright. Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 1707 is a Bill that was

116th Legislative Day

June 15, 1988

developed by the Joint Committee on Administrative Rules and was on the Consent Calendar. Earlier this year we passed House Bill 3145 which is also a JCAR Bill which unfortunately did not get out of Senate Rules. House Amendment #1 is a Amendment that was run by the two committee chairmen of Human Ser...Committee Chairmen and the Minority Spokesman of Human Services, and it's a JCAR Amendment which we would add to Senate Bill 1707. What is in it, is provisions dealing with the Department of Public Aid and with the Department of Public Health, both of which are not opposed by the agency."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1707 and on that question is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall the Amendment be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it and the Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. Representative Levin now asks leave to place this Bill back on the Consent Calendar. Are there any objections? Hearing no objections, the Gentleman has leave. The Bill will appear on Third Reading, Second Day, on the Consent Calendar tomorrow. Would you turn off Levin's switch, please. Representative Representative Leverenz. Is Representative Leverenz in the chamber? Going to the Order of Senate...oh, excuse Representative Leverenz is here. Representative Leverenz, you're recognized for an announcement."

Leverenz: "The Appropriations Committee I, will meet immediately after Session. We will be voting on all the Bills in 114.

That's all."

Speaker Breslin: "Okay. Representative Leverenz, would you come

116th Legislative Day

June 15, 1988

to the podium, please? Ladies and Gentlemen, we're going to go to Senate Bills, Third Reading, Short Debate Calendar, back to a Bill that Representative Piel took out of the record earlier. It appears on page four of the Calendar. House Bill 2228. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 2228, a Bill for an Act to amend an

Act in relation to banking. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Piel."

Piel: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. A couple...about ten or fifteen minutes ago we were talking about this Bill. In fact...about an hour ago, we were talking about this Bill. Representative Cullerton had some questions in reference to the...the wording. I think his questions have been answered fully. I'd be more than happy to answer any other questions. It is, as I say, basically technical in nature and also incorporating...Representative McGann's Bill, 3166, and I would ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman asks move for the passage of Senate Bill 2228 and on...this Bill is on the Order of Short Debate. Does anyone rise in opposition? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 2228 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. This is final passage. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 110 voting 'aye', 2 voting 'no', and 3 voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Representative White, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

White: "Madam Speaker, I rise for an announcement."

Speaker Breslin: "State your announcement, please."

White: "The Human Services Subcommittee on Hospital Services is

116th Legislative Day

- June 15, 1988
- cancelled for 8:00 o'clock tomorrow. The Human Services Subcommittee on Hospital Services is cancelled for tomorrow."
- Speaker Breslin: "...Services Subcommittee...okay. Thank you.
  ...Bills, Third Reading. Page 4, on your Calendar. Senate
  Bill 448, Representative Countryman. Clerk, read the
  Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 448, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Business Corporation Act, Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Countryman."
- Countryman: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 448 now makes relatively minor changes to the Business Corporation Act. It changes a definition of 'anniversary'. It allows the use of the inclusion of a rural route number in certain forms. It...makes the Business Corporation Act apply...equivalent with the Not-For-Profit Corporation Act by permitting the merger of business corporations with not for profit corporations. It reserves powers to the General Assembly in the General Not-For-Profit Act, and it provides for the revocation and dissolution of not-for-profit corporations. it has several additions relating to the penalty for filing. These are all relatively minor changes which has...been recommended by the Secretary of State's office and was all reviewed in the committee. And I move its adoption."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 448 and on that question, is there any discussion? Any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 448 pass? All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. This is final passage. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted

116th Legislative Day

June 15, 1988

who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 115 voting 'aye', none voting 'no' and none voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 502, Representative Satterthwaite. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 502, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Public Community College Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Satterthwaite."

Satterthwaite: "Madam Speaker, and Members of the House this is a technical change to the Community College District Act to bring into conformity a number of different Sections with uniform title referring to operations and maintenance. It is really not a substantive change. I would be happy to address any questions that Member might...Members might have and otherwise move for the passage of Senate Bill 502."

Speaker Breslin: "The Lady has moved for the passage of Senate
Bill 502 and on that question, the Gentleman from Cook,
Representative Cullerton. Representative Homer at
Representative Cullerton's desk."

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

Speaker Breslin: "She will."

Homer: "Representative Satterthwaite, the staff notes on the file that...that the Bill would make it easier to pass tax increase referenda. Could you address that aspect of the Bill?"

Satterthwaite: "Representative, I don't know that it will make it any easier, as you are aware, I'm sure, when a referendum is on a ballot, it is always incumbent upon the people who are supportive of that to put forth their recommendations for why that referendum will be needed. There is an

116th Legislative Day

June 15, 1988

indication that referenda have been confusing in the past because it has referred to building, even though the funds provided through this particular portion of the Act are for maintenance and operations of buildings rather than for the buildings and capital improvements funds. So there is some feeling that eliminating the reference to building may in fact help people to understand the true purpose of the tax that would be raised under this provision."

Homer: "There's a belief, then, that whenever a referendum proposition has terminology of buildings in it that it makes it less likely that that referendum would pass?"

Satterthwaite: "Well, I think there is some feeling that if people felt that this was being passed in order to have capital improvements, when in fact it is not meant to address capital improvements, that it may be misleading.

And so this will clarify that the purpose of this fund is, in fact, for the operations and maintenance of buildings that are already in existence."

Homer: "I see. So, actually, what you're doing is...just allowing the referendum to be stated more clearly so that people know what they're voting on."

Satterthwaite: "As to what its true purpose is, yes."

Homer: "Alright. Thank you."

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

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

Speaker Breslin: "She will."

Ropp: "Representative, as the Bill now stands, does this allow for community college to purchase land if that is needed or has that been eliminated from the Bill?"

Satterthwaite: "That would still be permissible."

Ropp: "It's still permissible? They will, by referendum now be

116th Legislative Day

June 15, 1988

able to continue to purchase land if they need to?"

Satterthwaite: "That's my understanding."

Ropp: "Okay. The other point, then, I think what you are attempting do here is to simplify the process so that people understand what they will be voting on in case a referendum comes before the body."

Satterthwaite: "That is our intent, yes."

Ropp: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Breslin: "Any further discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 502 pass? All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? This is final passage. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 115 voting 'aye', none voting 'no' and none voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 952, Representative Ronan. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 952, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Savings and Loan Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Ronan. Representative Ronan."

Ronan: "Yes, Madam Speaker. We...when we moved this Bill to Third Reading, we had an Amendment that had not been properly filed. I would like to call the Bill back to Second Reading, add the Amendment, then move the Bill out. So at this point, I would like to...I think I want to also like to withdraw Amendment #1 because this Amendment will replace Amendment #1."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman...the Gentleman move...asks leave to return this Bill to the Order of Second Reading for the purposes of a Motion and an Amendment. Does he have leave? Hearing no objection, he has leave. Represen...is there a

116th Legislative Day

June 15, 1988

Motion filed, Mr. Clerk? No Motion is filed. Representative Ronan from the floor asks...moves to table Amendment #1 and on that question is there any discussion? Hearing none...hearing no discussion, the question is, 'Shall Amendment #1 be tabled?' All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it and Amendment #1 is tabled. Are there any further Amendments?"

- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Piel."
- Piel: "Thank you, Madam Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Floor Amendment #2 is identical to #1 except it clarifi...corrects some gramma...a grammatical error that was in Amendment #1. That's the reason we had to withdraw Amendment #1 and so #2 is identical to #1."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 952. Is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall Amendment #2 be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it and the Amendment's Adopted. Any further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. Representative Ronan now asks leave for immediate consideration of Senate Bill 952 as amended. Are there any objections? Hearing no objections, the Gentleman has leave. Read the Bill on Third, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 952, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Savings and Loan Act. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Ronan."
- Ronan: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. This is a very simple concept.

# 116th Legislative Day

June 15, 1988

What this...what this Bill does now as amended, amends the Illinois Savings and Loan Act of 1985 by permitting State chartered savings and loans to operate a branch facility outside of the State of Illinois, but within the current banking region. This is an opportunity to bring the savings and loan industry in this State up to modern standards. I think it's a great concept. It's agreed by the commissioner of the Savings and Loan Department, by the agency, by the consumer, and by everyone else in the State. I'll be glad to answer any questions concerning the legislation."

- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 952 and on that question is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 952 pass?' all those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. This is final passage. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 114 voting 'aye', none voting 'no', and none voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1285, Representative record. οf the Senate DeLeo. Out Bill Representative Mautino. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1456, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act to regulate the granting of assistance to indigent war veterans and their families. Third Reading of the Bill."

  Speaker Breslin: "Representative Mautino."
- Mautino: "I would...thank you, Madam Chairman. I would like to ask leave of the House to take 1456 back to Second Reading for an Agreed Amendment that is provided by Representative Berrios and Martinez that's technical in nature."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has asked leave to return this Bill to the Order of Second for the purposes of an

116th Legislative Day

June 15, 1988

Amendment. Are there any objections? Hearing none, the Gentleman has leave. Are there any Motions or Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #2 is being offered by Representative Mautino, Klemm, and Breslin."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Mautino on Amendment 2."

Mautino: "For clarification, Mr. Clerk, is that 85...LRB8506527?

I want to get the right one."

Speaker Breslin: "Read the LRB number, please."

Clerk Leone: "HRS85S1456."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Mautino."

Mautino: "Basically, this Amendment is an Agreed Amendment between the counties, the veterans' organizations, and the VACS, Veterans' Assistance Commissions. It establishes the provisions for extending levies and funds extended by the Veterans' Assistance Commission. Providing that the county board shall approve of all expenditures and the fact that those employees of the VACS are not employees of the county. I move for its adoption."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 1456. On that question, the Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Klemm."

Klemm: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I stand in support of the Gentleman's Amendment. It's been a effort of trying to get the compromise between the veterans' groups and the county board members. I think we have accomplished that with this Amendment and I urge our side of the aisle to support the Amendment."

Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment 2 be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'aye's have it and the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

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

116th Legislative Day

June 15, 1988

Representative Martinez and Berrios."

- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Martinez. Representative Martinez."
- Martinez: "Thank you, Madam Speaker and Members of the General Assembly. Amendment #3 is a technical change in the language, simply adding two organizations, namely the Legion of American Veterans' and the American GI Forum to be included in this Bill. I would urge passage."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment 3 to Senate Bill 1456 and on that question is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall Amendment 3 be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it and the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

- Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. Representative Mautino now asks leave for immediate consideration of Senate Bill 1456 as amended. Are there any objections? Hearing none, the Gentleman has leave. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1456, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act to regulate the granting of assistance to indigent war veterans and their families. Third Reading of the Bill."

  Speaker Breslin: "Representative Mautino."
- Mautino: "Thank you, Madam Chairman. I believe everyone knows what is included. Amendment #1 and 2 provided for oversight by the county board and establishes who the employees are of the VACS. It also provided that the Department of Veterans' Affairs can accept and hold on behalf of the State for public interest grants, et cetera, that are provided to the department. And #3, it provides that the Mexican—Americans and two other classifications are included in the coverage and I move for the passage of

116th Legislative Day

June 15, 1988

Senate Bill 1456."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 1456 and on that question, the Gentleman from Warren, Representative Hultgren."

Hultgren: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Breslin: "He indicates he will."

Hultgren: "When this started out, there was an attempt, I think,
to resolve the dispute in power between the Veterans'
Assistance Commissions and the county boards. Where is
that...how have you balanced those two competing interests
in the Bill in its final form now?"

Mautino: "They signed off and it was their Amendment. It was

Amendment #1 which was the Mautino, Breslin, Klemm, Giorgi

Amendment. Everyone has agreed to everything that's in the

Bill this time."

Hultgren: "Thank you."

Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1456 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? This is final Voting is open. passage. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 116 voting 'aye', none voting 'no' and none voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared On page five appears Senate Bill 1470, Representative Bowman. Representative Bowman. Out of the Senate Bill 1475, Representative Currie. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1875, Representative Barnes. of the record. Senate Bill 1914, Representative John Dunn. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1987, Representative Daley. John Daley. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1996, Representative Preston. Out of the record. Senate Bill 2087, Representative Madigan, Cullerton. Out of the record. Representative Giglio is recognized for a Motion."

116th Legislative Day

June 15, 1988

- Giglio: "Madam Speaker, the Democrats would like permission to go to Caucus in Room 114 for approximately one half hour, immediately."
- Speaker Breslin: "Do the Republicans need a Caucus? No. Very good. Ladies and Gentlemen, the House will go to cau...the Democrats will go to Caucus at this time for one half hour. At that...after that caucus, we will return to the floor and we will proceed to the issue of Education Reform. So be prepared when you return to the Floor to debate that issue. The House stands in recess for a Democratic Caucus in Room 114 for one half hour."
- Speaker Breslin: "The House will come to order. Representative Ropp is recognized for an announcement."
- Ropp: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Because of the action that is being taken care of in the House, we're going to delay the softball practice from tonight until tomorrow night, same time, same place. So, one day later. Thank you."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Matijevich is recognized for a Motion."
- Matijevich: "Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would move and ask leave of the House and use of the Attendance Roll Call for that purpose, to extend the deadline for Senate Bills...Senate Bills Appropriations matters. The deadline from today until tomorrow, June 16th, so that the committee continue...can continue to deliberate on the Senate Bills. This has been cleared on both side of the aisle and I would asks leave for that purpose."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has asked leave to extend the deadline for Senate Approp. Bills until tomorrow, June 16th. Any objection? Hearing none, the Gentleman has leave with use of the Attendance Roll Call. Ladies and Gentlemen, the House will come to order. Would the

116th Legislative Day

- June 15, 1988
- Doorkeeper remove all unauthorized persons from the floor?

