June 23, 1987

- Speaker Greiman: "The hour of 12:30 having arrived, the House will be in Session. Members will be at their desks. Those not entitled to the floor will withdraw. The Chaplain for today will be Father Jeff Grant, Assistant Pastor St. Aloysius Catholic Church of Springfield. Father Grant is a etest of Representative Michael Curran. The guests in the gallery may wish to rise and join us for the invocation. Father Grant."
- Father Grant: "Oh Lord, our God, as we begin this Session today, we ask Your blessing on all who have gathered in this House. May we be a people guided in the ways of justice and peace and may we show charity in our dealings with one another. Hay our lawmakers be blessed with the wisdom to guide our state in the interests and concerns of all our people. We ask this in Your Name, Oh Lord. Amen."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Will, Mr. Petka, to lead us in the pledge to the flag."
- Petka et al: "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the Republic for which it stands, one Nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."
- Speaker Greiman: "Roll Call for Attendance. Ar. Matijevich, are there any excused absences on the Democratic side?"
- Matijevich: "Yes, Ar. Speaker, excused today, due to a death in the family, is Representative Douglas Huff. Also, we want to acknowledge the birthday of my seatmate, Jesse White, who is outside with his tumblers at this moment."
- Speaker Greiman: "Thank you. Hr. McCracken, on the Republican side."
- McCracken: "May the record reflect the excused absence of Representatives Harris, Tuerk and Olson, Myron Olson?"
- Speaker Greiman: "Yes, fine, let the record- so reflect. Mr.

66th Legislative Day

June 23, 1987

Clerk, take the record. 113 Members having answered to the Call of the Quorum, a quorum is present. Messages from the Senate.

- Clerk O'Brien: "A Message from the Senate. bу 'Mr. Speaker, I am directed to Secretary. inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has concurred with the House of Representatives in the passage of the following Bills, together with Amendments, to wit; House 48, 85, 99, 164, 226, 275, 305, 318, 319, 372, 394, 441, 462, 473, 474, 479, 486, 615, 703, 709, 726, 730, 871, 976, 1040, 1133, 1135, 1187, 1188, 1249, 1288. 1291. 1312, 1349, 1351, 1370, 1373, 1, 39, 117, 143, 181, 1306. 213, 216, 265, 294, 375, 2162, 2367, 2370, 2373. 2414, 2476, 2493, 2717, 2748, 2789, 2790, 2797, 2802, 2837, 2844, 2850, 2852, 2868, 2872, 1421, 1461, 1500, 1509, 1540, 1546, 1548, 1563, 1585, 1602, 1603, 1605, 1632, 1737, 1742, 1748, 1758, 1767, 1812, 1836, 1923, 1924, 1934, 1940, 1956, 2021, 2022, 2031, 2046, 2060, 2084, 2167, 2201, 2236, 2248, 2322 and 2360. passed by the Senate as amended June 22, 1987. Linda Hawker, Secretary."
- Greiman: "On the Order. Special Call, State Administration Second Reading appears Senate Bill 47. Out of the record. On that Order appears Senate Bill 266. Out And 484, out of the record. On that Order of the record. appears Senate Bill 537. Out of the record. And 943. Dut the record. Mr. Countryman, did you wish to proceed on 1304? Mr. Clerk, call the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1304, a Bill for an Act to amend

  Sections of the Personnel Code. Second Reading of the

  Bill. No Committee Amendments."
- Speaker Greiman: "Are there any Floor Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative
  Didrickson and Breslin."

66th Legislative Day

June 23 • 1987

- Speaker Greiman: "Lady from Cook, Ms. Didrickson, on Amendment
- Didrickson: "Yes, thank you, Hr. Speaker, Members of the House.

  Amendment &1, which is offered by Representative Breslin and myself, Representative Hasara, Representative Barnes, I believe Representative Currie, takes the program that we're instituting in Senate Bill 1304, which is a scholarship program or a development program for executives who are in State Government to go on for advanced degrees and makes every attempt... that the Director will make every attempt to guarantee that at least a third of the employees appointed to the program are females. I think it's a good faith effort that we show and demonstrate in this House by voting "aye" on Amendment #1 and I ask for your support."
- Speaker Greiman: "Lady from Cook, Ms. Countryman (sic —
  Didrickson), moves for the adoption of Amendment &1 to
  Senate Bill 1304. And on that, the Lady from LaSalle, Ms.
  Bresline"
- Breslin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen, I rise in support of the Amendment. Please know that we have this... or picked this idea just out of the air. The Department of Central Management Services provided the Conference of Women Legislators several statistics in the past couple of weeks doing comparisons of females in the state workforce. You should note that only ten percent of the state workforce, while it is made up of more than fifty percent of female, only ten percent of those females over 25,000 dollars or more. As a consequence, since this particular program is aimed at promoting state employees advancing state employees into high executive office, we certainly ought to be encouraging one half workforce to better itself and get over that... that hump of becoming major executives in State Government. I

66th Legislative Day

June 23, 1987

urge its adoption."

