119th Legislative Day

June 21, 1988

- Speaker McPike: "House will come to order. The Chaplain for today will be Reverend Jim Walden of the First Baptist Church of Pontiac, Illinois. Reverend Walden is the guest of Representative Ewing. Guests in the balcony may wish to rise and join us in the invocation."
- Reverend Jim Walden: "Let us pray. Lord God, thank You for the opportunity that we have to be here today and Lord, I simply don't stand here just to talk and be impressive. Lord Jesus, You have called us here to serve the people of Illinois. I thank You for each one who's here. The thoughts that You know are on their hearts and the work that needs to be done. God we ask for Your strength, the only kind of pure strength that we can have, that You will guide and lead us. And thank You for this day that You created. And O Lord, please bring rain. We need it so desperately. We pray in the power of Jesus Christ. Amen."
- Speaker McPike: "Be led in the Pledge of Allegiance by Representative McNamara."
- McNamara et al: "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United

  States of America and to the Republic for which it stands,
  one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice
  for all."
- Speaker McPike: "Roll Call for Attendance. Representative Piel."
  Piel: "All Members present, Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Matijevich."
- Matijevich: "Leroy Van Duyne is excused due to a death in the family."
- Speaker McPike: "Take the roll, Mr. Clerk. 117 Members answering the Roll Call. A quorum is present. Representative Matijevich asks leave to waive the appropriate rules so that the Rules Committee can meet while the House is in Session. Rules Committee was scheduled for 11:55. Hearing

119th Legislative Day

June 21, 1988

no objections, the leave is granted the Attendance Roll Call will be used, and the Motion carries. The Rules Committee will meet immediately in the meeting room right behind the House Chamber. Rules Committee will meet immediately. Representative Hultgren in the Chair."

Speaker Hultgren: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. If I may have your attention please. I would like to take this opportunity to introduce you to the 1988 Class A State Baseball champions (sic — Class AA State Baseball champions), the Galesburg High School Silver Streaks and their coach, Gary Brewington. I would like to turn the microphone over, if I may, to the coach, Gary Brewington, and ask him if he would, to tell us a little bit about the championship game and introduce the team members."

Coach Gary Brewington: "Okay. Thank you for the invite down here. Appreciate it. Thank you. We were fortunate enough to win the championship game. I don't know if I should say how much the score was but it was 21 to 4. And this group of young men here set 18 individual and team records during the championship series that went on here in Springfield a few days ago. They had a great season. We were 32 and 5 on the year, and what a great ending when you can beg...bring home the trophy that's sitting here to my right. Something that I personally have been striving for as a coach for a number of years. And then when you see it become a reality and the feelings that go along with it and seeing these young men appreciate that win and many other things that have occurred over the last two or three years makes teaching and coaching something special. I won't take anymore of your time to talk about the team. I would like to introduce the team to you. I'm going to probably have trouble seeing some of them. Okay, Corny Stanley, then, I believe, Jammy Taylor, and Bret Brewington, and

119th Legislative Day

June 21, 1988

Jason Libby, and Eric Gillenwater, and this right here was not one of the players, was a bat girl, Kristi Mustain. Of course, she got a lot of applause during the year, especially as it got warmer outside. Alright, Guy Goodman, Toby Davis, Jeremy Kleine, Sergio Interial, Joe Schwab, Scott Vanier, Lance Aten, where'd you play? Kelly Healey, and the biggest guy here, he's came to Galesburg High School from Texas this year, and all he did was set some individual records with 10 RBI's in the championship series and he was the most valuable player of the tournament, Doug Sholtis. And then clear down here is Brandon White, and then we have good old Mark Probst, Dusty Rhoades, and then some other people with us today down in the green tie. can tell these guys are administrators, they got ties John Browning, our principal; our assistant principal, Barry Swanson; and then two other guys that helped with the team during the...the tournament, Bill Allison and I think Phil Price is here someplace. There he is. Thanks a lot Gentlemen and thank you David."

- Speaker Hultgen: "Thank you, coach. I would also like to recognize with me on the podium here today, a former Member of the House, Senator Carl Hawkinson. Mr. Clerk, I believe we have a Resolution. Would you read the Resolution, please."
- Clerk Leone: "House Resolution 1609, offered by Representative Hultgren. Whereas the Galesburg High School baseball team, the Silver Streaks, won the Class AA State Baseball Tournament on Friday, June 10, 1988. And WHEREAS in the state title match in Springfield, Galesburg defeated Barrington High School Broncos 21 to 4 in just 5 innings. And WHEREAS the Silver Streaks set a tie, 18 tournament offensive records, during the title game. And WHEREAS team member, Doug Sholtis, a junior designated hitter, was named

119th Legislative Day

June 21, 1988

the most valuable player of the tournament. And WHEREAS other records by team members include Guy Goodman, Mark Probst, Toby Davis, and Jammy Taylor. And WHEREAS the Silver Streaks as a team also set ten records and tied three records during the title match. And WHEREAS their coaches who deserve credit for training and inspiration of the team members are head coach, Gary Brewington, and assistant coach, David Peck. THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE EIGHTY-FIFTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS that we congratulate the Galesburg High School baseball team for winning the Class AA championship and we commend the team members for their hard work, dedication, and good sportsmanship, and that we wish all the students of Galesburg High School happiness and success in their future endeavors. And be it further resolved suitable copies of this Preamble and that Resolution be presented to the State Championship Galesburg Silverstreaks baseball team."

Speaker Hultgren: "Thank you, Mr. Clerk. There being no discussion on the Resolution, all in favor signify by saying 'aye' opposed. The 'ayes' have it. The Motion...the Resolution carries. Thank you very much."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Curran in the Chair."

Speaker Curran: "Ladies and Gentlemen, I would like to draw your attention to the Speaker's Chair here. We have a unusual but very pleasant looking young lady who is standing on the Speaker's Chair. The reason she's standing, obviously, is you couldn't see her if she wasn't on the chair. And this little lady is the...the winner of the Little Miss Sigma Pageant this year, and her name is Jasmine Bland. And Jasmine is the daughter of Debra Gunn who's on the House Staff and the granddaughter of Wajeedah Raheem, who's a friend of mine from Springfield, and would Wajeedah, would

119th Legislative Day

June 21, 1988

you introduce the rest of the folks that are here."

Wajeedah Raheem: "Linda Williams, Jasmine's aunt; my daughter,

Khy, Jasmine's aunt; my granddaughter Edwinicia, Jasmine's
sister."

Speaker Curran: "And Carmaletta Hogan. Ηi Carmaletta. Carmeletta, you're the embassador from...the president of Sigma Gamma Rho Sorority, and so what we have here is House Resolution 1447 and it says that the Sigma Gamma Sorority is concerned about the development of black children and adults and therefore be it resolved by the Illinois House of Representatives that we congratulate Miss Jasmine Bland on being named Little Miss Jasmine, here is your award. Okay. I think Jasmine has something she would like to share with the House Members."

Jasmine Bland: "I would like to say thank you for presenting to me the proclamation and Sigma Gamma Rho Sorority for giving me the opportunity to be the first Little Miss Sigma.

Thank you."

Speaker Curran: "Jasmine, this is for you, honey..."

Jasmine Bland: "Thank you."

Speaker McPike: "Message from the Senate."

Clerk Leone: "A message from the Senate by Ms. Hawker, Secretary.

'Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has concurred with the House in the passage of the Bill with the following title; House Bill 3586, together with attached Amendments thereto which Amendments have been printed by the Senate in adoption of which I am instructed to ask concurrence of the House of Representatives to wit; Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3586, pass the Senate as amended June 17, 1988.

Linda Hawker, Secretary of the Senate."

Speaker McPike: "Page two of the Calendar, Special Order of Business. State and Local Government. We're going to

119th Legislative Day

June 21, 1988

begin with the Second Readings under this subject. And the first Bill on this order under Second Readings is Senate Bill 1676, Representative Phelps. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk. Never mind, out of the record. Senate Bill 2002, Representative Sutker. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "On page 11 of the Calendar, Senate Bill 2002, a

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

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

Speaker McPike: "Any Motions filed?"

Clerk Leone: "There are no Motions filed."

Speaker McPike: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #2 is being offered by Representative Sutker."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Sutker."

Sutker: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House.

Amendment #2 reflects the discussions which took place in Judiciary II Committee. It relates to the change order provisions of the Bill. The Amendment provides that the Bill only refers to change orders in excess of ten thousand dollars or more and only refers to change orders that reflect and increase or decrease in the time of completion of a contract of 30 days or more. This change is set forth in accordance with the pleas of certain governmental agencies that on minor contract changes, they should not have to abide by the strict limitations set forth in the change order provisions. I support this Amendment."

Speaker McPike: "Gentleman moves for the adoption of Amendment #2 and on that Representative Homer."

Homer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. This is a...an Amendment that was discussed in the House Judiciary II Committee that took care of a drafting problem that was in the original Bill. I know of no opposition would join the Sponsor moving adoption."

119th Legislative Day

June 21, 1988

Speaker McPike: "Further discussion? Being none, the question is, 'Shall Amendment #2 be adopted'. All in favor say 'aye' opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments? Further Amendments?"

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

Speaker McPike: "Representative Sutker."

Sutker: "Floor Amendment #3, Mr. Speaker, provides for local as well as state federal and federal administrations or procedures relating to federal or state or local minority or female owned business enterprise programs. It's a clean up Amendment that I think was the result of the comments of Representative Williams in committee. It also changes the penalty with respect to failure to report a kickback reducing the penalty from a Felony 4...Class Felony 4 to a Class A Misdemeanor. This is to bring it in accordance with other statutes in the Criminal Code. I ask for it's adoption."

Speaker Mcpike: "Is there any discussion? The question is,

'Shall Amendment #3 be adopted'. All in favor say 'aye'

opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is
adopted. Further Amendments?"

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

Speaker McPike: "Representative Sutker."

Sutker: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This
Amendment provides for the reduction and a penalty of a
failure to report a bribe from a Felony, Class Felony 4 to
a Class A Misdemeanor. It's also to conform this Amendment
and this penalty to that which is provided in other
Sections of the Criminal Code with respect to failures to
report briberies, kickback, or such other misconduct. I
move for its adoption, Mr. Speaker."

119th Legislative Day

June 21, 1988

Speaker McPike: "Any discussion? The question is, 'Shall Amendment #4 be adopted'. All in favor say 'aye' opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "There are no further Amendments."

Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 2042. Out of the record. On the same Order of Business, State and Local Government, Senate Bills. Third Reading. Appears Senate Bill 1532, Representative Steczo. Mr. Steczo. Out of the record. Out of the record. House Bill 1634 (sic - Senate Bill 1634), Representative Breslin. Out of the record. House Bill 1870 (sic - Senate Bill 1870), Representative Ronan. Representative Ronan. Out of the record. House Bill...Senate Bill 2152, Representative Barger. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 2152, a Bill for an Act to amend the Personnel Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Barger."

Barger: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 2152 as amended, reinstates the Term Appointment Law in the Personnel Code.

This law was first passed in 1980 and allows agencies and their heads to review the performance of the top management every four years. The courts recently ruled that the law is not in effect because of a sunset provision and this would reenact the Term Appointment Law without changing its substance."

Speaker McPike: "Gentleman has moved for passage of Senate Bill 2152. Is there any discussion? Being none, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 2152 pass'. All in favor vote 'aye' opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this Bill there are 111 'ayes', 3 'nos', none voting 'present'. Senate Bill 2152 having received the Constitutional Majority is

119th Legislative Day

June 21, 1988

hereby declared 'passed'. Senate Bill 2154, Representative Countryman. Oh, excuse me Mr. Countryman. We're going to return to Senate Bill 1870 that was taken out of the record just a minute ago. Senate Bill 1870. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1870, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Vehicle Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Ronan."

Ronan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Senate Bill 1870 is a...a clean up Bill sent over from the Senate that we've added a couple of Amendments to. The basic Bill prohibits on Sunday persons from leasing or offering to lease for a period of one year or more, new or used motor vehicles. We made two additions to it. One dealing with rental agreements between rental agencies and consumers to establish a two hundred dollar limit on liability expenses and finally we clarified another Section of the Vehicle Code to deal with the display of certificates of titles for motor homes. I'll be glad to answer any questions concerning Senate Bill 1870."

Speaker McPike: "The Gentleman moves for passage of the Bill.

And on that the Lady from Lake, Representative Stern."

Stern: "Mr. Speaker, and Members of the House. I know I'm whistling in the wind on this when I speak to the committee they practically laugh out loud, and when I speak to the House there is ill concealed amusement. But I've got to tell you, this is one lousy Bill. Any Bill that prevents consumers from doing business when they are available to do it is a bad Bill. We talk about economic development in this State and when we, the General Assembly, make the statement that you cannot buy a car or lease a car on Sunday. We are confining business quite seriously I believe. Buying a car is a family project. Sunday is the

119th Legislative Day

June 21, 1988

ideal day for mother and father and the kids to go to the automobile dealer and try out a car. The same would certainly be true of a long term lease. I have found it hard to understand how this got passed in the first place but when I tried to repeal it, I learned that every automobile salesman in the State of Illinois backs it seriously. Does not pretend that his boss or her boss is capable of closing the business if it is wished to do so. I urge a 'no' vote on this even though I recognize that I am fighting a rather enormous lobby. This is a bad Bill. It's a bad family Bill. It's a bad consumer Bill. It is a very bad idea. Please vote 'no'."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Preston."

Preston: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I can't pretend to be able to be as eloquent as the previous speaker, but I certainly can support her fine words. This isn't the worst Bill that we've every the Sunday closing on automobile sales is probably the worst Bill. This only goes down as the second worst concept that we can have. Next there will be people saying that other businesses, perhaps doctors and barbers and dentists, like to play golf on Wednesday so some genius will come up with a Bill saying you can't see the doctor on Wednesday unless it's an emergency. Or you can't go get a haircut on Wednesday because your barbers like to play golf on Wednesdays. And who knows what genius ideas we'll go to from there. Prohibiting businesses from doing business, prohibiting consumers from frequenting those businesses when it's convenient to them makes no sense whatsoever and I urge and encourage a 'no' vote."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Johnson."

Johnson: "I don't know how many of the Pages are here for the first year but probably quite a few of you. Probably

119th Legislative Day

June 21, 1988

people up in the galleries who are watching this proceeding for the first time. People in the news media who are covering the Illinois General Assembly for the first year. So I ought to give you a lesson about how government works sometimes in Illinois. If one of you were allowed as a Page to go around the chamber right now and ask all 118 of us how you feel about this Bill, probably 117, depending on how honest the Sponsor was being at the time, would say 'this is ridiculous. This is absolutely the worst Bill that anybody could possibly ever introduce in this chamber other than the underlying Bill that prohibits sales on Sunday.' Everybody knows it's ridiculous. But probably 63 or 65 or 80 people are going to vote for it, cause they say and they're right, 'the lobbyists that lobby for this Bill are really nice guys,' and they they're really nice guys, 'and we got to cast a bad vote occasionally so you might as well do it on this one. This is a terrible Bill but occasionally you have to rise above principle and comments like that.' And I suppose that I should...I've been around here for 12 years so I should know that with these comments, this Bill is going to fly out of here. But everybody in this chamber knows that this is ridiculous. We come in here and talk about free enterprise and competition and consumerism and then we turn around and vote for asinine Bills like this that are antithetical free enterprise and antithetical to to everything that we all are going to go around next fall the campaigns and say we believe in that you could ever have. So if we want to all be hypocrites let's put up our usual 70 or 80 votes. I hope...I hope that we will occasionally vote our principles that none of us do consistently, including me I'm not holier than thou, I'm not better than anybody else, but as a practical matter and

119th Legislative Day

June 21, 1988

as a realistic matter this is a ridiculous, socialistic, anticonsumer, anti-free enterprise Bill that everybody knows in their heart ought to be defeated. So vote however you want."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Parke."

Parke: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the General Assembly. I don't always agree with Representative Johnson on his positions, but I will assure you that I rise in support of his position on this legislation. I cannot emphasize any more important that government has the responsibility of staying out of the businesses concerns unless there is a definite problem for consumers that has to be done. is not a...this is an anticonsumer Bill. Everyday that I turn around, I am hearing people telling me that irritated because they cannot shop for cars on...on a Sunday. And here we're going to turn around and further restrict business and free enterprise opportunities to have say on what they want to do with their own ins...institution that they have and they make their livelihood. We want to further restrict the ability of business to make a living in Illinois. Another nail in the coffin of business in Illinois saying that we are now further restricting your rights to do things and do business in Illinois. This is a bad Bill and we vote 'no' on it."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Laurino."

Laurino: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Let me say that this is a proconsumer Bill not a anticonsumer Bill because encompassed in this Bill is a liability...a factor against the leasing car business putting the cap on the insurance that they have so beautifully avoided in the past. I think it's a necessary piece of legislation that closes loopholes and gaps in a already good law. And I urge for you people

119th Legislative Day

June 21, 1988

to vote for it. Thank you."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Regan."

Regan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. In order to reiterate the last Speaker, this does include the two hundred dollar cap on collision on a lease car which elminates the ripoff of ten or eleven dollars for what's called insurance at a leasing agency. Whether your position on open or closing is anything there, certainly this part of the Bill is extremely important and it does protect the consumer considerably. I urge for its passage."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Ronan to close."

Ronan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. At least the last two Members who spoke on this Bill gave a clear analysis of what we've got. You know, let's not confuse the issue. This isn't the Sunday Closing Bill. This General Assembly passed that years ago and we've reaffirmed it every time it's been brought before the General Assembly. This deals with long term leases. It's a minor change in the law concerning that, but the proconsumer aspects of Amendment 4 and 5 are really what this Bill is all about. And I hope that people realistically look at this legislation and cast an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1870 pass'.

All in favor vote 'aye' opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted?

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

On this Bill there are 67 'ayes', 40 'nos', 7 voting 'present'. Representative Stern."

Stern: "We would like to verify that vote, please."

Speaker McPike: "67 'ayes'."

Stern: "I had bet on 80."

Speaker McPike: "And the Lady asks for a verification. Mr. Ronan would request poll the absentees."

119th Legislative Day

June 21, 1988

- Clerk Leone: "A poll of those not voting. Representatives Barger, Flowers and Steczo. Beginning with the Poll of the Affirmative. Barnes. Berrios. Braun. Breslin. Bugielski. Capparelli. Christensen. Countryman. Daley. Daniels. Cowlishaw. Curran. DeJaegher. DeLeo. Deuchler. Dunn. Ewing. Farley. Flinn. Virginia Frederick. Giglio. Giorgi. Goforth. Granberg. Hallock. Hannig. Hasara. Hensel. Hoffman. Keane. Klemm. Krska. Kulas. Laurino. Leverenz. Martinez. Matijevich. McAuliffe. McGann. McNamara. McPike. Novak. O'Connell. Panayotovich. Bernard Pedersen. William Robert Olson. Peterson, Phelps, Rea, Regan, Richmond, Ronan, Ropp. Saltsman. Shaw. Sieben. Stange. Sutker. Ryder. Tate. Terzich. Wait. Wennlund. White. Williamson. Wyvetter Younge. And Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Hicks changes from 'no' to 'aye'. Representative Hartke changes from 'no' to Representative Steczo votes 'aye'. Representative Flowers 'aye'. Representative Wojcik votes votes 'aye'. Representative Rice votes 'aye'. Representatives Stern withdraws her request for verification. Mr. Clerk, have you got the accurate record? On this Bill there are 73 'ayes', 37 'nos', and 6 voting 'present'. Senate Bill 1870, having received a Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 2154, Representative Countryman. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 2154, a Bill for an Act to amend the Business Corporation Act. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Countryman."
- Countryman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 2154 amends the Business Corporation Act. It provides that a statement of correction to the Secretary of State from corporation may include changes in

119th Legislative Day

June 21, 1988

the estimates of property of the corporation, estimates of the business of the corporation, or a statement made in leu of these estimates. All such statements presented, being barred from being in a statement of correction at the present time. Make some changes in the terminology for purposes of clarification and the provisions dealing with the collection and refund of franchise taxes. It was amended with Senate...or with Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 2154 by Representative Cracken...McCracken to correct a...an oversight in the Bill. And I move its passage."

Speaker McPike: "Gentleman moves for the passage of Senate Bill 2154. And on that, Representative Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker McPike: "Yes."

Cullerton: "Representative Countryman. It seems to me Representative McCracken's Amendment #1 is more than just clarifying some language which is unclear. It seems to me that it's somewhat of a change. Now as I understand the Bill before this Amendment at the statement of correction which corrects a license fee a tax, a penalty, or other charge, which was established had to be documented by an annual report. And this Amendment says any document required to be filed by this Act. Now am I...am I misreading that? Does this mean that this Bill applies to any document filed...required to be filed by the Act or does it mean that the Bill will only applies to the annual report?"

Countryman: "Well first of all, it's my understanding a statement of correction is applicable to any other document other than the annual report. The concern was what Representative McCracken brought to our attention was that foreign corporations filed differently and that is that they file a certificate of authority rather than some of

119th Legislative Day

- June 21, 1988
- the other documents, and for that reason they wanted to be able to..."
- Cullerton: "I can't...I can't hear you. I can't hear you."
- Countryman: "Well, what I'm saying is that foreign corporations amend other documents and that's why we made it any document."
- Cullerton: "I see. Not just an annual report."
- Countryman: "Not just the annual report. Because those documents...it might be in the certificate of authority where they have to make elections as to...as to these estimates or statements of these estimates, that they need the ability to make it to any document. This was brought to the attention, I believe, of Representative McCracken by some lawyers who worked in this field and that's...and I don't mean to imply that it's merely technical but I think in it's affect it just allows people to correct any document that would reflect these estimates of business or assets."
- Cullerton: "No. I understand now and I agree with you.

  The...this Bill, was this Bill drafted by the Secretary of
  State's Committee that makes recommendations to the
  Secretary of State on the Business Corporation Act? Or was
  this just supported by the Secretary of State?"
- Countryman: "I didn't undertake the Bill originally. I picked it up from Senator Barkhausen, but it's my understanding it was the genesis of the Bill, the drafting of the Bill came from the Secretary of State's office. Yes."
- Cullerton: "And do you know, do they have a procedure whereby the Secretary of State's office has advice from a committee made up of nonemployees of the Secretary of State's office, the Bar Association types?"
- Countryman: "That's correct. I think it's some sort of corporate advisory council that meets and gives them input. There

119th Legislative Day

June 21, 1988

was at one time a discussion of making a rather controversial Amendment on this Bill, however that Amendment is not on the Bill and was not put on the Bill. This is a...this is merely a minor Amendment of the law so if somebody makes a mistake or overestimates how much that they...property they are going to have, and what have you, they can...they can then file a statement of corrections. This does not do what many corporations would like it to do."

- Cullerton: "Now does it also allow corporations to seek a refund for the overpayment of franchise taxes?"
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Braun in the Chair."
- Speaker Braun: "Senate Bill 2154. The Gentleman from Cook,
  Representative Cullerton."
- Cullerton: "Yes, I was in the middle of asking a question about this Bill. It deals with the issue of corporations being able to seek a refund for an overpayment of franchise taxes. Now, right now, if Representative Countryman, I'll address this question to you. How does it work right now? And how does this law change the...will this law change the practice?"
- Countryman: "Well right now as I understand it, the Secretary of State's authority is limited to the adjusting the amount of the assessment and therefore they can only do it prior to the time it's actually paid. Under this Bill..."
- Cullerton: "Wait...back up there. Did they get...if someone overpays, do they get a credit?"
- Countryman: "No. Now the...under existing law."
- Cullerton: "Under existing law do they...if someone overpays...if
  a corporation overpays franchise taxes based upon the
  initial estimates which are subsequently lowered, what
  happens right now for...with that money? How...how does
  the corporation get the money back?"

119th Legislative Day

June 21, 1988

- Countryman: "They don't. We don't have a mechanism to do that.

  This Bill will create a mechanism to allow for that."
- Cullerton: "And...and so subsequently there might be some loss to the state in revenues that are admittedly incorrectly obtained."
- Countryman: "Well, you know, there might be some minor cost to the State but these people are making estimates and if they overestimate and they come back in with further verification that they...the franchise taxes they paid were excessive, then they would be entitled to a refund. I think we used the same concept in terms of income taxes."
- Cullerton: "So...so this is a benefit to corporations but you think it's a fair one."
- Countryman: "I think it's a fair one. I don't think the revenue impact is a major one, and I suspect..."
- Cullerton: "Now what about the...what about the...that portion of the Bill that eliminates the need for a hearing to be held by the Secretary of State within 60 days concerning a contested assessment of corporate franchise taxes. Would...would we still have the hearings but they don't have to be within 60 days or is the hearing...the hearings eliminated all together?"
- Countryman: "It appears to me that...that since they can file an amended report now, they wouldn't have to file objections to the assessment. They could file by way of amended report but it does appear that the language dealing with the hearings and objections has been struck in the Bill."

Cullerton: "So there's no hearings?"

Countryman: "It would appears that way, yes."

Cullerton: "So we'll save money there because the Secretary of State's Office will not have to hire people on contract to conduct the hearings."

Countryman: "That's right."

119th Legislative Day

June 21, 1988

Cullerton: "Do you know how many hearing officers there are right now on contract that conduct these hearings right now?"

Countryman: "No, I don't."

Cullerton: "Do you know that there are any?"

Countryman: "No, I don't. They might do it in House, but..."

Cullerton: "And if they do it in House, then we'd be freeing up that employee for some more work?"

Countryman: "That...that's correct so it's a good government Bill."

Cullerton: "Okay. Thank you."

- Speaker Braun: "Is there further discussion? There being none, the Chair recognizes the Gentleman from...from DeKalb to close. Representative Countryman."
- Countryman: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I think I've thoroughly explained the Bill and I've answered the questions of Representative Cullerton with regard to it. I think that although it does maybe make some minor adjustments it brings fairness to the Corporate Franchise Tax suggested by the Secretary of State. And I ask you for a favorable vote."
- Speaker Braun: "The Gentleman has moved the passage of Senate Bill 2154. All in favor vote 'aye' opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. This is final action. Have all voted? Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are...the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Parke, for what reason do you rise? Representative Parke."
- Parke: "Thank you. I...it's not related to this legislation and if the Chair could recognize me after this vote is taken I would appreciate it. Thank you."
- Speaker Braun: "On this question there are 112 voting 'aye', none voting 'no', and Senate Bill 2154 having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared 'passed'.

119th Legislative Day

June 21, 1988

Senate Bill 2193, Representative Mautino. Representative Mautino. Out of the record. Representative Parke."

Parke: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Members of the General Assembly. The AMVETS Association would like to recognize some of the following members if they will go to the back of the chamber for the recognition. There is awards to be given for the on behalf of the AMVETS. And that would be Representative Breslin, Bugielski, Davis, Granberg, Hultgren, Johnson, Jones...Lo...Lovana, Kirkland, Kubik, Leverenz, Morrow, Mulcahey, Olson, Petka, Satterthwaite, Sieben, Stern, Tate, Terzich, Wennlund, Williams...Paul, and Curran. And the photographers will come to the back of the room, please."

Speaker Braun: "On page 3 of the Calendar appears Senate Bill 1615, Representative Cullerton. Representative Cullerton.

Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "On page 3 of the Calendar, Senate Bill 1615, a Bill for an Act to amend the Environmental Protection Act.

Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Braun: "Gentleman from Cook."

Cullerton: "Yes, thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Bill caused some confusion on Second Reading because of the Amendments that some of which were incorrectly reported as being adopted in committee. And so we, on Second Reading, I think clarified it by reading into the record LRB numbers. I would point out that the Bill right now has Amendments 1, 2, 5, and 6 on the Bill. So Amendment #1 was an Amendment that I had adopted in committee. The purpose of which was to remove Senate Amendment #2 dealing with removing certain banks and savings and loans form liability for cleaning up the superfund. And that Amendment simply struck Amendment #2. Senate Amendment #2. House Amendment #2 was offered by

119th Legislative Day

June 21, 1988

Representative Goforth and it really made technical corrections. I believe it removed the word 'or' there were 'two or' in the same sentence. Amendment #3 was by...wait presented а minute....that was withdrawn. Amendment #4 was also withdrawn. I'm sorry, Madam Speaker, I think that in...presenting this Bill on Third Reading, I think that there's still some confusion as to regard to which Amendments have adopted. I t. been was my understanding that Amendment #4 was adopted not Amendment #5 and yet the Calendar seems to show Amendment #5 as being adopted."

Speaker Braun: "Mr. Clerk, would you..."

Clerk Leone: "The records on Senate Bill 1615 show Amendment #1 being adopted in committee, #2 is adopted, #3 was withdrawn, #4 lost, #5 and 6 were adopted."

Cullerton: "I see. Thank you for that clarification. Amendment #4 was debated and defeated. Amendment #5 was offered by Representative Breslin and that reflected a...an agreement that had been worked out with certain power companies that nuclear power plants and the issue of operate decommissioning was addressed in that Amendment. And as Representative Breslin had indicated, this was agreed to by...required an owner and operator of the nuclear power plant to file a decommissioning plans with an agency days prior to the decommissioning. It also called for the nuclear power plants to establish two decommissioning trusts, one to meet a requirements of Internal Revenue Code for dedication purposes. The other to contain the excesses of decommissioning funds required by the commission over the funds placed in the tax qualified fund. It also placed restrictions on the distribution of money from funds either for decommissioning purposes or for refunds to customers. is indicated by Representative Breslin this was agreed

119th Legislative Day

June 21, 1988

to by the...power companies involved. Amendment #6 which also was adopted embodied the original Bill's purpose and it reflected an agreement as well, worked out between the EPA, the Pollution Control Board. the Illinois Manufacturers Association, and the Illinois State Chamber of Commerce, and the... Environmental Council. The purpose of the Amendment as opposed to the original Bill that introduced was to call for...in the area of nonhazardous waste on site disposal to call for certain reporting requirements rather than calling for the EPA permit requirements to be met. I indicated on Second Reading there was some language...legislative intent, I would at this time like to read that again into the record, to clarify that this Bill concerning notification is not intended in any way to restrict the power of the Pollution Control Board to adopt regulations requiring notification based on the environmental concerns including maintaining records for inspection or other notification requirements for facilities not specifically mentioned in this Bill's provision. So having embodied that intent into the Bill, I'd be happy to answer any questions and otherwise appreciate your support. I think this is a significant step forward with regard to the potential concerns that we have of onsight disposal of nonhazardous waste and I would appreciate your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Braun: "The Gentleman's move to passage of Senate Bill 1615 and on that is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1615 pass'. All in favor vote 'aye' opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. This is final action. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. this question On there are 115 voting 'aye', none voting 'no'. Representative Cullerton. None voting 'no' and Senate Bill

119th Legislative Day

June 21, 1988

1615 having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Representative Jones would like to have been recorded as voting 'aye' on this Bill. Representative Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Yes. Madam Speaker, now that Representative Monroe Flinn is in the chamber, I wanted to ask him on a point of clarification. He had talked earlier this year about a something called a June Swoon. And I wasn't sure what a June Swoon was, and I think I understand what it is now but I wondered if he could clarify exactly what a June Swoon is. I think when you go two and eight in the last ten games if you're the St. Louis Cardinals I think I understand what a June Swoon is. Or if your a 500 ball club. That must be a June Swoon. But maybe he's got some clarification."