  Representative McCracken, for what reason do you seek recognition?"
- McCracken: "I'd just like to compliment the Democrats on that half hour conference. They were very prompt in returning.

  Thank you."
- Speaker Breslin: "On House Bills, Second Reading, on page three on your Calendar appears House Bill 4101, Representative LeFlore. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 4101, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the School Code. This Bill has been read a second time previously. No Committee Amendments."
- Speaker Breslin: "Any Floor Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Parke."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Parke withdraws Amendment #1.

  Any further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Parke."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Parke withdraws #2. Any further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative
  Hoffman."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Hoffman on Amendment #3."
- Hoffman: "Thank you very much, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is the first opportunity that we've had as a Body to consider one of the very important issues before this General Assembly during this Session and this is the issue of Chicago School District reform.

  Amendment #3 is the work of a subcommittee of the House Republican Policy Committee and it's a pleasure, in fact, it's indeed a privilege for me to be the Sponsor of this Amendment and to explain the contents of this Amendment and

## 116th Legislative Day

June 15, 1988

to ask for your support. Now it may appear to some that it somewhat presumptuous of those of us who are interested in schools across the entire State to get involved in one particular school district and to come forth with a program to make rather substantial and dramatic changes in the way that a school district will operate in the future. I would point out to you, however, that approximately a third of the General Distributive Fund goes to that one school district, that that one school district has an excess of 22 percent of the student population in the State, that that school district, in fact, is 230 times larger than the average school district in the rest of the State and is factoring them into that equation. I think also we have to recognize as we look at the effort that was put in to try to come to some meaningful consensus on how to make changes in the Chicago School System to give the boys and girls better opportunities, that in fact, the old you cannot ask the priesthood to reform the church, also is applicable to this setting. You can't ask those people who are involved in an indigenous way to look at themselves and make the kind of changes that probably ought to be made. And so, I submit to you today the program that you find in Amendment #3. And let me quickly tell you what is in it and then I'll be glad to respond to questions. Number one, it abolishes the Chicago Board of Education immediately in its entirety and replaces it Reorganization and Receivership Board which will exist until July 1 of 1990 when elected school boards With the abolition of District 299, the...the office. legislation puts into place six autonomous school districts with seven member elected boards put into place. are suggesting is that we abolish Chapter 34 in the School Code and make all the rest of the School Code applicable to

## 116th Legislative Day

June 15, 1988

those six districts in Chicago which will be treated like every other School District in the State. It also provides for reduction in the central bureaucracy until the new School Districts go on line July 1 of 1990, immediately by third and then within six months, reduced to 50 percent of its current level. It provides that the local school improvement councils will work with the principals who will meet with them at least six times each year and gives to those same school principals the authority to make recommendations to the District Superintendent regarding appointments, retention, promotion, and assignment of all school staff, both certified and non-certified. That's a major change, as you know, from what happens today. principal is responsible for the educational functioning of the school and the operating engineer is responsible for the building. In this situation, the principal will be of the entire building which will make that compatible with what happens around the State. T+ also requires that all chapter one funds be allocated to the schools in proportion to the number of economically disadvantaged students that they serve. Currently 60 percent goes where the student is, 40 percent is in the general mix, or general distribution. Our program says 100 percent of it goes that way. We have shortened the remediation period for teachers and requiring that phase the system in they will all be required to have a teaching certificates as opposed to valid State certificates that they currently have which are developed and distributed and approved by the Chicago Board itself. We also provide choice within each of these six districts. We allow parents to have an opportunity to place their children in any school in the School District after the students who live in that attendance center, area, have an

# 116th Legislative Day

June 15, 1988

opportunity to enroll. So if you have, let's say, 60 extra spaces in that school, anybody in the district can apply on the basis of a lottery will be able to attend that school. We refer to that as choice. One of the District Four and the New York system has a similar system like this and...at work in the junior high school level. In order to limit the opportunities for growth of central administration bureaucracies in these six districts, we require that the pupil/administrator ratio in these new districts not exceed the statewide average for the previous year. I've tried to outline the major issues before you in this Amendment. Basically, just let me recap. One, we abolished the Chicago Board of Education, set up six different districts along township lines. The Reorganization and Receivership Board is a five member board with one member appointed each of the Legislative Leaders. The Chairman appointed by the Mayor and the Governor. And if they can't agree within days, we've had a recent experience where they weren't able to agree on, I think it was the McCormick place board. We provide that chairman will be appointed by the State Superintendent of Education. We shortened up the remediation time. We strengthened the roll οf the We strengthened the local school improvement principal. council and we give parents a choice to the degree that we can within a district and we limit the opportunities for future growth of the bureaucracy. I submit to you, your consideration, Amendment #3 to House Bill 4101 and ask for your support."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment 3 to House Bill 4101 and on that question, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative LeFlore."

LeFlore: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I respect the Gentleman who has offered this

116th Legislative Day

June 15, 1988

Amendment. I feel that his recommendation is well taken, but I stand in oppose to this Amendment because I feel the Chicag...Chicago District 299 is one of the largest districts in the State of Illinois and we definitely need the citizens' input from Chicago into the legislation that we adopt. So therefore, I would ask for a defeat of this Amendment."

Speaker Breslin: "The Lady from...the Lady from Dupage,
Representative Cowlishaw."

Cowlishaw: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. If Amendment #3 to House Bill 4101 sounds as though follows a familiar pattern, it...it rings a bell somewhere in our minds, that's because it does follow a familiar pattern. There are a good many discussions that have been held on this critically important subject of improving the schools for the children in Chicago. And many of those discussions there has been an attempt to find some new type of structure by which to make those schools more effective and more accountable. There is no need to find a new type of structure. There is one that already exists that is a model, that has worked well for generations throughout Illinois. That is the downstate school district which consists of a seven member elected School Board accountable to the voters. The School Board hires a Superintendent. The Superintendent is responsible the people, to the School Board, and to all the members of the staff. All of the other procedural matters that are typical in all downstate school districts simply need to be followed in Chicago, but they will never be if we do not accept what is probably the most basic premise, and that is that what we have in Chicago right now does not work. to simply say, 'Well, let's increase the number of School Board members,' or 'Let's change the way they're

116th Legislative Day

June 15, 1988

appointed,' or 'Well, let's do something about these subdistricts that are not even really districts,' is not going to improve things for children. It is not going to improve learning until we decentralize that system and create systems that follow a model that we all know works. And until, by doing so, we restore to the people of Chicago the right to say what is to happen in their schools, right now, what happens in the Chicago schools is controlled, and we all know this to be so, it is controlled by the Chicago Teacher's Union. And until you decentralize that system, the control will remain with the Chicago Teacher's Union, it will never, ever reach the people."

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

"Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Braun: House. I rise in opposition to this Amendment. aside for a moment the Chicago bashing that this debate has a tendency to inspire. The fact of the matter is that this This is a concept, perhaps an is not a plan. although I would not argue that it was much of one unfortunately. No offense Representative. However, the fact of the matter is that this is not the way to go. can talk about decentralization but the real decentralization that will make the improvement and will make the difference in the Chicago Public Schools lies in powering the parents in powering the teachers, bringing the decision and the policy making down to the local school level. This plan does not do that. This plan simply throws the baby out with the bath water, if you will. This plan simply takes a meat axe to the Chicago Public School System and does not affect the educational improvements that we are concerned about. I would say to you, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House that we have been in meetings now for several weeks in the Educational Task Force which

116th Legislative Day

June 15, 1988

has been happily a bipartisan multi-chambered exercise addressing the issues of education. We have considered all the various proposals, we have tried to come to consensus We have listened to educational on those proposals. experts, we have listened to the interested parties and we have reached consensus, that the approach in the first instance is not to hatchet to do a hatchet job on the school system, is not to break the system up into as parts as one can imagine, but rather is to take to the approach that this system can be reformed by Chicagoians and can be reformed by giving local school improvement councils and parents and teachers and principals and people who are involved with the system, the ability to make that will provide for educational correct decisions excellence and help to break us out of the cycle that have seen in the past. I encourage your defeat of Amendment #3 and urge your support for a later Amendment which represents the task force conclusions. Thank you." Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Parke." Parke: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Well we finally are getting to one of the major House. this Session. issues οf Last week after pleading assistance by the Republicans we were finally invited in to the negotiations on the Democratics Reform Committee on the school reform. I will say that we had opportunities to listen to the Chicago Board of Education, the Teachers Union, and literally many, many, interested and concerned citizens groups from the Chicago area. became clear as we sat there and listened to the hours and hours of testimony, discussions of meaningful and concerned Legislators on both sides of the aisle, that it came clear that the Democrats could not come up with an answer that addressed real and meaningful reform. Therefore, the

## 116th Legislative Day

June 15, 1988

Republicans have presented what we feel will accomplish that, because of this lack agreement, we are very concerned that the decision for school reform will be made through a Conference Committee Report made up of a small hand picked group of Legislators appointed by Speaker Madigan on June They'll present to us, a take it or leave it vote. A one vote, we think that's wrong, we think that discussion should be open and that, a lot of last minute negotiation should be made on it. We think that the approach that we have given with this Amendment is worthy of approval. Our proposal is very simple, it's formed on every other school system in Illinois. That the Chicago School System does not work, it is not something that we can leave alone, it must be broken down. We are using now, the six school districts based on current and established township boundaries. We further recommend an oversite board to be established during the transition of this that will be appointed by businessmen and women from the City of Chicago. Who will have no interest other than making sure that the children that are coming out of the Chicago system now and in the future will be meaningful employees, employees that can maintain and keep employment. That's the goal that we all have. And with this Amendment we can achieve that. This board, this oversite board will appointed one Member of each House, the Minority and the as the Chairman being appointed Majority as well agreement with the Governor and Mayor Sawyer. We propose the direct election of the School Boards everywhere else in Illinois and I would venture to guess in most places in our country, people are elected to School Boards. They put themselves on the line, they go to the citizens as we do here and say, 'this is my opinion, this is what I think I can stand for, this is what I'll support, this is what I'll

# 116th Legislative Day

June 15, 1988

not support'. And let the voters decide on what's right. We think that that's rightful, we think the citizens, the parents of the students of Chicago deserve the right to pick the people that guide the school systems. This is not unreasonable, it's only unreasonable currently. We think this Amendment addresses that and is healthy and is best for all the children of Chicago. There'll be seven board members, we suggest that four of the seven must have children involved in that current Chicago School that will be breaking it down. Each school, as is we have heard in those citizen groups that came and talked to us wants the ability to be involved in the process. Those local school improvement councils are a must. As we over the Amendment that has been proposed that comes behind this, we can see that there is a genuine attempt to give authority to those school improvement councils. they should be advisory, we question how many people are going to get involved and what their credentials are to get involved, to give the direction that this Amendment that's going to be proposed later really can do for those children. We feel though, that the these parents should be involved into the input of personnel, curriculum and the education program for their children. We believe that everybody in that School District should have the right to attend any school they want to attend in that school system. We are for open enrollment, that children find a school that meets their needs with teachers and curriculum that meets their needs and if there is a school that's not meeting their needs, children will not go there and they must change that school. We think open enrollment is an..."

Speaker Breslin: "Your five minutes are up, bring your remarks to a close please. Bring your remarks to a close Sir."

116th Legislative Day

June 15, 1988

Parke: "I've asked...I've asked for someone to give me their time, and I have Representative Tate...."

Speaker Breslin: "That's right, Representative Tate we seek recognition here by pressing our button and being recognized. Representative Tate you are recognized."

Tate: "Okay is your button pressed?"

Speaker Breslin: "It is."

Tate: "Okay, thank you Ma'am. I'd to give my five minutes to Terry Parke."

Speaker Breslin: "Very good, Representative Parke proceed."

Parke: "We think that the Amendment that we have offered is a meaningful and viable solution to the problem that faces the children of Chicago. We would perfer that it was not partisan. We would perfer that you on the other side of aisle who are just as interested as we are in addressing this issue. Join with us and I put this on the Bill that it will be an intricate part of the discussions. One thing is clear, all the Legislators at the meetings that I attended have only one goal. To provide the best possible education to the children of Chicago. How we reach the objective is the question that must be resolved. However, I have to point out, many Legislators have publicly taken the position that unless there is meaningful reform in the Chicago School System, they will not vote for a tax I want you to know that the Amendment that we have, addresses that, we have looked over the Amendment that is presented by our Democratic colleagues that will follow this one, and if our Amendment does not get adopted and you adopt your Amendment, then you must send a message loud and clear because your Amendment does not accomplish what the children of Chicago need, and therefore you must stand up and be counted and say there is no meaningful reform and therefore you will not vote for a tax increase.

116th Legislative Day

June 15, 1988

Thank you."

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

Cullerton: "Yes would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Breslin: "He will."

Cullerton: "Representative Hoffman, on page 63 of your Amendment, you defined six different districts. Now as I read this, let me ask you this question. Do you have six separate taxing districts? Does each district raise that money from its within its own district only?"

Hoffman: "Correct."

Cullerton: "Do you have a breakdown of the equalized assessed evaluation for each of these six districts?"