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

- Countryman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the I reluctantly resist this Amendment. supportive of the issues which the Sponsors of this Amendment are trying to persuade us to do here. However. this instance, we're dealing with a program where there will be only 25 of these in a year. My understanding present time, there are 766 males who could qualify, 128 females who could qualify. These are in programs where people will enroll in university MBA program? programs have affirmative action programs. This also will provide for reimbursement to the state if, in fact. thev leave the state's employment within four years receiving the benefits of this ABA program. But the matter is that only 14 to 15 percent of the people are females, and I think we're placing an undue burden upon the program administrator by adding this Amendment. T realize that the Amendment language is only precatory and is not mandatory, but, by the same token, I think that since it is a program within Central Management Services, that it will be construed as mandatory from that for that reason, I think a quota is improper and, as I say. I generally support the types of issues that involved here, but I feel that the Senate Sponsor is in agreement with me that we would resist the Amendment this time. And I'd ask for a Roll Call vote."
- Speaker Greiman: "There being no further discussion, the Lady from Cook, Ms. Didrickson, to close."
- Didrickson: "Well, I just think we ought to understand what we're
  voting on here. This Amendment is not a quota. It's not
  mandatory. It's saying that we in State Government are
  going to make every good effort to promote and move women

66th Legislative Day

June 23, 1987

into the management ranks in the State of Illinois. Whether you voted for or against comparable worth, this has got to be probably the best issue that you're going to have to vote and demonstrate your support of women in the State of Illinois this Session. I will just remind you that right now we have 57,952 women employees in the State Illinois, less than the men, but not by much. But what we see is that the percentage of the total workforce of in official or manager positions are 1.1 percent. 1.1 percent. This is an optional program to move into those management executive development programs. Ιt doesn't set a quota, but it says, \*We want to see some at the state level.' I ask for your 'aye' vote. can't imagine why you wouldn't support this Amendment. I really can't."

- Speaker Greiman: "Question is, 'Shall the Amendment be adopted?'

  All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 95 voting 'aye', 13 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present', and the Amendment is adopted. Are there further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative

  Homer."
- Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Fulton, Mr. Homer, on Amendment \$2."
- Homer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I ask leave to withdraw

  Amendment 2."
- Speaker Greiman: "Amendment #2 is withdran. The Lady from Cook,

  Ms. Barnes, asks leave to have the transcript indicated

  that she would have voted 'aye' on Amendment #1. Further

  Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative

June 23, 1987

Homer."

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Fulton, Mr. Homer, on Amendment

Homer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Amendment #3 would, first of all, establish in these programs for tuition grants that... that, in the event that the applicant does not complete the requirement satisfactorily, that those tuition payments would have to be refunded by that applicant to the State of Illinois and, further, that there would be an interest charge assessed at one percent per month, or twelve percent per annum on all funds to be recovered by the State of Illinois. I would ask for your favorable consideration of Amendment 3."

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Fulton moves for the adoption of Amendment &3 to Senate Bill 1304. And on that, is there any discussion? There being... Yes, the Gentleman from DeKalb, Mr. Countryman."

Countryman: "Thank you, Ar. Speaker. Will the Gentleman yield?"

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

Countryman: "Representative Homer, who would you contemplate the one to enforce these scholarships under the language in the Amendment?"

Homer: "CMS."

Countryman: "Okay, thank you."

Speaker Greiman: "There being no further discussion, the question is, 'Shall the Amendment be adopted?" Those in favor say 'aye', those opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Are there further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Greiman: "Third Reading. Alright. We will begin at the top of this Order again and ... appears Senate Bill 47, out of the record. Senate Bill 266. Mr. Novak, did you wish to

66th Legislative Day

June 23, 1987

proceed? Alright, out of the record. 484. out of the record. 537. Mr. Steczo, did you wish to proceed? 537, out of the record. Now, on the Order of Special Development. Call. Second Reading appears Senate Mr. Dunn, no, out of the record. Mr. Steczo, 591, out of the record. Mr. Mautino, 1249. Do you wish to Mautino, on that Bill? Out of the record, proceed. Mr. Mr. Panayotovich, on 1400. Now, on Special Call... On that Order is State and Local Government Second Readings, and on that Order appears Bill 957, Mr. Matijevich, yes. Mr. Clerk, read the Senate Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 957, a Bill for an Act to amend the Regulatory Sunset Act. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Greiman: "Are there any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative
Bowman."

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Bowman, on Amendment

Bowman: "Leave to withdraw Amendment \$1."

Speaker Greiman: "Amendment #1 is withdrawn. Further

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

Matijevich."

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich, on Amendment #2."

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

Bill is a Bill for the clinical social workers, and we've

been trying to work with the other social workers so that

there is an agreed Bill in the end. We're doing our best

for that. The Amendment #2 would provide a definition of

social worker, the general definition of a social worker,

June 23, 1987

because, throughout the statutes, there are many references to social worker. Also, it makes certain that we... the matter of diciplinary actions for social workers that are presently pending when this licensing Act is enacted, that those... action can be taken in those instances. This is an agreed Amendment, and I would move the adoption of Amendment &2 to Senate Bill 957."

- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich, moves for the adoption of Amendment &2 to Senate Bill 957. On that, is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall the Amendment be adopted?' All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', those opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The Amendment's adopted. Are there further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative
  Churchill."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Churchill, on Amendment \$3."
- Churchill: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Floor Amendment &3 basically takes the provisions of a Bill that we passed out of here with over a hundred votes in regards to safety in skiing, it puts all of the skiing provisions and everything into this Bill. It's a Bill that was considered earlier, and I would ask for the approval of this Amendment on this Bill."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Lake, Hr. Churchill, moves for the adoption of Amendment 4 to Senate Bill 957. On that, the Gentleman from Lake, Hr. Matijevich."
- Matijevich: "Speaker and Representative Churchill, I don't have any problem with that, except that I'm handling the Bill for the clinical social workers, and their... and they haven't discussed this Amendment with me. And I'm not sure if you've discussed it with Dick Lockhart, but his concern is that we not put anything on the Bill that would prevent;

June 23, 1987

one, passage of it and; two, the Governor's signature. So far, everything has worked out that they're assured that it could be passed and the Governor could sign it. That's my only opposition, Representative Churchill."

Speaker Greiman: "The ... "

- Matijevich: "In other words, if you could find another vehicle,

  I'd appreciate it."
- Churchill: "Unfortunately, I'm advised that there is not another vehicle available for this particular piece of legislation.

  It's something that got hung up in the Senate. It passed through here with overwhelming votes. I know that, although I have had some problems with..."
- Matijevich: "Speaker, I hate to do this to a good friend and colleague, but I don't think it's been printed and distributed, and I hate to do this in a technical way.

  Bob, I just..."
- Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Clerk, has the Amendment been distributed?

  Mr. Matijevich, it apparently is being passed out even as

  we speak. Even as we speak, it's being passed out. So,

  apparently, it is on some of the desks here. Yes, Mr.

  Matijevich."
- Matijevich: "Then I would renew and ask the Members, and I know many of them have received letters, as I have, from the clinical social workers, so that we not disturb a Bill that's in good form right now, I would urge the Members to oppose this Amendment."
- Speaker Greiman: "There being no further discussion, the Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Churchill, to close."
- Churchill: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And I understand the reticence of Representative Matijevich to have an Amendment placed on his Bill that he's trying to keep in a pure form, and I'm sorry that this got put on at the last minute.

  Unfortunately, the was the only vehicle that could be found

June 23. 1987

for this Amendment. This is a Bill that was passed out of here with over a hundred votes. It's not something that's going to harm his Bill. In fact, I've had problems with Representative Matijevich's Bill, and I think that if we can get my Amendment on it, then I can successfully go ahead and help vote for his Bill. So, maybe this will bring some votes that he might not have otherwise had. And I would just ask for the adoption of the Amendment."

- Speaker Greiman: "Question is, 'Shall the Amendment be adopted?"

  All in favor signify by saying 'aye', those opposed 'no'.

  All in favor signify by saying... by voting 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is now open. Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Matijevich."
- Matijevich: "Speaker, I've just received a copy of it and even

  God couldn't be against this. So, I'm for it, too."
- Speaker Greiman: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 94 'aye', 13 'no', 3 voting 'present', and the Amendment is adopted, God notwithstanding. Are there further Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment \$4. offered by Representative
  Bowman."
- Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Bowman, on Amendment  $y_4$ ."
- Bowman: "Mr. Speaker, can I ask the Clerk whether this Amendment has been printed and distributed yet?"
- Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Clerk. Ar. Bowman, the Amendment has not been printed and distributed."
- Bowman: "Mr. Speaker, while I would like to pursue this, I will place myself and this Amendment at the disposal of the Bill's Sponsor. What is his pleasure?"
- Speaker Greiman: "He's not seeking recognition. Mr. Matijevich."

  Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, this Amendment would put me in a very

66th Legislative Day

June 23, 1987

different position than the last Amendment, because it would definitely harm the signing of the Bill. And, therefore, I would move to table Amendment #4 because it has not been distributed."

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Lake moves to table Amendment #4

to Senate Bill 957. And on that, is there any discussion?

There being none, the question is, 'Shall the Amendment be tabled?' Those in favor 'aye', those opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The Amendment's tabled. Are there further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Greiman: "Third Reading. On this Order appears Senate
Bill 1005, Mr. Giorgi, 1005. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1005, a Bill for an Act to amend the

Court Reporters' Act. Second Reading of the Bill. No

Committee Amendments."

Speaker Greiman: "Are there any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Greiman: "Third Reading. On this Order appears Senate
Bill 1009. Ms. Braun, do you wish to proceed? So, we'll
take that Bill out of the record then. Me will come back
to it, Ms. Braun. Returning, Ladies and Gentlemen, to
Senate ... to State Administration Second Reading, and on
that Order appears Senate Bill 47, Mr. McPike. Out of the
record. 266, out of the record. 484, Mr. McPike. 484. I
think it's... Out of the record, Mr. McPike? No. Mr.
Clerk, read the Bill. 484. Read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 484, a Bill for an Act to amend the
Unemployment Insurance Act. Second Reading of the Bill.

No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Grelman: "Are there any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative

McPike and Farley."

66th Legislative Day

June 23, 1987

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Cook, ... from Madison, Mr.

McPike, on Amendment #1."

McPike: "Amendment #1 is a technical Amendment to keep this as a shell Bill to get it into Conference. Move for its

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Madison, Mr. McPike, moves for the adoption of Amendment #1. On that, is there any discussion? Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. McCracken."

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

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

McCracken: "Again, Representative McPike, this is for the purpose of seeking an agreed..."

McPike: "That's correct."