Speaker Braun: "Representative Monroe Flinn."

Flinn: "I don't know what the Gentleman is talking about but I happen to be a Cub fan and a Bud man."

Speaker Braun: "Alright, on page 10 of the Calendar appears

Senate Bill 1814. Representative Richmond. Representative

Richmond. Senate Bill 1814. Representative Richmond. Mr.

Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1814, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Farm Development Act. Second Reading of the Bill.

Amendment #1 was adopted in committee."

Speaker Braun: "The Gentleman from Jackson."

Richmond: "Yes, the...thank you, Madam Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The...this Bill...we put an Amendment on it last week when it was held up for a fiscal note and that...I think it's been filed. I'm asking the Clerk now, 'has that been file?'. If not we'll take this out of the record."

Speaker Braun: "Are there any Motions filed?"

119th Legislative Day

June 21, 1988

- Clerk Leone: "There are no Motions or further Amendments. A fiscal note on Senate Bill 1814 has been filed."
- Speaker Braun: "Out of the record. On Third Reading...Third Reading. The Bill will be held on the Order of Third Reading, Representative Richmond, and until such time as the Fiscal Note Act has complied with. Senate Bill 1834, Representative Olson. Representative Piel, for what reason do you rise?"
- Piel: "I'm sorry, Madam Speaker, I misunderstood you. Did you say that fiscal note had been filed?"
- Speaker Braun: "No, Sir, I said the Bill will be held..."
- Piel: "On Second Reading...you said Third Reading. That's the reason I asked the question. It's on the Order of Second Reading right now."
- Speaker Braun: "The fiscal note has been filed. The Bill was moved to Third Reading."
- Piel: "Okay, that's..."
- Speaker Braun: "I was in error. You're...you're correct. But the fiscal note has been filed."
- Piel: "Thank you."
- Speaker Braun: "The Bill is now on the Order of Third Reading.

  Senate Bill 1834, Representative Olson, the Gentleman from...Representative McCracken, for what reason do you rise?"
- McCracken: "Just...just to clarify. There had been a previous fiscal note requested on that Bill. Another one was requested 'as amended' which appears in today's Calendar.

  And I'm just curious if that fiscal note has been filed."
- Speaker Braun: "Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "The fiscal note that is on record is dated June 9, 1988."
- Speaker Braun: "Representative McCracken."
- McCracken: "I...I think if you look at our request, it was filed

119th Legislative Day

June 21, 1988

after that date and is asked for 'as amended'. So upon confirmation of that I would ask the Bill to be held on Second until it's complied with."

- Speaker Braun: "Representative Richmond. The Gentleman's observation is correct. The fiscal note which was filed was filed to the Bill in it's original form before Amendment. A fiscal note 'as amended' has not been filed on this Bill. Therefore, the Bill must be returned to the Order of Second Reading, and will remain on the Calendar and be reflected on the Calendar as such. Alright, Representative Olson, the Gentleman from Lee. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill. Senate Bill 1834."
- Clerk Leone: "On page 4 of the Calendar, Senate Bill 1834, a Bill for an Act to amend the Environmental Protection Act.

  Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Braun: "Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Lee."
- Olson: "Thank you very much, Madam Speaker, Members of the House.

  I wish to hold this Bill on Third. There is a meeting scheduled for 1:30 this afternoon between interested parties, including Pollution Control, Energy Environment, EPA, JCAR, so please hold the Bill. We'll get to it later in the week."
- Speaker Braun: "Out of the record. Senate...on page 4 of the Calendar appears Senate Bill 1989. Representative O'Connell. Senate Bill 1989. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1989, a Bill for an Act to amend the
  Unified Code of Corrections. Third Reading of the Bill."
  Speaker Braun: "Gentleman from Cook."
- O'Connell: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Senate Bill 1989 contains provisions which clarify the crime of home invasion.

  It...as it was amended on Second Reading, it provides language so that if an individual should lie and wait after illegally entering a vacant home and wait for the person to

119th Legislative Day

June 21, 1988

arrive home, that that would...that would meet the elements of home invasion. It also had some affirmative defense language for a person withdrawing from the home without any bodily contact. I would ask for a favorable Roll Call and be happy to answer any questions."

- Speaker Braun: "The Gentleman has moved the passage of Senate Bill 1989. And on that is there any discussion? being none, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1989 pass'. All in favor vote 'aye' opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. This is final action. Have all voted? Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 114 voting 'aye' and none voting 'no', and Senate Bill 1989 having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Bill 1994, Representative Ronan, Representative Ronan, 1994. Representative Ronan, are you prepared to proceed with this...Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1994, a Bill for an Act to amend the
  Unified Code of Corrections. Third Reading of the Bill."

  Speaker Braun: "Gentleman from Cook."
- Ronan: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. This is a Bill that I am carrying for the Cook County State's Attorney's Office. It creates a new offense titled 'Cannabis Trafficking' which is committed when a person brings across to be brought in Illinois one kilogram or more of Cannabis for the purpose of manufacture or delivery or with the intent to manufacture delivery. We have now amended that Bill to change that from one kilogram to two and a half kilograms. It as an amendment offered by Representative Countryman. I'll be glad to answer any questions concerning the Bill. And I move for it's passage."
- Speaker Braun: "The Gentleman has moved for passage of Senate Bill 1994, and on that is there any discussion? There

119th Legislative Day

June 21, 1988

being none, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1994 pass'. All in favor vote 'aye' opposed vote 'no'. This is final action. Have all voted? 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 Senate Bill 1994 having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 2127, Representative Parke. Representative Parke. Is the Gentleman in the chamber? Out of the record. Senate Bill 2258, Representative Regan. Are you prepared to proceed? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill. Representative Breslin in the Chair."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 2258, a Bill for an Act to amend certain Acts in relationship to certain criminal offenses.

Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Regan on the Bill."

the House. Regan: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, and Members of Senate Bill 2258 is a companion Bill to Countryman's 2257. These two Bills are agency Bills for the Department of Children and Family Services designed to give children consultation after criminal sexual abuse. And if the perpetrator of these vicious crimes can and is able to, he is obligated to pay for that counseling of the child. all know that...that this kind of a crime leaves scars not on the body necessarily but certainly in the mind. And the counseling is required. And the perpetrator should pay if he can. If he cannot, the counseling fees will come out of the Violent Crime Assistant Fund and what 2258 does is try to provide some funds to that...to that fund so that there's adequate funding available. It does that by creating a law...a new law which is called Juvenile Prostitution, The House of Juvenile Prostitution. It also has exploitation of a child and child pornography involved

119th Legislative Day

June 21, 1988

in the forfeiture provisions, the same as what we have in the drug laws...forfeiture provisions. If someone is...is convicted of one of these crimes and it's a home or a business or building involved with juvenile prostitution, that building or that home can be seized, sold, and the money goes to the Violent Crimes Assistant Fund. We've a...amended the Bill considerably to meet the concerns of mine, which were some, the concerns of the committee, and the concerns of the Illinois Bar Association. I think the Bill is now in fine shape, I urge it's passage."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 2258. On the question, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Yes. Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Breslin: "He will."

Cullerton: "Representative, you said you amended the Bill and my question concerns the Bill's...that Section of the Bill dealing with forfeiture of property. You still have some forfeiture of defendants property left in the Bill?"

Regan: "Yes. But in only three areas, Representative, juvenile prostitution, exploitation of a child, and child pornography. We have removed criminal sexual assult, aggravated criminal sexual assult, criminal sexual abuse from that forfeiture provision."

Cullerton: "Do you know the penalties for the one's that are...that remain?"

Regan: "The three that are remaining?"

Cullerton: "Right."

Regan: "Well, the...the new crime, a place of juvenile prostitution is a Class I Felony."

Cullerton: "How about the other two?"

Regan: "Exploitation of a child, I believe, is a Class X Felony."

Cullerton: "Okay. Now with regard to the seizing and forfeiting

119th Legislative Day

June 21, 1988

of a defendants property, does this take place before trial or after trial?"

Regan: "There is a hearing prior to the trial where the probable cause in which the property can be locked up."

Cullerton: "Now is it a problem..."

Regan: "It is not seized, though, until after the conviction.

It's not put up for auction. It's sold."

Cullerton: "Well, it's seized while it's priot to trial...it's not forfeited unless there's a conviction?"

Regan: "Yes."

Cullerton: "And the probable cause hearing to determine whether or not the property can be seized. What does that involve?

Now, the reason why I ask that is there's a probable cause hearing right now held unless someone is directly indicted on whether or not someone committed the crime. And I'm wondering how does this probable cause hearing differ or can it be done at the same time or just what is involved?"

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Cook..."

Regan: "I'll have to get an answer for that exact timing. It would be great if they could be held at the same time."

Cullerton: "But I mean the iss...issue..."

Regan: "It's a hearing prior..."

Cullerton: "...but to determine what? Whether or not it's likely that the...that the property...that the property was used in furtherance of the crime or whether or not the defendant committed the crime?"

Regan: "Whether the defendant committed the crime."

Cullerton: "And do you also have to show that the property was used in the...in the commission or furtherance of the offense?"

Regan: "Not necessarily so. If for example, if he's keeping a house of prostitution for juveniles and it's been proven that he's done this over 20 years, the money that he would

119th Legislative Day

- June 21, 1988
- have attributed to purchasing other things or that's in bank accounts can also be seized. But that's the same as the drug forfeiture laws."
- Cullerton: "Well, my question specifically is, maybe it's a technical question but the forfeiture provisions authorize seizure of the property when the property is, and I think I'm quoting from the Bill, used in the commission or furtherance of the crime. And I wonder if you could..."
- Regan: "...Because we eliminated a lot of that language with the Amendment."
- Cullerton: "Was that taken out or is that still in there?"
- Regan: "I think so. What page are you on there?"
- Cullerton: "I'm on page 2 of an analysis so if you let me find it in the Bill..."
- Regan: "When I eliminated those other crimes, in fact that was my idea..."
- Cullerton: "Let's talk about this, can someone...if someone is using their house for the purpose of juvenile prostitution, does this contemplate seizure of the house, forfeiture of the house?"
- Regan: "Yes, it does."
- Cullerton: "Okay. And you've amended the Bills so that the...there...the age of the prostitute which is very relevant to whether or not the property will be seized...knowing that the defendant has the right to prove
- Regan: "Knowingly."
- Cullerton: "...the defendant has the right to prove through an affirmative defense that he or she thought that the prostitute was older than 16?"
- Regan: "Yes, we added that in one, Amendment #4 or 3. There was additional language in #4 as well to protect the innocent from..."
- Cullerton: "Now, does the...does the place, does the location

119th Legislative Day

June 21, 1988

itself have to be the location where the prostitution is taking place?"

As I said, they can follow his assets Regan: "Not necessarily. through and if they can prove that he got the money purchase other...other homes, residence, boats from juvenile prostitution they can seize the other assets as But I think what you're getting at is what I had concerned originally, Representative Cullerton, eighty-five percent of child abuse usually happens in the home. other child abuse crimes when I eliminated them also it's elimination if a person owned a bookstore and in that bookstore he sexually abused a child. The original Bill said that you could seize the bookstore. That language is removed from the Bill. Now what we're going after is just what the drug trafficking situation does. keeping a house, we can get it. That's the primary thing. A house of prostitution, go after the house."

Cullerton: "Okay now, with regard to the issue of restitution.

Now this is to allow for the Judge to require restitution to go to the victim for counseling?"

Regan: "This is actually will be covered by Mr. Countryman in 2257 as well as this one ties together on counseling. But if a child has been sexually abused, the counseling costs will be paid for by the perpetrator, if he can, otherwise from the Victims Assistance Fund."

Cullerton: "Okay, here's...here's the question, again maybe this is more technical. You got mandatory provisions dealing with counseling. Now the counseling must be given in the case where based on the offenses charged rather than the actual conviction. I understand that if someone is charged with an offense, it's your intention that if they're convicted of those offenses, that counseling be required. Now, my question to you is, doesn't the Bill say that it's

119th Legislative Day

June 21, 1988

the initial charge as determined by the State's Attorney that will trigger that restitution so that if someone pled guilty or was found guilty of a lesser offense then that was charged, would they still be required to pay for this counseling?"

Regan: "Okay. Alright. I got that...that came up in committee.

Only if there's a plea in which means he pleads guilty to a
lesser crime. Alright. So there is a conviction. He's
pleading guilty. That's the only time that that plays a
part."

Cullerton: "So the defendant would be put on notice that even though he copped a plea so to speak and pled to a lesser charge which might result in less time in jail, he or she still is...has to pay for the counseling."

Regan: "That's correct."

Cullerton: "Okay. Most now is a practical matter not many of these people...you're...you're of the opinion that these people...these defendants, unlike most defendants have some money? Because they've been involved in juvenile prostitution?"

Regan: "In most cases yes. Just like drug selling."

Cullerton: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Breslin: "Any further discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 2258 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? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are lll voting 'aye' and none voting 'no', 2 voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. On the Special Order of Business dealing with education we will go to those Bills first that are on Second Reading. The first Bill is Representative William's Bill, Senate Bill 1856. Read the Bill, Mr.

119th Legislative Day

June 21, 1988

- Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1856, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee."
- Speaker Breslin: "Any Motions or Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Williams."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Williams."
- Williams: "First of all I would like to, could we go back. I would like to table Amendment #1 that was adopted in committee. Is that appropriate?"
- Speaker Breslin: "Yes, the Gentleman has move to table Amendment #1. Is there any discussion on that question? Hearing no discussion, the question is, 'Shall Amendment 1 be tabled'.

  All those in favor say 'aye' opposed 'nay'. In opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it. Amendment #1 is tabled.

  Amendment...excuse me, Representative McCracken."
- McCracken: "Speaker, we are joined today on this side of the aisle by Mr. Ed Vrdolyak. He's down here working on various matters of the State interest and I just wanted to let everyone know he's here. Welcome Ed."
- Speaker Breslin: "Welcome. Representative Williams on Amendment #2. Representative Braun in the Chair."
- Williams: "Okay, thank you, Madam Speaker, Amendment #2, this basically what it does is that we have various aspects of the present co...apparently there's been a correction. There's no Amendment #2, it's only Amendment #3 is what we have. I don't see an Amendment...the only one that's been distributed that I have too is Amendment #3. Could we move then to...I guess...take Amendment whatever's Amendment #2 out of the record and then go to Amendment #3? Because Amendment #3 is the only that I..."
- Speaker Braun: "Amendment 2 is withdrawn. Further Amendments?

119th Legislative Day

June 21, 1988

There are no further Amendments, Representative Williams. Representative Williams, it appears that Amendment 2 is identical to Amendment 3 so what has been passed around as Amendment 3 is in fact Amendment 2 as filed with the Clerk's office. So we request leave to correct Amendment 3 on its face to denote it as Amendment #2. Representative Cullerton."

- Cullerton: "Well, it's going to have to go back to the Senate so

  I would think that the...maybe the best thing to do would

  be to withdraw #3. I don't even know that #2 is even
  distributed."
- Speaker Braun: "For what reason does the Lady from DuPage,
  Representative Cowlishaw rise?"
- Cowlishaw: "Madam Speaker, I...I rise to ask a question if I may.

  I am really rather confused about this business with these
  Amendments. I thought Amendment #1 was adopted in
  committee to this Bill. Now have we here on the floor
  today removed Amendment #1 or is it still on the Bill and
  is this that we see here as #3 actually #2 and there is no
  #3. Could you please explain what the answer to that."
- Speaker Braun: "The Clerk advises that Amendment 1, adopted in committee, which had been adopted in committee has been tabled. Amendment 2 is the only subsequent Amendment.

  There is no Amendment 3. It was misnumbered in the copies passed out on the floor. We have requested leave of the House to have Amendment 3 redesignated as Amendment 2. Is there further discussion? Representative McCracken."
- McCracken: "....three, what we call three is in fact two which has already been distributed. So there is no physical Amendment #3."

Speaker Braun: "That's correct."

McCracken: "Okay."

Speaker Braun: "Is there further discussion? Representative

119th Legislative Day

June 21, 1988

McCracken."

McCracken: "Did he table this Amendment already?"

Speaker Braun: "No, he has not."

McCracken: "He just tabled one."

Speaker Braun: "Amendment #1 which had been adopted in committee,
was tabled, Amendment 2 is presently under discussion.
Representative Williams."

- Williams: "Excuse me for clarification. We had, I had on the record stated that we would in fact take number 2 out of the record and then go with number 3 and then it was the decision of the Chair, since there was no physical Amendment #2, to go with Amendment #3 and just redesignate it as Amendment #2, so that's the kind of clarify the record as to what took place. If that clarifies it, I'm not sure but that's my best attempt."
- Speaker Braun: "The Chair incorrectly said that #2 had been withdrawn, #2 is the only Amendment it is identical to the copy which is on your desk which says three presently we have by leave of the House re-denoted #3, as Amendment 2 which is presently under discussion. Representative Cowlishaw."
- Cowlishaw: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I thank you very much because I did speak before however that was an inquiry to the Chair. I hope I may be permitted to ask the Sponsor of this Amendment a question."
- Speaker Braun: "Certainly, but first we have to make sure the record is perfectly clear on this. Mr. Clerk, will you read the LRB number of the Amendment which is presently being debated."

Clerk O'Brien: "LRB8512305THksam"

Speaker Braun: "Okay, now Representative Cowlishaw you have a question of the Sponsor. He indicates he will yield."

Cowlishaw: "Yes, I want to ask the Sponsor, this is a very simple

119th Legislative Day

June 21, 1988

question to which there should be a straight forward, yes, or no answer. Is this Amendment what we typically refer to as the composite rate Amendment, which is certainly not unfamiliar to us having been adopted in the past."

Williams: "Yes, this is the composite rate Amendment."

Cowlishaw: "Thank you, very much."

Speaker Braun: "Is there further discussion? There being none the Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Williams to close."

Williams: "Principally what this Amendment does is that there is certain tax levies that after this year will then no longer be available to the City of Chicago, Board of Education, this Bill just allows us to continue to levy those taxes that we've already levied and collected and in essence it allows us to be able to meet our obligations with the Board of Education, with at least go partly towards meeting our obligation without addition, well, we probably will need additional state revenue, but for this part of the levy it will just continue in existence as it always has and we would just ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Braun: "The Gentleman has moved the adoption of Amendment #2. All in favor vote 'aye' opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record? Representative Krska for what reason do you seek recognition? Representative Krska's light is on. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On question there are 87 voting 'aye' 24 voting 'no' one voting 'present'. And Amendment 2 is adopted, further Amendments."

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Braun: "Third Reading. On page 4 of the Calendar appears

Senate Bill 1926, Representative Steczo. Representative

119th Legislative Day

June 21, 1988

Steczo is the Gentleman in the Chamber? Out of the Record.

Senate Bill 1999, Representative Satterthwaite.

Representative Satterthwaite. Are you prepared to proceed?

Mr. Clerk, Read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1999, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Satterthwaite: "Madam Speaker and Members of the House. This is a Bill that we really do need to have passed during this Session. It deals only with a certain group of people who are seeking certification in teaching. For whom the examination results will not be available in time for fall employment, and this would simply give them a non-renewable temporary teaching certificate until the thirty first of August. The State Board of Education indicates that this language is needed so that these teachers can be hired for the fall semester, even though the results of their tests are not yet made available, and I would urge the Members of the House to adopt the Bill."

Speaker Braun: "The Lady has moved the passage of Senate Bill 1999. And on that is there any discussion? The Chair recognizes the Lady from Cook, Representative Pullen."

Pullen: "I have a question please."

Speaker Braun: "She indicates she will yield."

Pullen: "What would be the outcome if a teacher were given this provisional certificate which expires August 31st, and is hired and then the test scores come in and it turns out that the teacher has not passed."

Satterthwaite: "They would be able to teach only until the end of the semester and then because they had not appropriately been certified they would no longer be able to teach."

Pullen: "So because the semester would begin before, or because the contract would begin before August 31st they would, the provisional certificate would still be good for that

119th Legislative Day

June 21, 1988

semester."

Satterthwaite: "That's my understanding. Yes."

Pullen: "Thank you."

Speaker Braun: "Is there further discussion? The Lady from Champaign to close."

Satterthwaite: "Madam Speaker, Members of the House. This is a Bill the merits of which have been argued before and have passed out of here. It is simply a stop gap measure for teachers who are caught in the timing. From now on this problem will not exist but we feel that the teachers who will not receive their grades in time for fall hiring should not be penalized by not being able to work this year. And I would urge Members to support House (sic) Senate Bill 1999."

Speaker Braun: "The Lady has moved the passage of Senate Bill All in favor vote 'aye' opposed vote 'no'. voting is open. This is final action. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 109 voting 'aye' none voting 'no' one voting 'present'. Senate Bill 1999, having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. The Chair recognizes the presence of a former Speaker of the House. Bill Redmond in the center aisle. Speaker Redmond, Speaker Redmond you're on the wrong side of the aisle, Redmond. Representative Daniels has something to say about that."

- Daniels: "After reading the platforms of the two parties over the weekend he has decided to join ours."
- Speaker Braun: "On page...returning to page 4 of the House Calendar. Representative Steczo, Senate Bill 1926. Mr. Clerk, Read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1926, a Bill for an Act to amend the

119th Legislative Day

June 21, 1988

School Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Braun: "The Gentleman from Cook."

Steczo: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Members of the House. Bill 1926 does four specific things with regard to schools and programs. First it authorizes the State Board of Education to contract with public or private ornot-for-profit organizations for pilot programs offering coordinated services to at-risk infants and toddlers and their familes. The State Board of Education has indicated that the funding for this program would come from what is now funding for the zero to three handicapped program which is being taken over by federal funds. The House last week also, I should mention that in committee an Amendment was added to provide a clerical correction with regard to scholarships, fellowships and traineeship programs. The word fellowship was included because the State Board felt the scholarship and traineeship wording needed to be clarified more. We also adopted an Amendment offered by Representative Mulcahey and Representative Sieben dealing with the school consolidation in their area to make it easier for a number of districts to consolidate. The House last Friday provided a technical change in Amendment #3 and in Amendment #4 provided that in elections for School Board Members or I should say in vacancies for School Board Members, if in fact the school board failed to act and the Regional Superintendent failed to fill the vacancy within thirty days that the vacancy would be filled at the next reqularly scheduled election and that's been non-contraversial subject matter in this House for about the last two years. Madam Speaker, I would answer any questions and if there are none would move for the passage of Senate Bill 1926."

Speaker Braun: "The Gentleman has moved the passage of Senate

119th Legislative Day

June 21, 1988

Bill 1926, and on that is there any discussion? The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from McClain, Representative Ropp."

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

Speaker Braun: "He indicates he will."

Ropp: "Representative, what kind of programs would this entail?"

Steczo: "Representative Ropp could you repeat the question please?"

Ropp: "Were dealing with programs that deal with kids at-risk now in your interpretation what kind of a program would you think would be a good one for a child at-risk?"

Steczo: "The Bill at the recommendation of the State Board of Education, provides that the school district may offer early childhood parental training courses during that period of day which is not a regular school day. So this would be pre-school at-risk and pre-school special education, I believe."

Ropp: "Well what would they do. I mean would they play games or would they actually be some instruction in reading and math or...we always talk about at—risk programs and I've never really heard what one is."

Speaker Braun: "Representative Steczo."

Steczo: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. According to the information, Representative Ropp provided to me by the State Board of Education, parents as teachers would provide parent education involving individual guidance at home, group meetings, resource materials, etc. The program actually Representative Ropp is designed to increase the parents knowledge of child development, build confidence in their, in their child rearing skills. Identify conditions that might inhibit normal development and develop parental involvement in education, prior to the child's formal education."

119th Legislative Day

June 21, 1988

Ropp: "In other words it would be kind of like a vocational program for a parent."

Steczo: "If you want to look at it that way."

Ropp: "Good idea."

Speaker Braun: "Is there further discussion? The Lady from Dupage, Representative Cowlishaw."

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

Speaker Braun: "He indicates he will."

Cowlishaw: "Representative Steczo, will you yield for a couple of questions please?"

Steczo: "Yes, Ma'am."

Cowlishaw: "Representative, let me review and be sure that I understand what is contained in the Amendments. underlying Bill, I don't think anyone would dispute that that is an excellent idea. But lets...lets because there has been a lot of confusion about some of this during this Amendment process. Let me understand and if I am not correct please feel free to interrupt. Amendment #2 provides that if you wish to form a unit school district, you can in the petition to do so, ask that those School Board Members who are to be elected in that new district come from sub-districts within the unit district rather than being elected at large. And it has long been I believe the belief of the State Board of Education and most other people who pay attention to these issues that that kind of provision would help to encourage the formation of unit school districts. Is that correct?"

Steczo: "Representative Cowlishaw, it is for exactly that reason that the Amendment is being offered, to encourage."

Cowlishaw: "And the Amendment was adopted."

Steczo: "Yes, it was."

Cowlishaw: "Alright, lets move on to number 3. I believe."

119th Legislative Day

June 21, 1988

Steczo: "Madam Speaker just to interrupt Representative

Cowlishaw, Amendment 2 was not adopted however Amendment 5

which was a technically correct Amendment was adopted."

Cowlishaw: "Oh, alright. Thank you, because that is one of the reasons why I was confused I was going to say well then what happened with five. Alright, thank you very much Terry. Number 3 I believe provides that the program for study and career compensation should be conducted in all of the school districts of the State rather than just in a few and I believe that that is to be conducted by the center for excellence in teaching. So that although you mentioned that it was a technical Amendment and it does have some technical language as far as removing some obsolete language about a report date, it does something more than just technical and it does, if what I believe it does is what it does than that's very advisable."

Steczo: "Representative Cowlishaw, you are correct. Because I happened not to be in Springfield, Friday when this Amendment was adopted, I glanced at it quickly and saw the technical language taken out and I unfortunately overlooked the Section that took five to seven out and in essence made it unlimited. But you are correct in your explanation."

Cowlishaw: "Thank you, so it is more than a technical Amendment, but certainly what it does, we would all be in accord with, I think. And finally Amendment #4, I believe that's an issue Terry that you've been working on for a long time and I'm glad to see that it got, it did get adopted."

Steczo: "Yes, Representative Cowlishaw, it did."

Cowlishaw: "Very good, I think thats... It's time that we stopped permitting boards of education which in most cases consist of only seven people to kind of limp along with only six because a regional superintendent of schools fails to do his or her duty in appointing a replacement. This would

# 119th Legislative Day

June 21, 1988

help to correct that situation. I think this is an excellent piece of legislation, I thank the sponsor for his willingness to answer the questions and now that we have clearly understood what is contained in the Amendments, I stand in support of this legislation."

- Speaker Braun: "Is there further discussion? The Gentleman from Henry, Representative Sieben."
- Sieben: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I also rise in support of this Bill, with the Amendments now that are a part of this Bill there are several provisions here that provide a lot of benefit for education and I urge a 'yes' vote on this Bill."
- Speaker Braun: "Is there further discussion? The Lady from, I mean the Gentleman from Cook to close. Representative Steczo."
- Steczo: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, I believe the issues that are contained in Senate Bill 1926, have been adequately addressed, especially, I appreciate Representative Cowlishaws bringing to my attention some of the things that were overlooked in the initial discussion. And I would move for the passage of the Bill, Madam Speaker."
- Speaker Braun: "The Gentleman has moved the passage of Senate Bill 1926. The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1926, pass?' All in favor vote 'aye' opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. This is final action. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 99 voting 'aye' 14 voting 'no' one voting 'present'. Senate Bill 1926 having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. On page 11 of the Calendar appears Senate Bill 2023, Representative Brunsvold. Representative Brunsvold, is the Gentleman in the Chamber? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

119th Legislative Day

June 21, 1988

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 2023, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee."

Speaker Braun: "Any Motions filed?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Braun: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Hultgren and Black."

Speaker Braun: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Warren on Amendment 2."

Hultgren: "If I may make an inquiry of the Clerk. Was...we filed two Amendments on this one and is Amendment #1 did we withdraw that? Or is there an Amendment 3."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #1 was a Committee Amendment."

Hultgren: "Okay, do you have an Amendment 3."

Clerk O'Brien: "Two and three filed."

Hultgren: "Fine. Then I would like to withdraw #2."

Speaker Braun: "Amendment 2 is withdrawn. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative
Hultgren and Brunsvold."

Speaker Braun: "The Gentleman from Warren, on Amendment 3."

Hultgren: "Thank you, Amendment #3, simply clarifies the Sponsors intent on this legislation to indicate that the personnel files of any individual teacher would only be available for access upon that teachers written permission. I understand that it has the support of the Sponsor and of other groups that are supporting this legislation."

Speaker Braun: "The Gentleman has moved the adoption of Amendment #3, on that is there any discussion? There being none.

The question is, 'Shall Amendment 3 be adopted.' All in favor say 'aye' opposed say 'no' in the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it, Amendment 3 is adopted. Further Amendments?"

119th Legislative Day

June 21, 1988

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Braun: "Third Reading. On page 4 of the Calendar, appears Senate Bill 2028. Out of the Record. On page 5 of the Calendar, appears Senate Bill 2147, Representative Granberg, 2147. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 2147, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendments #1, and 4 were adopted previously."

Speaker Braun: "Any Motions filed?"
Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Braun: "Mr. Clerk, Senate Bill 2147, appears to already be on the Calendar, Order of Third Reading. Does that comport with your records."

Clerk O'Brien: "Your correct. House (Senate) Bill 2147, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Braun: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Clinton,
Representative Granberg."

Granberg: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Senate Bill 2147, amends the School Code. Currently school boards must establish a list, catergorized by a position showing the length of continuing service for every teacher. Senate Bill 2147, merely expands that to have the school board compile a list for not only teachers but support personnel employees. Amendment #4, which was adopted last week, which was offered by Representative McNamara, which is also part of this Bill provided that student teaching would not be necessary if a teacher could show that he or she was employed as a teacher for five years, that was in support, that was supported by this body and was and the state board of education was in support of that Amendment as well."

Speaker Braun: "The Gentleman has moved the passage of Senate Bill 2147, and on that is there any discussion? The Chair

119th Legislative Day

June 21, 1988

recognizes the Lady from Dupage, Representative Cowlishaw."