Hoffman: "Yes, I do."

Cullerton: "And how much do they vary?"

Hoffman: "The variance in Cook County is less than the variance in DuPage County."

Cullerton: "That's not what I want to know. You...you've taken archaic if you would allow me, archaic township line?"

Hoffman: "No, no their historic. Their not archaic, their
historic."

Cullerton: "There historic. Right, now there historic if we're still using them, but we don't have township..."

Hoffman: "Well that's why they ...in the past and that's why we call them historic."

Cullerton: "If they were still being used and they were there for a hundred years they would still be historic but..."

Hoffman: "That's correct, but they wouldn't necessarily be archaic."

Cullerton: "Right, but they are Archaic because we don't use them for anything anymore other than to schedule hearings before the Assessors Office with the Board of Appeals for a property tax relief. we do not."

116th Legislative Day

June 15, 1988

Hoffman: "The fact of the matter...The fact of the matter is that it's on the basis of townships that property is laid out and property is assessed. And they are not used for any other reason and it's for that, that was one of the reasons why we chose them so we wouldn't have to gerrymander anything."

Cullerton: "It's not...What is the swing. Which... answer this question. Which township...which new six School District has the lowest assessed valuation and what is the total and which one has the highest and what is that total?"

Speaker Breslin: "Are you finished Representative Cullerton?"

Cullerton: "No, I asked a question."

Speaker Breslin: "Very good."

Cullerton: "I believe he's going to answer."

Hoffman: "The, let me just give you a couple of examples. For example, and then I will get specifically to what you asked. In DuPage County we have 42 school districts. The highest is eight hundred and fifty thousand dollars per pupil and the lowest is thirty—nine thousand, six hundred and thirty—nine dollars. In Lake County the high is three hundred and twelve thousand dollars per pupil, the low is fifteen thousand dollars per pupil. In Chicago, the range runs from a hundred and thirty five thousand dollars per pupil to thirteen thousand dollars per pupil."

Cullerton: "Say that again please, a hundred and thirty five.."
Hoffman: "A hundred and thirty five to thirteen."

Cullerton: "Which one is a hundred and thirty five? Which district?"

Hoffman: "That's District #5."

Cullerton: "Well I'm looking at the...your Bill on Page 63, is that..."

Hoffman: "That's District #5."

Cullerton: "Is that North and South Townships?"

116th Legislative Day

June 15, 1988

Hoffman: "Pardon me."

Cullerton: "Is that North and South Townships?"

Hoffman: "Yes."

Cullerton: "So that's a hundred and thirty five thousand dollars of equalized assessed valuation per pupil. Is that how you figure it?"

Hoffman: "Correct."

Cullerton: "And the lowest one, the one that's the least, the poorest district of these new districts your creating?"

Hoffman: "District Six."

Cullerton: "And that would be West Township?"

Hoffman: "Correct."

Cullerton: "The west side of Chicago."

Hoffman: "Well it's the west..."

Cullerton: "West Township, and it's a hundred and thirteen thousand?"

Hoffman: "No, that's thirteen thousand."

Cullerton: "I'm sorry, thirteen thousand."

Hoffman: "Thirteen thousand."

Cullerton: "And the other one is a hundred and thirty five thousand?"

Hoffman: "That's correct. Which puts it well inside the parameters, for example what you would find in Lake County or even here in Sangamon County."

Cullerton: "And would you have any provisions in here for Federal Desegregation Funds?"

Hoffman: "No, the rational for that is there going to have six separate districts, and each of those are going to have to deal with that particular issue."

Cullerton: "So the consent decree dealing with desegragation will not apply?"

Hoffman: "Would not apply because we no longer have District 299."

116th Legislative Day

June 15, 1988

Cullerton: "Thank you."

Hoffman: "I appreciate the opportunity to share information with you Representative Cullerton."

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

Black: "Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. To the Amendment, if might, you know, I have a lot of respect for people on the other side of the aisle but a while ago, one of stood up and said this was Chicago bashing. Oh heavens, I hope you don't think that's the only reason behind Amendment. I married a Chicago girl. Thank you. And I just want you to know the quality of the women you have from Chicago, we celebrated our 26th wedding anniversary here last Thursday, I certainly appreciate being here while she was home, but be that as it may. I want you to know that I love Chicago, I come up to Wrigley Field often, I got a parking ticket up in Chicago one day when I even there. I'm not here to bash Chicago, I don't think any of my colleagues are. Let me just reply to a couple of points that were made. You are a Charter School District. That in and of itself is an anachronism. I believe there's only 6 left in the entire State of Illinois. Most of us have been electing school board members and living with those mistakes...or that election for years. You should join us. There isn't anything wrong with electing your school board members. Somebody talked decentralization. six school districts represents legitimate attempt to decentralize a district that is so massive, so massive, how can you expect to get parental involvement. We have, I have no ulterior motives, I've taught for 22 years. True, I've not taught in Chicago, but I think we could agree, no matter what side of the aisle that we sit on that the Chicago School System needs to be

# 116th Legislative Day

June 15, 1988

examined, perhaps this is not the perfect document, perhaps this is not the final plan. But it's a place to start, And I don't think we should be Ladies and Gentlemen. afraid to let an Amendment go on to a Bill. that we can negotiate, that we can talk about, that has some ideas in it that are worth your time and discussion. Finally. point was made that non-Chicagoians should not propose something like this and how dare we do so, taking literary license with what was said. All of us, you pay taxes that help to go into the general aide school formula. The people in my district pay taxes that go into the general school aide formula. Some of that money goes to Chicago. say that we don't have an honest interest and desire to Chicago schools, is not true. We do, reform the certainly send some of our money up there, we want to work with you on genuine Chicago School Reform. Both sides agree it's an issue or we wouldn't be debating it. The issue may be what the final plan will be, the issue may be that you don't like some things in Amendment #3, but all I ask of you is to give it fair consideration and see it for what it is. It's a place to start, it's a place to begin discussion, there are ideas in here that are worthwhile. final plan may not involve for days. But I would urge that you give very careful consideration and please give support to Amendment #3 and then let's work out the reform package together, because if we don't Ι ask you on both sides of the aisle, will we really achieve a reform package, and as the Governor said, if we don't, he'll veto any revenue increase. Thank you."

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

Currie: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, and Members of the House. The proponents of Amendment #3 tell us it's a simple solution for the problems of the Chicago Public School System.

# 116th Legislative Day

June 15, 1988

Simple, yes, possibly even simplistic. A solution, this is not, reform it definitely is not. This is a warmed over approach tried in Detroit, tried in New York City. results of this kind of approach in Detroit and in New York City raised costs, increased the power and the authority of the teachers unions and did not result in improved student Every Civic Business Community Organization, every education watchdog group that has made proposals for changes in the structure of the Chicago Public School System has rejected the approach in Amendment #3 to House Bill 4101. This proposal has no educational precident, in terms of support from professionals from watchdog groups, the people who are paying attention to the school system and have helped us to identify the problems that the school system insufficiently responsive and accountable to the citizens and the taxpayers. Ιf this a solution likely to work, isn't it surprising that the education watchdog groups didn't think of it. Isn't it surprising that the Civic and Business Leadership of the City of Chicago in the State of Illinois, have already rejected it. We are given in Amendment #3 to House 4101, warmed over rhetoric, a warmed over idea that has failed in at least two major Urban School Systems, the only responsible thing for us to do is to defeat this Amendment and try to find a way to create a structure for the Chicago Public School System that will offer the youngsters of that City a chance to learn and the taxpayers of that City and this State some assurance that their dollars are well spent."

Speaker Breslin: "The Lady from St. Clair, Representative Younge."

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

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Hoffman will yield to a

116th Legislative Day

June 15, 1988

question."

Younge: "Would your Amendment change the State Aid Formula?"

Hoffman: "No."

Younge: "Thank you."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Anthony

Young."

Young: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. If I could reply to some of the comments that were made from many of the Speakers on the other side of the aisle who cloaked this Amendment, in terms of concerned for education in Chicago. It appears to me from reading this Amendment, that this is purely political, that it shows absolutely no concerns for the children in schools of the City of Chicago and absolutely no respect for the wishes of the parents of those children. Sponsor of the Amendment has admitted it ignores the school desegregation consent decree that is binding on the Chicago Public Schools at this very moment. One of the Sponsors of the Amendment spoke of the task force process and how this Bill or this Amendment has been carefully drafted. like to point out that just last week, it was breaking up Chicago Schools in the seven districts, this week it's six districts, and I think that absolutely no thought or concern has gone into how many districts are the make up of the districts, that it's just an attempt to break up the Chicago School Systems. One of the Speakers on that side of the aisle talked about parents rights. Well the parents ought to have a right to pick their own system and the parents in Chicago are not ready to break this system up. And finally those of us from Chicago who have been trying get things like the principal to skeet to their school for years, have been trying to pass property tax levies we could pay and support our own school systems. We've got

## 116th Legislative Day

June 15, 1988

no support from the other side of the aisle to know where has all your concern been over the years our schools have been deteriorated and why is there this sudden concern right now."

Speaker Breslin: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Parcells." Parcells: "Thank you, Madam...Thank you, Madam Speaker. actually surprised that Members of the other side of aisle wouldn't think this is a wonderful idea. We all know that Chicago School System is failing, we all know that Suburban Cook in downstate is the superior education, and what we are trying to do here, is set up the Chicago School System similar to what we have in the suburbs and what we have downstate where children are getting а better education. Right now we're spending 36 percent of the State funds on 25 percent of the students who are dropping out, who are functionally illiterate when they come out, and I don't know how you can go home and face those people and say, oh yeah we had a chance to give you a better education, we could give you education like their getting in the suburbs or downstate, but we chose instead to support the ...bureaucracy there on Pershing Road, and not give you guys a chance at having a better education. I think your students, your parents and the people that your asking to vote for you will be very disappointed if you vote against this. I suggest an 'aye' vote for Amendment #3 to House Bill 4101."

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

Levin: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I must reluctantly rise in opposition to Amendment #3. There are a number of very good ideas in that Amendment and I've had the opportunity to work closely with the Sponsors of that...of this Amendment on school reform and I think they do have a number of good ideas, I think

# 116th Legislative Day

June 15, 1988

they are extremely sincere, but unfortunately, I think there's some serious problems with the Amendment which would lead to the conclusion that a 'no' vote on Amendment is the appropriate vote. I have been one of the most critical Members of this House with respect to the Chicago Board of Education. Particularly with respect to the bureaucracy. Last fall in particular, I led the charge calling for saving of the magnet schools when general superintendent was attempting to protect his bureaucratic friends at the expense of the bureaucracy and we were successful with parents involvement and fending him off and I have an invested in protecting the magnet schools. interest in this, in that I have children in the system and stand here as somebody who I think would do what any parent given his opportunity to stand in my shoes would do in terms of reforming the system. But this approach is unfortunately not the answer. Last Fall, the late Mayor Washington raised the expectations of the people of the City of Chicago when he initiated the summit process. since then thousand of people have spent literally hundreds of thousands of hours coming up with a proposal for a reform in the Chicago Schools Public that deep-seated grass root support involving parents, involving involving...Representatives of the business community and I think that it is that the consensus came out of the Chicago Citizen Involvement, that we need to be looking at as far as the kind of reform we pass. And that is what is embodied in Amendment 6. The parents, business groups did look at decentralization, they did consider it, they did look at an elected school board. And I would remind you I was the Sponsor of an elected school board Bill just two years ago, House Bill 200, that got out of this House by a substantial vote. But, after input and

## 116th Legislative Day

June 15, 1988

consideration, the parents, the business community, the educators in Chicago decided. thev did not want decentralize the Chicago Schools. But instead wanted to transfer to control to the parents and the local school councils, and they also wanted to cut the bureaucracy. reluctantly, I would urge a 'no' vote, I think this is a very sincere proposal but I think we need to listen to what the grass roots is saying in Chicago. Let me suggest one other problem. The Chicago Board of Education in under a desegregation order as a result of litigation that ran several years. They are required to have integrated faculty, they're required to share resources, in terms of dollars and other resources among the different schools. I have a concern, having talked to a number of attorneys, there were parties to that litigation, that this proposal, in totally breaking up the Chicago Public Schools, would doing if we not stand up in court. And what we would be passed this would be to be making a promise to the parents of Chicago which we know will be struck down in the courts and would lead to even greater citizism. I am particularly concerned about protecting the Magnet Schools that would be So I would accordingly, hurt bv this proposal. relunctantly urge a 'no' vote and we will get to Amendment #6 which I think is a good starting point for reform. Thank you, Madam Speaker."

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

Terzich: "Yes, everyone who spoke before should not be able to speak on the further Amendment.."

Speaker Breslin: "Excuse me, proceed Sir."

Terzich: "I'd like to move the previous question. We have a lot of other Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question.