McCracken: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Greiman: "Further discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall the Amendment be adopted?' Those in favor 'aye', opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The Amendment's adopted. Are there further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Greiman: "Third Reading. On this Order appears Senate
Bill 537, out of the record. Out of the record, Mr.
Steczo? On this Order appears Senate Bill 943. Mr.
McPike, again, 943. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 943, a Bill for an Act to amend the Private Detective and Private Security Act. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment &1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Greiman: "Are there any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions. Floor Amendment #2, offered by

Representative Kirkland."

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Kane, Mr. Kirkland, on Amendment #2. Yes, Mr. Kirkland. Mr. McPike."

McPike: "This is a shell Bill only as it came out of Committee,

June 23, 1987

and if the Gentleman's not here, I would move to table his Amendment so that I can get this Bill into a Conference Committee also so that we can see if we can get an agreed Bill on this."

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Madison, Mr. McPike, moves to table Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 943. And on that, is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall the Bill be tabled...' 'Shall the Amendment be tabled?' All in favor 'aye', opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And Amendment #2 is tabled. Are there further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Greiman: "Third Reading. On this Order appears Senate
Bill 1000. Mr. Leverenz in the chamber? Out of the
record. On this Order appears... Ms. Braun took 1009 from
the record. Apparently they're ready for that. Mr. Clerk,
would you... with leave of the House, we'll move to 1009.
Mr. Clerk, would you read the Bill?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1009, a Bill for an Act authorizing the delegation of health tasks to physician assistants under the supervision of a licensed physician. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment &1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Greiman: "Are there Hotions with respect to Amendment #1?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Greiman: "Are there any Floor Amendments?"

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

Speaker Greiman: "Lady from Cook, Ms. Braun, on Amendment #2."

Braun: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Withdraw Amendment 2."

Speaker Greiman: "Amendment 2 withdrawn. Are there further

Amendments?"

66th Legislative Day

- June 23, 1987
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative
  Braun."
- Speaker Greiman: "Lady from Cook, Ms. Braun, on Amendment 3."
- Braun: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment 3 is, in one part, a technical cleanup of the Physician Assistants' Practice Act. In another part, it is an Amendment which clarifies the accountant's privilege. This Amendment has been requested by the CPA Society, and I urge its adoption."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Lady moves for the adoption of Amendment #3

  to Senate Bill 1009. Is there any discussion? There being
  none, the question is, "Shall the Amendment be adopted?"

  Those in favor say "aye", opposed "no". In the opinion of
  the Chair, the "ayes" have it. The Amendment's adopted.

  Are there further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #4, offered by Representative
  Churchill."
- Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman wishes to withdraw Amendment \$4. Are there further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Greiman: "Third Reading. And now, Ladies and Gentlemen, let us turn to the Order of State Government... State Administration on the Order of Third Reading, and on that appears Senate Bill 63. Ms. Barnes, do you wish to proceed? 63. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 63, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Lady from Cook, Ms. Barnes."
- Barnes: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate
  Bill 63 deals with amending the School Code, makes it
  illegal to distribute contraceptive drugs, products or
  devices on school grounds to anyone under the age 18. I
  would ask for an "aye" vote."

June 23, 1987

Speaker Greiman: "The Lady from Cook moves for the passage of Senate Bill 63. And on that, is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Williams."

Williams: "Again. I know that we've discussed this issue and I've discussed it. I assume that the House is going to concur as it did before, but, again, I'd like to beg this Assembly to reconsider their actions that they re about to take in to this issue. It's an extremely serious one and than into the individual morals more individuals. This goes to the real concept of whether or local governments. local school districts. given an opportunity to control the individuals will be lives and the education and direction that the children area is going to be able to take considering the realities of the factors that take place in their areas. I stated previously when the House Bill similar to this went through, that the area that I come from, the district I represent, the young men, the young women - they don\*t have the sort of guidance and sort of lifestyles that people would love to have, that people in the ideal... would have, but they do want to have hope. voung men. mavbe even myself. know many would not be standing here today if, in fact, there were a number situations that did not take place because we know that our lives can be just as well wrapped up into this. A child is serious thing to have, especially when you're talking about a 15 or a 13 or, in some cases, even a 12 and a 10 year old being forced into parenthood at an early age. Now, you can say, 'Stop', but stopping isn't so easy. How many of you at 16 years old was not curious about sex? How many of you at 16 years old did not date, did not have some of what it was about? And if you didn't have it, did not be concerned about and weren't worried about it? You

66th Legislative Day

June 23 1987

all had your chances looking in the <u>National Geographic</u> or what have you. But the point is children are concerned and interested and you cannot, as an Assembly, make this choice. Leave this to the local school districts. Leave this to us and let us handle our area, and one day you will avoid a problem that eventually will be in your area. I urge a 'no' vote on this legislation."

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

Didrickson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Members of the House. would say that Senate Bill 63 and its House component has certainly had every good hearing and every good response, and you've probably heard every good thing ar had thing about this Bill or the other Bill that you ever want to hear about. But I call this meddling, and I don't know why we down here in Springfield have to be meddling over which is strictly one of local control. Why, when weere working so hard and have been working so hard with regards to welfare dependency and breaking that cycle, would we re... to reduce the incidence of teen pregnancy. which is really one of the major contributors to long term welfare dependency, would we turn around and try and foist our mores back home on the local districts who are trying to solve this problem at the local I've said it before - I've got a double standard. I wouldn't want you putting one of these teen clinics in my district; but, school for those parents who choose and those school districts who want, I think it's appropriate and they should be left to do that. Senate Bill 63 is a proposal which is well intentioned, but it's restrictive of local school district control and individual freedom. would ask you to really consider your votes."