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

Speaker Braun: "He indicates he will."

Cowlishaw: "I believe that Amendment #1 to this Bill was adopted in committee, is that correct?"

Granberg: "Yes, Ma'am."

Cowlishaw: "It's my understanding that what Amendment #1 does is to require all school boards throughout this State to annually establish a complete list of non-certified employees, all catergorized by specific positions, showing the length of service of each employee qualified to hold each position, and requires that those school boards make copies of that list available to collective bargaining representatives by February 1, of each year. Is it correct that that is what Amendment #1 does?"

Granberg: "Representative Cowlishaw, that is correct. The School

Code currently provides that those school boards do that
with teachers, at the present time. At the present time
it's also my understanding that that many school boards
across the State do this as a matter of practice today."

Cowlishaw: "Thank you, for your answers. Madam Speaker, to the Bill. Anything that we enact here that requires of school districts some task that is not currently required costs those school districts money. This task may not cost a large amount of money, but one of our problems in dealing with our schools throughout this State as a General Assembly, is that we keep passing these little things, that only cost a little money, time and time and time again, and pretty soon we have imposed very considerable monetary impositions upon our school districts. It is for that reason and because I think it is time that we reverse this trend of finding more and more tasks to impose

119th Legislative Day

June 21, 1988

upon school districts and school boards throughout the State. That I believe this Bill should be defeated."

Speaker Braun: "Is there further discussion? The Gentleman from Clinton to close."

Granberg: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. In regard to Representative Cowlishaws remarks, I understand her position and in general I have concurred with her feelings all throughout the current year in the Elementary and Secondary Committee. But not only in that committee but as a matter of principal. Ι am firmly opposed to mandating any school district or any local unit of government programs to which they cannot afford. I believe that, I feel that way, and I feel very strongly about that position, that's why I normally agree with Representative Cowlishaw, but in this position, I would not Sponsor this Bill if I felt it would be a hindrance on our local school boards because I that strongly about that issue. That is why I would ask the Ladies and Gentlemen of this body to vote 'yes' on this Bill."

Speaker Braun: "The Gentleman has moved the passage of Senate Bill 2147, all in favor vote 'aye' opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. This is final action. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 99 voting 'aye' 13 voting 'no' and Senate Bill 2147 having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. The Chair recognizes Representative Hasara, for an announcement."

Hasara: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen we've all done a lot of talking about education and obviously its value and the status of education in the State of Illinois.

This afternoon I'm very pleased to introduce twenty one young students in high school from a variety of schools in

119th Legislative Day

June 21, 1988

Illinois who have been chosen to visit Russia for three weeks this summer as part of the people to people program and I'm sure you're as proud of all of them as I am. Representative Sieben, Saltsman, Curran, Brunsvold, DeJaegher, Mautino, and Tuerk share with me in having students from their districts as part of this program. At this time I would like to introduce the delegation leaders. Jeffrey Orton of Geneseo, and Elizabeth Talbet of Urbana who will just comment very briefly about how these students were selected."

Jeffrey Orton: "I want to thank you for this opportunity to recognize these students. We have twenty one of Illinois finest students that are going to the Soviet Union, they are known as we refer to them as student ambassadors and that's exactly what they will be doing they will be ambassadors for the State of Illinois and I think they will do a very fine job representing the State of Illinois, thank you for giving us this opportunity to be here."

Hasara: "Let's give them all a very big hand."

Speaker Braun: "Representative Breslin in the Chair."

Speaker Breslin: "The next Bill on the Special Order dealing with education is Senate Bill 2217, Representative Novak.

Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 2217, a Bill for an Act to amend

Sections of the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Novak."

Novak: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Members of the General Assembly. Senate Bill 2217, amends the School Code to provide that if a unit district annexes another unit district effective July 1, 1988, and part of the annexed territory is detached within thirty days, then the detachment shall be disregarded in computing supplementary payments. This basically corrects a technical inequity in

119th Legislative Day

June 21, 1988

the law as it stands right now. We had a school district reorganization in my district back home and a number of the students will be moving into a new district, the high school students. So since State aid is computed from the prior year this provision change in the law will allow the old school district to retain the State aid for the number of years its required to. I urge for its passage."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 2217, and on that question, the Lady from Dupage, Representative Cowlishaw."

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

Speaker Breslin: "He indicates he will."

Cowlishaw: "Representative, I believe this is a Bill with which we had a small problem in the committee. And for that I want to apologize."

Novak: "No problem."

Cowlishaw: "There were some other matters under discussion that had nothing whatever to do with your Bill. That got in the way of our looking at this on its merits. Fortunately, the other matters were put aside and we looked at your Bill carefully and I believe the committee vote was seventeen to nothing in favor of this Bill. This is the kind of Bill that many of us bring here every now and then but because of some specific problem within our own Legislative District, and that is all that Representative Novaks Bill does it takes care of I believe its the Hersher School District, in his State Representative District. And since each of us may at sometime have a similar problem for which we need the help of our colleagues, I suggest that we know help Representative Novak this Bill should be passed. Thank you, Madam Speaker."

Speaker Breslin: "There being no further discussion, the question

119th Legislative Day

June 21, 1988

is, 'Shall Senate Bill 2217, 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. question there are 109 voting 'aye' none voting 'no' and none voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Under the Special Order of Business, dealing... Representative Rice. Representative Rice wishes the record to reflect that he would have voted 'aye' on Senate Bill 2217. On the Special Order of Business, dealing with State Government. Those Bills on Second Reading, will be called. Senate Bill 1581, Representative Novak. Out of the Record. Senate Bill 1956, Representative McAuliffe. Mr. McAuliffe is the Gentleman in the chamber? Out of the Record. Therefore, Ladies and Gentlemen we will go back now to the Bills on Third Reading on this Special Order of Call. The first Bill appears on page 4 on your Calendar, Senate Bill 1781, Representative Mautino. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1781, a Bill for an, a Bill for an Act in relation to quarter payment, quarter monthly payments for certain taxpayers under the State Occupation and Use Tax Acts. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Mautino."

Mautino: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Senate Bill 1781, addresses the question of the quarterly monthly payments for those retailers who have been indebtedness of ten thousand dollars or more, per month. Normally, the are grocery stores, hardware stores, etc. In many cases car dealers as well. What this Bill does is provide for those same three payments or a fourth alternative, which is a hundred percent of the taxes due to the State to be paid as every other retailer does at the end of the following, the month

119th Legislative Day

- June 21, 1988
- following the indebtedness. It has also been amended with Amendment #1 that provides for an enactment date of January 1, of 89, and I'd be happy to answer any questions and move for its passage."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 1781. And on that question the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Young."
- Young: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Are Amendments two and three on the Bill?"
- Speaker Breslin: "Mr. Mautino to answer Representative Youngs question. Representative Mautino the question is are Amendments two and three adopted to the Bill?"
- Mautino: "I believe Amendments 2 and 3 were filed, I have not taken the Bill back. So, therefore Amendment #1 is the only Amendment on it. If it is the wishes of the Department of Commerce and Community Affairs on 2 and 3 we'll discuss that later."
- Speaker Breslin: "Any further discussion? Representative Young. Representative Young."
- Young: "As the Bill stands now, does it apply to counties that elect their county assessor."
- Mautino: "Speak up, I didn't hear you Anthony."
- Young: "As the Bill stands now, does it apply to counties who elect their county assessor."

Mautino: "No, it does not."

Young: "Thank you."

Mautino: "That is Amendment Tony, that is one of the Amendments."

Frederick: "Yes, thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Would the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Breslin: "He will."

Frederick: "Representative Mautino, would you explain what a

119th Legislative Day

June 21, 1988

retailer has to compute his taxes every single week and then file them every single week to the Department of Revenue."

Mautino: "The existing law that was called the accelerated tax payment that was enacted, I believe under Walker, if I'm not mistaken. I may be incorrect. It says that anyone who owes ten thousand dollars or more in sales tax normally, grocery stores, etc., large retailers, accelerate their payment to the State by paying four times a month. Once each week and then at the end of the month. This provides for a fourth alternative, where a hundred percent of that payment is due the month following the due taxes. Just like every other retailer. A problem occurred years ago and currently now where they have overpaid because it's based on last years sales. Okay, and then they get a credit and there is a time delay when the credit provid...is provided. Also what it will do is to provide for the auditors who audit these accounts to do their much better. And it would put everybody on the same scale still allows them to pay weekly if they so desire but also pay a hundred percent of what they owe and the month following the enactment."

Frederick: "Currently they pay a hundred and five percent."

Mautino: "Yes, Ma'am."

Frederick: "This would be a lost then in revenues, right?"

Mautino: "I don't consider it a lose when a person pays on an estimate more than what is actually due. I think with this proposal the State will be receiving absolutely what they have coming to them. And there would be no additional penalty provisions. Just like every other retailer, the current law is that you sell the product, you collect the tax and you submit it to the State within thirty days of last month. This puts everybody on the same basis."

119th Legislative Day

does."

June 21, 1988

Frederick: "How are they going to really be able to compute this
to get an accurate fix on what their liability really is?"

Mautino: "It normally comes from the cash register. X amount of
sales that's built already into the sale price and it shows
up on their return and they can still do it in quarterly
payments but it's much better for many of them to pay it
just like everyone else does and that's what the Bill

Frederick: "May I ask what organization really wanted this Bill?"

Mautino: "The Illinois Retail Merchants Association were the

individuals who are involved in the whole process of this

Bill."

Frederick: "Okay, thank you. Madam Speaker to the Bill." Speaker Breslin: "Proceed."

- Frederick: "Yes, I agree that 1781 seems like a good idea in theory, but I'm dubious whether a taxpayer could determine the actual liability for a quarter monthly reporting period. And get the payment to the department on time, thus, I would suggest that the proper vote on this Bill is a 'no' vote. Thank you."
- Speaker Breslin: "There being no further discussion.

  Representative Mautino to close. Do you wish to close Sir?

  Do you wish to close Sir?"
- Mautino: "I believe that everyone understands what the Bill does, it's the same effect for every retailer in the State, and provides that assistance to those large retailers to make one payment or have the opportunity of making four payments a month, it's just a an accommodation either way and I move for its passage."
- Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1781,
  pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye' all those opposed
  vote 'no'. Voting is open. This is final action. Have
  all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk

119th Legislative Day

June 21, 1988

will take the record. On this question there are 96 voting 'aye' 15 voting 'no' one voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. On page 3 of the Calendar appears Senate Bill 1958, Representative Parke. Terry Parke. Out of the Record. On page 3 appears Senate Bill 1978, Representative Hallock, John Hallock. Out of the Record. On page 3 appears Senate Bill 2003, Representative Kubik. Clerk, read the Bill."

- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 2003, a Bill for an Act to amend the Civil Administrative Code. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Kubik."
- Kubik: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 2003, is a Illinois Department of Transportation Bill which would allow the department to enter into agreement with Local Governments and architectural engineering firms, for the purpose of making improvements to Amtrak Stations. What this basically allows them to do it authorizes them to do that those kinds of things. There is no money attached to the Bill, and I'd be happy to answer any questions."
- Speaker Breslin: "Excuse me, Representative Kubik.

  Representative Cullerton for what reason do you seek recognition."
- Cullerton: "I wonder if Representative Kubik could just take this out of the record for just a second, so we can locate our file."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman agrees the Bill is Out of the Record. Special Order of Business dealing with public utilities. Appears Senate Bill 1626, Representative McPike. Do you want to proceed with this Bill? It's on Second Reading. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1626, a Bill for an Act to amend the

119th Legislative Day

June 21, 1988

Energy Assistance Act. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Any Motions or Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Homer and Ryder."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Homer."

Homer: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, would you withdraw Amendment

Speaker Breslin: "Excuse me."

Homer: "Withdraw Amendment #1, please?"

Speaker Breslin: "Withdraw #1, any further Amendments?"

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

Homer and Ryder."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Homer."

Homer: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen. underlying Bill is the Bill that would extend the ERAP program and make it a year around program. The Amendment that is being offered, Amendment #2, would insure that the cost of the ERAP program will not be passed along to utility rate payers but will instead be paid exclusively from the Exon Oil overcharge refunds, that are set aside for this purpose. Under this Amendment the program would be extended, the shorter of the two years provided for in the Bill or until the Exon Oil overcharge funds are exhausted, whichever event occurs first, would terminate the program. This Amendment is simply being offered in order to protect against a rate increases for utility consumers to fund what is otherwise a very good program. And therefore, I would submit that the Amendment strengthens the Bill and yet at the same time protects consumers against rate increases as a result of this program. I'd be happy to answer questions and then I would move for adoption of Amendment #2."

119th Legislative Day

June 21, 1988

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 1626, on that question the Gentlemen from Livingston, Representative Ewing."

Ewing: "Representative Homer, does this have anything to do with the air conditioning extention that has been included. Is that in this Bill now or?"

that referral Homer: "Yes. Representative Ewing, to air conditioning results from the fact that the original ERAP program was limited to the winter months, the heating The Senate Bill 1626 would extend that ERAP season. program year around in other words would also include the summer months. The air conditioning months. The Amendment does not change that but simply provides for a sunset of the Bill, at such time as the Exon Oil overcharge monies are exhausted. So that at the Amendment would limit the exposure of consumers to the underwriting of this Bill."

Ewing: "Representative, what happens after the sunset, who picks up the cost then?"

Homer: "Well, under the Amendment, the program would terminate at the time that the Exon money runs out. So, that there would be, the program would be discontinued after we run out of the Exon money."

Ewing: "That's in your Amendment?"

Homer: "That's in the Amendment."

Ewing: "Now, in the law now, is that the termination or is."

Homer: "No, in the Bill the Senate Bill 1626, is a two year program. That Bill unamended would mean after the Exon money runs out the utilities would have the right to apply to the commerce commission to build into their rate base additional funds in order to pay for this program. The Amendment would protect against that."

Ewing: "Okay, do you really think this program will terminate when the Exon money is gone?"

119th Legislative Day

June 21, 1988

Homer: "If this Amendments adopted it will have to. It is provided for in the Amendment."

Ewing: "Or they will have to come back to this Body and in its wisdom it can repass the program."

Homer: "Right."

Ewing: "Or..."

Homer: "It would require further enactment at that time."

Ewing: "Thank you for the clarification."

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

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

Speaker Breslin: "He indicates he will."

Kulas: "Representative Homer, how much money is left in the Exon fund? Representative Homer."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Homer you've been asked a question."

Homer: "It is my understanding, Representative McPike, the Sponsor of the Bill informs me that there is currently twenty four million dollars, of Exon monies remaining."

Kulas: "And how much did the ERAP program cost last year?"

Homer: "Again Representative McPike tells me eight million a year for the past three years, is his understanding."

Kulas: "Eight million dollars is all that the ERAP program cost last year."

Homer: "For the year, that's my understanding, but I don't have any independent confirmation of that."

Kulas: "And you say there is twenty four million left in the fund at the present time."

Homer: "Right, but you understand that the program is being expanded to include the summer heating season as well. The previous law only applied to the winter heating season. So, conceivably the cost will escalate as a result of including the summer season."

Kulas: "Thank you. Well, to the Amendment, Madam Speaker, Ladies

119th Legislative Day

June 21, 1988

and Gentlemen of the House. The ERAP program has been a very successful and worthwhile program and has been God sent to a lot of people in my district. I fear that adopting Amendment #2 would sound a debt null to the ERAP program, because once their money is gone, that program terminates, this is a program that needs to be kept in place, it's a program that needs to be kept in force. We need to find funding for this program, but we don't need to adopt this Amendment. And I would ask everybody to vote 'no' against this Amendment. And I would ask for a Roll Call vote."

- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Saline, Representative Phelps."
- Phelps: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in support of Amendment #2, when you, when you stop and access the success that the six month program has had, and what an impact it could have when we expand it to a yearly program for those who desperately need it and how best we could utilize the funds that are available, I don't think we would even stop and ponder that this would not be a good idea. So, I appreciate the 'aye' votes."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black."
- Black: "Thank you, very much, Madam Speaker. Would the Sponsor yield for a question?"
- Speaker Breslin: "He will."
- Black: "Thank you. Representative Homer, I think this is a very important Amendment and I'm not sure everyone on the floor heard your response to Representative Kulas question. It has been running at about an eight million dollar cost per year, but the underlying Bill, let's have you amplify that I think the underlying Bill greatly expands ERAP, and I hope everybody on the floor would direct their attention to

119th Legislative Day

June 21, 1988

Mr. Homer, because I think this is a key portion of the Bill, and it would indicate why his Amendment is so important."

Homer: "Yes, thank you, Representative Black. That's correct the previous law the ERAP program applied only to the heating The Bill, the cost of that Bill was about eight million dollars a year, to fund that. Now, the Senate Bill 1626, would extend ERAP, but would also enlarge it to a year around program, no longer would it be limited just to the heating season. It would be greatly expanded to also help subsidize the payment of air conditioning and other expenses that are incurred in the summer time. caused consumers throughout this State to be concerned about how this program would be paid for, so in response to the concerns of all consumers, who pay utility bills, this Amendment #2, would say that yes the program may be extended to year round however, it would be limited to the available monies that are now available through the Exon Oil overcharge funds. Therefore, when those funds run out we won't be requiring consumers to pay for this program. And I think that's a reasonable compromise and with twenty six million left in the Exon Funds that should provide a sufficient amount for the program but if it doesn't this would protect consumers against having to underwrite this expanded program."

Black: "Well, thank you very much, Representative. Madam Speaker to the Amendment. I think it's very important that you concentrate on what this Amendment does. A previous speaker said this underlying Bill, the ERAP program had been very important in his district. I concur with that, I dare say its probably been very important in many of our districts, certainly it has been in mine. However, when the money is not there to pay the bill on the ERAP program

119th Legislative Day

June 21, 1988

you must be faced with a hard decision. Do you add it to the rate base? Which no one in here, I don't believe anybody in here would like to see happen. Or do you go to the consumers and simply have them pay a surcharge to make up the shortfall which under this expanded program is estimated to run anywhere from twelve to fourteen million dollars a year. I think the Gentleman's Amendment gives us a funding mechanism for at least the next two years and gives us time to address the critical and crucial underlying facet of ERAP and that is how is this to be paid for. Without the Gentleman's Amendment you had better be willing to come up with an answer to that question, relatively soon, because you are expanding the program to include air conditioning cost during the summer. Now, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I can't afford to run my air conditioner anymore as I could five or six years ago. We try to keep the house any were from 79 to 80 in these hundred degree days. But what your doing is expanding this program and saying if somebody wants to keep their house at seventy and their on the program, that's fine. But the bottom line is somebody has to pay. I think the Gentleman's Amendment is a reasonable Amendment it gives us time to discuss the underlying problem of funding for those who can't afford utility Bills. I urge an 'aye' vote on the Gentleman's Amendment."

Speaker Breslin: "Is there any further discussion? The Gentleman from Effingham, Representative Hartke."

Hartke: "Thank you, very much, Madam Speaker. Will the Sponsor
 yield?"

Speaker Breslin: "He will."

Hartke: "Representative Homer, this is an expanded program, I think from the previous speaker I picked up that the winter ERAP program is costing about eight million dollars a year.

119th Legislative Day

June 21, 1988

Correct. And it is estimated that the summer cooling ERAP program and the underlying Bill is going to cost an additional twelve million dollars a year. Is that correct?"

Homer: "I'm not sure it's an additional twelve, Representative

Hartke. I think that, I think that the combined program

would be in the area of twelve to fourteen million dollars

a year, both summer and winter combined."

Hartke: "Well, I'm with the understanding that summer rates are much higher than winter rates. And therefore, it may be as much if not more than the winter rates are."

Homer: "Well, that, I can't argue the numbers specifically because I don't have them at my disposal. But suffice is to say that it's true that this underlying Bill would substantially expand the current ERAP program, well beyond its current limitation."

Hartke: "Let me refresh my colleagues memories. How many dollars did we get from the Exon Overcharge Fund to start with?"

Homer: "Ninety five point nine million dollars."

Hartke: "Ninety five point nine. Ninety five point nine million dollars, say one hundred million dollars, if it's costing eight million dollars a year. We've had it in play for three years at eight million dollars a year, why is there only twenty six million left?"

Homer: "Well, I believe that."

Hartke: "That doesn't add up."

Homer: "No, but I believe that a portion of that Exon money went for other purposes other than ERAP. I can't break it down exactly but. Forty four point seven of it went to ERAP. The other half or more went to other purposes. Weatherization and other energy related purposes but not the ERAP program."

Hartke: "Okay, well to the Amendment. I think it's a good idea

119th Legislative Day

June 21, 1988

that we recognize the fact that this money is going to run out on this program and that it ought to sunset and not go back on the rate payer or the consumer to be saddled with that Bill in the future. I support the Amendment."

Speaker Breslin: "Any further discussion? Hearing none.

Representative Homer to close."

Homer: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I think the Bill has, the Amendment has been well discussed, suffice is to say at issue here is whether or not we as a General Assembly want to pass good programs in a responsible way. The program is a good program, as was pointed out, it does help But we can't just pass programs willy nilly with absolutely no idea of how to pay for them. There are who say well, if there is no money let the utility rates go up and let people across this State who pay utility bills pick up the tab. I hope that the majority of this Body would not agree with that proposition. What this Amendment says is yes its a good program. It's benefiting people, but lets limit it to the dollars that have been earmarked and are available through the Exon Oil Overcharge Fund. That's all this Amendment would do would simply say it's limited the program is limited to those available funds, I think that's a very reasonable compromise and until someone can come up with some other revenue stream I think it would be irresponsible for us to pass Senate Bill 1626, without at the same time protecting consumers with an Amendment such as Amendment #2, so I would move it's adoption, Madam Speaker."

Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #2 be adopted'. All those in favor say 'aye'. 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 98 voting 'aye' 15

119th Legislative Day

- June 21, 1988
- voting 'no' and 2 voting 'present'. And the Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative

  Homer and Ryder."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Homer."
- Homer: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Amendment #3 is a technical Amendment that corrects a typographical error in Amendment #2."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 1626. Is there any discussion? Hearing none. The question is, 'Shall the Amendment be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye' opposed 'nay' in the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it and the Amendments adopted. Any further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. Under the Special Order dealing with public health and safety, appears Senate Bill 1475, it's on page 3 of your Calendar. Representative Currie. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1475, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Pesticide Act. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Currie."
- Currie: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, and Members of the House.

  This is a simple Bill that would require the Interagency
  Committee on Pesticides to conduct a special study of the
  effects of chemigation and other agricultural applications
  of pesticides, on ground water and requires the committee
  to include information and advise about the effects of
  pesticides on ground water and would require more
  intergovernmental cooperation in this area. I'd be happy
  to answer questions and would appreciate your support."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Lady has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 1475, and on that question the Gentleman from Cook,

119th Legislative Day

June 21, 1988

Representative Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Yes, will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Breslin: "She will."

Cullerton: "Yes, I apologize, I don't have my file so I have to ask some questions. Now were there more than one, were there negotiations on this Bill?"

Currie: "No."

Cullerton: "No."

Currie: "No."

Cullerton: "Well, could you say that, that there is two points of view on the Bill?"

Currie: "I would say that there is only one point of view on the Bill, there was no negotiation, there was no need for rapprochement."

Cullerton: "So there's...you...there was no rapprochement affected."

Currie: "No."

Cullerton: "Okay, thank you."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from McClain, Representative Ropp, on the Amendment."

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

Speaker Breslin: "Yes, he will."

Ropp: "Representative on this particular Bill when it states that this information should be made available for an annual public education program. Do they do that now and how do they do it if they do it?"

Currie: "My understanding is that they don't. This Bill is one that was first introduced and passed the Senate without negative vote a year ago. We did not get to this Bill on our Calendar last Spring, and I know that the environmental community supports the Bill and I am unaware of any opposition."

119th Legislative Day

- June 21, 1988
- Ropp: "So in other words they will be just initiating should the passage of this Bill become law those kinds of public information hearings throughout the State."
- Currie: "There is a committee already, and this merely, merely is an effort to make sure that it operates effectively and cooperatively."
- Ropp: "But what are they gonna tell everybody. I mean are they gonna tell them that these pesticides are bad in ground water or are they gonna tell them how not to allow those pesticide to get in the ground water or what are they gonna actually do?"
- Currie: "I think that they are going to work cooperatively on the whole issue of ground water. You remember that we passed major ground water legislation last year, this committee is in effect and my understanding is that those who are involved with it would be perfectly comfortable with this legislation."
- Ropp: "Okay, thank you."
- Speaker Breslin: "Any further discussion? Hearing none.

  Representative Currie to close."
- Currie: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I think it's a straight forward proposition of dealing with our efforts to make sure that we are dealing effectively with ground water."
- Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1475,
   pass?' 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 113
   voting 'aye' one voting 'no'. Representative Hallock.
   There are 113 voting 'aye' one voting 'no' and none voting
   'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional
   Majority is hereby declared passed. Representative
   Hallock. For what reason do you rise?"
- Hallock: "On a point of personal privilege, Madam Speaker. I am

119th Legislative Day

June 21, 1988

pleased to have seated with me here today on the House floor our former colleague, here in the House and former State Rep. and State Senator, Tim Simms from Rockford. Tim Simms."

- Speaker Breslin: "Welcome, welcome. The next Bill is on page 4 on your Calendar is Senate Bill 1647, Representative Phelps. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1647, a Bill for an Act to improve the delivery of health care services in rural areas in Illinois. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Phelps."

Phelps: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of 1647, authorizes the Illinois Bill House. Senate Department of Public Health to issue grants to assist counties in the operation of regional ambulance systems, permits the contiquous counties with an agrigation population of twenty thousand or less to qualify for these And it establishes regional ambulance system boards to plan and coordinate development of regional ambulance services. Small rural counties throughout this State have a quite a challenge on their hands trying to just come up with the basic emergency medical services. The only way that we can survive in providing the very minimum services is to try to have a regionalized plan because we realize every county cannot be taken care of isolated because they are so small. But when you have seven counties going together to try to secure six, two or three ambulances that's not asking for much. is permissive legislation it does not mandate or make it required that they get these grants but if they prove that they have the need and the Department of Public Health has the authorization and the money is available to help several contiguous counties to just survive and provide

119th Legislative Day

June 21, 1988

those kind of services, is not asking much. I appreciate your support."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 1647, and on that question the Gentleman from McClain, Representative Ropp."

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

Speaker Breslin: "He will."

Ropp: "In a number of areas throughout the State they have volunteer ambulance services as well as fire department services. Are you saying that you want to get the State involved in organizing these somewhat volunteer ambulance services."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Phelps."

Phelps: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Before we go on I need some clarification it's been brought to my attention by my colleagues that perhaps Amendment 2 was not adopted and I was under the understanding that it was last week. Could we check that?"

Speaker Breslin: "Mr. Clerk... we'll check it. Representative

Phelps, the Clerk says that they have no record of

Amendment 2 even being filed. They have only Amendment
#1."

Phelps: "Could you read the LRB number, Mr. Clerk."

Speaker Breslin: "Mr. Clerk, read the LRB number of Amendment #1."

Clerk O'Brien: "LRB8512309DJcham"

Phelps: "Thank you."

Speaker Breslin: "Are you finished, Representative Ropp?"

Ropp: "I really hadn't got started, no one never answered."

Speaker Breslin: "Proceed, Representative Ropp."

Ropp: "The question was under our analysis is that it requires the Department of Public Health to issue grants and to establish these kind of rural health care services and I'm

- 119th Legislative Day

  June 21, 1988

  wondering why are you wanting government to get involved in
  this again."
- Phelps: "I didn't hear the last part of your question,
  Representative Ropp, but it is my understanding this is
  permissive it does not require the Department of Health to
  issue the grant. It's merely authorizes them to have it in
  place and if they are convinced that the need is there and
  the money is there for whatever request it's reasonable
  then they can. Right now they do not have the authority."
- Ropp: "Do we, have you approriated money in our appropriations budget to take care of this estimated three hundred thousand that's required?"
- Phelps: "I don't know where the estimated three hundred thousand your getting, I don't have any such estimate, do not have any plans to put anything in myself. So, I can't say that, answer the question because there is no amount that I am putting in or have plans too."
- Ropp: "Why can't rural communities establish their own ambulance service now."
- Phelps: "I guess they can but there is a Rural Health Care Services Improvement Act that was passed and within that Act there are...which was Amendment 1, I tried to clear up the confusion on that, permitted the trauma of services of counsel that's been created throughout the State even includes some regions to be able to organize and be a part on that council. Have representation which is what Amendment 1 addressed, and so what I'm saying is that some counties that don't have the hardware, the resources of people to do it on their own. Had to look at a regional down our way at least, I'm sure it's the same in your area."
- Ropp: "Are you saying every trauma center now, does not have an ambulance service?"

119th Legislative Day

June 21, 1988

Phelps: "Well, first of all there's not trauma centers throughout the State. We don't have such trauma centers."

Ropp: "I thought they were pretty much throughout the State."

Phelps: "No."

Ropp: "Okay, thanks."

Phelps: "No, this really just basically says there needs to be a plan to coordinate maybe through the public health departments. In my area there is a southern seven county health department, and they do not have the authorization to give grants even if they had the money that could be probably designated or at least recognized to be within those perimeters. So, now were giving the authorization, if the money is not there they can't give it."

Ropp: "Okay, in other words the department could in fact even if they had the money would not necessarily be forced to give it even though a rural community would request it."

Phelps: "Right, the regional. To try to guarantee this that one county wouldn't be asking for grant and some other county might have a greater need, we have a regional plan in motion here that would address for example, in out of eight counties in my district we only have one hospital, and so we have to have a..."

Ropp: "You don't have very big counties either though do you?"

Phelps: "I'm sorry."

Ropp: "You don't have real big counties either though do you?"

Phelps: "No, but if your parents, grandparents or children have needs and they need to be transported one hundred and fifty miles, it doesn't matter if there are five people in that county or one hundred thousand. Would there be? They have needs."

Ropp: "Probably put them in a car."

Phelps: "You want them to move or something or how would you..."

Ropp: "No, I would just use an automobile."

119th Legislative Day

June 21, 1988

Phelps: "So if we're small, you're saying you die."

Ropp: "No. I'd say an automobile could transport them."

Phelps: "Well, I don't know if they have the EMT's and nurses and those kind of things for heart attacks that would need to be aboard but I'm a little more sensitive to these needs than that."

Ropp: "Thank you."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Dupage, Representative

McCracken."