116th Legislative Day

June 15, 1988

The question is, 'Shall the main question be put? A11 those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it. The main question is put. Representative Hoffman to close. Representative Hoffman." very much, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Hoffman: "Thank you Gentlemen of the House. What this Amendment addresses. contrary to what some of the people who have taken the opportunity to express their opinion on the Amendment. felt that we were not using a meat axe or a hatchet, as Representative Braun indicated. We felt this was a scalpel and that we were carefully crafting some of the changes that need to be made in the Chicago School System. to address the issue of the bureaucracy, we have to address the role that is played by the various employee groups in the school system and this Amendment does that. saying that we're attacking the system, I'll just show you the newspaper that put together all the stories the Chicago Tribune, the headline on the front page, 'Chicago Schools Worst in America'. Now if you have a school system which on a headline of the local paper says it's the worst in the country, then obviously your going to have to do something dramatic, something significant if your going to make change. Now we're not suggesting that this Amendment takes you to 'nervana', but what we are saying is that this Amendment will make a significant change if adopted in the opportunities for boys and girls the City of Chicago. As Representative Parke said, all of us who are working on this issue have the best interest of the boys and girls in Chicago as the bottom line. Parental involvement obviously is very important. And our Amendment addresses that by requiring the membership of parents for the seven on the school board. Give them the opportunity for choice in where they send their children to

## 116th Legislative Day

June 15, 1988

school within the limitations of the Bill, and to suggest, to suggest that we did not have the parents and the children in mind is not correct. And let me just conclude with this, as important as the parents and the children are, the contribution that the young people who are going to come out of the Chicago School System can make to the welfare of this State is one of the major considerations which we have to place before us and we have to face up to it. The economic welfare, the type of lifestyle which we lead and which give people opportunities to enjoy has to be done through the basic elementary and secondary education system initially. I am suggesting to you that with the adoption of this Amendment we can take the headlines and all the stories in the Chicago Paper and there's all kinds, no clout, no concern, the bottom line is For many poor kids, books have no place in no education. Tangled supervision let in apt the home. teachers free. We can do away with all of this with the adoption of Amendment. And I ask, I implore for your support on this fine Amendment."

Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #3 be adopted'? All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Representative Davis, one minute to explain your vote."

Davis: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. We in Chicago, we recognize a need for improvement in education across this country. As a parent of children who attended Chicago Public Schools as a grandparent of children who currently attend Chicago Public Schools, I'm certainly interested in that system. We know that the educational problems are a result of many things and one of them being a decrease in money for education when the system becomes majority/minority. In Los Angeles,

116th Legislative Day

- June 15, 1988
- California, New York City, Detroit, and Chicago, there's a decrease in money when the system is majority/minority. Even in parochial schools that are located in minority communities, the AC..."
- Speaker Breslin: "Bring your remarks to a close please. She's recognized to bring her remarks to a close."
- Davis: "I'm bringing my remarks to a close, I feel that the purpose for division of this system at this time is for the reasons of exploitation. And I vote 'no' on this Amendment."
- Speaker Breslin: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 49 voting 'ayes', 63 voting 'no' and 2 voting 'present'. The Amendment fails. Are there any further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #4, offered by Representative
  Hoffman."
- Speaker Hoffman: "Representative Hoffman, withdraws Amendment #4.

  Any further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #5, offered by Representative Braun."
- Speaker Breslin: "Withdraw Amendment #5. Any further
  Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #6, offered by Representative Braun."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Braun."
- Braun: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. One of the previous speakers...oh, hello, hello, alright thank you. Are we on? We are. One of the previous speakers on an earlier Amendment talked about the need for dramatic and significant change in the Chicago Public Schools given the kind of reports and the reputation that the school system had received nationally. And our

# 116th Legislative Day

June 15, 1988

concern with the welfare of the children. Well I want to say to you that Amendment #6, Ladies and Gentlemen is only dramatic and significant change, it is, if you will revolutionary change for the Chicago Public Schools. literally turns the system upside down. And in so doing, gives power to the people and empowers parents and teachers and principals to control the future in the destiny their schools. It will give us an opportunity to achieve educational excellence in the City of Chicago by putting the power where it is the most effective at the local level. We are talking about bottom up planning as opposed top down. This legislation, Amendment #6, represents the coming together of the...and consensus of the force on education which listened over a series of weeks to input from the unions, from teachers, from principals, from business groups, from Republicans, from Democrats, from Senate Members and House Members, we listened to everyone. And we have taken the very best of the comment and the conclusions that have been reached and tried to bring them together in the form of Amendment #6. The Amendment itself, is not perfect but it is as close to perfection as I think in this life we can achieve. It provides for a cap the Administration. For example, an issue which concerns people, concerns a lot of people when they talk about the overpowering bureaucracy of the current system. This Amendment puts in a cap, a real cap that will...that go throughout the system and will require that the and the spending be focused on educational opposed to Administration. services as We focus on throughout the Legislation on whole the issue οf educational excellence. And in so doing empower, the local school to make the decisions that will best achieve the excellence in that community and in that given school.

# 116th Legislative Day

June 15, 1988

Theoretically. and programmatically if you will, the legislation sets up, the principal, puts the principal charge of the schools, so the principal becomes, if you will, the chief executive officer of that school. same time, the local school council, which is comprised primarily of parents becomes the board, if you will, school. The school councils and the principal along with the teachers will develop a school improvement and will come up with specific recommendations for change at that school that will achieve the kind of educational improvement that we all want to see for the Chicago Public Schools. Further, at the district level, the district will provide a coordinating function levels for the elementary schools known as feeder schools as well as high schools in a given district. Again, the district superintendent is, if you will the CEO of that district the district council acting as the board for that district. The general superintendent again, is responsible for the entire system with the Board of Education being the board for the entire system. All of the actors, all of the major actors in this formula are on performance contracts. The principal, the district superintendent, the general superintendent, are all accountable to their respective boards for their performance. At the local school level of course, that is the parents. The legislation provides for teacher accountability, it provides for reduction in the remediation period and for change in procedure by which teachers, bad teachers or unsatisfactorily performing teachers are removed from their responsibility. At the same time, it is the intent of this legislation that focus be put on teacher incentives, incentives for good teachers, who are doing a good job will be teachers opportunities for training, for reward for the conditions

# 116th Legislative Day

June 15, 1988

at their local school that will allow them to explore the teaching and creativity that they are capable communicating to the students. At the same time, there is parental accountability in this Bill. This Bill requires that parents be responsible for picking up the report cards and consultation with the teachers at a local school. We believe the parental responsibility is an important element because without the input and involvement teachers...of the parents in their youngsters education we can never hope to achieve educational excellence in any School District. In all, this Bill represents the best that Chicago has to offer to reform its own schools. is a no cost piece of legislation. In fact, if anything, this legislation as presently constructed will save money for the school system in Chicago. I would point out however, that more dollars are needed, not only for the Chicago Public Schools, but for the schools and school systems throughout this State. We have seen a decline in the support of education that this General Assembly has been willing to give over the last ten years, I would very much like to see my last term in this General Assembly with a turn around in that trend with additional resources put into education so that we can fulfill our Constitutional responsibility to have the primary response...funding of education take place at the State level. But in the meantime, we have a structural problem, we have an issue of reform before us and this legislation, Ladies and Gentlemen gives us a better way to run our schools without regards to dollars, this I believe is an answer that is responsive to the call, the cry that we've heard from our community throughout the State of Illinois to reform the public schools, and I encourage your support for Amendment #6."

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

116th Legislative Day

June 15, 1988

Amendment #6 to House Bill 4101, and on that question, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Williams."

Williams: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of Assembly. I rise in support of Amendment #6. Now this is done with a full knowledge that Amendment #6, not contain all of the things that we would like to see within this piece of legislation. However, overriding question, and this relates to Amendment #3 and all the others. How do we get the parents in the schools involved in making sure that the educational system that their children and that their futures are based upon have a clear opportunity to have direct input into the running of those schools. This Amendment tries to do that. Amendment said that you would get better participation creating districts, districts aren't the answers, parents are the answers. This is an Amendment that's drafted based upon recommendation of parents. This is an Amendment begins to at least, sincerely take a look at what we need. I would hope that we would all begin, but at the same time. I say this to the Sponsor of the Amendment and to all of us, this Amendment is a start, not a finish. Amendment does need work but it does include the essential element, and the key component of what it takes to have good schools and that's active and involve parents. must allow the local schools and the parents in the local schools to have authority to run those schools. there is need for additional powers for principal, the principal needs more than just a key to He needs authority to run the school. There are school. a lot of things that we don't like, but I do believe this is a good start and I urge support of Amendment #6."

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

116th Legislative Day

June 15, 1988

Hoffman: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Will the Sponsor of the Amendment yield to some questions?"

Speaker Breslin: "She will."

Braun: "Of course."

Hoffman: "In the ..in your plan, are there any provisions for elections of any kind?"

Braun: "Yes, the local school management councils are elected.

The parents will elect the parent members, the six parent members, teachers and staff will elect the staff members, and in fact there is a requirement that one of the staff be a teacher. The community participants will elect the community members, and so yes, there are elections provided for in the composition of the local school council."

Hoffman: "And that's at the site level?

Braun: "That is correct."

Hoffman: "At the Board level, it's still is an appointment by the Mayor, is that correct, and you have increased the number from 11 to 15?"

Braun: "The Board is..the number for the Board starting in June of 1989 is increased to 15, however, it is not just simply an appointment by the Mayor, the nominating commission which is made up of Representatives from the district level. We have a bottoms up process, Representative so the local school councils create the district level councils which creates the nominating committee that comes up with the names. And the Mayor is required to select from names chosen by the nominating commission. I would point out, that right now, there is a nominating commission, but that process is an informal one, this codifies the process for a nominating commission and empowers that commission to make recommendations on a district by district level."

Hoffman: "In your Amendment, does it do as ours did, give the principals complete authority over the operation of their

116th Legislative Day

June 15, 1988

building?"

"We reach a, we strike a balance on that issue. Braun: The principal is given the authority as Chief Executive Officer of the school to run that school building, however, principal is..and the principal administers the issue. However the question having to do with food service engineers and the like, those iob condition issues, highering and firing are not taken up by the principal. But at the same time, the principal can direct the operating engineer or food service and they can evaluate their performance. So yes, we've struck a balance somewhere in the middle of between complete principal control of the non-educational activities at that building and the present system."

Hoffman: "So, the fact of the matter is that you kind've of middled that issue. Is that a fair statement?"

Braun: "I don't think that is a...middle of the issue confuses it, Representative. We think we have reached a compromise that is sensible, in light of the fact that principals are charged with educational improvement and issues having to do with education while they are given the authority to direct...specific activities. It is not made their responsibility to make sure that the windows are cleaned."

Hoffman: "Let me ask you this. In your Amendment, do you delete that Section in the statute which keeps the keys with..."

Braun: "Yes."

Hoffman: "Thank you very much. Let me ask you a couple of other questions. You talked about a drawing from all the various sources, I noticed there is no provision for an oversite committee or commission in your Bill. Would you care to explain why you turned your back on those people who felt that was important?"

Braun: "Well we didn't turn our backs on anyone Representative."

116th Legislative Day

June 15, 1988

Hoffman: "Okay, well turn a little sideways."

Braun: "No, we, the oversite, the issue of a specific oversite authority was debated in the task force and was rejected by the task force, on the grounds that we (a) already have oversite in the school finance authority, already have oversite in the Board itself and to have yet another authority would only further defuse responsibility in this regard and give us another layer of bureauracy. The decision was made instead to go with...to expand the role of the school finance authority in terms of reports on the spending of money in the system and to expand the reporting requirements by the Board and by the Superintendent, to require them to report on educational excellence issues to us in the General Assembly as well as to the City Council."

Hoffman: "The discretionary funds that are mentioned in your legislation had fifty dollars per pupil. At what point..."

Speaker Breslin: "Bring your remarks to a close, Sir."

Hoffman: "No that's alright, that's okay. No that's alright, I know their not going to turn me off. Okay, at what point do you put the fifty dollars into the mix, if you will.

Does the fifty dollars per pupil come off the top?"

Braun: "No Sir, the fifty dollars is taken out of the altogether, that was an earlier draft of another Bill and it is a suggestion that has been floating around, we that it was inappropriate to put in a specific dollar amount in this, but rather to put in a percentage, quidance that says that specific dollars can be appropriated, but we don't put in an actual dollar amount Bill. in the On Page 72, of the legislation, Representative Hoffman, there is no dollar amount put in there because particularly in the absence of a funding mechanism, it really would be unfair, we think to raise hopes of people and not have it funded when the Bill

116th Legislative Day

June 15, 1988

passes."

Hoffman: "Alright, I realize there are other people who want to make some comments on this Amendment, let me just conclude, Madam Speaker if I may. If you will look at Amendment #6 and if you look at Amendment #3 you will recognize that we all drawn out of the same well, if you..if I may use that term, various groups have come forward, suggestions for change and you'll find great similarity. The difference between this Amendment and Amendment #3 is that they didn't go as deep down into the well as they might have and taken out the fine clear water that we have proposed in Amendment #3. They worked the surface very nicely and we are thankful for that but we believe more can be done and more should be done and for that reason I believe that this Amendment should be opposed."

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

"Thank you, thank you Madam Speaker and Members of the McGann: Assembly. Amendment #6, which really becomes House Bill 4101. As a member of the task force, I would like to point out to the Members of this Assembly. No vote was ever taken to approve or reject this Amendment. We had a task force that worked many, many hours, many weeks, yet nobody formulated a final proposal which would have been approved disapproved by the task force. The Amendment does not address the true needs of the children, as much as it fails to insert mechanisms to correct failures of the management councils. Further, we do not address the dropouts, the poor reading scores, we have no mechanism to check on balance on this area. We do not address the maintenance and repair problems in such a large district. A terrible deteioration is taking place in our schools. This is not adequately addressed. We do nothing with this

# 116th Legislative Day

June 15, 1988

Amendment but window dress. I ask the Members of this Assembly to send the proposal back to the task force in order to truly provide meaningful reform for the Chicago Board of Education and let us not hamstring principals from being able to carry on their duties under a suggested performance contract."