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Cook, Ar. Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

66th Legislative Day June 23, 1987

Speaker Greiman: "Indicates she will."

Cullerton: "Representative Barnes, as I understand the Bill, it has an Amendment #1 on the Bill. It was you... You were the Sponsor of Amendment #1."

Barnes: "Yes."

Cullerton: "And what does that Amendment do?"

Barnes: "Amendment #1 says that there will be no contraceptives dispensed no matter who is consenting to it."

Cullerton: "And how does that differ from the Bill that passed the Senate? How does that affect the Bill, in other words, that passed the Senate?"

Barnes: "It has that provision on there."

Cullerton: "So, in other words, Senator Kelly, Senator Richard Kelly passed a Bill out of the Senate that prohibited the selling of contraceptives, unless parental consent was obtained. Is that correct? And you amended the Bill, you, Representative Barnes, amended the Bill to say even if parental consent was obtained, it still can't... it still can't be prescribed. Is that correct?"

Barnes: "Representative, it was also at the wishes of Senator

Kelly that we would have that stipulation on his Bill."

Cullerton: "Oh, you've... you've checked that out with Senator Kelly?"

Barnes: "Oh, yes, Sir."

Cullerton: "Now, did Senator Kelly tell you why that was not included in the Senate Bill as it passed the Senate initially?"

Barnes: "I really didn't ask him that question."

Cullerton: "Was it a Senate Amendment that had been offered that had been defeated in the Senate?"

Barnes: "Representative, I°m very busy on this side of the rotunda. I am not privy to all that happens over in the Senate. I only know that Senator Kelly requested that I

66th Legislative Day

June 23, 1987

keep the Bill in this form for him, and I'm doing it as the Senate Sponsor has requested.

Cullerton: "Well, you said that he asked you to keep the Bill in
this form. You're changing... You've changed the Bill from
the way it was passed out of the Senate. correct?"

Barnes: "Representative, you're twisting my words. I would like
to make a statement that the Senator would like this Bill
to be in the form that contraceptives are not to be passed
out in the schools no matter whom is requesting the passing
of contraceptives to the students under 18."

let me Cullerton: "Well, let me... tell you that the Digest shows, page 38 of the Digest, Senate Bill 63 was offered by Senator Kelly and that Senate Amendment 21 was adopted, moved by Senator Berman and adopted on a vote of 29 to 28 that provides that the prohibition shall not apply if written parental consent has been obtained. Now your Senate Amendment... House Amendment Ø1 removes that. So. what I am suggesting to you is that the Senate has already rejected Senate Amendment \$1... I'm sorry, House Amendment #1 by the passage of Senate Amendment #1, and it's the will Senate that if there's parental consent, that this the should not be prohibited. So, my question to you is, the need to pass House Amendment #1? What is the problem if there's parental consent?"

Barnes: "Representative, I think it's a moral problem, as far as

I'm concerned. I was asked to handle this Bill. It is a

very difficult Bill, and I am following the wishes of

Senator Kelly, myself and a lot of people that believe as I

do that it is morally wrong to be passing contraceptives

out in the high schools."

Cullerton: "Even if the parents say that it's okay."

Barnes: "That is correct."

Cullerton: "Well, I think you're endangering a Bill that you

June 23 1987

that prohibits the prescription of would like to pass contraceptives when there is no parental consent. You're clearly endangering it by trying to pass this Bill with Amendment #1 on it. And for that reason, I think should be rejected, you should bring the Bill back to Second Reading and you should remove Amendment 81. hecause going to end up doing is having this Bill in a vou\*re Conference Committee where the Senate will not go that proposal. It is not, in my opinion, a very wise decision to either procedurally or substantively - if that allows such prescribing or selling of parent contraceptives, I think the parent should certainly right to allow for that, just as I believe the local school districts should be the one that would eventually make up the decision. And I'm sure that the Governor would like to see this Bill on his desk with Amendment #1. not your Amendment @1, on the Bill. So, for that reason. a 'present' or a 'no' vote at this time until would urge the Sponsor takes Amendment #1 off the Bill."

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

Gentleman from McLean, Mr. Ropp."

Ropp: you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. an issue that some have said is a moral issue, and that's why we ought to not be dealing with this in schools. my judgement that to go to school, one goes to learn and to learn a broad variety of academic programs, as well as programs dealing with life. I guess there are those who say that this is kind of a moral issue. Ţ guess raise the question - is it a moral issue to not be concerned with those unwanted pregnancies or those vouna people who come into this world and ultimately, because of lack of good nutrition, end up not reaching their full physical growth or, because of lack of funds, do not fully

66th Legislative Day

June 23. 1987

have the opportunity to go to school and make the very best of themselves? I think that this is an issue that should left in regards to local control on this particular issue. And it's an issue that I think, should we it in this manner, we're not attempting to deal with one of the dreadedest diseases that we have known as AIDS which is deadly. Now, I can assure you that if this Bill passes or not, it's going to have a major impact on the spread disease and I certainly think that people ought to be given that opportunity through schooling to acquaint themselves with some kind of preventative measures which would prevent the spread of this deadly disease. And urge you to strongly consider not supporting it."