McCracken: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise in opposition to the Bill. Apparently from the language of the Bill it is permissive the department is not required to make these grants. But what we will see in the future is the department coming back and asking for a line item in its appropriation Bill to make these grants. What will start out as a discretionary Act in the department will virtually automatically turn into a need, a...not a request to do something in its discretion, but money to make the grants that are allowed under this Act. This is a matter since it has the revenue implications that should be considered in conjunction with the entire issue of spending. It is not being done in this case, there's not even and appropriations Bill that accompanies this. I just think it is improvident at this time to set up more of these discretionary grant programs, when there is no attention given to there funding, and no provision made for there So, I think we should be voting against this, funding. that's consistent with a cut in spending that a lot of people feel should be made. Thank you."

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

Black: "Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

119th Legislative Day

June 21, 1988

Speaker Breslin: "He will."

Black: "Thank you. Representative, just a few questions if I might. And while your counties might be small, I'm sure they are outstanding counties and I commend you for your concern for the people who live in them. But it would appear that the legislation would only effect multi-county agencies. If I'm wrong correct me, but what if we had a small single county who wanted to do this. The way the legislation is drafted, it appears that they might not be able because they're only a single county to participate in the legislation as it's now drafted."

Phelps: "Representative, I don't think there is anything in the Bill that would prohibit the public health department from, just because they were a single county request, deny the request. The chances of them getting the grant will lean heavily toward how regionalized in their planning. And that's one of the things that we in the counties commission, that Senator Rock and Madigan set up three or four years ago. This is one of the outcomes and that Lieutenant Governor Ryan himself said that we've got to serve a broader area before we best justify the utilization of State monies and this is one of the reasons why we have these plans. So although it would be much harder for that county it does not prohibit it, for a smaller unit."

Black: "Thank you very much. Also, are there provisions or are you just assuming that because of referenda abilities that there would have to be a local funding mechanism triggered in if there was a multi-county, say an ambulance or health care services improvement district. I would assume that we would rely on some kind of property tax local funding initiative to go along with this. Am I correct?"

Phelps: "I'm not saying that would, that would probably not be ruled out, but it is not a hinge upon the fact of getting

119th Legislative Day

June 21, 1988

the grant. And I know that we all would encourage if the any local entity and are there on responsibility that they could come forward with some of local match. I can only point you to an example and two years ago in Harden county where they were through the levy of the county board were funding ambulances but there was a ruling come down from the feds that those volunteers had to be paid more than minimum wage and they had to pay retroctive and as a result broke their account. And they had no money to even continue the ambulance service. So this is one of the things that instigated a desperate situation to be addressed."

Black: "Well, as I looked at the Bill, I didn't see any local funding mechanism but I just wanted to ask you for the record, there isn't and doesn't appear to be. But for the record, there is no permissive property tax levy that would be allowed under your proposed legislation."

Phelps: "No, that is correct."

Black: "Alright, let me ask you one further question. Do we have currently in the department of public healths budget any grant money currently available for the replacement of ambulances that are used in rural ambulance districts? I'd be, I don't think there is but if you know of money that might be available, I'd certainly like your amplification on that."

Phelps: "No, not to my knowledge, there is no specific money for that program."

Black: "Thank you very much Representative. You've been very helpful."

Speaker Breslin: "Any further discussion? Hearing none.

Representative Phelps to close."

Phelps: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Some of the previous speakers, although have brought out very good points, I

119th Legislative Day

June 21, 1988

acknowledge. One of the previous speakers mentioned about the spending question and I agree we all need to address that responsibly this Session, but if we at this Body as long as I've been here, I've seen several of these previous speakers support funding vans going to Japan or elsewhere. And here we have counties without even ambulance services just asking if there was five or six, seven counties that could go in together and be covered where they have to transport people in desperate life sustaining situations more than one hundred and one hundred fifty miles just to be served in a hospital, I don't think it's asking much to at least set the authority in place and let's see what means that the Public Health Department can provide if they have the authorization. And I appreciate your support for this very necessary Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 1647. All those in favor vote 'aye' all opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take record. On this question, on this question there are 71 voting 'aye' 41 voting 'no' none voting 'present'. Representative Wait votes 'aye'. There are 72 voting 'aye'. Representative Dunn votes 'aye'. There are 73 voting 'aye' 41 voting 'no' and none voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared. Representative Huff votes 'aye'. There are 74 voting 'aye' 41 voting 'no'. Representative Hensel changes his 'no' vote to 'aye'. Anymore? There are 75 voting 'aye' 41 voting 'no' none voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. On page 4 of the Calendar appears Senate Bill 2117, Representative Hoffman. Representative Hoffman. Out of the Record. On page 5 appears Senate Bill 2199,

119th Legislative Day

June 21, 1988

Representative Ryder. Representative Ryder. Out of the Record. Senate Bill 2201, Representative Ryder. Out of the Record. Representative Churchill is recognized on a point of personal privilege."

Churchill: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I bring to you some important news about a former Members of ours. Apparently over this past weekend, former Representative Sam Vincent."

Speaker Breslin: "Whose he."

- Churchill: "Yea, you know that guy that runs around the back halls now. Sam Vincent had a stroke of fortunate luck, and he finally got a hole in one. On the sixteenth hole at Columbia Country Club in Bethesda, Maryland. It was a hundred and fifty three yard hole and it was in a member guest tournament, Sam swears that the hole in one was not only witnessed but verified in the tournament. So it counts in the record books, but it is being speculated that when Sam returned to the clubhouse, he rose to speak and with the usual convoluted logic that Sam is so well known for that he convinced everyone around the bar to buy him drinks, so if you do see Sam around the back halls I think it's only fair that you badger him to open up a charge account at some local establishment and allow us to do the traditional method whereby he buys us the drinks."
- Speaker Breslin: "Thank you. The next Order of Business, Special Order, deals with administration of justice. Those Bills on Second Reading appear on page 10 of your Calendar, Senate Bill 1773. John Dunn, Representative John Dunn. Out of the Record. On page 11 appears Senate Bill 2041, Representative John Dunn. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 2041, a Bill for an Act in relationship to retaliatory charge of an attorney. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

119th Legislative Day

June 21, 1988

- Speaker Breslin: "Are there any Floor Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #1, is being offered by Representative Dunn."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Dunn is now returning to the floor. The Membership would like to know if you received a note Representative Dunn and what did the note say."
- Dunn: "I didn't need a note, just personal charisma and charm.

  It's just charm and charisma there was no note involved."
- Dunn: "Okay, if I can find it. Amendment #1, to Senate Bill 2041, is a an Amendment which would provide for retaliatory discharge legislation across the board and enable those employees who have been in laymens language, placed in a box who have been middled or squeezed, who are asked to do something by their employer that they feel they should not do to take action to recover in the event they are discharged for failure to do something that they really ought not to do. So, I would ask for adoption of Amendment #1."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 2041. On the question the Gentleman from Dupage, Representative McCracken."
- McCracken: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I wonder if the Sponsor would yield, briefly?"
- Speaker Breslin: "He will yield."
- Dunn: "First of all, yes, I want to withdraw Amendment #1 and go with Amendment #2, Madam Speaker. Madam Speaker, I'd like to withdraw Amendment #1 and go with Amendment #2."
- Speaker Breslin: "Withdraw #1. Are there any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Dunn."

119th Legislative Day

June 21, 1988

Speaker Breslin: "Representitive Dunn."

Dunn: "Okay, now I presume, he has sites on the same question about Amendment #2."

Speaker Breslin: "Okay, Representative McCracken"

McCracken: "Yes, thank you. This Amendment, have you spoken to any employer groups or do you know whether they have seen this Amendment and if so how recently."

Dunn: "I think most employer groups have seen the Amendment because they have talked with me about it today. And I in all cander think they're all opposed to the Amendment."

McCracken: "Okay, thank you. I think they have just seen it today, that's my understanding."

Dunn: "That is correct."

McCracken: "Okay"

Speaker Breslin: "Representative McCracken."

McCracken: "To the Bill, thank you. This Amendment is lauditory in one respect. The Bill is originally introduced applied only to attorneys, so I think to the extent that the Gentleman seeks to expand the concept to cover other types of employees he does us all a good service. However, this Bill as amended or this Amendment is frought with danger. This Bill goes beyond what the Supreme Court has authorized as a cause of action for retaliatory discharge and in the first instance it is because the employee can rely on a good faith and reasonable belief as to the legality of the orders and is immunized based on his refusal to follow the order. But he may be wrong in fact, now what is the state of the law pursuant to supreme court decision, is that the retaliatory actions are invalidated that the employee has a cause of action but only where the order in fact is unlawful or requires and unlawful activity. It is not merely based on a good faith belief as to the unlawfulness of the activity. Now I suppose we

119th Legislative Day

June 21, 1988

could all up with extreme examples where come Representative Dunns analysis or formulation of the cause of action should be based on good faith and reasonable belief but let me tell you, as a practical matter on a day to day basis it will create much more havoc and do much more harm than it seeks to correct. The Supreme Court already recognizes a cause of action for this, however, it is not based only on a good faith belief it is based on the fact of whether the Act is legal or illegal and that is how it should be. To leave it within the discretion of the employee who can have a cause of action even if the Act were legal just doesn't make good public policy. So, I rise in opposition to this for two reasons, one it should not be based on good faith, and two I think the employers on such a substantial issue should have opportunity to review this matter and contact the Members of this Body than just today. Thank you."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Champaign, Representative

Johnson. On the question of the Amendment. The Gentleman

waives his right to speak. The Gentleman from Cook,

Representative Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Breslin: "He will."

Cullerton: "Representative, the previous speaker indicated that his interpretation of the Amendment is that if a employee believed in good faith that he or she was being asked to violate the law, and refused to do that and his result was fired, that this Amendment would allow that former employee to bring an action for a retaliatory discharge. And he seemed to think that that wasn't fair. Is...my question is, is that what the Amendment does and, if so, why is it not fair?"

Dunn: "You'd have to ask the previous speaker why it isn't fair,

119th Legislative Day

June 21, 1988

first of all, and secondly, that is, in fact, what the Amendment does. And, I suppose to give the previous speaker his due, the Amendment is a broad concept and perhaps...needs further refinement in some people's view, but the...the basic concept of the Amendment is to provide a means for someone who is discharged for standing up for what is right and correct to file an action against the employer who unfairly discriminates and discharges that employee for doing something which the employee really ought to do. So, the answer is yes."

Cullerton: "Well, another question is...he seemed to make it...he seemed to make the argument that the law is very clear right now that case law allows for an action concerning retaliatory discharge and I thought that the law was relatively restrictive. I thought that in this case, 'Herbster' versus North America, a 1986 case, the court held that the retaliatory discharge was not available in a case where an attorney had been discharged for refusing to destroy discovery information."

"That is...that...that case to which you just referred was Dunn: the genesis for the original Senate Bill which we have before us today and, yes, I agree with you, the outcome of the court decision in that instance is generally viewed as very restrictive and...and it is my feeling that we do need to explore this entire area to...to provide means for those employees who find themselves in this awkward spot, to take action. But, at the same time, to...provide for a work place environment with the employer so that the employer can feel comfortable in dealing with employees. In the attorney situation, you of course, throw another ingredient into the mix and that is the attorney-client privilege."

Cullerton: "What this...this Amendment would address, not only that concern, but also the concerns of any other employee

119th Legislative Day

June 21, 1988

who was asked to, if I understand this correctly, the employee is...is asked to...to do something which the employee believes would be, in good faith, believe to be a violation of law."

Dunn: "That's correct."

Cullerton: "And, as a result, they...they say, 'No. I'm not going to do that.' They...they then get fired and this Bill, all this Amendment would allow is for that person to bring a cause of action. I...I, quite frankly, can't understand why anybody would be that upset with it and I think it's a good Amendment."

Dunn: "The only thing I would add is you should be a Cosponsor."

Speaker Breslin: "The question..."

Dunn: "You've done such an excellent job."

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

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

Speaker Breslin: "He will."

Didrickson: "Representative Dunn, I'm under the impression that there are some retaliatory discharge provisions already currently existing in State statutes. Is that true? And if it is true, could you reiterate whether this...expands upon that or does it limit it?"

Dunn: "You would have to call this an expansion because it is my understanding that all of the law in the State of Illinois at this time on the subject of retaliatory discharge is case law. None of it is statutory, to the best of my knowledge."

Didrickson: "So this expands upon case law on this particular provision?"

Dunn: "Yes, this would have to be considered an expansion because the...the case law is...is very restrictive and...as a matter of fact, a number of people feel that the case law,

119th Legislative Day

June 21, 1988

- existing case law, is bad law."
- Didrickson: "Well, my understanding, the original Bill was put in at the request of a Bar Association. And...is that not correct?"
- Dunn: "Don't...no, I don't think so. I think it was put in at the request of the Sponsor who was outraged by the court decision to which one of the previous speakers alluded.

  Now, I...and I think I'm correct about that."
- Didrickson: "Okay. Well, I will strike that comment, then. But,
  this does regard the legal profession with regards to
  profession standards, correct?"
- Dunn: "It...this Amendment...the Bill that came over..."
- Didrickson: "In the Amendment, though, expands upon that and it includes the whole employer community..."
- Dunn: "Yes, it does. The original Bill was directed to the attorney...attorney employee relationship and this Amendment is...much broader. You're correct."
- Didrickson: "Well, some of the concerns that I've heard from the business community relates to on page one, here, under Section 1(d), the retaliatory action, and the fact that it opens up all kinds of causes of action. Is that your intent with this Amendment, to expand upon it to that degree?"
- Dunn: "This...this Amendment is...is an across the board Amendment, that is correct."
- Didrickson: "Well, if we go back on page two, then, Section 2, it looks like 'prohibited retaliation', you're trying to limit it. But, you've got some sanctions there for employees, but are there any provisions here for the employer?"
- Dunn: "Well, the...the...I don't know that we need provisions for the...the employer. The...the employer is not in the position of the employee that the...what you visualize in the situation is an employee who's sole livelihood is

119th Legislative Day

June 21, 1988

derived from a paycheck provided by an employer who asks that employee to do something that is a violation of law or something that the employee knows should not be done. So the employee says, 'I will put my entire livelihood on the line and...and I won't do it.' And, the employee's fired, loses the only source of income available to the employee and the question at the present time is, is that employee out there on a limb and has no where to go for doing what is right. The purpose of this Amendment is to say that an employee caught in that situation can take action."

Didrickson: "Well, I guess I would look at this and I would just wonder but what if, you know, in good faith, the employer does not believe his action to be, or her action to be a violation of the law?"

Dunn: "Pardon me, what was the question again?"

Didrickson: "Well, I mean, you know, what happens if the employer believes that, in good faith, this was not...his action was not a violation of the law?"

Dunn: "Then, then there is an issue joined and...as in every...in every case, the complaining party is not always right. So, the employer would win the retaliatory discrimination case in that situation."

Didrickson: "Well, counsel, or staff here advises me that that is not correct. But, I won't belabor the point beyond the fact that I think several concerns have been raised here. We were trying to address an issue in the original Bill with regards to the legal profession, the employer They haven't community is very concerned. had an opportunity to go over this. This is a tremendous expansion beyond what the intention of the original Bill was. I enjoin my colleagues who are opposed to this and I would look very carefully at this Bill if I were you."

Speaker Breslin: "There being no further discussion...excuse me,

119th Legislative Day

June 21, 1988

the Gentleman from DuPage, Representative McCracken, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

McCracken: "Only...only to say that...in response to
Representative Cullerton, he may be correct about the State
of the law. I talked to one of our attorneys and then
checked with the second one after he spoke and I may be
wrong in that. So, I will defer to those who claim to
know."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Dunn to close."

Dunn: "Thank you, Madam Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. In this State at this time, we have a case on books which resulted in an awkward situation where an employee who honestly felt that something was going to be done which was wrong, refused to participate in that action, and was fired by the employer, took the employer to court and lost. The purpose of this Amendment is to...is to address that situation and to suggest language for our statute books which provides access to the courts for those persons who are...find themselves in...between the rock and the hard place. Do they do what they know is wrong to keep a pay check coming in or do they plant their feet and do what is right and risk their entire livelihood with no...no possible way to recover and perhaps a vocation or a career ruined? This Amendment would allow those people to seek redress and I urge adoption of this Amendment."

Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 2041 be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'nos' have it and the Amendment fails. The next item of business under the Special Order...the Bill moves to Third Reading, yes. Senate Bill 2041 moves to Third Reading. The next Special Order of Business is State and Local Initiatives. These Bills are all on Second Reading. The

119th Legislative Day

June 21, 1988

first one appears on page six on your Calendar, Senate Bill 1592, Representative DeLeo. Out of the Record. Senate Bill 1599, Representative Novak. You read the Bill, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1599, a Bill for an Act to amend the Environmental Protection Act. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Any Floor Amendments?"

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

Churchill and Wennlund."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Churchill and Wennlund."

Churchill: "Madam Speaker."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Churchill."

Churchill: "We wish to withdraw this Amendment."

Speaker Breslin: "Withdraw #1. Are there any further Amendments?"

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

Virginia Frederick and Steczo."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Virginia Frederick and Representative Steczo. Representative Steczo."

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

Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 1599 places water slides and, I
believe it's regular slides, over...over a certain height
in the Carnival and Amusement Park Safety Act. It's my
understanding that the other slide portion was something
recommended by the Department of Labor and based on a story
that was...that was reported on channel five in Chicago
last week. The water slide portion is pretty much agreed
to by the...by the industry who also feels that they should
be placed under the Act. So, I would move for the adoption
of the Amendment. If there are any questions, Madam
Speaker, I'd be happy to answer those."

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

119th Legislative Day

June 21, 1988

Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 1599 and on that question, is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall Amendment 2 be adopted?' All those in favor...Representative Hultgren."

Hultgren: "Will the Sponsor yield, Madam Chairman...Madam Speaker?"

Speaker Breslin: "He will."

Hultgren: "Did...this is...is water slides and dry slides, is
that right?"

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Novak. Excuse me, Representative Steczo."

Steczo: "Representative Hultgren, that is correct."

Hultgren: "Well, is this conceivably, then, going to cover the slides in the municipal parks and the school playgrounds and so forth in each and every one of our districts?"

Steczo: "Representative Hultgren, the definition is a dry slide over twenty feet in height. So these are the slides that you see in the amusement parks where the children on rugs or on some kind of matting will slide down."

Hultgren: "Thank you."

Speaker Breslin: "There being no further discussion, the question is, 'Shall Amendment 2 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: "Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative Homer."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Homer withdraws the Amendment.

Any further Amendments?"

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

119th Legislative Day

June 21, 1988

Novak."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Novak."

- Novak: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Members of the General Assembly. Floor Amendment #4 to Senate Bill 1599 addresses some of the concerns that were conveyed by the National Solid Waste Management Association and I believe it addresses the concerns and all parties are...have agreed to the Amendment. Thank you."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment 4 to Senate Bill 1599. On that question, is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall the Amendment be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it and the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #5, offered by Representative Homer and Novak."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman withdraws the Amendment. Any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #6, offered by Representative Wennlund."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Wennlund. Withdraw the Amendment. Any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "There are no further Amendments."
- Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. On page four...Representative Currie, we're going to skip over your Bill and go to the other Bills on Second Reading. The next one is on page six of the Calendar, Senate Bill 1685, Representative Granberg. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1685, a Bill for an Act to Amend the Employee Ownership Assistance Act. Second Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Breslin: "Any Motions or Amendments?"

119th Legislative Day

June 21, 1988

Clerk Leone: "There are no Committee Amendments. Floor
Amendments...Floor Amendment #1 is being offered by
Representative McCracken."

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

McCracken: "I'll withdraw that."

Speaker Breslin: "Withdraw #1. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #2 is being offered by Representative Weaver and Giglio."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Weaver."

Weaver: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. This Amendment which is a rewrite of Representative Giglio's Bill was drafted to address a problem of interpretation by Department of Employment Securities concerning contract callers. It's my understanding the JCAR has offered recommendations that give directions to DES in prospective rather than a retrospective manner. And, in view of those negotiations going on, I'd like to withdraw Amendment #2."

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

Weaver: "Madam Speaker."

Speaker Breslin: "Oh, he withdraws the Amendment? The Gentleman withdraws the Amendment. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative Granberg."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Granberg."

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

Amendment #3 was drafted at the initiation of the

Department of Commerce and Community Affairs. When Bill

was heard in committee, they had some current concerns with

the language of the Bill and I agreed to Amend it on Second

Reading. It would simply provide that certain decisions

under the province of the Act will be made in conjunction

with the Illinois Development Finance Authority in the

119th Legislative Day

June 21, 1988

Employee Owned Enterprise Council. It would make their recommendations permissive. I would ask that we adopt the Amendment."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Amendment 3 to Senate Bill 1685 and on that question, is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall the Amendment be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it and the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

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

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Black."

"Thank you very much, Madam Speaker and Ladies and I hope that you pay particular Gentlemen of the House. attention to this Amendment. I'm not aware of opposition to it. However, let me tell you right up front that Amendment #4 abolishes the Illinois Neighborhood Core. Now, before you get too excited about that, let me tell you the genesis for this abolishment came from the Illinois Community Action Association and I think all of you would agree that those people are the ones on the front lines who work in the poor neighborhoods and would try to make this Act work if at all possible. What happened is that the Illinois Neighborhood Core Program, which was passed in 1983, was originally designed to allow communities to access Job Training Partnership Act monies temporary employment of skilled workers to improve economic conditions in low income neighborhoods. However, that was ruled the use of JTPA funding for that purpose was ruled Consequently, the program is now administered by illegal. the Illinois Department of Commerce and Community Affairs out of some block grant programs. And let me just share

119th Legislative Day

June 21, 1988

with you why the community action agencies want this abolished. Last year they only had \$90,000 to work with. They had three applications that were funded out of five that were turned in. And those three applications were funded for approximately \$30,000. The administrative cost of those three programs was nearly \$6,000 or more than 20 percent of the total program cost. So what the Illinois community action agencies are asking is that since this program really isn't meeting any needs, let's do away with it, and put that \$90,000 funding into a program that may more effectively address the problem of low income Illinois communities such as weatherization. I would ask your favorable vote on Amendment #4."

- Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #4 be adopted?' And on that, the Gentleman from Clinton, Representative Granberg."
- Granberg: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To Amendment #4, because of the fine sponsorship of this Amendment, I would concur in its adoption."
- Speaker McPike: "Further discussion? The question is, 'Shall Amendment #4 be adopted?' All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1771, Representative Preston. Representative Breslin will handle the Bill. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1771, a Bill for an Act for the sale of the interest of the State of Illinois in certain lands to Loyola University. Second Reading of the Bill. There are no Committee Amendments."
- Speaker McPike: "Any Floor Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #1 is being offered by

119th Legislative Day

June 21, 1988

Representative Parcells."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Parcells."

Parcells: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Amendment just makes sure that the State of Illinois will not be liable for any significant erosion and damage caused on the Lake Michigan shore line due to the lake landfill project. We all know that sometimes grounds will shift as we fill and because the State owns all the underlying property, we just wanted to make sure with this Bill that we would not be liable for any shifting that would...would occur due to this landfill project."

Speaker McPike: "Is there any discussion to the Lady's Amendment?

Being none, the question is, 'Shall Amendment #1 be
adopted?' All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The
'ayes' have it and the Amendment is adopted. Further
Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Preston and Breslin."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Breslin."

Breslin: "Withdraw the Amendment."

Speaker McPike: "The Lady withdraws Amendment #2. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative Preston and Breslin."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Breslin."

Breslin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen,
Amendment #3 incorporates the agreement of...between
the...between Loyola University and the Department of
Transportation regarding any land, or the development of
any land that should be left over. It gives that right
back to the Department of Transportation and makes sure
that the land wouldn't be used, or the waters wouldn't be
used for any other purpose than is in the agreement between

119th Legislative Day

June 21, 1988

Loyola and the State. So, I move the adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker McPike: "The Lady moves for the adoption of the Amendment. Is there any discussion? Being none, the question is, 'Shall the Amendment be adopted?' All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "There are no further Amendments."

Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. Representative Tuerk.

Representative Tuerk. Fred Tuerk from...the Gentleman from Peoria, Representative Tuerk."

Tuerk: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker McPike: "The Members wanted to know what happened to your head."

Tuerk: "Well, I'll tell you a little story about that, but it takes too long. They said it might be an ingrown hair follicle and I said, 'That's not possible up there.' So, I want to think I was bit by some kind of an insect or something, I don't know. It got a little infection and...getting out of this place, I think, will take care of a lot of the ailments that I've had in recent years. Anyway, I think it's time for a Republican conference."

Speaker McPike: "How much time do you need, Mr. Tuerk?"

Tuerk: "Oh, we always figure about an hour. Maybe we'll get back sooner than that, but I think it'll take three quarters of an hour."

Speaker McPike: "Forty-five minutes?"

Tuerk: "That ought to do it."

Speaker McPike: "So the House...be a Republican caucus immediately in Room 118. The House will stand in recess until the hour of 4:15. When the...when we come back at 4:15, we will do Appropriations Bills and that will last until approximately 6:30. So we could have been out of

119th Legislative Day

June 21, 1988

here at 5:30, but Representative Tuerk has asked for a caucus. So, it looks like we'll be here until 6:30. House stands in recess."

Speaker McPike: "Come to order. Committ Report."

Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Matijevich, Chairman of the Committee, on Rules to which the following Bills and Resolution were referred. Report the same back with the following recommendations; 'be adopted' House Resolution 1604, exempt pursuant to Rule 29(c)3. House Bills 1584 and 4293, John Matijevich, Chairman."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Tuerk."

Tuerk: "Mr. Speaker, that Committee Report, reported that House Bill 4293 was voted out of Rules. I'd now like to move to suspend the appropriate Rules to advance that to Second Reading, Second Legislative Day without reference to a committee. All it is, is a revisory Bill it's a shell Bill. We'd like to pass it out of the House, send it to the Senate, they're going to hold it until the Fall in...in the event that we have some correction to be made yet. Representative Matijevich is in agreement on that."

Speaker McPike: "The Gentleman's Motion is to discharge House Bill 4293 from committee, move it to Second Reading, Second Legislative Day. Is there any discussion? And suspend the appropriate deadline rules on this Bill. No discussion and the Gentleman asks leave for the Attendance Roll Call. Leave is granted, Attendance Roll Call is used, Motion carries, the Bill is now...House Bill 4293 is on Second Reading, Second Legislative Day. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 4293, a Bill for an Act relating to revisory...revision of the statutes. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker McPike: "Any Floor Amendments?"

119th Legislative Day

June 21, 1988

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. Page six of the Calendar,
Appropriations Bills. Senate Bill 1520. Out of the
record. Senate Bill 1657. Out of the record. Senate Bill
1689. Representative Keane. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1689, a Bill for an Act making certain appropriations for higher education. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendments #1 and 2 were adopted in committee."

Speaker McPike: "Any Motions filed?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed."

Speaker McPike: "Any Floor Amendments?"

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

Mautino."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Mautino. Representative Mautino. Representative Keane. Representative Keane. Mr. Electrician, would you turn on Mr. Keane. Thank you."

Keane: "Thank you. I move to table Amendment #3."

Speaker McPike: "The Gentleman moves to table Amendment #3. Is there any discussion? Being none, the question is, 'Shall Amendment #3 be tabled?' All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the Amendment is tabled. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1690, Representative Keane. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1690, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Illinois Community College Board.

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

Speaker McPike: "Any Motions filed?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed."

Speaker McPike: "Any Floor Amendments?"

119th Legislative Day

June 21, 1988

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

Mautino."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Mautino. Is the Gentleman in the chamber? Representative Keane."

Keane: "Move to table Amendment #2."

Speaker McPike: "The Gentleman moves to table Amendment #2. All those in favor of the Gentleman's Motion say 'aye'...excuse me. Representative Mautino on Amendment #2. Representative Keane withdraws his Motion to table. Representative Mautino is recognized on Amendment #2."

Mautino: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I apologize for not being here, when it was first called. What this Amendment does, if in fact, you want to do something for the students and the parents, is to change the funding mechanism that provides for salaries at the university setting and put it into the merit scholarship provision for those students who are valedictorian, salutatorian in our school systems. This is the establishment of that \$500 stipend that we have promised for years, established and took out, put back in. What this does is put it in. If you truly want to help the students and the parents, you'll support this Amendment."

Speaker McPike: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of the Amendment and on that, Representative Keane."

Keane: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A question of the Sponsor."

Speaker McPike: "Yes, go ahead."

Keane: "What does...what \$500...what happens to the \$500?"

Mautino: "Excuse me, Jim. I'm sorry."

Keane: "Would you repeat what you said about...giving each student \$500?"

Mautino: "We established a program years ago called the Merit
Scholarship Program that provided for a \$500 stipend for
the Valedictorian and Salutatorian of the classes of every
high school in this State that are going to college. At

119th Legislative Day

June 21, 1988

one time, it was established and put in, authorized, and funded. Two years later it was taken out and then it was cut in half. What it does here is establish it back at \$500 and it provides those funds to those students who have achieved in high school I think it's a good proposal and...and a good program."

Keane: "Thank you for your explanation."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Countryman."

Countryman: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker McPike: "Yes, he will."

Countryman: "Representative Mautino, this money has to come from somewhere. Where's it coming from?"

Mautino: "Comes from the line items that we have established for funding of the higher education."

Countryman: "Does it come out of personal services?"

Mautino: "Yes."

Countryman: "And where...where does it...are you going to do this all across higher education?"

Mautino: "Yes. That's my intention. That was the first Amendment well. May I point out Representative as Countryman, you know, people come down to us in the General Assembly and say, 'We need this and we want this and we to fund this to make everything work.' I'm...I've been here long enough to know that all the calls my office have been receiving is not to provide whirlwind salaries for existing administration. The parents are calling saying their children cannot get student guaranteed loans or the ISSC has shut off. In order to help the student and the parent, this is one way to do it, to provide for at least those Valedictorians and Salutatorians that have done the exceptional work in high school, providing the funds for them to go to college. By the same token, I think it's fair..."

119th Legislative Day

June 21, 1988

Countryman: "This...this just funds the merit scholarships that go without financial need, is that correct?"

Mautino: "Correct."

Countryman: "So, it goes across the board, right?"

Mautino: "Correct."

Countryman: "And you...what you're cutting are the...any salary increment, or part of the salary increment that we're proposing to our faculty to retain them in Illinois. Is that correct?"

Mautino: "That's correct. I think that's more fair, by the way.

I think we should address the concerns of the students and the parents in this State and look at it very logically.

Either providing additional backup to the federal funds on the Student Guaranteed Loans, or providing the additional funds in ISSC, or doing this innovative program which shows that we care for those individual students who do a good job in high school."