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

Ropp: "Thank you Madam Speaker, would the Sponsor yield please?"
Speaker Breslin: "She will."

Ropp: "Representative, can you in your opinion tell me as a downstater, what you consider is the number one problem with the Chicago School System in a very few words?"

Braun: "In twenty five words or less?"

Ropp: "I'll give you thirty."

Braun: "The problem, I think has been one of funding, it has been one of accountability, it has been one of responsiveness of the school system to the needs of the children who are in the schools and finally it has been one of the flight from the public schools of the middle class throughout the city and all of those issues, we are looking at, with this Amendment, with this approach, making the Chicago Schools competitive once again with the private sector so that a parent who has an option of sending his or her child to a private school will say there is a public school in my neighborhood that I know I can have some voice in, I can make decisions on curriculum, teacher selection and the like and I want to send my child to this public school. We are trying to achieve that goal with this legislation."

Ropp: "Well I would commend you, because they are the same logical kind of conclusions that all of us want throughout the State, as we send our own children to school. My question though is, when in fact you have your Amendment,

116th Legislative Day

June 15, 1988

that increases the membership on the school board from eleven to fifteen, will that include or increase the quality of education for those young people that need to learn how to read and to write and be prepared for the world of work? No."

Braun: "I agree with you."

Ropp: "In the area..."

Braun: "Representative, Representative Ropp, that's not the point. I mean, I agree with you, the reason the increase happens is because we have this bottom up process where the local schools make decisions and from each local school a district council is created. The Board itself, the big Board is created by input from the local or the district council. The only way you can do that mathematically given the size of the Chicago System is to effect this increase in the size of the big board, the super board, if you will. So, no, that issue is more one to respond to the various communities in the City of Chicago to give them a voice, an equal voice as opposed to anything going specifically to the issue of educational improvement in excellence in the system."

Ropp: "To continue, if you are attempting to establish a cap on administrative expenditures, will that improve the quality of education of that kindergardener? No. To have parents.."

Braun: "Do you want me to respond or are you giving a speech? I mean do you want me to respond or are you giving a speech?...Oh."

Ropp: "No I'm not answering asking a question, I'm asking after the first one. The first one was to you, the rest of them I will take care of the answers."

Braun: "...The rest of the speech. Okay, no problem, go ahead."
Ropp: "In the proposed legislation that will allow parents to be

116th Legislative Day

June 15, 1988

permitted to be absent from work for one hour, four times a years to go pick up the childs report card. Will that improve the quality of education, urging a person to be able to..."

Speaker Breslin: "Proceed Representative Ropp."

Ropp: "The answer is no. Parents who fail to pick up children's report cards shall be quilty of child neglect and so charge. Will that improve the quality of education in Chicago? Absolutely not. Ladies and Gentlemen, we have a chance at this very moment to be very much concerned about what goes on in the City of Chicago dealing with children and preparing them for the world of work. We are not really addressing that. We're not really addressing any particular phase in this Amendment that will deal with assuring quality teachers and adequate class size, so those teachers can in fact be able to disseminate knowledge and to deal with those individual children that need it. Now there are those of you who say we don't need to deal with class size. I can assure you, and would almost guarantee you that darn few of you have ever been in a classroom of thirty-five or forty and had any ability to walk away with a clean mind and ability to even do anything in the evening, I can assure you. Ladies and Gentlemen, this will not do what we are attempting to do. We have a chance really, to really respond and to insist that young people that come out of the Chicago System are prepared to go into the world of work or even go on and to become graduates at some higher institution by assuring that we established some criteria, some standards to which we assure that these young people will meet those standards as they improve and are able to advance in our world of work opportunity. This..."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Sangamon, Representative

116th Legislative Day

June 15, 1988

Curran."

"Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentleman of the Curran: House. I cautiously rise in support of this Amendment and I do so, because I know the hard work that went in and I know the wisdom of allowing Legislators from the Chicago area to fashion, in large part, the response to the problem of Chicago Schools. However, I have at least one important concern that I have an agreement with the Sponsor of the Amendment to offer in a legislation which perhaps be allowed to be offered tomorrow and that is that I think that what we ought to be doing here in addition to asking improvement which clearly that's something that is important to us all, is to set either a three or a year goal for specific percentages of improvement. For example, if we desire as a Body to have drop outs in a given school system reach the statewide average or the ACT reaches a certain percentage of the Statewide average, then I think that we ought to ask for that for that legislation. We ought to demand that and we ought to say. we are going to check back in three or four or five years and so, that is an Amendment which I will offer to an additional piece of legislation, along with Representative Hartke, and there will probably be others, and I would suggest to those of you downstate, for those of you who are interested in this matter at all that we ought concern ourselves with percentages of improvement. present time, we are talking about improvement that maybe one or two percent and therefore, according to these school management councils or whatever that might be good enough. I don't think it's good enough for the children of Chicago, I don't think that would be good enough for us as a However, I think so much work has gone into this Amendment and such a willingness to agree, to accept that Amendment

#### 116th Legislative Day

June 15, 1988

on..or work for that Amendment on other legislation tomorrow or in the near future, but I think we ought to be supporting this and then we also ought to support specific percentage goals of improvement for the Chicago Schools. So I rise in support."

Speaker Breslin: "Lady from Dupage, Representative Cowlishaw." Cowlishaw: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The Sponsor of this Amendment began by describing it as being revolutionary. I have read this material very carefully, and there are just a couple of things about it that bother me more than some of the other things so let me just, time being brief for this hit the major points. Apparently we feel that the Board of Education, of the City of Chicago is doing such a magnificent job that we're going to increase their numbers from 11 to 15. That really bothers me. The next thing is that we are going to do this fancy little trick where we give with one hand and take back with the other. We are going to give the principal authority over the custodian, the engineer and so forth. But at the same time we're going to establish a committee people who live right there in that principals attendance center who hire him, who evaluate him, who tell where he can spend his money, how much he could pay for substitute teachers and all the way down the line. We have given with one hand and taken away with the other, but maybe we've taken away more than we've given. principal ought to be answerable for what goes on in that school, but can not be if the principal hasn't authority to make the major decisions. And most of all, what this plan does is make the principalship of every school in Chicago a popularity contest. And finally, there is a portion in here which says that when there are

dismissal proceedings against a teacher, it is to be

# 116th Legislative Day

June 15, 1988

assumed that those accusations against the teacher have been proved and the teacher must disprove the accusations. thought a fundamental concept of law in this nation was that people were innocent until they were proved guilty, not the otherway around. Having reviewed this material carefully and looked at all the provisions, I would say this exactly what a prior Speaker said of Amendment #3. is very sincerely presented. It is obviously very well meant, however, looking at it very carefully, I have found that the adjective, revolutionary just does not apply. There is another adjective that begins with the same letter even that applies. This is the Revlon Amendment. R.E.V.L.O.N., the greatest manufacturer of cosmetics in the United States. Thank you."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Kulas." Kulas: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the A lot of people spent a lot of time, a lot of work has gone into the combination of Amendment #6 to House Bill This isn't a chips Bill, it's not a cure Bill, it's not the Mayor's Bill, it's not the Parent's Bill, it's a combination Bill. A Bill that we think can pass the House and the Senate. We all know that this Bill is going to go into a Conference Committee. We all know it's going to come out of a Conference Committee. What's going to be there we don't know. But I'll tell you what's wrong with the School System in Chicago, you know what's wrong, got the truant officers, policing the wrong people. The truant officers should be out there policing the parents because it's the parents who have been delinquent and negligent in there responsibilities. Ιf the parents weren't we wouldn't be in this bind today. One thing we can't legislate though is parental responsibility, that we can not legislate. But I think this Amendment is a step in

# 116th Legislative Day

June 15, 1988

the right direction and I would ask for your support."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Klemm."

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

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Braun will yield."

Klemm: "On Page 81, Representative Braun, you define or mention the parent or guardian of a child whose enrolled. I was wondering why you didn't say a parent?"

Braun: "Representative Klemm, I appreciate your remark. It's just that I hadn't noticed that it was a 'the' instead of an 'and'."

Klemm: "Well, the reason I say that, here let me, let me explain.

Your asking for, we've had four hundred and thirty five
thousand children in Chicago, let us assume there's three
hundred thousand families with parents and you're asking
then six hundred thousand to come four times at one hour.

Now let's translate that to lost."

Braun: "We can change 'the' to 'and'. That's not a problem."

Klemm: "...let's translate that to lost work time then, if we're talking about trying to put a burden on somebody we're talking about then over two million lost work hours just in Chicago on your local businesses that have to be taken out. Then you go on with your Amendment and said there will absolutely be no penalties against a parent who does that. Does that mean then, and it's repeated twice, does that mean then that that employer must then pay and if not it goes on to say then that the business would have to have that person with flex time pick it up at some other day and if there's a contract, say in any hours over 8 is time and a half, then again that business out of over two million work hours would have to be paying time and a half, and I don't think that's your intent, and if it is, it's poorly

ll6th Legislative Day

June 15, 1988

drafted. I'd like your explanation on that."

Braun: "Thank you, Representative. In the first instance, you probably are correct. It should be a parent or guardian."

Klemm: "That cuts it down in half. We're over now just only over a hundred..a million."

Braun: "In the second instance, the..as previous speeches have emphasized, the importance of an educated work force in the of Chicago and the importance to the business community. It seems to me a small contribution by the business community and we're only talking about businesses of over twenty five employees, larger businesses, to allow a parent time off to pick up that childs report card. It may not be necessary, it may be and there are directions given to the local council to work out ways in which parents can be afforded an opportunity to come to the school to pick up the report card and to council or consult with that child's teacher. Our emphasis are intent with this Section, is that a parent would be encouraged to participate in his or her childs education, to come to the school to consult with the teacher to pick up the report card and that that individual not be penalized if that person works, that that person not be penalized at their place of employment for doing so."

Klemm: "Alright. In your second...well then to the..."

Braun: "Further. Further, Representative Klemm, if you read further, there are penalties. What we do, is we give four..."

Klemm: "...since I'm running out of time. I understand....I've addressed that."

Braun: "There are four opportunities in a year for a parent to come to the school to pick up a report card, if that parent fails on any...on all four of those occasions then that does trigger a charge of child neglect."

116th Legislative Day

June 15, 1988

Klemm "To the question then, Madam Speaker..."

Speaker Breslin: "Proceed."

Klemm: "I'm running out of time. The last question I had was that again the correction of about making a parent or both parents guilty of neglect to their child because they don't both appear at least once, is what the Amendment really would say because it says the parent. And again you got two of them. And sometimes we have split sometimes we have broken homes. but we still have two parents and therefore we think, I think that is, that is terrible. I think to have burden besides the business community but have that burden on every father and mother in Chicago is ridiculous. And I think you should correct that...Thank you."

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

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

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question, the question is, 'Shall the main question be put. Gentlemen...Gentlemen... Representative Flinn is within his rights. All Members, you understand, if the Motion carries will be recognized to explain their vote. If you do not wish to accept the Gentleman's Motion you should vote 'no', all those in favor of the Gentleman's Motion, to cut short debate vote 'aye', all those opposed, vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 60 voting 'aye', 49 voting 'no' and the Motion fails. The next person to be recognized is the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Parke."

Parke: "Thank you, Madam Speaker and I commend my colleagues on both sides for sustaining the discussion in keeping it going because this happens to be one of the major issues effecting us today. Would the Sponsor yield for questions,

116th Legislative Day

June 15, 1988

Madam Speaker?"

Speaker Breslin: "Proceed."

Braun: "Yes, I'll yield, certainly."

Parke: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

Braun: "Certainly."

Speaker Breslin: "She will."

Parke: "Thank you. Let me ask you Representative Braun, it says in Page 2, it says that the local school management council is to approve or disapprove all obligations from the principals discretionary fund. Where are they going to get the money for this fund? Where's it going to come from?"

Braun: "Oh, that is already, that already exists. The discretionary fund consists of monies that are allocated to the school for text books, for supplies, for materials, and a host of other non-contract obligated expenditures. So that already exist, those funds already go through the budgetary process into the schools as a discretionary fund."

Klemm: "So, we're saying now that the principal does not have discretionary because the School Management Council can approve or disapprove, so you've taken that..."

Braun: "That is correct."

Braun: "...Authority away from the principal and he no longer has that authority is that right?"

Braun: "You will recollect, Representative Parke, in the original legislation providing for the school improvement councils, the councils were given the authority to make recommendation with regard to that money, that part of discretionary money. It was found and...and it was decided by the parents who have participated in the summit process, who have participated in the local school councils over time that that did not give them sufficient control over the activities and the use of those dollars at a given

116th Legislative Day

June 15, 1988

school and they have specifically requested budgetary authority to empower the local schools and the local school councils."

Parke: "Okay, I'm glad you brought that up, because I would like to read to you that in 1987, the State Board of Education reviewed the progress of past school, public school reform and they said, 'Legally constitute a local school improvement councils have not been given the kind of support by management which has been envisioned', and the very legislation that you passed here two years ago.."

Braun: "Right."

Parke: "And not a single school budget was altered by the district to spite more than 100 objections to them by the councils over a two year span."

Braun: "Representative Parke, you just made the strongest argument for this Section because that precisely, no Sir."