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

Braun: "Thank vou. Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. And to the Bill, I am... I am surprised that some of the Legislators who are supporting this Bill, who have been with us over the years discussing issues having to do with teen pregnancy, having to do with babies having babies, having to do with the conditions in where voung people are a11 too often not availed of an opportunity to take care of themselves. tο protect themselves from unwanted pregnancies. I am surprised that those people would be in support of legislation like which is not only an issue of local control - certainly it has been discussed that this is what the parents This is what the communities where those children live want. This is not only an issue of local control, this is also an issue... a health issue. And the question is whether or not we in the General Assembly are going to allow for the development of locally based health clinics that provide young people not only with birth control information, but with the plethora of

June 23. 1987

services which will allow them to be healthy citizens capable of contributing to society. If we send this 8111 out of here. we will not only be sending a message regarding contraceptives and whether or not it is... it is proper for people in high school to engage in sexual activity, we'll not only be sending that message, but we'll be sending a message that the General Assembly does not care whether or not you are exposed to disease; the General Assembly does not care whether or not there is health services available to you; the General Assembly protect you and help you at the time of your life when decision making may not always be as clear as we like think that it is later on in life. I'm afraid, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, that this have a chilling effect, a chilling effect on the availability of health care services across the board. that it will have a chilling effect and will stop young people from seeking assistance, will stop young people seeking help, will, in fact, say to them, 'Go back into the streets, go back into the back alleys, go back to the corner for your advice and information because it's not available to you here in school. It's not available to you here where it ought to be. This Bill has a damaging effect that goes far beyond the actual languages and the parameters of the legislation. Ladies and Gentlemen. This Bill calls on all of us to act responsib... it calls on all us to consider in our heart of hearts whether or not we to grips with realities with the twentieth whether or not we can come to grips with the fact that these young people may not have another alternative. This may be the end of the line. And this General Assembly is being called upon to act responsibly, to act responsibly and defeat this legislation because what we're saying to

June 23, 1987

these young people and what we're saying to their parents what we're saying to their community is. 'No. we want to keep our head in the sand. No, we are going to stand on a righteous pedestal and we're going to pretend that reality isn't and we're going to pretend that babies don't have babies, and we're going to pretend that this is not an issue for education in the high schools. and Gentlemen. this is an issue for the high schools. This is an issue for the schools generally. And if we are to be responsible, we have an obligation to those young people. to their families and to the communities in which they live to be responsive to them. Thev action at DeSalle High School, at Orr High School, they have said, 'We want to have health clinics based the I say to you we should say to them, 'Right on. It's good idea. Let's go forward, educate yourselves, train yourselves and protect yourselves from the crippling effects, from the crippling effects of underage and teenage pregnancy. I urge your opposition to this Bi 11. hope it goes down in defeat. Thank you."

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

O'Connell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was reluctant to stand up on this issue, because it is an emotional one and it is one that most of us have already made up our minds about. But I'd like to address the question as to whether this issue addresses morality or not. And I don't think it is a question of morality. I think that each individual, no matter the age, should have the opportunity, absent this General Assembly, to determine his or her dealing of the issue of teenage sex. But I think we're looking at much more of a constitutional and a legal issue that we have an obligation as a General Assembly to address and that is, what is the role of the school system when it comes to the

June 23. 1987

issue of morality? If we have the obligation, and I think do. to include in the curriculum the subject of health. which invariably includes the question of sex education, think that there is a proper role for the education system to teach both sides of the issue. And the auestion contraceptions in part of the education is probably a reasonable expectation. In fact, there was a Bill in this Assembly several years ago which precluded the discussion, the discussion of contraceptions as one Member of this General Assembly who has always been a pro-life supporter, voted against because penalties involved from even discussing contraception. But we're not talking about that in this Bill. He°re talking about schools giving out contraceptives. the equivalent of class discussion of whether we smoke or not and then we would say, 'If you do accept the premise that you should smoke, we have some cigarettes here to give you for you to experiment with. don\*t think there is much difference in a class dealing with sex education where both sides of the coin, whether abstinence whether they engage in teenage sex then they should use If we were to then say, 'If you d٥ premise that you wish to engage in sex, and you should a contraceptive, and if you do, use here the are I don't think that that is the role that contraceptives.\* a school system should be playing. Ιf we're aoina Don't also take an affirmative role in educate. educate. helping that child make up his mind whether or she is going to engage in the sex. I think this Bill draws over which that the school systems doesn't have a a line actively engaging in role of an affirmative role encouraging the teenage sex. I don't think that by so doing we will do anything to diminish the problem

June 23. 1987

pregnancy and certainly won't do anvthing to diminish the problem of communicable diseases. So. I would support Senate Bill 63, and I would especially support Amendment #1 that Representative Barnes rejected; because, if we give the consent, allow a parent to consent the distribution contraceptives. we've the blown philosophical argument where we do draw a line between what the General Assembly can do in the way of encouraging... or rather, what the school systems can do and what they With or without a parental consent, the school system has no business distributing contraceptives."