Countryman: "Well thank you, Representative. To the Amendment, I think it's important for me, at least, to point out that those of us who have major state universities in our districts ought to look carefully at this because you're cutting off the...cutting off some of the proposed increase funding salary increases which could talk about faculty retention. Granted, you may be only talking about cutting small portion οf that increase, cutting...you're cutting part of that increase and you're doing so at the risk of funding people who are not, necessarily meritorious for financial need, but are...do obtain the scholarship for merit. Certainly we all people calling us and complaining to us about not getting the merit scholarships, but I think the question now with the present funding is, 'What do we do? Do we retain the good faculty? Do we attract good faculty that we have at

119th Legislative Day

June 21, 1988

universities? Or do we adopt this program and cut one more erosion into their proposed increase?' So I'd vote 'no' on this Amendment."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Satterthwaite."

Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I rise in opposition to the Amendment. Although certainly there is a good purpose to be served by funding the Merit Scholarship Program, this, I believe, is an inappropriate way to do it. If, in fact, we are to have a tax increase and provide additional money for education, then I certainly think the Merit Scholarship Program should be funded as a part of that package. But lacking funds for...new revenues to go into higher education programs, I think it's a mistake for us to adopt this Amendment and to decrease the small amounts that we will be able to provide to our colleges and universities."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Bowman."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. While I was Sponsor of the Bowman: Merit Scholarship Program, and I certainly think it's a fine one. However, I want to point out to the Membership what's going to happen if we adopt this Amendment. adopt this Amendment, it's going to go over to the Senate where I can assure you that it will be rejected and then we will have to consider whether to recede or not. the meantime, we will probably, our offices will be flooded with phone calls from people who are going to be hysterical about having their personnel lines cut. So, I think if...if you think you can put this Amendment on and forget about it and go on about your business, you're mistaken because I think you're going to be fielding questions from now until next week as to why you cut the personnel line. So I think would be a very bad mistake at this time."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Regan."

119th Legislative Day

June 21, 1988

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

Speaker McPike: "Yes, he will."

Regan: "Just...just...Representative, what is the fiscal impact of this, anticipated cost?"

Mautino: "The current proposal is an increase of seven percent.

This Bill reduces that seven percent to six percent and takes that one percent, puts it into the program for merit scholars, which is the top ten percent of the graduating class of the school."

Regan: "You can't give me a total figure on that?"

Mautino: "Eight point five million dollars."

Regan: "Okay, thank you."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Mautino to close."

Mautino: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, what this Amendment does and those that following it is to establish that we are setting the quidelines for who will be the recipients and receive the help as it pertains to higher education. If you want to help the student and the parents, these are the Amendments of which will accomplish that. We're reducing the seven percent increase to six percent, taking that additional one percent, providing it to those students who warrant and merit that assistance by virtue of their classes and the grades they have received in four years of high school. good policy. It's telling in response to Representative Bowman that the House wants to help the students and the parents. And the Senate will have to judge for themselves and I don't think they'll disagree with it. Therefore, if you want to help the students, this is the way to do it and I ask for your acceptance of Amendment #2."

Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #2 be

119th Legislative Day

June 21, 1988

adopted?' All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this Amendment there are 65 'ayes', 41 'nos' and 3 voting 'present'. The Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1692, Representative Satterthwaite. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1692, a Bill for an Act making certain appropriations of the board of trustees at the University of Illinois. Second Reading of the Bill.

Amendments #1, 2, and 3 were adopted in committee."

Speaker McPike: "Any Motions filed?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed."

Speaker McPike: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #4, offered by Representative

Mautino."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Mautino."

Mautino: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Amendment is identical to the last Amendment. It will...the same Amendment will be addressing in the other two systems. It does the exact same thing, change the seven percent to six percent. Fairly across the board with all the universities, providing those funds for the students and their parents and I ask for its adoption."

Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall the Amendment be adopted?' Is there any discussion? Representative Satterthwaite."

Satterthwaite: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I am opposed to this as I was to the Amendment on the previous Bill. Part of the problem is we are losing good faculty people at the University of Illinois in unprecedented numbers. I don't think we do any favor to our Merit

119th Legislative Day

June 21, 1988

Scholarship winners by providing them with a little bit of money but sending them to a university that does not have quality staff people left because we aren't able to give adequate increases to the staff people. And so I would call for the rejection of Amendment #4."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Parke."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of rise in opposition to this. One of the House. I, too, major issues on schools that I have heard from my constituency is they lack a quality salaries for our top professors on a university level. It is going to do us good to provide scholarship money to our young adults if we don't have quality instructors in our universities. All of us want to be able to provide an easier way for our young adults to attend college, but we also have to look at the careers of the people who we count on to provide that I think this Amendment quality education. is intended, however, we do not have the financial resources to do all things for all people and I think that it's a mistake to take money away from our university professors and our university teachers for this reason. So I ask that my colleagues vote 'no' on this Amendment."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Mautino to close."

"Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Mautino: So that no misunderstands, the Amendments that you will be seeing before you is a total for all the school systems at That's not each individual board of governance. million. The U of I is no different than any other school. students will be receiving the money, they will be giving it to the school as well. It comes as...as a recipient to the student and the parents, they also pay for their fees, et cetera. it goes to the university. It's a good proposal. Ιt should be fair...throughout our whole

119th Legislative Day

- June 21, 1988
- governance system and it provides those students with assistance and I ask for adoption as well."
- Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall the Amendment be adopted?' All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'.

  Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this Amendment there are 62 'ayes', 45 'nos', and 3 voting 'present'. The Amendment's adopted.

  Further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #4...5, offered by Representative
  Hultgren."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Hultgren."
- Hultgren: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House.

  Floor Amendment #5 would delete a committee add on,
  appropriating two hundred thousand dollars to the
  University of Illinois. During the committee hearing,
  Doctor Ikenberry indicated that, although this was...well
  intentioned, that it was not first priority for the
  university. So I'd ask for an 'aye' vote deleting the add
  on of two hundred thousand dollars."
- Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall the Amendment be adopted?' Representative Tate."
- Tate: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the I rise in support of the Amendment. Representative Hultgren had indicated, President Ikenberry during his...during the questioning in the hearing had indicated that, certainly this would be a desirable program if...if the university had sufficient funds or ample funds. But this was in a very low priority, under the current funding levels. All of us, I'm sure, would desire additional pork projects for our district and additional money for our district, but this is just plain pork. This is no where in the university's budget. university doesn't want it right now. Nobody else wants it

119th Legislative Day

June 21, 1988

except for one legislative district and I'd hope all the Members would take this for what it's worth and vote against it."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Younge on the Amendment."

Younge: "Will the Speak...will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker McPike: "Yes, he will."

Younge: "What does the Amen...your Amendment do?"

Hultgren: "It deletes the sum of two hundred thousand dollars which was added in Section 12(b) of the Bill, appropriating money for the Consortium on Early Intervention."

Younge: "Thank you."

Speaker McPike: "Further discussion? Being none, the question is, 'Shall the Amendment be adopted?' All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"

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

Speaker McPike: "Representative Hultgren."

Hultgren: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. This
Amendment is similar in that it deletes a hundred thousand
dollars which was a committee add on, again funds that
Doctor Ikenberry said that he would like to have, well
intentioned, but not the first priority in terms of where
the university ought to be doing its spending. Would ask
for a favorable Roll Call and would answer any questions."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Younge on the Amendment."

Younge: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker McPike: "Yes, he will."

Younge: "What does the Amendment do?"

Hultgren: "This deletes a hundred thousand dollars in committee add on which was designed for a branch of the University of Illinois College of Architecture."

119th Legislative Day

June 21, 1988

Younge: "Mr. Speaker, to the Bill, to the Amendment."

Speaker McPike: "Proceed."

Younge: "I would ask everyone to vote 'no' on this Amendment for the reason that...different from the prior Amendment, Doctor Ikenberry supports this Amendment asking for a branch of the University of Illinois School of Architecture in the East St. Louis area. This architectural laboratory and planning center will offer an excellent opportunity for the students in the architectural school to participate in one of the most dynamic growth areas in Illinois, the East St. Louis River Front area. It will be of great benefit to all of the citizens of Illinois because it will give the possibility of the maximum potential development of an area that can add economic growth to Illinois while providing a laboratory for the students in the School of Architecture to expand and broaden their architectural skills. Amendment will save money for the people of Illinois and will give an excellent opportunity to fill a local that does not have any planning capacity, does not have any research capacity, and for these reasons I ask you to vote 'no' against this Amendment because it will actually save money by establishing the branch of the Architectural School. So I'll ask my colleagues to vote 'no' on this Amendment."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Tate on the Amendment."

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

I rise in support of the Amendment. I...I don't really understand the logic of how we're spending money here, we save money. I think all of us would agree that maybe there's...there's many communities in the State that probably could improve upon their architecture, but, however, the bottom line here is...when...when the committee questioned President Ikenberry on this specific

119th Legislative Day

June 21, 1988

Amendment, the president indicated that this was not in his budget request, it was not in the budget request at the University of Illinois submitted to this General Assembly. This is a add on Amendment. This is a pure pork. I think all of us would like to bring back new buildings, new projects, and new bacon back into the districts, but...but certainly this isn't the time. And I would ask all of you to very seriously look at this Amendment and vote against this Amendment for what it is."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Hultgren to close."

Hultgren: "I think the subject of the Amendment has been adequately debated. I would simply ask a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #6 be
 adopted?' All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'nos'
 have it. The Amendment is defeated. Further Amendments?"
Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1693, Representative Keane. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1693, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Board of Governors of State Colleges and Universities. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee."

Speaker McPike: "Any Motions filed?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed."

Speaker McPike: "Any Floor Amendments?"

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

Speaker McPike: "Representative Mautino."

Mautino: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is the identical, same
Amendment to the Board of Governors that we had before us
providing for the students assistance, five hundred
dollars, ten percent, same way, reducing the seven percent

119th Legislative Day

June 21, 1988

down to six percent for the administrative increases and providing that same assistance to the students. I move for its adoption."

Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall the Amendment be adopted?' Is there any discussion? Being none, the question is, 'Shall shall Amendment #2 be adopted?' All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments."

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1694, Representative Richmond. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1694, a Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expenses of Southern Illinois University. Second Reading of the Bill.

Amendment #1 was adopted by committee."

Speaker McPike: "Any Motions filed?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed."

Speaker McPike: "Any Floor Amendments?"

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

Mautino."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Mautino."

Mautino: "Mr...thank you, Mr. Speaker. Same Amendment for SIU's budget as it was for the others. Move for its adoption."

Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall the Amendment be adopted?' Is there any discussion? The question is, 'Shall Amendment #2 be adopted?' All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment's adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative Younge."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Younge. Representative Wyvetter Younge, the Lady from St. Clair. Amendment #3."

Younge: "Would...would the Clerk read the Amendment?"

119th Legislative Day

- June 21, 1988
- Speaker McPike: "Amendment #3? Withdraw the Amendment? The Lady withdraws the Amendment. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #4, offered by Representative Curran."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Curran. Withdraws the Amendment #4. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "There are no further Amendments."
- Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1695, Representative Ropp. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1695, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Board of Regents. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee."
- Speaker McPike: "Any Motions filed?"
- Clerk Leone: "No Motions filed.".
- Speaker McPike: "Any Floor Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative

  Mautino."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Mautino."
- Mautino: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The same Amendment's for the Board of Regents that was provided for the U of I Board of Governors and the other agencies providing for the students stipend. Move for its adoption."
- Speaker McPike: "Is there any discussion of the Amendment? Being none, the question is, 'Shall Amendment #2 be adopted?'

  All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no' and the 'ayes' have it and the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "There are no further Amendments."
- Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1696, Representative Tate. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1696, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Illinois State Scholarship Commission. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee."

119th Legislative Day June 21, 1988

Speaker McPike: "Any Motions filed?"

Clerk Leone: "No Motions filed."

Speaker McPike: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #2 is being offered by Representative Mautino."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Mautino."

Mautino: "Since it's been adopted on the...on the Board of Governance's Bills, we'll withdraw this."

Speaker McPike: "The Gentleman withdraws the Amendment. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative Mautino."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Mautino withdraws Amendment #3.

Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "There are no further Amendments."

Speaker McPike: "Third...Representative Mautino?"

Mautino: "I...I apologize. That was wrong. We withdrew #2. I have to go with #3 and I'll explain exactly what it is.

Since we provided the..."

Speaker McPike: "So the Gentleman withdraws his Motion to withdraw the Amendment. We're now on Amendment #3.

Representative Mautino."

Mautino: "This is the Amendment that provides the funds that we just changed in the Governance Bodies to the undergraduate students under the Merit Recognition Scholarship Program.

It's that 8.5 million dollars that we just rearranged in the previous Bills and I move for its adoption."

Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #3 be adopted?' And on that, Representative Tate."

Tate: "Thank you...thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Even though I think many of the Members in this chamber were not...were not in favor of some of the cuts made in the personal service line, I think that the

119th Legislative Day

June 21, 1988

vast majority of the Members on this side of the aisle would agree with this Amendment and like to see the scholarship money funded."

Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall the Amendment be adopted?' All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "There are no further Amendments."

Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1728, Representative Mays. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1728, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the Abandoned Mine Lands Reclamation Council. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee."

Speaker McPike: "Any Motions filed?"

Clerk Leone: "No Motions filed."

Speaker McPike: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1729, Representative Mays. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1729, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses to the Department of Agriculture. Second Reading of the Bill.

Amendments #1, 6, 7, and 9 were adopted in committee."

Speaker McPike: "Any Motions filed?"

Clerk Leone: "No Motions filed."

Speaker McPike: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #10 is being offered by Representative Hultgren."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Hultgren."

Hultgren: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Several years ago, when the economy in the farm belt hit bottom, we adopted a program for trying to relieve the situation in

119th Legislative Day

June 21, 1988

the farm community and established the Farm Resource Center to conduct, among other things, stress counseling and training for farmers who were in dire straights. That budget has been cut in...in this most recent year. think, in part, because the situation in the farm belt was gradually turning around and perhaps the needs were less than they had been in prior years. However, any of you who travelled back to your districts over the weekend know that with the current dry weather situation and the...the probability of much reduced harvest this fall, the need for farm stress counseling is going to be just as great this summer and fall as it was back in 1983 at the height of the So this Amendment is to restore the farm depression. funding for the Farm Resource Center and specifically for counseling with the...with it in mind stress that...weather related crop failure is going to necessitate our resources being applied in this area."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Leverenz on the Amendment."

Leverenz: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker McPike: "He will."

Leverenz: "Could you reiterate again for us what funding you're doing this money with?"

Hultgren: "This is for the Farm Resource Center which was established a few years ago and simply..."

Leverenz: "What kind of money..."

Hultgren: "Would be funds for farm stress counseling."

Leverenz: "Is that agricultural premium fund or general revenue?"

Hultgren: "No. I believe this is GRF."

Leverenz: "Pardon me?"

Hultgren: "GRF, Sir."

Leverenz: "Which stands for what?"

Hultgren: "General Revenue."

Leverenz: "General Revenue."

119th Legislative Day

June 21, 1988

Hultgren: "That's right."

Leverenz: "I would like to invoke, if the Sponsor might understand, Committee Speech #101, which in essence means we don't have no General Revenue, therefore this Amendment should fail."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Hultgren to close."

Hultgren: "Thank...thank you, Representative Leverenz. I understand Committee Speech 101 and there certainly is a shortage of General Revenue. I suspect there are far fewer farmers in your district than there are in mine. And, would...would say to you that perhaps your priority as to how the General Revenue Funds should be allocated would be a bit different if you represented a few more farmers. I would ask for a favorable Roll Call on the Amendment."

Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #1 be adopted?' All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'nos' have it and the Amendment's defeated. Further Amendments?" Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #11, offered by Representative

Speaker McPike: "Representative Brunsvold on Amendment #11."

Brunsvold: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Amendment #11 would insert in place of 'resource center for farm stress counseling and training', would add the words 'farm debt mediation programs' to that list. That's what the Amendment does."

Speaker McPike: "Is there any discussion on the Amendment?

Representative Mays."

Mays: "Is it...is it correct that this is not increase the dollars for this purpose. It just adds 'farm stress' to...or debt mediation to farm stress and legal counseling?"

Brunsvold: "That's correct, Jeff."

Mays: "Thank you."

Brunsvold."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Mautino."

119th Legislative Day

June 21, 1988

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

Speaker McPike: "Yes, he will."

Mautino: "Is there substantive legislation that provides for the expenditure of those funds?"

Brunsvold: "Not...not yet. But one must proceed, this early in the Session, on the assumption that good things will come to pass."

Mautino: "In other words, you want the appropriation before the substantive language, is that correct?"

Brunsvold: "You know, Representative, if that program wouldn't pass, you know, the money is used for a resource center and farm stress counseling. There's no substantive language so you...so you wouldn't use the money for that. So it really doesn't do anything unless the Bill passes."

Maution: "Okay, Joe, fine."

Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #11 be adopted?' All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the Amendment's adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "There are no further Amendments."

Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1730, Representative Mays. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1730, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses to the Commissioner of Banks and Trust Companies. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee."

Speaker McPike: "Any Motions filed?"

Clerk Leone: "No Motions filed."

Speaker McPike: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1731, Representative Mays. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

119th Legislative Day

June 21, 1988

\*\*Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1731, a Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Bureau of the Budget in the Executive Office of the Governor. Second Reading of the Bill. There are no Committee Amendments."

Speaker McPike: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "There are none."

Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1732, Representative Mays. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1732, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the Capital Development Board. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee."

Speaker McPike: "Any Motions filed?"

Clerk Leone: "No Motions filed."

Speaker McPike: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1733, Representative Mays. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1733, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Illinois Commerce Commission. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee."

Speaker McPike: "Any Motions filed?"

Clerk Leone: "No Motions filed."

Speaker McPike: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1734, out of the record. Senate Bill 1735, Representative Mays. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1735, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Department of Conservation. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #2 was adopted in committee."

119th Legislative Day

June 21, 1988

Speaker McPike: "Any Motions filed?"

Clerk Leone: "No Motions filed."

Speaker McPike: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #3 in committee was withdrawn.

Amendments #4 and 5 lost. The next Amendment is Floor

Amendment #6, offered by Representative Mays."

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Clerk, were there any Motions filed to the Amendments adopted in committee?"

Clerk Leone: "There were no Motions filed."

Speaker McPike: "We're now on Floor Amendment #6. Mr. Clerk, who's the Sponsor of Amendment #6?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #6, offered by Representative Mays."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Mays. Representative Mays on the Amendment. Representative Mays."

Mays: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Amendment #6
appropriates a hundred thousand dollars to the Wildlife and
Fish Fund to the Department of Conservation for a grant for
Illinois' participation in the North American Waterfowl
Management Plan. I would move its adoption."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Leverenz on the Amendment."

Leverenz: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Mays: "Certainly."

Leverenz: "What kind of money is this?"

Mays: "This is Fish and Wildlife Fund Monies. This is non GRF."

Leverenz: "It's not General Revenue?"

Mays: "Yes."

Leverenz: "It is General Revenue?"

Mays: "No. It is not GRF. It is Fish and Wildlife Fund Monies."

Leverenz: "Okay, fine. Thank you."

Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall the Amendment be adopted?' All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment's adopted. Further

119th Legislative Day

June 21, 1988

Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #7, offered by Representative Richmond."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Richmond. Representative Richmond here? Representative Mays. The Gentleman's not in the chamber."

Mays: "I'd like to table the Amendment."

Speaker McPike: "The Gentleman moves to table Amendment #7. All those in favor of the Gentleman's Motion say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the Amendment's tabled.

Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #8, offered by Representative

Mautino."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Mautino, on the Amendment."

Mautino: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I believe that this is the Amendment that re-establishes the cut that was instituted in the Senate as it pertains to the Open Space Land Acquisition Program in the amount of approximately five hundred and thirty thousand dollars to complete the purchases for that open space that was included in the priority list of last year and I move for its adoption."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Mays on the Amendment."

Mays: "Yes, would the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker McPike: "Yes, he will."

Mays: "Are these...what types of funds are these?"

Mautino: "Originally, there is bond authorization under Federal Program and GRF. This may be the GRF portion."

Mays: "Yes. I understand this is five hundred and nine thousand in GRF, this Amendment."

Mautino: "Yes, Sir, it is."

Mays: "Thank you, I'd simply rise in opposition to the Amendment."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Mautino to close."

119th Legislative Day

June 21, 1988

- Mautino: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Basically, this whole system works on a priority list. Originally, set at, I believe, five million dollars. It has been reduced down to 3.5. That is the funding mechanism from the Federal Government. In order to complete that priority list for the purchases of which the Department of Conservation has...is involving themselves, there was a shortfall of five hundred and nine thousand dollars. In order to complete that and with the support of the department, I I presented the Amendment and I think it's correct and proper and I move for its adoption."
- Speaker McPike: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Amendment #8. All in favor to the Amendment say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'nos' have it and the Amendment's defeated. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #9, offered by Representative Mays."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Mays."
- Mays: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Amendment #9 simply puts the Illinois Conservation Corp Funding back in the land management division. There's no dollar change. It simply puts it back in the original division in which it was formed. I would move its adoption."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Mays moves the adoption and on that Representative Leverenz."
- Leverenz: "You just have...Sponsor give us a brief explanation why they should go there?"
- Mays: "It's my understanding from staff that this is where the Illinois Conservation Corp has always been and it was moved out of there through a Senate Amendment earlier this year and the rational for that hadn't been fully explained to me, so I just felt we should try to put it back in where it has always been."

119th Legislative Day

June 21, 1988

Leverenz: "We'll put it on."

Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall the Amendment be adopted?' All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment's adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #10, offered by Representative

Mays."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Mays on the Amendment."

Mays: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Amendment #10 is a seventy thousand dollar Amendment from the State Parks Fund to DOC. This amount represents a settlement amount with the former operator of the Pere Marquette Lodge and it represents a settlement, a court settlement, earlier this spring so I would move its adoption."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Leverenz on the Amendment."

Leverenz: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker McPike: "He indicates he will."

Leverenz: "What...what happened that we got this...today? Why didn't we hear about this a week ago or two weeks ago when we were going through the process? What we're talking about here, is that correct, we're buying out a guy's contract at a concessionaire at a park, is that correct?"

Mays: "That is correct and it's...as you know, we did extensive renovations at the...at the lodge itself which happened prior to the...excuse me. Which happened in the middle of the existing operator's contract. The lodge had to be closed. He had damages. He sued the department and in an out of court settlement, I don't know when that settlement was reached, the settlement represented the...a part of the solution to this problem that was brought up. These are not GRF. These are Parks and...State Parks Funds so I would...I hope that clarifies...I could try to get you the information on when the settlement was actually brought

119th Legislative Day

- June 21, 1988
- down from the Circuit Court down there, but I don't have that information right now."
- Leverenz: "Did the Crcuit Court determine it, or...you just said it was an out of court settlement?"
- Mays: "It was done in conjunction with the courts and it is a part of the settlement that the courts approved."
- Leverenz: "And when did...when did this get negotiated?"
- Mays: "I imagine it's been in process since the lodge was closed because I know the Gentleman..."
- Leverenz: "Did they just wrap it up yesterday? They didn't have the courtesy to come and talk to us last week about it or anything?"
- Mays: "I agree. But I had not heard anything about this until about two hours ago, myself."
- Leverenz: "Then, would you concur with me that they should go to the Court of Claims and that's why we have it established?"
- Mays: "The only thing is, with a Court of Claims, can they take it out of the Parks and Conservation Fund?"
- Leverenz: "Let him take his claim there. It shouldn't be negotiated by the department. They may have a secret deal with this guy."
- Mays: "Okay. Why don't we withdraw this amendment."
- Leverenz: "Good idea."
- Mays: "And I'll try to get some further answers for you on this.

  Whithdraw the Amendment, please."
- Speaker McPike: "Gentleman withdraws the Amendment. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #11, offered by Representative Mays."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Mays."
- Mays: "Withdraw."
- Speaker McPike: "Withdraws that Amendment. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "There are no further Amendments."

119th Legislative Day

June 21, 1988

- Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. Turn to Senate Bill 1734.

  Representative Mays. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1734, a Bill for an Act making appropriations and reappropriations to various State Agencies. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendments #1, 2, 3, 10, 11, 14, 16, 19, 20, 21, and 22 were adopted in committee."

Speaker McPike: "Any Motions filed?"

Clerk Leone: "No Motions filed."

Speaker McPike: "Any Floor Amendments?"

- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #23 is offered by Representative Wyvetter Younge."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Younge, withdraws the Amendment.

  Fur...Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "Amendment #24 is offered by Representative Black."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Black withdraws the Amendment.

  Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "Amendment #25 is offered by Representative Mays."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Mays withdraws the Amendment.

  Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "Amendment #26, offered by Representative
  Brunsvold."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Brunsvold."
- Brunsvold: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Amendment #26 was...would put the sum of three hundred and fifty thousand dollars into the Moline River Front Development Project. This is some land that John Deere has given to the City of Moline.

  I'd ask for the adoption of Amendment #26."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Mays. The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of the Amendment and on that..."
- Mays: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. This represents three hundred and fifty thousand dollars from the Tourism Promotion Fund and that's all well and good. But, I think

119th Legislative Day

June 21, 1988

there's some legal questions as to whether funds from that particular fund can be used for the purposes for which the Gentleman is requesting the dollars and I would therefore rise in opposition to the Amendment."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker McPike: "Yes, he will."

Leverenz: "What kind of thing you want to do here?"

Brunsvold: "Pardon, Representative? Would you ask that question again?"

Leverenz: "Is this the Amendment you offered in committee?"

Brunsvold: "Yes."

Leverenz: "Can you simply restate it again?"

Brunsvold: "It's three hundred and fifty thousand dollars for the Moline River Front Development. This is some land that was given by John Deere to the City of Moline for development."

Leverenz: "This is not General Revenue Funds?"

Brunsvold: "No, it's not."

Leverenz: "I would encourage the support on the Gentleman's Amendment."

Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #26 be adopted?' All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the Amendment's adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #27, offered by Representative Leverenz and Stange."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Leverenz."

Leverenz: "I defer to Stange."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Stange. Is the Gentleman here?

The Gentleman's not here. Representative Mays."

Leverenz: "Speaker."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Leverenz."

Leverenz: "I want to withdraw the Amendment."

119th Legislative Day

June 21, 1988

- Speaker McPike: "The Gentleman withdraws the Amendment.

  Amendment number...further Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #28, offered by Representative DeJaegher."

Speaker McPike: "Representative DeJaegher."

DeJaegher: "Thank you...thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the General Assembly. What this Amendment does is it asks for a sum of ten thousand or so much thereof as it may be necessary as appropriated from the Tourism Promotion Fund to the Department of Commerce and Community Affairs for a grant for a Tri-County Corridor Council. I move for the passage of the Amendment."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Mays on the Amendment."

Mays: "Thank you very much. Will the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker McPike: "Yes, he will."

Mays: "What are we going to get with ten thousand dollars from the Tourism Promotion Fund for this Corrido Council?"

DeJaegher: "Restate the question, will you, Jeff?"

Mays: "What are we going to get for ten thousand dollars for this Corridor Council?"

DeJaegher: "What are we going to get? Oh, my goodness. You're going to get untold returns on ten thousand dollars. Without a doubt, you realize the State of Illinois is probably promoting tourism as no other state, than the State of Illinois does. What we're going to try to do is to try to establish a dinner train in conjunction with the river boats that are operating on the Mississippi River. It's a feasiability study."

Mays: "For ten thousand dollars? Don't we have a Corridor's

Council Appropriation in the Department of Commerce and

Committee Affairs already?"

DeJaegher: "Yes, but I believe that the problem...the problem...is..."

119th Legislative Day

June 21, 1988

Mays: "You believe in circumventing the process?"

Dejaegher: "I believe that...No, I'm not doing this. I believe that the proper allocation is through the Tourism Council because it's going to be benefiting tourism."

Mays: "To the Amendment, Mr. Speaker. This is another fine example of a misuse of the Tourism Promotion Fund. We have an example of somebody that's trying to circumvent the well documented process. We've got funding in DECCA's budget for Corridor's Council. If this Amendment gets on, I would recommend that whoever makes the recommendations reduce the Tri-county's Corridor Council by this amount. So I would oppose the Amendment."

Speaker McPike: "Excuse me. There's a Gentleman in the balcony that has a phone on the banister. I'm afraid it might fall on Representative Leverenz. Thank you very much. Representative Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Well, if that phone was in Hinsdale, we'd be okay.

Would the Sponsor of the Amendment yield?"

Leverenz: "Save me, Hugh Hill! Save me! Is he going live now so we can disrupt his broadcast?"

Speaker McPike: "Proceed, Sir."

Leverenz: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker McPike: "He will."

Leverenz: "Is that a maybe? I think, Mr. Speaker, to the Amendment, this is probably one of the most worthwhile ten thousand dollars amounts of money that we'll ever appropriate. The Department of Commerce and Community Affairs comes to us all the time telling us all these great ways...and soon you'll see, if not in the budget already, a million and a half dollars for international trade and tourism. This is a mere pittance, but will grow probably

119th Legislative Day

- June 21, 1988
- in a million and half ways coming back to the State. I'd move for its adoption along with the Representative."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Preston."
- Preston: "Thank you...thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just wanted to comment to Representative Leverenz's question about Hugh Hill and whether he was going live. Hugh Hill hasn't been live for years so he has nothing to worry about."
- Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall the Amendment be adopted?' All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the Amendment's adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #29, offered by Representative Leverenz and Mays."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Mays on the Amendment."
- Mays: "Yes, I believe Representative Leverenz is the chief Sponsor on this Amendment."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Leverenz."
- Leverenz: "This replaces Amendment #25, I believe, that has the total amount for the training funds and allocates them to all of the projects that we have endorsed. I would move for the adoption of the Amendment."
- Speaker McPike: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of the Amendment. There being no quest...no discussion, the question is, 'Shall Amendment #29 be adopted?' All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the Amendment's adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #30, offered by Representative Leverenz."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Leverenz."
- Leverenz: "On Amendment #30 would restore Senate cuts and I would move for the adoption of the Amendment."
- Speaker McPike: "Is there any discussion on Amendment #30? Any discussion on Amendment #30? Mr. Mays is there any

119th Legislative Day

- June 21, 1988
- discussion on this Amendment? The question is, 'Shall the Amendment be adopted.' All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no', the 'ayes' have it and the Amendment's adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #31, offered by Representative Sieben and Mays."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Sieben. The Gentleman withdraws the Amendment. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #32, offered by Representative Mays."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Mays, Amendment #32."
- Mays: "Thank you very much. I don't believe there's any dollar change with this Amendment, net dollar change, what we're going to be doing though is allocating I think about fourty thousand dollars to the Hong Kong office to reflect the difference in currency exchange rates. It has caused some problems in that particular office. And I would move its adoption."
- Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall the Amendment be adopted.' All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no', the 'ayes' have it and the Amendments adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #33, offered by Representative Phelps."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Phelps. Is the Gentleman here?