Parke: "What makes you think that this...but it does not work...it does not work. It says right here it did not work. I'd like to know what's different to make sure we're not white washing those very school councils that you supported and wanted. What's different in your proposal?"

Braun: "Thank you, Representative Parke. You have just made the strongest argument for the empowerment of the local school councils by giving those councils authority over the discretionary funds. The point is, as the State Board found, those councils as long as they only recommendational authority and did not have actual authority over the spending could not make the kinds of adjustments necessary to make that to achieve educational improvement and educational excellence at that school. So the whole idea, is to empower parents, to empower the teachers, to empower the principals at the local school and make that the corner stone of this entire

116th Legislative Day

June 15, 1988

system. And this provision allows that."

- Parke: "Well we're talking about discretionary funds and at the hearings, I heard sometimes there was no discretionary funds. What is the percentage of money that goes into this supposedly great discretionary fund that we have. What is about the percentage that we can expect that these local school improvement councils will be able to work with."
- Braun: "As I understand it, Representative the amount in a given school, that is allocated for what's called Discretionary Funds may vary depending on the size of the school, whether it's a high school or an elementary school, it varies by school, except to say however, that this provision will allow for parents to have a voice in how the money will be spent in their local school for school improvement."
- Parke: "Isn't it true that at the hearings that we heard that we heard there was even less that one percent of the allocation of that school budget that that's all they're really going to have to be discretionary funds, that in fact there will be no money in some cases in those funds, so in fact they really don't have much control over the finances of that school."
- Braun: "No Sir, in fact on Page 19, if you will take a look at Page 19 of the Bill, we are, the local school improvement councils will have authority over an expanded number of funds, so you have the Discretionary Fund over which they have authority, the Chapter one, Chapter two, Supplemental State Title I bilingual gift..."
- Speaker Breslin: "Bring your remarks to a close, the five minutes are up. Complete your answer and then Representative Parke."
- Braun: "Oh, okay, well I was in the middle of a response. On page 19, it goes through the various amounts of money or pots of money, if you will, over which the local school

116th Legislative Day

June 15, 1988

councils will have authority. And we believe that this expanded definition and giving them the authority to prove or disapprove those funds will in fact give people power where it counts and that is over the budget."

Parke: "Madam Speaker, Madam Speaker, Representative Regan would like to be recognized to yield his time to me."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Regan, Representative Regan."

Regan: "I'd like to yield my five minutes to Representative Parke please."

Speaker Breslin: "Proceed Representative Parke."

Parke: "Thank you, Speaker, I appreciate the courtesy. It also says on Page 5, (h) the Board of Education shall higher outside consultants to provide extensive training. Doesn't outside consultants again take away money that is suppose by applied to it. I mean, isn't this a continuation of the pork projects that we had the continuations of programs taking money away from the children of Chicago. Why do we need outside consultants to give extensive training which probably will mean they will have to go on junket somewhere to take that training. Why do feel it's important to hire these consultants?"

Braun: "Thank you, Representative for your question. The point is that we want to have a board which is capable of running a multi-billion dollar corporation which is the Chicago Public School System. We have in this School System over four hundred and twenty thousand students which dare say is more than you have in your district. In order to deal with the extensive budgetary educational community issues that are faced by that Board, which we are calling in this debate a Super Board. It is important that you have people trained to the task and the only purpose of that Section is to make sure that we have the appropriate training for Board Members so that they may make intelligent decisions

116th Legislative Day

June 15, 1988

and will not become captives of any educational lobby or any group of specific interest group. So the training really is a very posessive thing for the Board and again this is a proposal which has been...which has been concurred in by just about every educational group that has considered the issue of the reform of the Public Schools from the summit onto the various other groups which have published and written in this area. So this is a...a board educational tool which we believe is important for future functioning of that Body."

Parke: "So you're trying to tell us that these appointment by the Mayor Sawyer, or any Mayor of Chicago are special and different than every other School Board in the State of Illinois who has the opportunity to go to a State and National Training Conferences that are offered that we have to bring in special consultants because they are special on how you spend your citizens money to take care of them.

Braun: "Representative, if I may respond to that."

Parke: "Please do."

Braun: "Other School Districts are currently doing just that.

Other School Districts have brought in Illinois Association of School Boards and the like to train their Boards, and I would dare say that a School District that is one twenty fifth the size of Chicago School District should at least, if they're doing it already, the Chicago School System ought to have that made available to them."

Parke: "Yes, and I can appreciate that, however, nowhere do we mandate that these programs should be established in my local School District..."

Braun: "It's not mandate it's a may"

Parke: "It's part of the legislation."

Braun: "It's preparatory, yes but it is not a mandated endeavor,

116th Legislative Day

June 15, 1988

it is guidance, legislative guidance to the Board or to the new Board that they trained professional...trained in the matters that I have mentioned before they actually take office."

Parke: "Okay, you point with pride on Page 6 (L) about the Administrative Cap that you are going to put on it. But in fact, as I look this over, this is no cap at all. Can you explain to me #1, what this jargon in 1 means because I have no idea what one increase the resource devoted instructual purpose has measured as a portion of the actual education fund expenditures of the district. What does that mean?"

Braun: "Well, the administrative cap language we've taken from guides that provides us by the State Board of Education in the first instance. However, the language of this is hopefully to insure, not hopefully, the languages of the Bill will insure that we no longer have the problem of the Pershing Road bureaucracy that has been mentioned in this Floor Debate that in fact the administration will be cut back in favor of additional attention and spending in education for educational services to children."

Parke: "Well, I could appreciate that statement because it still doesn't make sense, but I may point out to you that it says here that you are going to be able to have two functions of the so called cap. The lower of the statewide average, or the prior years expenditure whatever is the lower, I would presume that means. However, if you follow down on the next paragraph, it says that the School Finance Authority has the right, the function of those may wave, those functions, that cap that we so desperately need on the...on the amount of people that are hired, they at their discretion without accountability to anybody but to the Mayor..."

116th Legislative Day

June 15, 1988

Speaker Breslin: "Bring your remarks to a close please."

Parke: "May I have, Representative Olson would like to give me his time."

Speaker Breslin: "Sure. Representative Olson yields his time to Representative Parke."

Parke: "Thank you, I will be finishing up shortly. It says that this so called cap that your priding yourself on this can be waived by the School Finance Authority. So in fact there is no cap. They can waive it. Can you explain if I'm incorrect, please correct."

Braun: "Thank Representative, under you, you are misapprehension about this Section. I would point out to you that there were calls for an oversite authority consistant through the debate. We have with this Bill, put the School Finance Authority in the position of an oversite authority on finances. We have given them specific directions to reduce the administration of the system. given them specific direction with regard have to educational goals and educational excellence. However, it is irresponsible of us to give the School Finance Authority and the Board of Education this direction without giving them some flexibility to deal with specific situations. As the cap is written, it is a complete cap. It is not just a cap at the top at Pershing Road, it is a cap that goes throughout the system and this allows them, however, in the event that the School Finance Authority finds some reason to make a variance. They are empowered to do that."

Parke: "Well, it seems to me that we, in fact, allow specific points in your program to be waived by another group that's not accountable to anybody. It just seems to me that this whole plan reeks with the fear of the Democratic process the process of direct election and it is not in here there's no accountability in your program to...to the

116th Legislative Day

June 15, 1988

citizens other than through the locally elected school...groups which, to me, is a major flaw. And to finalize, I would just like to know why you think this plan is better than our plan."

Braun: "Oh...Let me count the ways."

Parke: "Please do."

Braun: "Thank you. Am I...Madam Speaker. Madam Speaker. Madam Speaker, is it time to close?"

Speaker Breslin: "No it is not."

Braun: "It is not. Then Representative Parke, I would be delighted to detail the reasons why this plan is to be preferred...at...be prepared to do that at the time that I close. I understand that there are other questions pending."

Parke: "Not detailed...Okay. Thank you. I will now just simply say is that it is obvious in the discussions and the questions that are brought on even though... I know there's a meaningful attempt by many, by all, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to come up with a solution. And that's all they've done is they they have come up with some kind of a solution. But unfortunately I am telling you and I tell all my colleagues this is a whitewash of the major problems facing the children in your system and the Chicago school system. There are no caps. There's no oversites. We must vote 'no' on this legislation, this Amendment, because I am disappointed. The taxpayers of Illinois are disappointed. And the children of Chicago are disappointed with this Amendment."

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

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

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman moves the previous question. The question is, 'Shall the main question be put?'. All those

116th Legislative Day

June 15, 1988

in favor say 'aye' those opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The main question is put. Representative Braun to close."

Braun: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of You know I... I got excited at one point. One of the previous speakers referred to this Bill as Revlon, and just want to point out Representative there are a lot of ladies in this world who could not function as well as they did were it not for Revlon. So we have gone a long way to improving this system. This Bill actually does accomplish real and genuine reform of the Chicago Public School System. Just as...just as we have approached this issue from the perspective of trying to do what we could for the children without regard to the various special interests that might have been involved. We have tried to come up with a product which represents consensus here in the General Assembly. May I have some attention, Madam Speaker."

Speaker Breslin: "Excuse me, Representative Braun."

Braun: "May I have some attention in the room."

Speaker Breslin: "Surely."

Braun: "Thank you. No I am very serious about this Ladies and Gentlemen. This is a very serious matter. We have before us one of the most critical questions that we will address or have addressed in my ten years here in the General Assembly. And I say to you we have an opportunity for real reform of the Chicago schools that creates an opportunity for fairness, for equity in the system, and at the time that emphasizes educational improvement and excellence for the four hundred and twenty thousand children in the Chicago public schools. This legislation represents consensus. It is not perfect and not everybody's idea is incorporated in it. But one of the prob...one of

# 116th Legislative Day

June 15, 1988

facts of life about this legislative process is that in education everybody has an idea, everybody has an answer, but nobody has 'the' answer. We have tried to come up with an answer which is the most responsive to the most important priorities, those priorities being the children. Representative Ropp in one of his comments earlier talked about reducing class size to a maximum of twenty-five. love to see class size reduced. But the fact of the matter is we haven't funded the classrooms at the level that we presently have them. We have not funded the school system to allow it to function even at what the modicum of success that I think we are entitled to expect. In the absence funding, however, we have attempted with Amendment #6 to put together a reform of the system so that the system can be accountable, so that the system can function, so that we can get the most bang for our buck, and so that local school decision making will happen at the behalf of the parents and the teachers and principals who are involved on a day-to-day basis with the education of our children. Our children are our future and education is in fact my number one priority and I encourage your support for Amendment #6."

Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #6 be adopted'. All those in favor vote 'aye' all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Representative Keane, one minute to explain your vote."

Keane: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. It's very difficult to explain five weeks in one minute but I think if you closely read the Amendment, you'll find out that the principal who we're holding to a performance contract has no discretion over the operation of the school. The budget, the running, the evaluation and the whole operation of the school is under the parental group. I don't mind that if that's the way

116th Legislative Day

June 15, 1988

you want to go, but don't put the principal on a performance contract. Don't hold his feet or her feet to the fire and allow the group to fire them on the basis that the principal is inadequate when in fact he is the tool of the school board. On terms of the...terms of the engineers, the school people, the cafeteria people, the whole things lies in the fact that the word for the principal where they, we headed as the principal was in charge of the educational part."

Speaker Breslin: "Bring your remarks to a close, Representative."

Keane: "Where the principal was...we had the principal in the existing law says he's in charge of the educational program the fact in this Amendment the word education is struck and the word total operations is replaced, replaces it puts the engineer and the cafeteria people under the direction principal. We had worked hard and long for a separate school facility authority. At one time that was accepted by the task force, somehow that's missing. And for those reasons I would ask you to vote 'no' on this Amendment"

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Flinn, one minute to explain your vote."

Flinn: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'm voting 'present' simply because this Amendment does a whole lot of superficial changes and very few substantive changes. What it will serve as is an excuse for the weeklings in office not to vote for an income tax increase. I'm almost positive that that's what the net...the thing will be. Let me tell you this, if this ever wasn't ever a mirror and smokescreen Amendment, I never saw one. I think unless we do something up front about the Chicago school situation we are most certainly going to defeat any prospects that the income tax will pass, increase will pass, and if I were the Governor downstairs listening to this, I would withdraw my offer to

116th Legislative Day

June 15, 1988

have it raised. Right now."

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

Anthony Young."

Young: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the As, as part of the task force and who's...who, one who introduced reformed Bill based on the wishes of a lot the parents in this city, there's a great deal in this Amendment that I am unsatisfied with. There's a lot of the process that went into this Amendment that I am unsatisfied with. I think the parents won't like several of the things in this Amendment. But at the same time, I'm going to vote for the Amendment because the parents will like a great deal of the things in this Amendment, and as we all know, today is the 15th of June and it's a long time before the 30th of June so I think we ought to send this Bill over to the Senate and at the same time keep working to make the final product more agreeable to those of us who want a little stronger final product."

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

Davis: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I feel that it's significant that parents pick up there children's report card because if you're aware of situations in Chicago, you'd know that sometimes parents do not come up to the school to get their report card and they don't know what the child is doing in school. I'm going to vote 'yes' on this Amendment because I feel that a school management council that gives the three P's, the power that's needed to improve education at all, the parents, the pupils and the principal. Those are the three people, the three groups who will actually will make any reform. Now all they need is the M which is money. It's PM time in education. And it's time for us to start reform and this Amendment certainly does that. Thank you."

116th Legislative Day

June 15, 1988

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Will, Representative Petka."