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Kane, Mr. Kirkland,"

Kirkland: "It's hard to know what to add in a debate like this. So much has been said, but I could certainly respond and would respond to the previous speaker in trying to draw the smoking analogy. The tragedy that occurs with smoking it certainly may be long range, but the tragedy that occurs with smoking or even with sexual activity teenagers when no pregnancy occurs, it is no comparison to the tragedy that occurs when, in fact, a pregnancy occur, when, in fact, a child then faces perhaps a lifetime and loneliness, perhaps when a child faces the povertv question of abortion, which, of course, that child would not face had the pregnancy not occurred. I'd like to think that the availability of contraceptives with parental consent... or one could think that maybe that would cut down the sexual activity, but not really. I don't think anybody believes that once the child is at that stage, that the availability of contraceptives is going difference as to whether that child engages in sexual activity. And, just repeat sort of one other thing, that I think there really is a moral question also tied in with the practical question of ... of just how terrible the

June 23, 1987

tragedy is when we allow in this General Assembly. bv preempting a local solution to a terrible problem - 50 percent pregnancy rate and so forth - just a moral question of how... of whether we should do that and whether should encourage that kind of tragedy to OCCUP. And they\*re real tragedies. They're practical tragedies. tragedies that are long... Thev\*re lifelong lasting, a repeat every 15 years, if an unwanted child repeats kind of act as a parent who was unwanted when she was born. It's a terrible situation. He should allow the local governments to address their local issue, and I think we should vote against the Bill."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from St. Clair, Mr. Flinn."

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

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from St. Clair moves the previous question be put. All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it.

Ms. Barnes, to close."

Barnes: "Thank you, Ar. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen I find this Bill to be very interesting. Two years Seattle we had the National Council of State Legislatures meeting. Only two Representatives from this Body who were in attendance, and there were many of us, chose to attend a big seminar on health clinics for teens. I came away so impressed with the idea of health clinics in high schools. because I felt that the students are captive, that I came back and contacted the Governor's staff to see if we couldn't start to have health clinics in Illinois. That's how impressed I was. It just so happens that last Friday I was at another meeting with ten Legislators from across the United States and the Legislator that had conducted the seminar on health clinics was there. And I said, "You know", I said. "He"ve been

June 23, 1987

quite successful. We have approximately three health clinics now in our schools and I'm hoping that we're going have more. And the Legislator from Delaware said, 'I can't even get a health clinic. He said, \*They are so afraid that they're going to start passing contraceptives out in the health clinics. She says, 'Isn't that the silliest idea you've ever heard of?' I said. 'I'm going to tell you something. I said, \*Little did I know when I came back and supported health clinics, which I very strongly supporting, did I realize that they would be passing out contraceptives in these schools. One of Legislators on the other side said that we are sending the wrong message to the teenagers. I don't think so years ago in this Body I was the Sponsor of teen pregnancy task force legislation. Another Legislator the other side was also appointed to that committee, never showed up at all. My concerns are for the teenagers. I certainly do not live with my head in the sand. that sex is everywhere. My grandchildren listen to it on television, just as well as yours and my two oldest grandchildren are teenagers. They're 15 and thev\*re I'd like to think that they are going to school to learn and to make something out of themselves and have some self esteem. I want my grandchildren to be like your children in your schools. I don't think it should be your neighborhood and my neighborhood. I think they should And we should be concerned about our our neighborhoods. We shouldn't be misleading a little girl, telling her, 'Here's some contraceptives, honey, and vou\*re not going to get pregnant. As I •ve in Committee, when I was a girl growing up, and it's certainly been many, many years ago, I was taught the only safe way was to keep your legs crossed. I do not think we should be

June 23, 1987

misleading these little girls who aren't ready t o handle i f they should get emotionally. pregnant. and mavbe somebody would suggest that they would have an abortion. Emotionally, a teenager is not ready to handle emotion. I think it's like handing them a gun and letting them play Russian roulette. We should want the best for We should want the best education for our children. Sameane says. 'Well, what are you doing, sitting around reading National Geographic? Thank God would start to sit around and read a few books. You know. Our children in schools we're very remiss. todav cannot and write and cannot do better for themselves. Let's not handle them another deterrent to good thinking and good educational processes. Let these young men and these young women know that we care enough about them that we're not going to hand them contraceptives and tell them. \*You don't have to think about schools, kids, just get your emotions to a point because we're handing you contraceptives everything is going to be safe. And I don't think that we should mire down these young girls with the care of a baby. these men know and these young lads there must be commitment to a woman before he has her engage in sex. him realize that he is going to support these children that he is out siring. Let's not make light of family life. Let's pass Senate Bill 63. I ask for your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Greiman: "Question is, "Shall this Bill pass?" All those
in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'.

Voting is open. This is final action. Ms. Jones, one
minute to explain your vote."