  There he is. Read the Amendment. I'm sorry Mr. Clerk, Mr.

  Phelps on the Amendment."
- Phelps: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #33 actually designates the sum of five hundred thousand from the tourism promotion fund to the Department of Conservation for the purpose of funding the Office of Resource Marketing that passed this House a few days ago."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Leverenz on the Bill, on the

119th Legislative Day

June 21, 1988

Amendment."

Leverenz: "I just rise in support of the fine Amendment the individual has offered."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Mays."

Mays: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I rise in opposition to the Amendment. This is another half a million dollars in the tourism promotion fund that is now being allocated for purposes for which the fund cannot be used. It is absolutely illegal to be using dollars for this purpose from that fund. And I would ask for a Roll Call on this issue."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Mays."

Mays: "I withdraw my request for a Roll Call."

Speaker McPike: "Question is, 'Shall the Amendment be adopted.'

All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no', the 'ayes' have it

and the Amendment's adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #34, offered by Representative Rice."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Rice. Representative Leverenz on the Amendment."

Leverenz: "Thank you. This is a hundred thousand dollars from the tourism promotion fund to the Department of Commerce and Community Affairs for a grant to the Henry Rucker Foundation for the vocational training program there. I'd move for the adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall the Amendment be adopted.' Representative Mays."

Mays: "This Amendment been distributed? Our staff doesn't have a copy of it."

Speaker McPike: "The Amendment was just filed. Representative Leverenz the Amendment is not printed."

Leverenz: "Well what do you want to do now coach?"

Speaker McPike: "This Bill will be held on Second Reading. Taken

119th Legislative Day

June 21, 1988

out of the record at this point. Senate Bill 1736, Representative Mays. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1736, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority.

Second Reading of the Bill. There are no committee Amendments."

Speaker McPike: "Any floor Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "There are none."

Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1737, Representative Mays. Read the Bill Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1737, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Illinois Educational Labor Relations Board. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee."

Speaker McPike: "Any Motions filed?"

Clerk Leone: "No Motions filed."

Speaker McPike: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1738, Representative Mays. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1738, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Department of Employment Security, Second Reading of the Bill. Amendments #1, 2, and 3 were adopted in committee."

Speaker McPike: "Any Motions filed?"

Clerk Leone: "No Motions filed."

Speaker McPike: "Any Floor Amendments."

Clerk Leone: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1739, Representative Mays. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

119th Legislative Day

June 21, 1988

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1739, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses for the Environmental Protection Agency. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendments #1, 3, 6, and 7 were adopted in committee."

Speaker McPike: "Any Motions filed?"

Clerk Leone: "No Motions filed."

Speaker McPike: "Any Floor Amendments."

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #8 was withdrawn. Floor Amendment #9 is being offered by Representative Leverenz."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Leverenz. Mr. Leverenz."

Leverenz: "I lost my place in the book, Sir."

Speaker McPike: "We're on Senate Bill 1739, Amendment #9."

Leverenz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I found my place in the book.

Amendment #9 would appropriate sixty million dollars from
the Water Pollution Control Revolving Fund to the EPA for
the financial assistance to units of local government for
sewer systems and waste water treatment and I move for the
adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall the Amendment be adopted.' All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no', the 'ayes' have it and the Amendment's adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #10, offered by Representative Giglio and Panayotovich."

Speaker McPike: "Floor Amendment #10 is withdrawn. Further

Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "There are no further Amendments."

Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1740, Representative Mays. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1740, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Environmental Protection Agency.

Second Reading of the Bill. Amendments #1 and 3 were adopted in committee."

119th Legislative Day June 21, 1988

Speaker McPike: "Any Motions filed?"

Clerk Leone: "No Motions filed."

Speaker McPike: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1741, Representative Mays. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1741, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Illinois Farm Development Authority.

Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendment."

Speaker McPike: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "There are none."

Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1742, Representative Mays. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1742, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses for the Department of Financial Institutions. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendments #1 and 2 were adopted in committee."

Speaker McPike: "Any Motions filed?"

Clerk Leone: "No Motions filed."

Speaker McPike: "Any Floor Amendments?"

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

Speaker McPike: "Representative Mays."

Mays: "I'd like to withdraw Amendment #3."

Speaker McPike: "Withdraws Amendment #3. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #4 is being offered by Representative Mays."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Mays."

Mays: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I was asked to put this

Amendment in at the request of the Department. What has

happened is we've had people in the unclaimed properties

division on...in the currency exchange division on the

119th Legislative Day

June 21, 1988

unclaimed property payroll and they sought to correct this. It would involve a hundred and one thousand dollars additional GRF and we don't have that at this time so I will withdraw this Amendment."

Speaker McPike: "Withdraws the Amendment. Further Amendments?" Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1743, Representative Mays. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1743, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses to the Department of Labor. Second Reading of the Bill.

Amendment #1 was adopted in committee."

Speaker McPike: "Any Motions filed?"

Clerk Leone: "No Motions filed."

Speaker McPike: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1744, Representative Mays. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1744, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses the Department of the Lottery. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker McPike: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #1 being offered by Representative Brunsvold."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Brunsvold. Is the Gentleman here? Representative Brunsvold here? Amendment #1."

Brunsvold: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #1 to the Lottery would address the problem I've had in my district from my constitues regarding the millionaires party. Approximately fifty thousand dollars was used for the millionaires party and last year as a promotion of the over seventeen million

119th Legislative Day

June 21, 1988

dollars that's going to be used now for advertising the Department of Lottery this Amendment would decrease that amount by fifty thousand dollars or approximately the amount of the millionaires party. And I realize that fifty thousand dollars out of seventeen million is just a pittence but I think we need to make a statement here that a millionaires party is not necessarily appropriate. And I would ask for the adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker McPike: "Any discussion? Representative...Representative Mays."

Mays: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. This issue came up in the Appropriations Committee also and in response to questions on this it was brought out that they...the Department of Lottery probably received more free publicity than they could have ever expected to receive from a similar amount spent directly for advertising. And that's the way it's been in the past. The Department understands the ticklish nature of this particular expenditure and have committed to hold the line on this next years party. And I believe that if they stick to that amount the Amendment is not necessary and I would therefore ask for opposition."

Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall the Amendment be adopted.' All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no', the 'nos'

have it, the Amendment's defeated. Further Amendments?"

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

Speaker McPike: "Representative Mays Amendment #2."

Mays: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. This Amendment restores seven hundred thousand dollars to Lottery for the printing of the instant games tickets. This is the one major glaring deficiency in their budget at this point. And I would move for its adoption."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Will the Sponsor yield."

119th Legislative Day

June 21, 1988

Speaker McPike: "He will."

Mays: "Yes, I will."

Leverenz: "What glaring fund does this money come from?"

Mays: "Lottery fund."

Leverenz: "All lottery?"

Mays: "Yes."

Leverenz: "Does this pay to have our tickets printed out of State?"

Mays: "It pays to have our tickets printed so that we can buy them and keep the Lottery going."

Leverenz: "But they print our tickets out of State? They don't use an Illinois company?"

Mays: "It's my understanding that there are no in State producers of these tickets."

Leverenz: "Do they give special consideration to Illinois companies?"

Mays: "If there were Illinois companies interested I'm sure that they would get what ever preferences they're statutorially enabled to get."

Leverenz: "Judging from the Tribune articles one could be created in a matter of weeks. Thank you."

Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall the Amendment be adopted.' All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no', the 'ayes' have it, the Amendment's adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "There are no further Amendments."

Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1746, Representative Mays. Representative Giorgi in the Chair. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1746, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Military and Navel Department. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee."

Speaker Giorgi: "Any Motions?"

119th Legislative Day June 21, 1988

Clerk Leone: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Giorgi: "Any Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #2 lost in committee. Next Amendment is

Floor Amendment #3 being offered by Representative Mays and
Black."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Mays on Amendment #3."

"Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Amendment #3 reduces the Department's appropriation by a hundred and three thousand in General Funds dollars. These dollars have gone for the last several years to the Chicago Park District to help them maintain the Broadway Armory in the City of Chicago. We felt that it would be appropriate to offer this Amendment because I don't know of any other area in the State where there's an armory where the park districts get any kind of use, free or otherwise, let alone get State subsidies to support the continued use. The operating budget for the Chicago Park District's about a hundred and fifty million from what I understand and this hundred and three thousand dollars would more appropriatly come from their budget directly and as much as we are allowing them the use of the armory for a thousand dollars a year. I would move for it's adoption. I would ask for a Call."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Leverenz on Amendment #3."

Leverenz: "Would the Gentleman respond to a question or two?"

Mays: "Certainly."

Leverenz: "In the past we have always funded this operation. Is that correct?"

Mays: "I think we began funding this through a Burman Amendment back in 198...in fiscal 84. We had not funded this prior to that."

Leverenz: "We have funded it then since 1984?"

Mays: "Since fiscal 84 and we're in fiscal 89 now. The last five

119th Legislative Day

June 21, 1988

years we have funded this amount. I think this is at last years level as a matter of fact."

Leverenz: "So it is a general ordinary operation of government that we've been doing for years and years?"

Mays: "It's one of those built in budget busters that we've continually tried to get out in committee that...I know it's not a whole lot of money in the skeim of things..."

Leverenz: "So how many dollars..."

Mays: "But a hundred and three thousand is a hundred and three thousand we could put it to a lot of other better uses."

Leverenz: "How much money?"

Mays: "A hundred and three thousand dollars."

Leverenz: "Have you checked with President Reagan on cutting this defense budget? Yes or no?"

Mays: "I have not."

Leverenz: "Then it's a terrible Amendment and ought to be defeated."

Mays: "Well it is a Roll Call and you can have your chance to defeat it on a Roll Call vote."

Leverenz: "It's a bad boy. You're going be a...you'll never get invited to go play golf with us again."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Bowman on Amendment #3."

Bowman: "Thank you. I also stand in opposition to this Amendment. The reason that it wasn't in the budget before 1984 is the Broadway Armory didn't exist before 1984. And it exist today through the efforts of the State of Illinois if it weren't for the State the armory would not be a reality and would not provide the necessary recreational services in that part of the State. People in other parts of the State of course have State parks that they can take advantage of but in urban metropolitan area the armory program is about the only thing that we have. So I would recommend a 'no' vote on this because this is an on going

119th Legislative Day

June 21, 1988

part of State Government."

Speaker Giorgi: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 1746 be an Amendment.' All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', you want a Roll Call vote? All those in favor signify by voting 'aye' and those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Reverend Leverenz to explain his vote. Representative Leverenz from Currie's desk to explain his vote. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On this question there is 56 'ayes' and 58...60...55 'ayes', 60 'nays' and the Amendment is defeated. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "There are no further Amendments."

Speaker Giorgi: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1747."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1747, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses for the Department of Nuclear Safety. Second Reading of the Bill. No committee Amendments."

Speaker Giorgi: "Any Motions or Floor Amendments?"

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

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Leverenz on Amendment #1."

Leverenz: "Well this is the one you've all been waiting for. The

Amendment would add ten million and fifty thousand of the
low level waste fund money in the following manner; ten
million for site selection eight hundred thousand for
grants to local governments, fifty thousand dollars for
grants andd scholarships to students in institutions and
reduces the reappropriation for site selection by a million
five six nine. I'd move for the adoption of the Amendment.
I understand it's okay."

Speaker Giorgi: "Any further discussion? The question is, 'Shall Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1747 be adopted.' All in favor signify by saying 'aye', those opposed 'nay', the 'ayes'

119th Legislative Day

June 21, 1988

have it and the Amendment's adopted. Any further Amendments?"

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

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Mays on Amendment #2."

Mays: "Thank you very much. This is two hundred thousand more dollars for the department low level waste funds not GRF and this is a follow up in adjunct to the Amendment that was just adopted. I'd move for it's adoption."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Leverenz on Amendment #2."

Leverenz: "Yes and to also apologize to the Membership on the floor. I seemed to give the wrong signal last time. I think I said green and it was really a red. So thank you for your attention. This is a green one."

Speaker Giorgi: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #2 be adopted.' All in favor signify by saying 'aye', those opposed 'nay', the 'ayes' have it and Amendment #2 is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Giorgi: "Third Reading. Peg Breslin in the Chair."

Speaker Breslin: "Ladies and Gentlemen we are going to the Special Order of Business under state and local initiatives. The first Bill is Senate Bill 1592, Representative DeLeo. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "On page 6 of the Calendar Senate Bill 1592, a Bill for an Act to create the Home Equity Assistance Act. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee."

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

Tate: "Well thank you, Mrs. Speaker. I rise on an inquiry of the Chair. We were informed that we were going to take the Appropriation Bills, all the Appropriations Bills on Second Reading. Is it the intent of the Chair to go back to that

119th Legislative Day

June 21, 1988

Order of Business before the end of the business day today or both Democratic and Republican staffs are on the floor. We'd like to know rather they can go sit down and have a rest or what the situation's going to be."

Speaker Breslin: "I see. It is the intent of the Chair to go back to appropriations if there is time. So the suggestion is that staff should stay close so that if we get time to move back to that we certainly will. Okay."

Tate: "So Representative McPike had earlier indicated that the House would adjourn at 6:30 is that still the intent of the Chair then?"

Speaker Breslin: "That's the hope. We'll see how quickly we can move. Okay. We were are Senate Bill 1592 the Bill is on Second Reading. Did you say there were Motions or Amendments Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #1 was adopted in committee."

Speaker Breslin: "Any Motions or Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No Motions filed. Floor Amendment #2 is being offered by Representative Williams."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Williams."

Williams: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Amendment #2 deals with one of the aspects of the Bill which quite honestly we feel needs to be better defined in order for this Bill to avoid the racial connotations that have been outlawed. One of the problems that we find is that there's no concise definition of what a local adverse housing market condition is. We believe that in order for this particular piece of legislation to be as the Sponsor claim it is, void of racial intent, and I don't know if that can be done but this particular Amendment tries to say that the triggering event in this particular piece of legislation is not race but it can be any one of the local adverse marketing conditions here listed or those that are in addition. And

119th Legislative Day

June 21, 1988

I would hope that those who really wish to try to make this Bill as best as it possibly can not saying that it can be made good but as best as it possibly can would support this Amendment because all it does is define local adverse marketing conditions. I'd ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of
Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 1592 and on that question the
Gentleman from Cook, Representative DeLeo."

DeLeo: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Members of the House. It's not my intention or the Sponsor's intention the co-sponsors intention or the Senate Sponsor to make this Bill have any racial overtone. I'd ask for a 'no' vote on Amendment #2."

Speaker Breslin: "Is there any further discussion? Hearing no discussion the question is, 'Shall Amendment #2 be adopted?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 28 voting 'aye', 77 voting 'no', 3 voting 'present' and the Amendment fails. Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #3 offered by Representative Williams."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Williams."

Williams: "Take Amendment #3 out of the record."

Speaker Breslin: "Withdraw #3. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #4 offered by Representative Williams."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Williams."

Williams: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Amendment #4 what it does is under the present piece of legislation the question is who are the eligible applicants. Now one of the real problems is that this particular Bill intends to tax everybody who owns a particular piece of property in this

119th Legislative Day

June 21, 1988

particular area regardless of whether or not they will participate in the program. And that would include not only individuals but it says that a corporation that may own property would be subject to the tax but could not be able to benefit under the program cause they wouldn't be eligible. This only says that if a corporation owns property in that area and it is forced to pay that tax if they also if they desire would be eligible for the program. That's all it does is try to give a certain amount of fairness to everyone who might be involved with this particular program and who might be subject to the tax. I urge an 'aye' vote."

- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #4 to Senate Bill 1592 and on that question is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative DeLeo."
- DeLeo: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. The Amendment #4 which I have rise in opposition of would change the Bill completely. It is not the original intent of the Bill. In line 20 which make eligible applicant means the owner of a qualified residence. That's in the Bill. I ask for a 'no' vote on Amendment #4."
- Speaker Breslin: "Is there any further discussion?

  Representative Williams to close."
- Williams: "Okay. Even though as he stated it says the intent, will the intent is to insure the value. Well let's insure the value and we shouldn't discriminate between those individuals who own property by some other means then by their natural selves. I believe that this particular Amendment puts corporation and other individuals who are subject to the tax into the same position as all those individuals who otherwise would be eligible to collect under this program. I would hope that you would take a

119th Legislative Day

June 21, 1988

good look at this and at least be fair to those corporations who will be forced to pay this tax. And I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #4 be adopted.' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no', voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 32 voting 'aye', 66 voting 'no', 13 voting 'present', the Amendment fails. Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #5 offered by Representative Williams."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Williams."

Williams: "Out of the record."

Speaker Breslin: "Withdraw #5. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #6, offered by Representative Williams."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Williams."

Williams: "Okay. Amendment #6 and I'm doing this, so I hope the people at least understand this is sort of an explanation of some of the areas that we're about to get into in this new piece of legislation. What it says is that under this particular Bill the Bill sets up the commission. The commission has the right when they need to to individuals, to raise bonds, to issue referendum to basically tax the people without any additional referendums, without any additional approval from the voters or from anyone. You give it the commission the power to increase levies as they need be to care the burden of this program. This Amendment basically says that they can't create new taxes by that commission not approved by the referendum or by the corporate authorities in which the municipality in which this program exist. All this

119th Legislative Day

June 21, 1988

particular Amendment does is to at least put some sort of control over an otherwise all powerful governing commission. And I would urge an 'aye' vote for this Amendment."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #6 to Senate Bill 1592, on that question the Gentleman from Cook, Representative DeLeo."

DeLeo: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. This is absolutely contrary to what the language in the Bill. This would remove the twelve percent cap that we've put in the Bill. The twelve percent cap for the property tax rate would be voted on by voters by referendum. And what the State of Illinois is doing is putting an absolute cap on this. I'd ask for a 'no' vote on Amendment #6."

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

Cullerton: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

Williams: "Yes he will."

Cullerton: "I didn't understand your explanation this to be the actual Amendment. I understood that what you're trying to do with the Amendment was to try to put a limit on the amount of tax that could be raised. And yet the Amendment appears to remove the cap that is placed into the legislation. So as I understand the legislation it says you can't exceed a certain cap but it still has to be approved by a referendum to be part of... to create the commission in the first place. So you vote on whether or not you want to create a commission and you at the same time vote as to what the tax rate shall be but in no case shall it exceed a certain rate. Now how does your Amendment change the current law."

Williams: "Okay. Because under the piece of legislation it says that it does now approve a tax rate but it also allows for

119th Legislative Day

June 21, 1988

the commission when in fact if the program were to go bankrupt or to do other things to pass additional tax revenues for the purpose of fulfilling the requirements of the program. This says that under no situation can they in essence add additional taxes that were not originally approved in the original program. And this is to allow because if they have the authority to increase taxes it's assumed they would have the authority to increase them to what ever the need is and this says that it will not increase those taxes beyond the original referendum amount."

Cullerton: "Alright but I understand what your point is but are also removing line 12 of page 15 which says in no case shall exceed a rate of point one two percent assessed valuation of all property equalized the territory. By your Amendment your removing the cap. You're saying that it can't exceed what they originally approved but at the same time by removing the cap you're allowing them to raise the tax even higher then the point one two percent. I don't think it's what you really want to do and I think it's a good reason to be opposed to the Amendment, although I understand what your Amendment proports to do. I just don't think it does it properly."

Williams: "Well I believe it does and I can only disagree with your reading of the law as you see it. And I would then again move for a favorable Roll Call on this particular Amendment."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Williams to close."

Williams: "As I stated this particular piece of legislation and this commission that we're creating to oversee the transfer of property in a given area is a very powerful commission. The commission has the right, first of all, you have to get permission for approval to move out, commission has the

119th Legislative Day

June 21, 1988

right to do what ever is necessary to get the funds for this particular program to operate. I believe that if ever you have a situation where your creating a government a Body that is not subject to the electorate but is only subject to the wishes of a small group of people who put that commission in that commission becomes very dangerous and there needs to be some safeguards against that commission and its tax proposals. I believe this Amendment does that so safeguards and based upon that I would ask for an 'aye' vote."

- Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #6 be adopted.' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no', voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 33 voting 'aye', 74 voting 'no', and the Amendment is lost. Are there any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #7, offered by Representative Williams."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Williams."
- Williams: "Okay. This Amendment is very simple. Basically all it says is that if this program is so great, let's make it statewide, let's make it available to everybody in the State and I ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #7 to Senate Bill 1592, on that question the Gentleman from Cook, Representative DeLeo."
- DeLeo: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Amendment #7 is another attempt to sabotage the Bill, it takes out the words with a population of more than a million. This Bill has been worked on and drafted for residents of the City of Chicago were amendable at anytime once this becomes law to further expand this Bill. At this time I'd ask for a 'no' vote on

119th Legislative Day

June 21, 1988

Amendment #7."

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

Cullerton: "Yes, I think phylosophocally there's no problem with the Amendment but as a practical matter we discovered there were a couple of municipalities that have already adopted by ordinance a home equity proposal. I think one of them was University Park and the second one was Oak Park and rather than wipe out their existing home equity programs the thought was that we would just pass it for the City of Chicago, if other parts of the State indicate a strong willingness to join in this great program then maybe they could come down here and petition the Legislature and have us next year make it statewide. But the only reason why this wasn't originally in the Bill was because these two existing home equity programs already were in existance and we didn't want to pre—empt them."

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

Davis: "Yes, I would like to ask a question, Madam Speaker.

Since I'm a resident of the State of Illinois and since I own a home that I have lived in since 1962 why can I not participate in this program. I mean if I want to sell my home I want to make sure that I get a certain value out of it also, so why can I not participate."

Williams: "Presently the program as drafted and the question becomes as he said the Sponsor of the Bill says, the Bill was drafted and the legislation was drafted for the City of Chicago. The City of Chicago should deal with the issue however they haven't so now we look to big brother now to pass everything city won't. So I'm saying if the State of Illinois wishes to pass a Bill, State of Illinois should pass a Bill for State of Illinois and not for the City of Chicago. The State of Illinois should not be the proper

119th Legislative Day

June 21, 1988

body to overview and to supplant and to begin to take the place of the deliverate body that exist in the City of Chicago. And to answer your question if you live in the State and you believe in this sort of concept which I do not then you should be allowed to participate under this program and I urge an 'aye' vote. Excuse me, I'm responding but I'm also closing unless there's further discussion."

Speaker Breslin: "Okay. There's no further discussion. The question is, 'Shall Amendment #7 be adopted.' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no', voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 43 voting 'aye', 62 voting 'no', 7 voting 'present' and the Amendment fails. Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #8, offered by Representative Williams."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Williams."

Williams: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Amendment #8 principally does what this Bill says that you're all suppose to do. And it makes the Bill applicable city wide. That means that we would have one program to exist in the City of Chicago to be governed by one commission and I think it's important to understand this, because people say that's city wide now because it allows each community to set up their own little commission. There's a certain hidden danger in this because as we all know whether or agree with me there are a lot of minorities and blacks in particular who believe that this particular piece of legislation has racial overtones. When you create a situation where you have 30, 40, possibly 50 or more separate little commissions operating in the city you create a we versus they attitude. You create a

119th Legislative Day

June 21, 1988

where our commission will protect our neighborhood against that commission in that neighborhood. And then before long what you have is guards standing at the door of each neighborhood saying that our community will be protected by our commission. This says we'll have one program city wide and it's whole purpose is to reduce the conflict that I know will occur when this particular piece of legislation becomes law. And for the simple purpose of making one program citywide this Amendment attempts to do that. Thank you."

- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #8 to Senate Bill 1592, on that question the Gentleman from Cook, Representative DeLeo."
- DeLeo: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I just want to clarify that this is city wide. What this General Assembly did in its wisdom in 1987 is we changed the territory to each individual precinct. We changed the smallest unit of government to a precinct so each individual precinct could put on that referendum, vote on that issue, precinct by precinct. It is available city wide. It's not discriminatory. I ask for Amendment #8 to be defeated."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Cullerton, on the Amendment."
- Cullerton: "Well, I'm going to oppose this Amendment and I'll
  tell you why. If this passed there'd be only one
  commission if it was approved city wide. And since this
  Bill would authorize the possibility of raising city wide
  property taxes of almost seven million dollars and since in
  my district we don't want this home equity program I don't
  want to have my property taxes go up and for that reason
  I'm going to oppose the Amendment."
- Speaker Breslin: "There being no further discussion Representative Williams to close."

119th Legislative Day

June 21, 1988

Williams: "Thank you, Representative. I do appreciate your desire not to have it in your community but the point is is that when they say city wide and I point this out, I actually worked with the Sponsor to make sure that every that there are people in each precinct that tries to deal with a referendum. But the point is we're trying to deal with reduction of racial conflict. And think about it. my community sets up a little commission and those who want it determine what the commission will be they'll say these are the borders of my area. This is my community and my borders. The next area sets up and says this is my community and my borders. What we're doing is we're separating Chicago into little territories where everyone will be fighting against each other to protect themselves. And I already know, I've been in it long enough to know that the steam rollers are on and things are going but I ask you in all your consciencousness to take agood look and begin to understand that what we are about to do. We're about to create territories within the City of Chicago which have only one purpose and that will be eventually to create conflict and a we versus they attitude on this piece of legislation and I urge an 'aye' vote on this Amendment #8."

Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #8 be adopted.' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no', voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 30 voting 'aye', 75 voting 'no', 5 voting 'present' and the Amendment fails. Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #9, offered by Representative Williams."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Williams."

119th Legislative Day

June 21, 1988

Williams: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Now this one, I even want the Sponsor to listen to this because I think if you listen and you understand you might have some sympathy for this. says is this, under the present piece of legislation this particular use of the funds can only be to keep the program going. We're saying that if in my area if I wanted to set up the program even under the little what I call little homestead or little commissionary it says that my commission in my area determines if we're going to have the program and we determine we want to use the funds something other. Say for instance if we wanted to use the funds to help to reinvest in rehab of housing in that area which goes more to the destruction of value, then the influx of the change in race, then we would be allowed to those funds for that purpose. It does not prevent other areas from using it how they wish. This only that in the areas that they so choose that they can create different uses for the funds along with the referendum when the ordinance is created. I believe that's fair, I believe that's equitable, and I believe that it allows for greater use of this program for other purposes. And I would urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #9 to Senate Bill 1592, and on that question is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative DeLeo."

DeLeo: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Members of the House. I did listen to the Sponsor of this Amendment, Representative Williams. And he has some very valid points, except I have to rise in opposition to his Amendment because the legislation that we have before us in Senate Bill 1592 defines the purpose of the fund. His Amendment adds additional not only additional purposes but authorizes the

119th Legislative Day

June 21, 1988

fund to be used for any purpose. This Amendment is much much to broad. The legislation before us defines the uses I ask for a 'no' vote on Amendment #9."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Turner on the Amendment."

Turner: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Will the Gentleman yield for a question?"

Speaker Breslin: "He will."

Turner: "I have a quarrel, I'm curious regarding the use of these funds. This tax that's being raised is being raised on property owners in a given area. Am I correct?"

Williams: "Correct."

Turner: "And it is regarding housing and the stability of the housing market in a particular area. Am I right?"

Williams: "That's correct."

Turner: "Was it possible then through the use of this Amendment then that those funds could be used for redevelopment in that particular area. Say a similar subject area housing related."

Williams: "Not under the present legislation as it now reads. If
this is adopted it would allow for those other uses and I
would like to add on it says it can be used it didn't just
say any purpose but it says for any purpose approved by the
referendum pursuant to the Act. So that means if in fact
the voters who actually put in this particular ordinance in
their area so approve additional uses then those uses would
be allowed to be used. I don't see it affecting anyone
except for the individuals who might have in a different
areas and there allowed for a positive use. If that...
think that the Bill itself is negative at least allow for
some positive use of this particular piece of legislation
and this Amendment would do so."

Turner: "So then it is safe to assume then that an area that I'd

119th Legislative Day

June 21, 1988

be interested in in terms of rebuilding housing in a given area that they could very well by referendum take some of the tax that's being used to rebuild housing in a given community where the tax is being implemented. Am I correct?"

Williams: "If it was approved by the referendum creating the Act it could be so used."

Turner: "To the Amendment. Ladies and Gentlemen, I rise in support of Amendment #9. I think that the fact that you're allowing a voice by the people through referendum as to how the funds are going to be used is a good idea and I ask that we vote 'aye' on this referendum."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Williams to close.

Representative Williams, excuse me, Representative

Cullerton for what reason do you seek recognition?"

Cullerton: "I just want to ask a question."

Speaker Breslin: "Proceed."

Cullerton: "You're amending the Bill on page 5 line 9 this is the...it talks about the when the petition is initially put together to be placed on the ballot?"

Williams: "Yes."

Cullerton: "And the petition shall state additional purposes if any for which the guaranteed fund may be used?"

Williams: "Yes."

Cullerton: "And that's anything?"

Williams: "Any thing approved by the referendum that they so desire. In other words, when we're putting together because...understand this particular legislation creates an Act that says that you have to go back and then create little districts who have to vote on the referendum. When you put the referendum on your particular area and you wish to have other uses say you wanted to use it for low income trust housing fund or low income loans for rehabs that

119th Legislative Day

June 21, 1988

really go for the area value you could put that on there and they could be approved."

Cullerton: "I understand that but does the refer...where would it spell out specifically what the uses might be."

Williams: "It would be spelled out in the referendum."

Cullerton: "In the petition?"

Williams: "In the petition and in the referendum if it so desire."

Cullerton: "Okay. Now your Amendment though doesn't give any guidance at all as to what those limits might be. I understand the low income housing would be one, that was talked about in debate, but you don't, now are these people, any commission can decide their going to have a property tax increase to spend money to build a new power plant or a new stadium or..."

Williams: "The whole essence of this Bill in its lack of wisdom is that those people so desire to tax themselves and if that be their reason to do it then we should allow them to do it for whatever reason they wish to tax themselves. So if your reasoning if the reasoning of the Sponsor of the Bill carries through then it would also seem to bear that the people who so put on the tax could put on it for what ever purpose they desire. And I see no reasons against that."

Cullerton: "But the Bill makes it very specific as to what they are taxing themselves for."

Williams: "Well the Bill says that if a group of people want to tax themselves for that purpose I'm saying if they want to tax themselves for another purpose why not."

Cullerton: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Davis. The Lady does not wish to speak. Representative Williams to close."