Petka: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Members of the House. It has been well documented, I believe, in the Chicago media that we have a, a child in the City of Chicago, a child that is crying. Crying for an education. Upon closer inspection we discovered that that child has a soiled diaper. And that diaper is, in my opinion, is the Chicago Board of Education. We've an opportunity right now to change the diaper, but instead we change the pin. And no matter how we want to paper that over, we have not changed a diaper, but we have put on a brightly shining pin. Well, Members of the General Assembly, the child is still crying because the diaper is still smelling. It still stinks. I vote 'no'."

Speaker Breslin: "The Lady from Lake, Representative Stern."

"What an atrocious analogy, Representative Petka. Speaker, Ladies and Gentleman of the House. pretend to know the answers for the Chicago school system, and I...I'm not altogether happy with either of the Amendments that have been before us, but I've been thinking as I listened. We talk a lot out our way about local And it appears to me that this is the absolute control. time when local control should be foremost with us. should I from Lake County or you from DuPage or Madison or wherever gain, say, the Chicago Legislators who have decided that this is the plan that they think is feasible and possible for the City of Chicago. It doesn't have to If it pleases the people whom it serves, that please me. is appropriate. I am going to vote 'aye'."

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

One minute to explain your vote."

Levin: "Madam Speaker. One of the fundamental tests of this proposal is what it does as far as the bureaucracy. This

# 116th Legislative Day

June 15, 1988

is something those of you not from Chicago have to go back to your constituents and report on. This proposal makes meaningful cuts in the bureaucracy by setting the cap based on the average for the unit districts around the State. According to figures provided me by the Chi...Chicago Panel of School Finance, it would cut fifty—four million dollars out of the Chicago bureaucracy. Money that can be used to educate kids. This, I think, is an uncirtant thing to me. I think it is something you can take back to your constituencies that Chicago is in fact willing to reform itself. I urge an 'aye' vote on Amendment #6."

- Speaker Breslin: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? A Majority vote is required to carry the Amendment.

  Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record.

  The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Parke. For what reason do you seek recognition?"
- Parke: "I inadvertently asking for the Speaker...asking for the Speaker, I inadvertently hit my 'yes'. Would you please record me 'no'."
- Speaker Breslin: "Surely...the Roll Call has not been announced.

  The Roll Call has not been announced. The Gentleman,
  Representative Cullerton, for what reason do you seek
  recognition?"
- Cullerton: "Is...if this passes I want to do a verification."
- Breslin: "Representative Cullerton asks verification of the Amendment. Representative Parke wishes to change his vote from 'aye' to 'no'. Would you change him, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 57 voting 52 voting 'no' and voting 4 'present'. Representative Leverenz, for what reason do you seek recognition? Representative Leverenz votes Representative Cullerton has asked for a verification but Representative Cullerton, Representative Parke had

116th Legislative Day

June 15, 1988

previously asked for a verification although his microphone had been turned off. So Representative Parke had initially asked for the verification and that will be recognized. Poll the Affirmative...poll the Affirmative, Mr. Clerk."

- Clerk O'Brien: "Poll of the Affirmative. Berrios. Breslin. Brunsvold. Braun. Bugielski. Capparelli. Cullerton. Curran. Currie. Daley. Christensen. DeJaegher. DeLeo. Farley. Flowers. Giglio. Giorgi. Hannig. Hartke. Hicks. Homer. Huff. Granberg. Jones. Kulas. Lang. Laurino. LeFlore. Leverenz. Levin. Matijevich. Mautino. Martinez. McNamara. McPike. Morrow. Mulcahey. Novak. O'Connell. Phelps. Rea. Rice."
- Speaker Breslin: "Excuse me, Mr. Clerk Representative Parke.

  Representative White ask leave to be verified. May he have leave?"

Parke: "Yes."

Speaker Breslin: "He may. Representative Berrios makes the same request, Mr. Parke."

Parke: "Yes."

Speaker Breslin: "You may leave Sir. Proceed, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Rice. Richmond. Ronan. Saltsman.
Satterthwaite. Steczo. Stern. Sutker. Terzich. Turner.
White. Williams. Anthony Young. Wyvetter Younge. And
Mr. Speaker."

Parke: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, I appreciate the courtesy.

Representative Christensen."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Christensen. Ray Christensen.

How is the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Breslin: "Remove him from the Roll Call."

116th Legislative Day June 15, 1988

Parke: "Mautino. Representative Mautino."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Mautino, is in his chair."

Parke: "Thank you. Representative Farley."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Farley. Bruce Farley, is in the chamber."

Parke: "Thank you. Representative Shaw."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Shaw is not voting 'aye'."

Parke: "Representative Wolf."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Wolf is not voting."

Parke: "Thank you. Representative Huff."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Huff. Representative Doug Huff is in the chamber."

Parke: "Representative Morrow."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Morrow. Chuck Morrow is in..."

Parke: "Representative Brunsvold."

Speaker Breslin: "Is in the Chamber. Representative Joel Brunsvold. Is the Gentleman in the chamber? He is."

Parke: "Representative Phelps."

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

Parke: "Thank you for your courtesy. We appreciate it. I have no more questions."

Speaker Breslin: "On this question there are 57 voting 'aye' 52 voting 'no' 4 voting 'present' and the Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #7, offered by Representative Cullerton."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Cullerton."

Cullerton: "I would like to withdraw the Amendment please."

Speaker Breslin: "Withdraw the Amendment. Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #8, offered by Representative Ropp."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Ropp."

116th Legislative Day

Ropp:

June 15, 1988

"Thank you, Madam Speaker, and Members of the House. Amendment #8 to House Bill 4101 is one that I think really the guts of attempting to deal with school reform and establishing an environment in which a teacher and student relationship can be at such a pitch that that student is able to learn and gets turned on and he is excited about wanting to come back to school everyday. All too many times we talk about teachers, good teachers, leaving the profession. That's frankly true because they're wore out. They're wore out because they have too many kids in which to instruct, they become discouraged, and turn to other professions where they do not have to deal with that This environment. Amendment establishes kindergarten through third grade a maximum class size in the Chicago system. In the Chicago system where WA desperately need to establish school reform where WP attempt to really deal with those people who need to become better educated. Where in fact, we can cut into the dropout rate that is exceeding in some areas 70 percent where the unemployment rate is the highest. Where many tragically enough of those people who are not well-educated end up in one prisons. Where those people are ill prepared to go into the world of work. Ladies and Gentlemen, you in fact will continue to add to the costs of State Government if we do not really get to the very root of our educational any business ever spends money to make Yes i f money, that's exactly what we ought to be doing in case. If you think that it's going to cost a little money, that's true. But I can assure you that the cost we will spend in preparing this kind of environment will be money well worth it. Money that will certainly show return in reducing our prison cost in reducing those people who are illiterate, in reducing those people who are unemployed,

116th Legislative Day

June 15, 1988

and reducing those people who are on welfare. I ask for your support in this very important major, in attempting to deal with school reform in one of our largest cities in this country. Ladies and Gentlemen, give the teacher an opportunity to teach in the kind of environment that will make her or him the very best person in which to affect the lives of all those young people that will be the future citizens in the State of Illinois. I urge you to support Amendment #8 establishing a maximum class size for kindergarten through third grade of twenty-five in a district. I'll be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment 8 to House Bill 4101 and on that question, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative LeFlore."

LeFlore: "Thank you. I have a question for the Sponsor of the Amendment. Will he respond to a question?"

Speaker Breslin: "He will respond to questions."

LeFlore: "Representative Ropp, how much will this cost?"

Ropp: "I don't have any idea right now, but when I had this Bill a couple of years ago establishing a class size of twenty throughout the State of Illinois that cost was about sixty million. Then this year I dropped it down to a twenty with a student, with an assistant coming in for every student up to eleven after that they brought that figure down to something around to six million or seven million. I think we may be talking about a million to two million. Maybe not even that much. So I certainly don't think the cost is going to be that prohibited."

LeFlore: "Where do you propose the money will be coming from in order to finance this particular program?"

Ropp: "Well, I think we, as Members of this Body, will have to address the need for providing quality of education of the State of Illinois. We certainly may be needing to look at

116th Legislative Day

June 15, 1988

increasing the revenue of this State. By that increase of revenue this certainly ought to be one of the priorities for that funding."

LeFlore: "So, you're saying to me that you're willing to support a tax increase, right?"

Ropp: "I think it's time to look at where the State's going in terms of quality education in the State of Illinois and certainly in the heart of Chicago is where we ought to begin. And I'm certainly willing as a downstater to look at that area for improving the quality of education, elementary, secondary, as well as in higher education throughout the State."

LeFlore: "To the Amendment."

Speaker Breslin: "Proceed."

LeFlore: "I realize...I realize that Representative Ropp is trying to improve the quality of education for our Chicago school system but as we stand now, presently, we're suffering a short fall. So with us, not being able to identify where the funding is going to come from I will have to oppose this Amendment."

Speaker Breslin: "Any further discussion? Hearing none, Representative Ropp to close."

Ropp: "Ladies and Gentlemen, I think it's time that we address and stand up and be courageous and where we want the State of Illinois to go in terms of education of our young people. We have not in any way attempted to really deal with what young people will become by the year 2000. That's just some 12 years away. You look at any kind of statistics, we will not at the present state be able to prepare the kind of work force that the people in the State of Illinois who are operating our major businesses want and deserve. Today is the day we can start. Let's support preparing young people for that world of opportunity in the

116th Legislative Day

June 15, 1988

year of 2000 and I urge a 'yes' vote."

- Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #8 be adopted'. All those in favor say 'aye' all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'nos' have it. The Amendment fails. Any further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment 9, offered by Representative Ropp."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Ropp."
- Ropp: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. We had a...a Amendment some time ago on another Bill dealing with establishing some kind of uniformity with the classroom sizes or teacher-pupil ratio or administrator ratio that we have in downstate with the Chicago area. This Amendment provides that the enrollment of pupils in grades kindergarten through three...correction, that we should have a, a pupil-teacher ratio in the Chicago area that is equal to the previous year average of downstate schools. And I urge support of this Amendment in an attempt to begin to deal with allowing the kind of environment that we need in the State of Illinois to make those teachers be the very best that they can so that the young people that they are teaching will be able to be the very best that they too can become. I urge your support of this Amendment."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment 9 to House Bill 4101. On that question, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative LeFlore."
- LeFlore: "Yes. Madam Speaker, again this Amendment will cost more money, that we don't have. Therefore, I oppose this Amendment."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Ropp to close."
- Ropp: "Ladies and Gentlemen, it is time we stand up and be courageous. I hoped that we would at some point in time and I ask for a Roll Call vote."

116th Legislative Day

June 15, 1988

Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #9 be adopted'. All those in favor vote 'aye' all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 28 voting 'aye' 76 voting 'no' 3 voting 'present'. The Amendment fails. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #10, offered by Representative
McGann."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative McGann."

McGann: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, and Members of the Assembly. Could we have a little order please, Madam Speaker. Amendment #10 to House Bill 4101 creates the Chicago Board of Education Building and Maintenance Authority. purpose of this Amendment is to try to do something to correct dilapidating environments of the schools in the City of Chicago. Presently there's a tax levy on the people on the City of Chicago for fourty-one cents in assess value which is supposed to be used for the maintenance and repairs of the schools in the city. you're ever to take a trip through the city outside of the buildings that have been recently been built by public building commission, you will find the schools in very, very much disrepair. What this Amendment does is it creates an authority that is, the members are appointed by the Mayor. The seven member board, they would be selected from architectural field, labor field, educational field, a representative of the superintendent, and they would work and receive the successed levies into the authority in order to repair the schools. We would also in this Amendment give them a bonding authority so that they can go out and use their bonding authority to build new schools where ones that are existing are beyond repair. It also

# 116th Legislative Day

June 15, 1988

have more accountability to the building program in the city. If you allow the system to continue to have the main board of education handle these dollars, you're going to find an ongoing, continued dilapidation occurring. Because the dollars that are allocated for the repair maintenance do not filter down for their purpose but are used for other purposes. This will corr...correct It will also add another measure of reform situation. that's so badly needed. I ask your support for this Amendment because we can put a great accountability into such a large system. If we hadn't been able to work in the other areas today, this is one area we should all behind, on both sides of the aisle, and pass Amendment #10 to House Bill 4101. I'll answer any questions. you."

- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment 10 to House Bill 4101. On the question, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative LeFlore."
- LeFlore: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, with the respect I have for the Sponsor...the two Sponsors of the Amendment, I understand what they are trying to do. This particular issue was discussed in the task force. Majority of the members on the task force was in agreement with it. Therefore, I'm going to have to oppose Amendment #10."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman. The Gentleman from DuPage,
  Representative Hoffman."
- Hoffman: "Thank you. Will the Sponsor yield to three questions?" Speaker Breslin: "He will."
- Hoffman: "Number one, does this set up another governing authority?"
- McGann: "In essence it does because of the fact that the present

  Board of Education does not live into the intent of the

116th Legislative Day

June 15, 1988

present statute that governs them in regards to building and maintenance."

Hoffman: "Alright. Second question, does this transfer the title of the property from the current Board of Education to this new authority?"

McGann: "That is correct."

Hoffman: "Thirdly, does it allow the new authority to sell bonds and what are the limits of the sale of those bonds?"

McGann: "The...all bonds shall be issued in the name of the authority. On page 18, I think, and 19 will answer your questions."