Williams: "Thank you. As I stated this Bill all it does is say

119th Legislative Day

June 21, 1988

to those individuals who going to be forced to live in the city with an ordinance or with a Bill coming out of the State Legislature that effects their lives that if you got to live with this thing at least you can find some positive purposes for it. I urge an 'aye' vote because this tends to at least make the Bill a positive as well as a negative piece of legislation. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #9 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: "Representative, I'm sorry, Madam Speaker. I wanted to explain my vote. First of all I don't understand why all the Legislators or the majority of them are voting against Representative Williams Amendment when this Bill does not affect them or their districts. This Bill only affects people who live in Chicago and only those who live in a certain area of Chicago. So my question to the rest of the Body is why are you voting against Paul Williams' Amendment when all that Amendment does is attempt to offer some equity and paraty to the citizens all across the State of Illinois or Illinois or Chicago. Now if you live downstate or if you live in what should we say, DuPage County this Bill does not affect you. So I'm wondering why are you voting against Paul Williams' Amendment and I will be supporting the Amendment and I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Breslin: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question...the Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 48 voting 'aye', 57 voting 'no' and 7 voting 'present' and the Amendment fails. Are there any further Amendments?"

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

119th Legislative Day

June 21, 1988

Williams."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Williams."

Williams: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. This piece and what it does is this. We'll dealing with an all powerful commission. This commission has the ability to set up its own rules and The commission has the ability to tax. commission has the ability to determine what is and what is not fair price. The commission has the ability to in essence determine who must give you notice to sale. The commission has the ability to disapprove of the sale. The commission has the ability to do a lot of things. All this says is that once this commission exist it's setting up its rules and regulations that will govern this commission, that the commission has to get those rules and regulations approved by the municipal body that would be responsible or that's in the area in which the program is operated. with that I would ask for an 'aye' vote and the rules regs is just to put some sort of check and balance upon this all powerful commission."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #10 to Senate Bill 1592 and on that question the Gentleman from Cook, Representative DeLeo."

DeLeo: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I also rise in opposition to Amendment #10. Maybe Representative Williams and I was reading a different Bill and I've set through hearings at the State of Illinois Building through hours and hours and hours of debate and my interpretation of this legislation is that the Governing Commission has to have public hearings before they can set policy. It doesn't have the broad authority where they're able to govern and set policy without the public hearings. In the legislation it definitely spells out that there must be public hearings. So we're not giving this commission that abusive power. I

119th Legislative Day

June 21, 1988

ask for a 'no' vote on Amendment #10."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Williams to close."

Williams: "I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #10 be adopted.' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no', voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 46 voting 'aye', 60 voting 'no', and 6 voting 'present'. The Amendment fails. Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #11, offered by Representative Williams."

Speaker Breslin: "Withdraw #11. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #12, offered by Representative Williams."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Williams."

Williams: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. This is the one Amendment, the one Amendment that I believe when most people say this Bill has tried to remove all of the racial context. And this is the one Amendment that I wish to say points to what I believe is one of the most serious, serious questions as it relates to the racial content of this piece of legislation. The present Bill says that we will guarantee the value of our home based upon you keeping up that home, based upon you being there. Now it says in order for you to collect you must continously or a member of your family and they tell you who the member of family is must continuously occupy that piece of property for five years. Now what that does in essence is says that piece of property will be controlled by that family or that ethicity or that particular person who happens to be white for a minimum of five years if you're going to collect. It doesn't say and understand this goes against our basic

# 119th Legislative Day

June 21, 1988

values, right now if you own property keep it up you should be able to rent it. If your under this program you can't rent it to somebody out side of your family and collect. You can't do anything to this property except for keep your family member there. Those of you who know the federal fair housing law the one particular where we would call sort of get away from the housing is what we call and pa exception or the exception that says if you or a member of your family occupy that home you have the legal right to discriminate in who lives there. This Amendment allows them to say our area will remain white for a minimum of five years that...this Amendment tries to take that out. This Amendment says that if in essence you own title for five years, you keep up your property for five years, you should be able to collect under this program. There should be no requirement, I mean we should not put any sort of requirement and this doesn't go to white or black, this goes to the question of how do you want to view yourself as people dealing with your property in this country. We're basic changing the premises here. This particular Amendment says we can not tell a person who must occupy This Bill does that. This Bill says that you that home. are your family member must live there for five years. where in the history of this country do we tell people who must live in a home. We're doing it today and I urge that you support this Amendment and if you're truly those Sponsors who truly want to relieve this of its racial odious state and that's what it is they would support this Amendment because this Amendment is the one Amendment and that particular clause is the one most racist part of this particular Bill and I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #12 to Senate Bill 1592 and on that question the

119th Legislative Day

June 21, 1988

Gentleman from Cook, Representative DeLeo."

DeLeo: "Thank you once again, Madam Speaker. This Amendment is also the same Amendment as Amendment #3 which we defeated a few minutes ago. Excuse me, it was withdrawn, it does is it eliminates the continuous occupancy of that residence. What the commission has done and what this legislation has done in these hours and hours negotiation it allows five years ownership and it must be lived...the owner must live in the residence. I think for start up program like the home equity Bill, this would allow the fund to be solvent. This isn't, once again, this legislation to be racist. there's no intention of It's there just to continue the program and allow five years of ownership and live in that residence. I ask for a 'no' vote on Amendment #12."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Young." Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the "Thank you, House. I rise in support of the Amendment and hope people have been listening to the debate. I think this is the most crucial Amendment of those that have been offered because this is the biggest change in the real estate law this State has seen. If you don't adopt this Amendment you're telling home owners that they can not rent their property and still participate in this program. If in fact the reason for the program is to protect the value of home then this Amendment says as long as you protect the value of the home you can still enjoy the rights of ownership that any other home owner in the State has and that's to live there or not live there or have a member live there or rent it for income if you so desire to who ever you choose so long as you keep it up you can still participate in the program. If you want to make this a little more palable, if you want to hold to the principles

119th Legislative Day

June 21, 1988

we've all held for years and since this country began about the right of an individual to do what he wants with his own property then I urge you to support this Amendment."

Speaker Breslin: "There being no further discussion, Representative Williams to close."

"Basically, and I know that a lot of people heard a lot Williams: of discussion about this Bill and I don't mean to rely on the Sponsors of this Bill because in their heart they may not believe that what they're doing has a racial overtone but the reality of what you believe and what is, is always two different things. And what is, is that we're now doing the opposite of what we couldn't do one way. We couldn't make laws that says we going to keep black people out, we going make laws that's going to keep white people in. that's what they're doing. And I'm saying that if there's any one particular aspect, and we asked the Sponsors why is this in there and they say to protect against gougers and investors. And I say well that doesn't make sense because if a person is trying to rip the program off why would you buy in at a present value of a certain dollar amount hold the property for five years just to be quaranteed that same amount of money back. That makes no sense. That's their reasoning for this Amendment. I mean for this particular aspect of the Bill. This Amendment says we should not put family, we shouldn't put requirements on property on who should live in a given piece of property, that's serious, You can not dictate that's dangerous. to anybody, who should live in a given piece of property, a anywhere, family member, they even name the family members, don't want married husbands coming in there because married husbands might be black. They tell you that it's to be your sister, your brother, your mother, they tell you who can live in your property for you to collect under this

119th Legislative Day

June 21, 1988

program. Any one piece of this legislation that sticks out as a sore thumb that will follow us for all time, because when we inact this legislation Illinois is going on record as saying yes we believe that you can protect against black people, yes we believe black people are a detriment to this country and yes it's alright to do with them what we please. I urge the adoption of this Amendment more so if you have any consciousness please think about what we do. There's no reason for family requirement. The question should be do you own the property, do you take care of the property, is the property in good shape. Not who lives there. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved...was that a close...that was a close...a good close. The question is, 'Shall Amendment #12 be adopted.' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no', voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 77 voting 'aye', 27 voting 'no', 9 voting 'present', the Amendment is adopted. Are they any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #13, offered by Representative Williams."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Williams."

Williams: "Basically all this says and I'm so elated I'm going to be quick on this one, all this one says is that in order for those groups that have the right to actually give people the nominees for the commission that they don't have to benot-for-profit organizations. It makes no sense for them to benot-for-profit organizations since in fact they don't collect any money. We just want to make sure that we have the widest input possible in the determination of who will be the various commissioners. I urge an 'aye' vote."

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

119th Legislative Day

June 21, 1988

Amendment #13 to Senate Bill 1592 and on that question the Gentleman from Cook, Representative DeLeo."

- DeLeo: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. If I read Amendment #13 right,

  I stand in opposition to Amendment #13 because it deletes
  thenot-for-profit tax status which we have to do under the
  Internal Revenue Code. So I rise in opposition of this."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Cullerton."
- Cullerton: "Yes, we had hearings on this Bill when we had provided many opportunities for people to come forward with recommendations for change. I don't recall this particular proposal having come forward before. I just wondered if you can tell me specifically what type of for-profit organizations you have in mind that would be exclude from making recommendations to the Mayor who makes the appointments."
- Williams: "No, what it does it doesn't take out the...it takes out the 501(c)3 and 501(c)4 requirements. Which are Federal Government requirements which deal with rather or not you have tax exempt status. That particular status can be very difficult for some organizations to acquire if they don't have lawyers and other the people to help them acquire it because they have to go through the Federal Government. We're saying that those who nominate to the commission should be allowed other people besides those groups because quite honestly the more groups that are best organized, the ones that are the...sometimes in this area not necessarily those that are the best able, say instance in a given area you can't have real estate people, you can't have other people suggest who might be on this commission if they don't have that tax status and I'm saying since those groups don't collect any money or don't do any funds there's no real need for them to be 501(c)3

119th Legislative Day

June 21, 1988

- and 501(c)4 organizations."
- Cullerton: "Let me see if I understand this. You're going to allow for a community organization...which you're going to say it doesn't have to be a nont-for-profit organization but you are saying it must have been...okay. But does it have to be registered for at least five years in the State and maintain an office? Who does it have to be registered with?"
- Williams: "I guess it'd be registered with the Secretary of State and not necessarily with the Federal Government. 501(c)3 and (c)4 is the Federal Government."
- Cullerton: "As a what though? Give me an example."
- Cullerton: "Okay, so you're still requiring that they be a not-for-profit."
- Williams: "Well I thought it would be easier just getting rid of the tax status. We can set it up not-for-profit status is a lot easier than trying to get 501(c)3 and 501(c)4 designation."
- Cullerton: "Well, it's very...I really can't articulate any opposition to it because I don't, this is the first time we've heard of it I haven't heard from any of the proponents of the Bill as it whether or not they'd be for or against the Amendment. I just don't think it's that important that the...of an oversight if it was an oversight if we did make it initially."
- Williams: "The only thing I'm trying to do is trying to make those people who are able to nominate people to be on the commission to have as any people involved in that process as possible. That's all I'm trying to do with this Amendment. I urge an 'aye' vote."

119th Legislative Day

June 21, 1988

Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #13 be adopted.' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no', voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 35 voting 'aye', 71 voting 'no', 5 voting 'present', the Amendment fails. Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #14, offered by Representative Williams."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Williams."

Williams: "Okay. This is my last Amendment. Basically what this

Amendment says, I'm going...at this time...I'm going to
take 14 out of the record."

Speaker Breslin: "Withdraw #14. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #15, offered by Representative Parke."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Parke."

Parke: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment 15 simply clarifies that the guaranteed value is established on the date of registration in the program. In other words, when a piece of property goes into the program that date will be the date of the quaranteed value for the future of that piece of property. The second part is appraisers who meet the standards of American Institute of Real Estate Appraisers or American Society of Appraisers and who submit their names to the governing commission can not be excluded from for reason other than completeness or consideration timelyness of appraisal reports submitted to the governing commission. Ιt just simply means that established appraisers will have the right to appraise property based on their own competency, based on the standards that are set up by their own professional associations. And number

119th Legislative Day

June 21, 1988

3 the third part of this Amendment simply states that members of the home equity program can either offer their for sale personally, that's a basic right everywhere else in the United States for the most part, that personally can put your home up for sale yourself or list with a real estate broker of their choosing during the first ninety days their home is for sale. During the last 60 days the member shall list their homes with a real estate broker of their choosing. It simply means as a person who is about to sell their home has the right to pick the person that they want to use to sell their home. A basic approach that's used in all real transactions, I would presume throughout Illinois. So I'm just asking, I think that this Amendment makes the Bill better and I think that it accomodates the basic values of our real estate community that we have today. I ask for a positive vote on Amendment 15."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #15 to Senate Bill 1592 and on that question the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Yes, would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Breslin: "He will."

Cullerton: "With regard to your first point, clarifing the guaranteed value is established on the date of registration in the program. Why shouldn't the guaranteed value be established on the date that the appraisal is completed so we know what the value is?"

Parke: "Well, I think that if somebody is going to go into this program, they ought to have the ability of finding specific date that finalizes everything at one time. That at that point in time we know they're going to use the value of that home at that time."

Cullerton: "You mean the appraisal has to go back to the date

119th Legislative Day

June 21, 1988

they signed up for the program and the appraisal shall say this is what the property was worth on a particular date in the past? That's in the form of a question, Madam Speaker, if the...I'm still questioning."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Parke to answer the question."

Parke: "I believe I answered it. I think that's an appropriate time to use this."

Cullerton: "Maybe I didn't ask the question properly. The way the program works, the guaranteed value is established at the beginning of the program when you get your house appraised and then five years later if there is a claim the amount that is refunded is the difference between the quaranteed value and what that lower sale price is. Now what this Amendment does is to say, I think that quaranteed value is established on the date of registration in the program. So my question to you is when you get your appraisal originally when you get your appraisal is the appraisor suppose to appraise the house on the day that the person registered in the program and if so why? Why not just the date that the appraisal was requested?"

Parke: "Well, I think...I think you're probably misunderstanding what I believe the intent of this Amendment does. What ever the value of the home that it's been appraised at, what ever that value is at that time going into the program that is the date that we use. It isn't five years later, it's the value that it's appraised. We take an appraisal value in at that time that you have and you say here is the appraised value of this home, I'm going into the plan and this sticks. I don't think that's unreasonable, I don't think that's out of line."

Cullerton: "No, you're misunderstanding what my question is.

First of all your Amendment doesn't say what page it

amends, now what page are you on? Where's Section J, of

119th Legislative Day

June 21, 1988

subsection J of Section 3? It's on page 3 of the original
Bill."

Parke: "We are looking at that Section if you'll give us a minute please. Paul. Paul."

Cullerton: "Okay what you do is..."

Parke: "Could you repeat you question one more time,

Representative Cullerton?"

think that if you look at subparagraph (b) of Cullerton: " I Section 3 on page 1 of the Bill, there's a certificate of participation that's a notorized document of membership in the program signed by the qualified applicant and by an authorized representative of the governing commission which specifies the location and description of the guaranteed residence, its quaranteed value, the registration date and which has attached to it a copy of the program appraisal. That's the date that the quaranteed value refers to. Okay. I don't think it's a major point, the real problem with your Amendment is you have three Sections to it, the real problem with the Amendment is the last Section which talks about the final 60 days that the property is listed. the way the final 60 days was set up is a person goes out and tries to sell their home, listed it with a real estate broker or selling it by themselves for 90 days and if they have not been able to obtain a bonafide offer what we have said is that the commission itself then can go out to protect themselves from fraud and to get their own broker. Now we make sure that there's no stearing in the Bill, make sure that they can't discriminate in picking that broker but the commission is the one that should have the right to pick their own broker. Not the same person who had picked the broker, for the first 90 days. That is the person who is trying to sell their home. So we talked about this with the realtors. We took as much of their

119th Legislative Day

June 21, 1988

recommendations, many of their recommendations, they were very helpful in drafting the Bill, but this particular Amendment that particular Section dealing with the last 60 days just is inconsistent with the purposes of the program. For that reason I would oppose the Amendment."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Warren, Representative
Hultgren. The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative
McCracken."

McCracken: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise in support of the Amendment. I think it's very important that we understand that the commission, the governing body, the body responsible for the payments, the body responsible to the taxpayers in the event of a referendum necessary to raise the money to support these activities shouldn't be the body that's also setting the values. I think we have a situation here a kin to a separation of powers...policy and I think we should come down on the side of the people residents in these areas that are under the commission should have the ability to have an independent appraisor not only appraisors chosen and approved by the commission. Although the Gentleman says they take the possibility of stearing out of the Bill, I respectfully disagree. As long the commission has the right to chose and approve the appraisers you're going to have the opportunity to want to avoid the opportunity to stear. respectfully think that the prior speakers arguements as to the various subsections or the technical quality of the Amendment is merely a red herring. The bottom line here is let's get appraisers who are independent, let's not be required to use appraisers under the commission. the entire point of the Amendment."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Young."
Young: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the

119th Legislative Day

June 21, 1988

House. I too rise in support of this Amendment. For two reasons, first of all if there is going to be munipulation of the system by the commission it will come in at the time of sale. And again, secondly and most importantly we're talking about private property here. We're talking about an individual who's going to sell his own home and without this Amendment he doesn't have a right to pick his own broker or his own real estate agent or have his own appraisal done. Again this is private property, property rights that this General Assembly private generally respects, an individual who wants to sell his home ought to have the ability to sell it through people he has confidence in and who he is sure are looking out for his best interest and not subject to the munipulation of this all powerful commission. So I would urge an 'aye' vote."

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

Black: "Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. Would the Sponsor of the Amendment yield?"

Speaker Breslin: "He will."

Black: "Thank you. Representative Parke if I interpret your Amendment correctly, without your Amendment the owner of the property would be subjected to having a real estate broker and or an appraisor thrust upon him or her at the capricous and arboratary whim of some commission. Is that the thrust of your Amendment?"

Parke: "That's my understanding."

Black: "In other words, in other words, this...if we don't pass

Amendment #15, what we've done is basically aggregate any
right of free enterprise in the real estate process.

Correct?"

Parke: "That is absolutely correct."

119th Legislative Day

June 21, 1988

Black: "Thank you very much. To the Amendment, Madam Speaker, with that explanation from the Sponsor I would urge an 'aye' vote."

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

Bowman: "I move the previous question."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman moves the previous question, the question is, 'Shall the main question be put.' All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'nay', in the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it, the main question is put Representative Parke to close."

Parke: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. The person that the Representative spoke out against the Amendment to try to make it sound like there was some inconsistency is very artful in trying to make it sound that way. As I presented the Amendment and it was explained by Representative Black it is something that takes away the basic underpending of the real estate community. I ask for a 'yes' vote to this Amendment."

Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #15 be adopted.' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no', voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 75 voting 'aye', 36 voting 'no', 2 voting 'present' and the Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #16, offered by Representative DeLeo."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative DeLeo."

DeLeo: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Is this the last Amendment?"

Speaker Breslin: "I think so."

DeLeo: "I'll withdraw it."

Speaker Breslin: "Withdraw #16. Representative DeLeo."

119th Legislative Day

- June 21, 1988
- DeLeo: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. At this time I'd ask to leave the Bill on Second Reading."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative...Representative Ronan is recognized for a Motion."
- Ronan: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Pursuant to House Rule 37(a), having voted on pervailing sight I'd move to reconsider the vote by which Amendment #12 to Senate Bill 1592 passed."
- Speaker Breslin: "You have heard the Gentleman's Motion. His

  Motion is that we reconsider the vote by which Amendment

  #12 was adopted. That question is debatable. Does anyone
  wish to debate the issue. The Gentleman from Cook,
  Representative Williams."
- Williams: "Yes I move to table that Motion that was just made by Representative Ronan to reconsider the vote."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Williams moves to table Representative Ronan's Motion to reconsider the vote. That's not debatable. So the question is, 'Shall Representative Ronan's Motion be tabled.' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no', voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 57 voting 'aye', 56 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. Representative DeLeo was recognized."
- DeLeo: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'd ask for a verification of the affirmative and a poll of the absentees."
- Speaker Breslin: "Poll the absentees Mr. Clerk. Before we do that Ladies and Gentlemen the Doorkeeper has delivered to us a billfold of Rachel Samuels, it was left in the gallery. So if anyone knows Rachel or Rachel is still in the gallery the billfold is up at the Speakers Podium. Proceed to poll the absentees, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "A poll of those not voting. Levin and Sutker.

  No further."

119th Legislative Day

June 21, 1988

- Speaker Breslin: "Poll the affirmative Mr. Clerk. Representative Brunsvold changes his vote from 'present' to 'no'. On this question there are 57 voting 'aye', 57 voting 'no', none voting 'present'. Representative Williams for what reason do you seek recognition."
- Williams: "I ask to verify the 'no' vote."
- Speaker Breslin: "He ask to verify the 'no' vote. Poll the negative votes, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Berrios. Black. Breslin. Brunsvold. Capparelli. Christensen. Bugielski. Churchill. Cullerton. Daley. Daniels. DeJaegher. DeLeo. Farley. Flinn. Doederlein. Ewing. Giorgi. Goforth. Granberg. Hallock. Hanniq. Hartke. Hensel. Hoffman. Homer, Hultgren, Keane, Krska, Kulas, Lang, Martinez. Matijevich. McAuliffe. Laurino. McCracken. McNamara. McPike. Mulcahey. Novak. O'Connell. McGann. Panayotovich. B. Pedersen. W. Peterson. Petka. Phelps. Rea. Richmond. Ronan. Steczo."
- Speaker Breslin: "Excuse me, Mr. Clerk. Representative Steczo ask leave to be verified. Does he have leave? Leave.

  Proceed."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Terzich. Weaver. Williamson. Wolf. and Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker Breslin: "Do you have any...Representative Sutker, you are recorded as not voting Representative Sutker."
- Sutker: "I will vote 'no'.
- Speaker Breslin: "Change Representative Sutker to 'no'.

  Representative...Proceed Mr. Clerk. Are you finished?

  Okay. Mr. Williams do you have any questions of the negative roll?"
- Williams: "Yes, Representative Christensen."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Christensen. Ray Christensen.

  Is the Gentleman in the chamber? How is he recorded?"

119th Legislative Day

June 21, 1988

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman's recorded as voting 'no'."

Speaker Breslin: "As voting 'no'. Remove him from the Roll Call."

Williams: "Representative McNamara."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative McNamara. John McNamara. How is the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman's recorded as voting 'no'."

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

Williams: "Representative Flinn."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Flinn. Monroe Flinn. How is the Gentleman recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman's recorded as voting 'no'."

Speaker Breslin: "Remove him from the Roll Call. Excuse me,
Representative Johnson for what reason do you seek
recognition? Excuse me. Proceed, Mr. Clerk. Or
Representative Williams."

Williams: "Representative Krska."

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'no'."

Speaker Breslin: "Remove him."

Williams: "Representative Farley."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Farley. Bruce Farley. Is the Gentleman in the chamber? How was he recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman's recorded as voting 'no'."

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

Stephens for what reason do you seek recognition?

Representative Johnson for what reason do you seek recognition?"

Johnson: "Yes, could you switch me from 'yes' to 'no' please?"

Speaker Breslin: "Change Representative Johnson to 'no'. Proceed
Mr. Williams."

Williams: "Representative Hannig?"

119th Legislative Day

June 21, 1988

Speaker Breslin: "Excuse me, Representative Stange what is your pleasure?"

Stange: "Vote me 'aye' to 'no' please."

Speaker Breslin: "Change Representative Stange from 'aye' to 'no'. Proceed Mr. Williams."

Williams: "Representative Keane?"

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Keane, Jim Keane is in the chamber."

Williams: "Representative Ewing?"

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Ewing. Representative Stephens for what reason do you seek recognition?"

Stephens: "Can you change my vote to 'no' please?"

Speaker Breslin: "Change Representative Stephens from 'aye' to 'no'. Representative Ewing was...are you in your...I can't see the Gentleman is the Gentleman in his chair? He is indeed. Any other questions Mr. Williams? Representative Tate for what reason do you rise?"

Tate: "Madam Speaker, I'd like to be recorded as 'no'."

Speaker Breslin: "Change Representative Tate to 'no'. Representative Ryder?"

Ryder: "Same request."

Speaker Breslin: "Change Representative Ryder to 'no'."

Williams: "No further."

Speaker Breslin: "On this question there are 52 voting 'aye', 58 voting 'no', none voting 'present'. And the Gentlemans Motion fails. Now we're back to Representative Ronans Motion to reconsider the vote by which Floor Amendment #12 was adopted to Senate Bill 1592. There is debate on that question. Does anyone rise to debate? Hearing none the question is, 'Shall the vote be reconsidered as to Amendment #12 to Senate Bill 1592?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. The question is, 'Shall the vote be reconsidered?' The

119th Legislative Day

June 21, 1988

question is, 'Shall the vote be reconsidered?'
Representative Ronan one minute to explain your vote."

- Ronan: "Just to clarify it, if you're for home equity it's an 'aye' vote. I don't want anyone confused on this issue.

  So the 'aye' vote is the vote for home equity folks. Thank you."
- Speaker Breslin: "Have all voted who wish? The question we are considering is whether or not we will reconsider the vote by which Amendment #12 was adopted. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 57 voting 'aye', 55 voting 'no', and 3 voting 'present'. And the Motion to reconsider prevails. And now we will go back to Amendment #12 and Representative Williams will present Amendment #12 again. Representative Williams."
- Williams: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, and our absent Speaker, the . one who engineered this. The one who I quite honestly felt a lot of admiration and at least respect for. The one who I believed had the best interest of all Democrats in mind. Not just certain Democrats. And I guess you got to wonder because throughout this whole Session we're being told, we gotta save 'Verella'..., we gotta save this person, we gotta save that person. Right now you're about to doom whole race of my people. It's hard to keep that respect. It's hard to keep that admiration for a party that cares so little about us. We give our heart to this party. We give more votes to this party than anybody, anywhere, anyhow. The very group that we're trying to stop don't vote for this party. Sort of a shame. I want everybody to know. jackets gotta be worn. It's a shame that this State, this nation's about to do is going to have to be seen, going to be dealing with a lot of legal stuff. The law suits are already being prepared. The State will pay

119th Legislative Day

June 21, 1988

that. This issue's not going to die. It's going to grow. Just like a giant cancer. As we reconsider this vote, as we reconsider this Amendment, there's no sense in talking about the Amendment. I said what it did. It removed the most nasty, racial aspect of this Bill. But I guess this Body's going to decide that that nasty, racial aspect should be in here. So handwriting song...you're a great guy Mr. Speaker. Lot of power. If power rules over common sense. If politic rule over right, so be it. All I do is ask for your 'aye' vote. I hear the gallery laughing at me. And I know they laugh because they figure, oh black folk don't know what they're talking about. We don't know what affect us. We don't know what affects our rights and our livelyhood. We're too dumb, too stupid. Well I tell you, what we do today you all I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #12 to Senate Bill 1592. And on that question the Lady from Cook, Representative Davis."

Davis: "Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I don't believe that Abraham Lincoln would turn over in his grave, I think he'd get up and walk away. I think he'd be ashamed to remain in the State of Illinois. That Amendment passed fair and square. And I don't understand a reconsideration on that Amendment. If that's the way the ball game is played, I've got two or three things that went down, can we hear those again? Do I have an opportunity to bring those back? Do we look at this floor and find that there really aren't Democrats and there really aren't Republicans, but there are racists. I vote 'aye'."

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

DeLeo: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'd just like to just read a

part of the Bill, the original Bill, the Senate Bill. It's

on page 19 and it's line 17. And it says in the original

119th Legislative Day

June 21, 1988

Bill and why we do not need this Amendment and it's 'no provision of this Act under the provisions of this Act is intended as and none shall be used as means of discriminating against any individual on basis of ethnic background, gender, race or religion.' Those words are in the Bill, in the Senate Bill. There's no need for this Amendment to be adopted at this time. I ask for a 'no' vote on Amendment #12."

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

McAuliffe: "Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The Gentleman from the other side of the aisle tried to make a racial issue out of this. And it's not a racial gallery issue. These people up in the here Representative Bugielski's district and from my district and Representative Capparelli's district have come here for a year and a half to try and get legislation passed that they feel would help them protect their neighborhood and their homes. I don't think that's racist. There are black families that also can participate in this program. These people have a right to have their Bill presented the way they wanted it presented. There's no group of people who has come down more to Springfield to lobby for any piece of legislation. They've talked to the Speaker, they're from the Speakers District, they're from Representative Terzich's District. This is the way they want the Bill. They don't want this Amendment on the Bill. Why can't we give them what they want. Give it a chance to work and see if we can't successfully help these people stay in their home. That's all they're asking for a chance to finish out their lives in their home and their own neighborhood without moving again."

Speaker Breslin: "No demonstrations are allowed in the gallery.

119th Legislative Day

June 21, 1988

The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. We have to look beyond intent to affect. And I think I cannot offer words any more eloquent than Representative Williams offered earlier in debate when he said that the effect of the Amendment or...excuse me, the Bill without the Amendment, is to keep white people in which of course has the same affect as keeping black people out. And the test of that effect is to be found in the definition of family. Because the definition of family in the Bill very clearly excludes family by marriage. Very clearly excludes the possibility of an inter-racial marriage. And I think that particular feature of the Bill is so offensive that it should be excised by this Amendment. The Amendment carried fair and square in the first instance. I think it deserves another 'aye' vote."

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

Panayotovich: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I remember months ago, I should start off by saying the previous Speaker talked about Abraham Lincoln and he might want to leave his grave. I remember months ago when we watched Mayor Harold Washington stand with Governor Thompson and talked about how important home equity was. And I am saying I watched the two of them when they said home equity is important to the City of Chicago. And I remember that day and I think everybody else should remember that day."

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

Morrow: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. We're talking about equity.

We're talking about equity of a certain group of people.

Later on this week or next week we're going to be talking

119th Legislative Day

June 21, 1988

about the equity of the people that surround White Sox Park, on the south side. We're going to be talking about the equity of the people on the west side who might lose their homes so that we can put up a place of pleasure, so people from outside my community won't be able to get into the games and see them in person or on TV. We're going to talk about equity, let's have equity for everyone in this State. Not just for the benefits of a few people. put White Sox Park up, we put Bears Park up what about the equity of those people who are going to lose their homes? Consider those issues when you place your vote on this Bill here. If we're going to be fair, let's be fair to everyone in this State. I'm from the 32nd District, my district is 98 percent black. But when I place a vote, I vote not because I'm a...I have a district of 98 percent black, I vote because I am a State Representative of eleven million We have to be fair, we have to people in this State. change our attitudes and vote on principal This is the job that we've been sent here to do politics. and all we ask for is fairness. I urge that we support Representative Williams on his Amendment. I urge that when other issues of this type come before us between now and June 30th that we be fair, and don't change the rules middle of the game. Because what's the sense of playing the game if you don't know what the final score is going to really be? Because if you think you win, you turn around and you lose in the last second. Thank you."

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

Shaw: "Yes, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I think that Representative Paul Williams said it best. That we all are Democrats. And from time to time we are asked to support issues that affect the Democratic party and people of this State. And that's what I'm...I rise and ask

119th Legislative Day

June 21, 1988

the people of this side of the aisle to support what's right. There's no reason that this Amendment or that this Bill should say that when a black move into a neighborhood that the property value goes down. That's what you're voting on in essence. And I don't think that that's right. And I don't believe that the Leadership of our party should such an effort. Ι don't believe support that Leadership of our party and the Members of our party and the Members of this General Assembly should support that. Most of the Members of this General Assembly have minorities in their district. And those minorities vote for the Members of this General Assembly. And many times and in many instances some Members of this General Assembly could not be here or would not be here without that And I would ask the minority support. Members of this Assembly not just the one who has minorities in their district, but I would like for those Members on side of the aisle to vote against...to vote for this Amendment. Because this Amendment is right. Representative Williams is right. And we have stood with the Democratic party, we have stood with you on this side the aisle, the 14 black Members on this side of the aisle have voted down the line with every Democratic Member on this side of the aisle. Whether it be in committee or the House Floor. When it comes to a major issue that affects you or your people. And I think that you, should understand the sensitivity that's involved in this Amendment. That's involved in this Amendment. A few years ago when the airport was trying to be taken away Mayor Harold Washington, then some fellow wanted Members made reference to, or the park district was being taken away, trying to be taken away, I thought we had come to some common consensus in this Body. But if you do this

119th Legislative Day

June 21, 1988

to over a million people, million and a half people in Chicago, this affects you around this State. And not only does it affect you here it affects you in the November election. That's what we're talking about. These people are...you know, they're like I am and you, they have memory and they're going to remember what your vote was here. I hope every newspaper in this State carries what this vote I think what we should do, if we are for the was or is. right thing and I believe and I've always been a Member of the Democratic party and I believe in the Democratic party. And I think that we should stand for what's right. right not just for what a few people want, what people want does not affect the masses. What a few people want, Representative Williams pointed out that you have a few people that's concerned and point...and people will point and say well we have some minorities that it that's not the case. What you are attempting to do here is sanction in law that minorities bring down the property values of people of this State. And that's not true. And I would hope that the sane minded people of this Body, would vote against it. Thank you very much."

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

Buqielski: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen from the General Assembly. My district is racially mixed. blacks on the south side of my district. referendum was held in our district. The entire district which adjoins Representative DeLeo's and the black areas, the home equity referendum carried 18 to 1. The black people voted for this. They asked for this, they knew what it was...what was coming. What Representative Shaw mentioned about people are afraid of black people moving in, there's a black person that lives three doors away from

119th Legislative Day

June 21, 1988

me, right across the street. Before I moved in I knew he was there, that did not stop me from moving in. All we're asking and the people in my district as well as the other districts, they're asking for equity on their home. They don't want to lose money on their homes. And I just ask for your favorable Roll Call. Thank you."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Champaign, Representative Johnson."

Johnson: "I move the previous question."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman moves the previous question. The question is, 'Shall the main question be put?' All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it and the main question is put. Representative Williams to close."

Williams: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Again, briefly just so that we know what this Amendment does. All this Amendment that in order to collect under the program, it doesn't do away with it, it says that it's not a requirement that family members stay there. And that the areas stay white for a minimum of five years. All it says is that if you keep up the property and keep title you shall be able to collect. I want to close by just being fair, because they said they read right into the record about what the Bill says about fairness and equity. That was put on as an Amendment. What the original Bill said is that the purpose of this Act is to protect the value of the home that will lost due to racially changing neighborhoods. That says I as a black people, I am dangerous, that the Government has a legitimate interest to protect against us, and as such we're going to create laws to make sure that you don't get out of hand. Well, I say to this Assembly, I say to everybody, what we are starting here today won't end here today. And it ain't going to end in the courts, more

# 119th Legislative Day

June 21, 1988

likely Chicago's a white, racial high bed of tension right now. One Speaker alluded to the late Mayor. I beg to say that I knew him better. I beq to say that prior to the day before he died we walked into his office with the Dearborn Board and the one thing the man said was 'look get off this home equity, cause it's the worst thing that can be'. understood it. He realized that the precedent we set today, we will never be able to come up under it. me, if the City of Chicago needs this Bill, let the City of Let the City of Chicago enact its own Chicago pass it. law. Let us not be a part of the racial bigotry that exists there. Let us not be a part, let us live true to the concept that a person will be judged by the content of his character and not by the color of his skin. Let us be fair, fellow Democrats. You walk up and down these aisles, you talk to my 14 other black Members here, you tell us all the time, please save this for my district, please save this for the party, please and we came around. Let's have (Arillo Pentisky) in our area, let's have Joe Berrios in our area. Let's walk all of these people around. turn around and you take us for granted. You tell us that we care nothing about you. We only care about a small segment of our vote that might switch. You won't switch and we don't care. Well I say this and I say this loud and clear and I hope the papers pick it up, all over this State we're going start caring, we're going to start looking, we're going start seeing because the reality of it all is this, it's not your best interest is not in the party but in the issue and in the person who cares about you as a people. Obviously this Body don't care about us as a people. I ask for an 'aye' vote and I would hope that people vote with their hearts and with their minds. think political, think logical. I ask an 'aye' vote."

119th Legislative Day

June 21, 1988

- Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #12 be adopted?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Representative Jones one minute to explain your vote."
- Jones: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Members of the House. I'm very emotional right now, but I've...I raise very seldom do I rise to say anything, because most of the times I vote and go along with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle. But today a half an hour ago, I realized you are not the Minority Party, we are the Minority Party. And to the other Democrats over here and to Mr. Speaker, today I do realize your power."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from DuPage, one minute...Representative Barger one minute to explain your vote."
- Barger: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. About 15 or 18 years ago in order to have public housing in Wheaton we established a Human Relations Commission. A couple of years after that we found out we didn't have any problems in that area, so we changed the name of it to the Community Relations Commission. We have had black citizens in Wheaton since before the Civil War. They are treated with respect, they treat us with respect. To a large extent they vote Republican. Being a Democrat is not necessarily the best way to protect yourself, you need a two party system, you need some Democrats, you need some Republicans. So you can play them against each other. You've been robbing yourself for years by supporting the Democratic party. And it's about time you learned that there are better ways."
- Speaker Breslin: "Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Turner."
- Turner: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Assembly. I heard in earlier debate someone mentioned

119th Legislative Day

June 21, 1988

that the Members of the black community in the area that he represents support this issue. I represent a district that's about 95 percent black and I talked to a lot of people in the community and in our area two flats sell for about \$30,000.00 that's today. Five years ago those houses you could by for about \$25 to \$27,000.00 so property value has actually went up. And in talking with my constituents they said they do not want to be taxed on home equity But I think this issue goes much further and I piece. think that the General Assembly ought to keep in mind that going to be taxed on this issue, because as Representative Williams mentioned there will probably be law suits and the only people who are going to really make out on this will certainly be the courts whom we hope to find some remedy. But will be the lawyers who we will pay through the court of claims and I only regret at this time that I'm not one of the lawyers representing the State in this issue. Because I'm certain he's going to be paid. And I urge an 'aye' vote on this Amendment."

Speaker Breslin: "Only vote your own switches. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 52 voting 'aye', 55 voting 'no' and 6 voting 'present'. The Amendment fails. Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #..."

Speaker Breslin: "Excuse me, Representative Williams."

Williams: "Verification on that vote, please."

Speaker Breslin: "I've already declared the vote Representative Williams. I kind of waited for you, but you didn't ask for it. You can register your decent from the vote surely.

And that will be journalized. Are there any further Amendments Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #17 offered by Representative

119th Legislative Day

June 21, 1988

DeLeo."

- Speaker Breslin: "Representative DeLeo. Withdraw #17. Any further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #18 offered by Representative DeLeo."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative DeLeo. Representative DeLeo you're recognized to present the Amendment."
- DeLeo: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Members of the House.

  Amendment #18 deletes line 4 on page 4, and we insert the
  words 'American Institute of Real Estate Appraisers, the
  National Association of Independent Fee Appraisers, the
  National Society of Real Estate Appraisers'. I ask for
  Amendment #18 to be adopted."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of

  Amendment #18 to Senate Bill 1592 and on that question the

  Gentleman from Cook, Representative Parke."
- Parke: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I've noticed that previous Amendments were removed, what is the difference between the previous Amendments and the Amendment #18? And has it been printed and distributed to the Members of the House?"
- Speaker Breslin: "Mr. Clerk has it been printed and distributed?

  It has been printed and distributed. There is a question pending to you Representative...excuse me? Has the Amendment been printed and distributed Mr. Clerk? The Clerk tells me...it's Amendment #18, the Clerk indicates the Amendment has been printed and distributed. Any further discussion? Representative DeLeo is recognized to answer Representative Parkes question."

DeLeo: "Representative Parke are we on the same Amendment now?"

Parke: "I'm sorry?"

DeLeo: "Are we on the same Amendment now?"

Speaker Breslin: "Yes. It's Amendment #18."

Parke: "We finally got it, it's still hot."

119th Legislative Day

June 21, 1988

DeLeo: "Okay."

Parke: "So what is the difference between 17 and 18?"

DeLeo: "On Amendment #18 it...Amendment #17 was withdrawn. There is no difference. The differences between Amendment #17 and 18, there is no difference."

Speaker Breslin: "Any further discussion? The Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black."

Black: "Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. Would the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Breslin: "He will."

Black: "Representative since I'm not one of the fortunate few who has Amendment 18, are you simply adding additional appraisal categories or are you substituting appraisal categories?"

DeLeo: "Representative Black, we're adding additional national recognized appraising organizations."

Black: "Okay, so the thrust of my question is then you're not deleting any additional appraisal..."

DeLeo: "No Sir, no Sir, we're adding."

Black: "Thank you, thank you very much."

DeLeo: "Thank you."

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

McCracken: "Point of Order, Madam Speaker."

Speaker Breslin: "State your point."

McCracken: "I believe the Amendment is not in Order, because that precise paragraph sought to be amended by 18 was previously amended by 15 which had been adopted as you know. And does not identify the Section sought to be amended as having previously been amended. It's out of order."

Speaker Breslin: "While we consider this point of order, I'll make another announcement about this billfold that was left in the gallery. The name in the billfold is Rachel

119th Legislative Day

June 21, 1988

Samuels. Rachel Samuels. We have her billfold at the podium. Rachel Samuels. Thank you. Representative McCracken your point is well taken as to Amendment #18. It is improperly drawn. Representative DeLeo is recognized."

DeLeo: "It's been a long afternoon Madam Speaker."

Speaker Breslin: "Indeed."

DeLeo: "Representative McCracken was right once again this year, this will make twice this year to Representative McCracken's been right. I'd ask leave to withdraw Amendment #18. And ask leave of the Body to go back to Amendment #17."

Speaker Breslin: "Okay, the Gentleman has asked leave to withdraw #18 and go back to #17 which was previously withdrawn. Are there any objections? Hearing none we'll go back to #17 and Representative DeLeo is recognized on #17."

DeLeo: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. It's exactly the same thing.

This deletes in Senate Bill 1592 on page 4, I'm deleting line 4 and inserting the words 'American Institute of Real Estate Appraisers, the National Association of Independent Fee Appraisers, and the National Society of Real Estate Appraisers.' I ask for its adoption, Amendment #17."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #17 to Senate Bill 1592. And on that question is there any discussion? Hearing none the question is, 'Shall Amendment #17 be adopted?' All those in...Representative Williams do you seek recognition? The Gentleman has a question of the Sponsor. The Sponsor will yield."

Williams: "No, I have a question of..."

Speaker Breslin: "Oh, excuse me."

Williams: "Okay, now we just went from 18 to 17 on an Amendment that was taken out of the record."

Speaker Breslin: "Correct."

Williams: "My question is, 'Can we go from 18 back to 14 of which

119th Legislative Day

June 21, 1988

was taken out of the record?'"

Speaker Breslin: "With leave of the Body, I believe that that is possible. However, we got leave for this so you'll have to get leave for that. And while we work on #17 perhaps you could work on getting leave for that. Okay? Okay. The question before this Body...we do want to leave...Representative Black is recognized however, for a question or a comment. He doesn't want to leave."

Black: "No, absolutely not Madam Speaker. I'm really into this now. I just need to ask the Sponsor another question if I could? Amendment 17 deletes line 18 on Amendment #15 and inserts some language there of the following. I see a period and a quote mark ending on Amendment 17, I just want to make sure that it goes on and allows or the American Society of Appraisers which then runs on into line 19. I assume that's your intent, isn't it Representative?"

DeLeo: "Yes it is."

Black: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Breslin: "There being no further discussion the question is, 'Shall Amendment number...the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Parke on the question."

Parke: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I have a question of the Sponsor of this Amendment. Representative DeLeo I noticed that on my Amendment 15 which passed that you have deleted the American Society of Appraisers with your Amendment. Is there any particular reason why you've chosen to delete them from the Amendment?"

DeLeo: "Representative Parke, this is in lieu of Amendment 15 and we're adding the other two associations of appraisers.

We're not deleting any, we're adding two more. Not in lieu of your Amendment, in addition of, making this Amendment much...making this Bill much, much better."

Speaker Breslin: "Any further discussion? Hearing none the

119th Legislative Day

- June 21, 1988
- question is, 'Shall Amendment #17 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. Any further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Williams is recognized for a Motion."
- Williams: "Yes I'd like to...leave of the Body to move back and reconsider Amendment #14."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman asks leave to go back to
  Amendment #14 which was previously withdrawn. Are there
  any objections? Representative DeLeo."
- DeLeo: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Can I have an inquiry of the Clerk? Could you tell me what the status of Amendment #14 was?"
- Speaker Breslin: "Amendment #14...excuse me, Mr. Clerk."
- DeLeo: "Was that withdrawn or was there a vote on the Amendment?"

  Clerk O'Brien: "The Amendment was withdrawn."
- DeLeo: "At this moment as Sponsor of Senate Bill 1592, I would object to going back to Amendment #14."
- Speaker Breslin: "Okay, Representative Williams there are objections. The Lady from Cook, Representative Parcells for what reason do you seek recognition?"
- Parcells: "I'm sorry, Madam Speaker. I was just going to speak in favor of Mr. Williams, please."
- Speaker Breslin: "There are objections heard Representative Parcells."
- Parcells: "Thank you I though what was fair for one would be fair for both."
- Speaker Breslin: "Any further Amendments Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Williams for what reason do you seek recognition?"

119th Legislative Day

June 21, 1988

Williams: "Yes, can I move then by a vote of some sort to reconsider Amendment #14 to go back?"

Speaker Breslin: "You may."

Williams: "I so move."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman moves to go back to Amendment #14
which was previously withdrawn, 60 votes are required to do
that. All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed
vote 'no'. Voting is open. Sixty votes are required.
Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The
Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 58
voting 'aye', 47 voting 'no', 2 voting 'present' and the
Motion fails. This Bill moves to Third Reading. Ladies
and Gentlemen, Representative Jesse White is recognized for
a Motion. Representative White."

White: "Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 2052 was on the Consent Calendar and it now appears on Second Reading, Short Debate. And it's there primarily because of a typographical error. Someone forgot to draw a line under where it says 'scope of article'. And so I would like to adopt this Amendment, Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 2052 and I think there is another Amendment if this one is adopted."

Speaker Breslin: "Okay, we've gone to the Order of Senate Bill 2052. The Bill is on the Order of Second Reading, Short Debate. It appears on page 5 on your Calendar. Representative McCracken for what reason do you seek recognition?"

McCracken: "How do we find ourselves here?"

Speaker Breslin: "The Chair recognized Representative White and he asked that this Bill be taken care of now so that it can be put back on the Consent Calendar."

McCracken: "Well, we don't want an Amendment. We don't want

Amendment #3. I mean we object, we don't...I don't care if

119th Legislative Day

June 21, 1988

yours goes on, but we don't want the other one to go on by agreement. So if it's your intent to return the Bill to Short Debate or Consent move on 2 and we'll move it with 2 but not 3."

- Speaker Breslin: "Okay, that makes it very clear. On page 5 on the Calendar appears Senate Bill 2052, are there any Amendments filed on this Bill Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "House (sic Senate) Bill 2052, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Insurance Code. This Bill has been read a second time previously. Amendment #1 was adopted."

Speaker Breslin: "Any Motions filed?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Breslin: "Any Floor Amendments?"

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

Speaker Breslin: "Representative White."

- White: "Mr...Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I just explained the Amendment. All it does is puts a line under where it says 'scope of article'. It was a typographical error and this Amendment seeks to resolve that problem."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 2052. On the question the Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Klemm."
- Klemm: "Just for clarification, I think the Clerk did say House Bill 2052. And you may want to read it in record that it is a Senate Bill."
- Speaker Breslin: "Yes it's Senate Bill 2052. Any further discussion? The question is, 'Shall Amendment #2 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 O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #3 offered by Representative

119th Legislative Day

June 21, 1988

Leverenz."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Amendment #3 is the same as

House Bill 3537. The third party paid the Pharmaceutical

Bill that we...I'm sorry the Pharmacy Bill that we passed

to the Senate with a vote of 75 to 36. I would move for
the adoption of Amendment #3."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment 3 to Senate Bill 2052. On that question the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "A question of the Sponsor."

Speaker Breslin: "Proceed."

Bowman: "When you speak of third party pay, is this is that the HMO Bill? The Freedom of Choice Bill?"

Leverenz: "This is the Independent Pharmacy Bill. The HMO Bill I was just asked is it the Anti-Walgreens Bill? The fact is the Amendment is that which you speak and it provides that the independence now as you have in the State of Wisconsin or in the 6 or 7 other states where they have this legislation on the books, they develop networks. They end up bidding against Walgreens, they end up helping the HMO's keeping the costs down. And Walgreens apparently doesn't want any competition. So therefore I move for the adoption of the Amendment."

Bowman: "Okay, on the...Madam Speaker."

Speaker Breslin: "Proceed."

Bowman: "Okay, to the Amendment. My understanding is that yes indeed there was a consortium of independents in this State that bid and I believe that at least in one case they...I think it was Anchor HMO, they actually got the contract. But then the problem...a problem arose over payment, because apparently the consortium did not pay one of the or maybe more of the independents promptly and that

119th Legislative Day

June 21, 1988

independent then sued Anchor and the whole thing developed very quickly into a morass. And so that's why the HMO's are taking the position that they are. They didn't want to deal with consortium. I think there are probably ways out of this problem without going as far as the Amendment proposes to go. I certainly think we ought to permit consortiums to bid, but I'm afraid that the Amendment goes too far and so I would rise in opposition to it."

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

"Thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise in opposition to McCracken: the Amendment and again this is the Bill 3537, which had been previously been voted upon. You know the irony is that this may be perceived by the Democrats pro-business vote. It is perceived by us as maybe a anti-business vote. And the reason for that is because it would allow the smaller companies which often cannot afford to compete with the larger companies which often have to charge more for the services, because of their size and the scale of economys. It would require that the employer allow them in, or I shouldn't say the employer in...it would require that they be allowed into the program regardless of their ability to compete at price. the problem with this. And the effect is going to be that the union benefits which are more and more including this program as a part of their union benefits are going to cost more and more for the employer to offer. This...on the surface seems like a good idea, it sounds like competition. But the fact is it merely opens up of the process to people regardless of price, regardless of their ability to compete on an economic basis. I think it's a bad idea and correct me Representative Leverenz if I'm wrong, but I think the AFLCIO is against this. According to our records, the

119th Legislative Day

- June 21, 1988
- unions were against this Bill 3537, I believe that's correct. In addition, various employers are against it."

  Speaker Breslin: "Representative White is recognized."
- White: "Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, it's getting rather late and I think it's fitting improper for me to take...ask you to take this Bill out of the record."
- Speaker Breslin: "Surely, the Bill will be removed from the record. Are there any Agreed Resolutions Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Joint Resolution 140, Johnson. 141,
  Johnson. 142, Tuerk. House Resolution 1607, McPike.
  1611, Matijevich. 1613, Terzich. 1615, Farley. 1616,
  Novak. 1617, Kulas. 1618, Stern."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Matijevich."
- Matijevich: "Madam Speaker, I would move the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it and the Agreed Resolutions are adopted. General Resolutions."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Joint Resolution 206, McCracken. House Resolution 1608, Barnes. 1612, Madigan and Sutker. 1614, Currie."
- Speaker Breslin: "Committee on assignments. Death Resolutions." Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 1610 offered by Representative
- Rice, with respect to the memory of Henry Jefferson Brandon, Sr."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Matijevich on the Death Resolution."
- Matijevich: "I move the adoption."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman moves the adoption of the Death Resolution. All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'nay'.

  In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it, the Death Resolution is adopted. Representative McPike now asks

119th Legislative Day

June 21, 1988

leave that the House be able to read all of the Appropriations Bills a second time in Perfunctory Session so that we will be able to go back to them tomorrow. he have leave? Hearing no objection leave is granted. Representative McPike now moves that this House stand adjourned until 10:00 tomorrow morning, allowing Perfunctory time for the Clerk. All those in favor 'aye', opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it and this House stands adjourned until 10:00 tomorrow morning."

Clerk O'Brien: "Message from the Senate, by Ms. Hawker, Secretary. 'Mr. Speaker I'm directed to inform the House of Representative the Senate has concurred with the House of Representatives in passage of the following Bills together with Amendments. The adoption of which I'm instructed to ask concurrence of the House to wit; Bills #3636, 3653, 3666, 3668, 3671, 3705, 3712, and 3730. Passed the Senate as amended June 21, 1988.' Linda Hawker, Secretary. On Senate Bills, Second Reading: Senate Bill 1520, a Bill for an Act to amend...that Bill's been read a second time previously. Senate Bill 1657, a Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expense for the State Comptroller. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1734, a Bill for an Act making appropriations and re-appropriations for various state agencies. Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1748, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expense for the prairie state 2000 authority. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1749, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expense of certain retirement systems. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1750, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expense for

119th Legislative Day

June 21, 1988

the office of Commissioner of Savings and Loans. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1751, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expense of the Department of Alcoholism and Substance Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1752, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and of the Guardianship and contingent expense Commission. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1754, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expense for the Department of Mental Health and Developmental Disabilities. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1755, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expense the Department of Public Aid. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1756, a Bill for an Act making certain appropriations to the Governors Purchase Care Review Board. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1757, a Bill for Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expense of the Prisoner Review Board. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1758, a Bill for an making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expense of certain retirement systems. Second Reading of Senate Bill 1759, a Bill for an Act making the Bill. appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expense the Department of Veterans' Affairs. Second Reading of the Senate Bill 1776, a Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expense of the General Assembly. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1777, a Bill for an Act making appropriations of the General Assembly for staff and officers. Second Reading of the Senate Bill 1778, a Bill for an Act Bill. making appropriations to various legislative support agencies. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1779, a Bill for

#### 119th Legislative Day

June 21, 1988

an Act making appropriations of the Auditor General. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1835, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the Attorney General. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1836, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the Attorney General. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1897, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the contingent expense of the State University Civil Service System. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1902, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the Judicial Inquiry Board. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 2021, a Bill for an Act making re-appropriations for permanent improvements. Second Reading of the Senate Bill 2022, a Bill for an Act making appropriations of the Capital Development Board. Second Reading of the Senate Bill 2112, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the State Board of Education. Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 2151, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the Illinois Asbestos Abatement Authority. Second Reading of the Bill. There being no further business, the House now stands adjourned."

REPORT: TIFLDAY

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

PAGE 1 07/21/88

JUNE 21, 1988

HB-4293	SECOND READING	PAGE	91
HB-4293		PAGE	91
	THIRD READING	PAGE	63
SB-1520	RECALLED	PAGE	189
SB-1592	SECOND READING	PAGE	133
SB-1599	SECOND READING	PAGE	82
	THIRD READING	PAGE	20
SB~1626	SECOND READING	PAGE	54
SB-1647	THIRD READING	PAGE	66
	SECOND READING	PAGE	189
	SECOND READING	PAGE	85
	SECOND READING	PAGE	91
SB-1690	SECOND READING	PAGE	92
SB-1692	SECOND READING	PAGE	97
	SECOND READING	PAGE	103
	SECOND READING	PAGE	103
SB-1695	SECOND READING	PAGE	104
SB-1696	SECOND READING	PAGE	105
SB-1728	SECOND READING	PAGE	106
	SECOND READING	PAGE	107
SB-1730	SECOND READING	PAGE	110
SB-1731	SECOND READING	PAGE	110
SR-1732	SECOND READING	PAGE	110
	SECOND READING	PAGE	111
	SECOND READING	PAGE	116
SB-1734	SECOND READING	PAGE	190
SB-1735	SECOND READING	PAGE	111
	SECOND READING	PAGE	123
	SECOND READING	PAGE	123
SB-1738	SECOND READING	PAGE	124
SB-1739	SECOND READING	PAGE	124
	SECOND READING	PAGE	125
	SECOND READING	PAGE	126
SB-1744	SECOND READING	PAGE	127
SB-1746	SECOND READING	PAGE	129
SR-1747	SECOND READING	PAGE	131
	SECOND READING		
		PAGE	190
	SECOND READING	PAGE	190
SB-1750	SECOND READING	PAGE	190
SB-1751	SECOND READING	PAGE	190
	SECOND READING	PAGE	190
	SECOND READING	PAGE	190
SB-1755	SECOND READING	PAGE	190
SB-1756	SECOND READING	PAGE	190
SB-1757	SECOND READING	PAGE	190
	SECOND READING	PAGE	190
	SECOND READING	PAGE	191
	SECOND READING	PAGE	88
SB-1776	SECOND READING	PAGE	191
SB-1777	SECOND READING	PAGE	191
	SECOND READING	PAGE	191
	SECOND READING	PAGE	191
	THIRD READING	PAGE	50
SB-1814	SECOND READING	PAGE	23
SB-1834	THIRD READING	PAGE	24
	SECOND READING	PAGE	191
	SECOND READING		
		PAGE	191
58-1856			
	SECOND READING	PAGE	32
			32 9
SB-1870	SECOND READING	PAGE Page	9
SB-1870 SB-1897	SECOND READING THIRD READING SECOND READING	PAGE Page Page	9 191
SB-1870 SB-1897 SB-1902	SECOND READING THIRD READING SECOND READING SECOND READING	PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE	9 191 191
SB-1870 SB-1897 SB-1902 SB-1926	SECOND READING THIRD READING SECOND READING SECOND READING THIRD READING	PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE	9 191 191 38
SB-1870 SB-1897 SB-1902 SB-1926 SB-1989	SECOND READING THIRD READING SECOND READING SECOND READING THIRD READING THIRD READING	PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE	9 191 191 38 25
SB-1870 SB-1897 SB-1902 SB-1926 SB-1989	SECOND READING THIRD READING SECOND READING SECOND READING THIRD READING	PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE	9 191 191 38
SB-1870 SB-1897 SB-1902 SB-1926 SB-1989	SECOND READING THIRD READING SECOND READING SECOND READING THIRD READING THIRD READING	PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE	9 191 191 38 25
SB-1870 SB-1897 SB-1902 SB-1926 SB-1989	SECOND READING THIRD READING SECOND READING SECOND READING THIRD READING THIRD READING	PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE	9 191 191 38 25

REPORT: TIFLDAY 13:53° €

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

PAGE 2 07/21/88

JUNE 21, 1988

SB-1999	THIRD READING	G	PAGE	36
SB-2002	SECOND READIN	NG	PAGE	6
SB-2003	THIRD READING	G	PAGE	54
SB-2021	SECOND READIN	NG	PAGE	191
SB-2022	SECOND READI	NG	PAGE	191
SB-2023	SECOND READIN	NG	PAGE	43
SB-2041	SECOND READIA	NG	PAGE	74
SB-2052	RECALLED		PAGE	185
SB-2112	SECOND READIN	NG	PAGE	191
SB-2147	SECOND READIN	NG	PAGE	44
SB-2151	SECOND READIN	NG	PAGE	191
SB-2152	THIRD READING	G	PAGE	8
SB-2154	THIRD READING	G	PAGE	14
SB-2217	THIRD READING	G	PAGE	48
SB-2258	THIRD READING	G	PAGE	27
HR-1607	RESOLUTION OF	FFERED	PAGE	188
HR-1608	RESOLUTION OF	FFERED	PAGE	188
HR-1609	RESOLUTION OF	FFERED	PAGE	3
HR-1611	RESOLUTION OF	FFERED	PAGE	188
	RESOLUTION OF	FFERED	PAGE	188
		FFERED	PAGE	188
HR-1615	RESOLUTION OF	FFERED	PAGE	188
		FFERED	PAGE	188
HR-1617	RESOLUTION OF	FFERED	PAGE	188
		FFERED	PAGE	188
HJR-0206	RESOLUTION OF	FFERED	PAGE	188
		FFERED	PAGE	188
		FFERED	PAGE	188
SJR-0142	RESOLUTION OF	FFERED	PAGE	188

## SUBJECT MATTER

HOUSE TO ORDER - REPRESENTATIVE MCPIKE	PAGE	1
PRAYER - REVEREND JIM WALDEN	PAGE	1
PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE	PAGE	1
ROLL CALL FOR ATTENDANCE	PAGE	1
REPRESENTATIVE HULTGREN IN THE CHAIR	PAGE	2
INTRODUCTION GALESBURG BASEBALL CHAMPIONS	PAGE	2
INTRODUCTION COACH GARY BREWINGTON	PAGE	2
REPRESENTATIVE MCPIKE IN THE CHAIR	PAGE	4
REPRESENTATIVE CURRAN IN THE CHAIR	PAGE	4
INTRODUCTION LITTLE MISS SIGMA-JASMINE BLAND	PAGE	4
WAJEEDAH RAHEEM-INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS	PAGE	5
JASMINE BLAND	PAGE	5 5
MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE	PAGE	5
REPRESENTATIVE MCPIKE IN THE CHAIR	PAGE	5
REPRESENTATIVE BRAUN IN THE CHAIR	PAGE	17
REPRESENTATIVE BRESLIN IN THE CHAIR	PAGE	27
REPRESENTATIVE BRAUN IN THE CHAIR	PAGE	33
REPRESENTATIVE BRESLIN IN THE CHAIR	PAGE	48
REPRESENTATIVE MCPIKE IN THE CHAIR	PAGE	88
COMMITTEE REPORTS	PAGE	90
RECESS	PAGE	90
REPRESENTATIVE GIORGI IN THE CHAIR	PAGE	129
REPRESENTATIVE BRESLIN IN THE CHAIR	PAGE	132
AGREED RESOLUTIONS	PAGE	188
GENERAL RESOLUTIONS	PAGE	188
DEATH RESOLUTIONS	PAGE	189
ADJOURNMENT	PAGE	189
PERFUNCTORY SESSION	PAGE	189
MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE	PAGE	189
PERFUNCTORY SESSION ADJOURNMENT	PAGE	191