Hoffman: "As I read page 11 item 8, it says to borrow money from time to time and in evidence thereof to issue and sell bonds in such amount or amounts that the board of the authority may determine. That would appear to me to be that it is a relatively open ended bond...bond program, and I think in terms of what we're trying to accomplish with this particular piece of legislation, that it might not be in our best interest to adopt this Amendment with all due respect to the Sponsor."

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

Leverenz: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Breslin: "He will."

Leverenz: "I'm trying to do my best to add my support to the reform of the Chicago school system and your Amendment, does this provide for an unlimited bonding power?"

McGann: "I don't think that that's exactly the intent of having an unlimited bonding power. But an adequate bonding power to correct the schools as soon as possible to give a more pleasant, encouraged environment for the children."

Leverenz: "Well, let me take you back..."

McGann: "I would be very happy to amend it in the Senate to be

116th Legislative Day

- June 15, 1988
- sure that the authority is limited. I do not want to have an open ended bonding authority."
- Leverenz: "Let me take you back then to your first sentence. You said that that was not your intent, but does it in fact allow for an unlimited bonding power?"
- McGann: "Well, as we read it here, it probably does but it certainly will have the, my commitment to amend it to limited authority and when the Bill would go over to the Senate if it does so such."
- Leverenz: "Then might I suggest that you might want to withdraw the Amendment rather than to send a Bill to the Senate that would go to the Senate with a...an unlimited bonding power in it which might give some bad signals to your consituents. And you might then get a lot of bad press over the weekend because they would be calling on you as to why you would be allowing an unlimited bonding power and they would foresee an increase in their property tax."
- McGann: "There is, no doubt, the chances are in answer to the Representative Leverenz's question that taxation down the road may be well needed, but then again it may not be needed if the adequate amounts of the present levy would take care of the needs in order to place the schools back in a little better environment as I stated before. If the Sponsor of the Bill would be willing to take it back from Third Reading, I would be very happy to withdraw the Amendment now and then have it corrected and brought back before this Assembly on Third Reading."
- Leverenz: "Let me state it then another way. Speaker to the Bill, or the Amendment rather."
- Speaker Breslin: "Proceed."
- Leverenz: "If this Amendment would be attached, I think it would place a number of people in a posture where they could not support the Bill, but we now have it amended in the fashion

# 116th Legislative Day

June 15, 1988

that we want and you would scare off a lot of green votes if you had an unlimited bonding power in the Bill. So I would just suggest that you withdraw the Amendment rather than to jeopardize your work and the work of all the others. Thank you."

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

Parke: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield for one quick question?"

Speaker Breslin: "Representative McGann. The Gentleman will yield."

Parke: "Thank you. Representative McGann, will all of this work that is being proposed in this Amendment be done by union workers?"

McGann: "Pardon me."

Parke: "Will all the work that your proposing on this Amendment be done by union workers?"

McGann: "Well, actually yes because Chicago's a union town,

Representative Parke."

Parke: "So all of them will be union jobs. Okay, to the Bill.

Indifference to the Sponsor, to both Sponsors of this

Amendment, it is very complex, it is an Amendment that I'm

afraid will have negative affects on the overall Bill, and

I think that with a critical time for finances that send

the wrong signal to all the people of Illinois and

especially to the people of Chicago, and I'm afraid that we

should vote 'no' on this legis...on this Amendment."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative O'Connell. Excuse me, Representative McGann, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

McGann: "The Amendment, at this late hour, the Amendment is not in my original intention. Some place we have some errors either in the proposal or in the typing. And I ask to withdraw this Amendment. I would hope that the Sponsor of

# 116th Legislative Day

June 15, 1988

the Bill in the respect to the problems that are in the City of Chicago regards to schools, in all of our districts, would give consideration for a corrected Amendment when it's brought before a Third Reading, if not then we'll handle it back in the Senate. So at this time I withdraw the Amendment."

- Speaker Breslin: "Withdraw Amendment 10. Are there any other Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. Representative Leverenz, you're will recognize to make an announcement as to what the Approp. Committee is going to do today and tomorrow."
- Leverenz: "Here's the one you've all been waiting for.

  Immediately we're going to 114. We are going to hear the
  Attorney General, Conservation, and DCCA. We will be out
  of there, hopefully, prior to 8:00. Tomorrow morning we
  are starting at 8:00 a.m. We'll run all the Bills that we
  have heard and do all of our Amendments at approximately
  11:00 or 11:30. The carry over on the ICC and we will be
  done prior to noon with your cooperation. Thank you."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Bowman on the...your Appropriation Committee."
- Bowman: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Appropriations II will be convening tonight immediately after Session in Room 118 and I think if everyone is there promptly, we can finish tonight."
- Speaker Breslin: "Agreed Resolutions."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Joint Resolution 204, offered by Representative Hasara. House Resolution 1568, Giglio; 1569, Terzich; 1570, Matijevich; 1571, Countryman; 1572, Matijevich; 1573, Richmond; 1574, Kubik; 1575, Kubik; 157..."
- Speaker Breslin: "Just a minute. Just a minute. Just, since

# 116th Legislative Day

June 15, 1988

Members are leaving, we are not coming in at 12:00 tomorrow. We're coming in at 11:00. So, in case you have a misconception, before you leave. Proceed with your Agreed Resolutions, Mr. Clerk."

- Clerk O'Brien: "1576, Kubik; 1577, Kubik; 1578, Hicks; 1579,
  Richmond; 1580, DeJaegher; 1581, DeJaegher; 1582,
  DeJaegher; 1583, DeJaegher; 1584, Robert Olson; 1585,
  DeJaegher; 1586, DeJaegher; 1587, Johnson; 1589, Johnson;
  1592, Novak; 1596, Ackerman; 1597, Wojcik; 1598, Ronan;
  1599, Ronan; and 1600, Parcells."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Matijevich, moves the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. All those in favor say 'aye' opposed 'nay'. In opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it. The Agreed Resolutions are adopted. Ladies and Gentlemen, I have been asked to announce that the reception at the Sangamo Club has been held open for one hour after adjournment for Legislators from the House to attend. That's the Ada S. McKinley reception at the Sangamo Club that has been held open for one hour for House Legislative Members. General Resolutions."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 1593, Robert Olson; House Resolution 1594, Hultgren."
- Speaker Breslin: "Committee on Assignments. Approval of the Journal. Representative Matijevich."
- Matijevich: "Madam Speaker, I move that we dispense with the Reading of the Journal and the following Journals be approved: 84th of February 25, 85th of March 23, 86th of March 31, 87th of April 5, 88th of April 8, 89th of April 12, 90th of April 13, 91st of April 14, 92nd of April 15, 93rd of April 20, 94th of April 21, 95th of April 26, 96th of April 27, 97th of April 28, 98th of May 3, 99th of May 4, 100th of May 5, 101st of May 10, 102nd of May 11, 103rd of May 12, and 104th of May 13, 1988."

116th Legislative Day

June 15, 1988

Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall the Journals be approved as read. All those in favor say 'aye' opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it.

The motion carries. Messages from the Senate."

Clerk O'Brien: "A message from the Senate by Miss Hawker's Secretary. 'Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has concurred with the House of Representatives in passage of the following Bills. Together with Senate Amendments House Bills 1584, 27...that's House Bills 1584, 2794, 2918, and 3100. Passed by the Senate as amended, June 15, 1988, Linda Hawker Secretary."

Speaker Breslin: "Death Resolutions."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 1567, offered by Representative Shaw, with respect to the memory of Lee Phillip Hills; House Resolution 1588, offered by Representative Johnson, with respect to the memory of Lucile Holmes; House Resolution 1590, offered by Representative Johnson, with respect to the memory of Hugh B. Good; House Resolution 1591, offered by Representative Homer, with respect to the memory of Donald L. Gideon; House Resolution 1595, offered by Representative Churchill, with respect to the memory of Owen Ferguson."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Matijevich moves the adoption of the Death Resolutions. All those in favor say 'aye' opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it. The Resolutions are adopted. Representative McPike now moves that this House stand adjourned until 11:00 a.m. tomorrow morning. All those in favor say 'aye' opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it. And this House stands adjourned until 11:00 a.m. tomorrow morning."

DOCUMENT NAME

REQ STORE PRINT D DOCUMENT NAME

OPER GROUP COMMAND DATE COPY WIDTH DEPTH ERROR

T061588

9 0 pj 08/24/88 1 66 78

REPORT: TIFLDAY

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

# PAGE 1 07/15/88

JUNE 15, 1988

HB-2063 THIRD READING	PAGE	25
HB-2102 THIRD READING	PAGE	26
HB-2228 THIRD READING	PAGE	27
HB-2260 THIRD READING	PAGE	32
HB-2264 THIRD READING	PAGE	35
HB-4101 THIRD READING	PAGE	74
SB-0448 THIRD READING	PAGE	64
SB-0502 THIRD READING	PAGE	65
SB-0952 THIRD READING	PAGE	67
SB-0952 THIRD READING	PAGE	68
SB-1456 THIRD READING	PAGE	69
SB-1456 THIRD READING	PAGE	71
SB-1593 THIRD READING	PAGE	
SB-1603 THIRD READING		12
SB-1611 THIRD READING	PAGE	36
SB-1642 THIRD READING	PAGE	4 5
SB-1655 THIRD READING	PAGE	
	PAGE	5
SB-1671 THIRD READING	PAGE	5
SB-1691 THIRD READING SB-1704 THIRD READING	PAGE	13
	PAGE	5
SB-1707 RECALLED	PAGE	61
SB-1707 THIRD READING	PAGE	5
SB-1709 THIRD READING	PAGE	5
SB-1714 THIRD READING	PAGE	5
SB-1723 THIRD READING	PAGE	5
SB-1789 THIRD READING	PAGE	5
SB-1800 SECOND READING	PAGE	4
SB-1812 THIRD READING	PAGE	5
SB-1827 THIRD READING	PAGE	5
SB-1830 THIRD READING	PAGE	5
SB-1868 THIRD READING	PAGE	14
SB-1869 SECOND READING	PAGE	4
SB-1880 THIRD READING	PAGE	5
SB-1888 THIRD READING	PAGE	5
SB-1947 THIRD READING	PAGE	5
SB-1966 THIRD READING	PAGE	5
SB-1979 THIRD READING	PAGE	14
SB-1990 THIRD READING	PAGE	17
SB-1998 THIRD READING	PAGE	36
SB-2007 THIRD READING	PAGE	6
SB-2009 THIRD READING	PAGE	6
SB-2011 SECOND READING	PAGE	4
SB-2012 THIRD READING	PAGE	6
SB-2013 THIRD READING	PAGE	18
SB-2035 THIRD READING	PAGE	6
SB-2040 THIRD READING	PAGE	6
SB-2049 THIRD READING	PAGE	6
SB-2051 THIRD READING	PAGE	6
SB-2052 SECOND READING	PAGE	4
SB-2124 THIRD READING	PAGE	6
SB-2124 MOTION	PAGE	60
SB-2153 THIRD READING	PAGE	6
SB-2197 THIRD READING	PAGE	6
SB-2218 THIRD READING	PAGE	6
SB-2228 THIRD READING	PAGE	63
SB-2238 THIRD READING	PAGE	6
S8-2243 THIRD READING	PAGE	6
SB-2249 THIRD READING	PAGE	6
SB-2263 THIRD READING	PAGE	6
SB-2264 THIRD READING	PAGE	35
HR-1495 RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	37
HR-1567 RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	141
HR-1568 RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	139
HR-1569 RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	139

REPORT: TIFLDAY 11:55

AGREED RESOLUTIONS

**DEATH RESOLUTIONS** 

**ADJOURNMENT** 

**GENERAL RESOLUTIONS** 

MESSAGES FROM THE SENATE

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

# PAGE 2 07/15/88

JUNE 15, 1988		
HR-1570 RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	139
HR-1571 RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	139
HR-1572 RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	139
HR-1573 RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	139
HR-1574 RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	139
HR-1575 RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	139
HR-1576 RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	139
HR-1577 RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	139
HR-1578 RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	139
HR-1579 RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	139
HR-1580 RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	139
HR-1581 RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	139
HR-1582 RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	139
HR-1583 RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	139
HR-1584 RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	139
HR-1585 RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	139
HR-1586 RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	139
HR-1587 RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	139
HR-1588 RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	141
HR-1589 RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	139
HR-1590 RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	141
HR-1591 RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	141
HR-1592 RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	140
HR-1593 RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	140
HR-1594 RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	140
HR-1595 RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	141
HR-1596 RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	140
HR-1597 RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	140
HR-1598 RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	140
HR-1599 RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	140
HR-1600 RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	140
HJR-0204 RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	139
SUBJECT MATTER		
HOUSE TO ORDER - REPRESENTATIVE BRESLIN	PAGE	1
PRAYER - PASTOR JOHN WARTON	PAGE	ī
PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE	PAGE	Ž
ROLL CALL FOR ATTENDANCE	PAGE	2
INTRODUCTION OF HIROSHI KUDO	PAGE	Ž
HIROSHI KUDO	PAGE	2
INTODUCTION TEACHER OF THE YEAR - GENE TELLO	PAGE	4
CONSENT CALENDAR-SECOND READING	PAGE	4
CONSENT CALENDAR-THIRD READING	PAGE	4
ACCEED DESCRIPTIONS	DACE	120

PAGE

PAGE

PAGE

PAGE

PAGE

139

140

140

140

141