Jones: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Not to beat this issue to death, but I would like to say just two things. The school based clinic... my district and also Representative William's district, I went to every meeting

June 23, 1987

the school board had, and I also went to every meeting that parents had. Had one of you over there had an issue and 400 people, constituents, came out for that issue, don't think you would be here today voting against your constituents. That's the position that we are in now. Me did not support the clinic when it came out. The women and fathers, the mothers and fathers in that district came out and asked for that clinic. I don't think this Assembly, no one in here has the right to take that privilege away from a mother or a father that's trying protect her 13 or 14 year old daughter. And just for your information, the ones that are really concerned welfare reform - everytime a child is born without a father, that child goes on public aid. It costs that child for the delivery of that child 1.700 dollars. For the last four months of the pregnancy. it costs 250 dollars. After birth of the child, public aid pays out 250 dollars a Food stamps are 149 dollars. month. **Medicald** is 2,358 a year. The first year, for that infant care, is dollars 478 dollars. If you are truly not hypocrites and you truly for Welfare reform, then you will help, help to rid the rolls of public aid. And those are constituents mv that voted for that school-based clinic..."

Speaker Greiman: "Bring your remarks to a close, please."

Jones: "And I'd urge an 'aye' vote... a 'no' vote."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from St. Clair, Mr. Stephens, one minute to explain your vote."

Stephens: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. This opponents seem to think that this says that children can't practice birth control. It... They seem to imply that the parents can't intervene in their children's sex lives. What this Bill says is that we don't want i t done schools. Schools are for learning. We have enough

June 23, 1987

problems teaching children to read and write here in Illinois. Ыρ aught to take our efforts in schools and funnel them towards those few things, reading and writing. And all this Bill does is says that you can't... It's really a bad Bill. You can't have abortions in schools. You can't dispense contraceptions... aids... contraceptive It doesn't say that parents can't get aide in school If parents... if you want to give your involved. children give it to them. That's not your... that's those things, your privilege. Go ahead and do it if that's the way tο raise vour family. But don\*t do it in the classroom next to where my child is being taught. I f T want to send my kid to a school where they are dispensing those prophylactics and things, I ought to have that right. And that's what this Bill is about."

- Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Young, one minute to explain your vote."
- Young: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rose to request a
- Speaker Greiman: "Alright, Sir. The Lady from Cook, Ms. Flowers, one minute to explain your vote."
- Flowers: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. last speaker so said that he would like to have the to send his kid to a school where they do not dispense birth control pills, well, I too have a right. Δnd i f choose to send my kid to a school to dispense birth control pills, I should have the privilege to do so. Also, another spoke about the emotional trauma of a child having an abortion. What about the emotional trauma of having a baby? Do you think that a teenager that's 16 years old can deal with raising a kid when there's a lot of us, supposedly adults, today are having problems raising our kids? And we expect for the teenagers obviously to be

June 23. 1987

more prepared to raise kids than we are. I urge a 'no'
vote on Senate Bill 63."

- Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. LeFlore, one minute to explain your vote."
- Leflore: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This issue I have heard over and over and over this Session. I feel that we should let our communities decide on whether we will have birth control clinics in our schools. I think this decision should be left up to the Board of Education on the local level. I feel that the General Assembly is taking one step too many. I feel the communities should be the one who make the decision on whether we should have contraceptives in our schools. And I urge a "no" vote."
- Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Rice, one minute to explain your vote."
- Rice: heard from my colleagues on both sides of the aisle. In the last week since ыe heard in our appropriation meeting students who came before us and talked who said that we should have these kinds of programs throughout the State of Illinois, and it should decision of those local communities. We listened to the church alliance who said, as modern day ministers. the people make a decision at the local level regarding these moral, if you will, problems. We are being ignorant and stupid when we say that a 14 or 15 year old is not curious or a 14 or 15 year old on the other side or any side that didnot look at the Geographic magazine and become inquisitive of what takes place. All that that we are saying today is very simple - let us make the decisions in those high-intensive areas in the City Chicago and throughout this state about what we should do in our school in relation to this problem. Finally, talk about welfare reform and everytime that a 14 or 15

June 23, 1987

year old girl has one baby and when she reaches 18 or 19 years old, you're saying if she does not have a high school education she can't receive public aid, then we're crazy. It's about time for us to take this back home and let the people in the district make a decision as to where the contraceptives will come from and not your little boys that's carrying them little rubberbands in your pocketbook. Thank you."

Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Champaign, Mr. Johnson, one minute to explain your vote."

Johnson: "A while ago when I was considering my vote on this issue, I really had pretty much determined that I was going vote for it, but then I kind of examined my philosophy that I've expressed from time to time and I really convinced that if I voted for it I really wouldnot be being very true to some of the things that I said I believed in. I said I believed in parental involvement in decisions and yet this Bill works quite to the contrary. I'm concerned, as a lot of us are, about the spiraling costs of public aid and what that does to the state psyche, as well tax coffers, and this Bill if it passes can only mean substantial increases in the economic cost likelihood of a necessitated tax increase. and the And I generally consider myself, even though I don't like these terms, as a pro-life Legislator, and, vet. supporting this Bill, the inevitable result is to force young people into decisions where they have no choice but to seek abortions and to seek other means pregnancy, as much as I am opposed both philosophically and legally to those steps. So, I really determined that I couldn't, in good conscience, vote for a Bill that work as a practical and as a philosophical matter precisely to the opposite of what I said I believed in.

June 23, 1987

changed my mind and I'm voting 'no'."

Speaker Greiman: "The Lady from Cook, Ms. Davis, one minute to explain your vote."

Davis: "Yes. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think the tragedy here is that the General Assembly has reached an attitude in which it feels it sees all, knows all and is to be the god for the State of Illinois. T think if the local conditions are such that the parents in that community want something. think conditions are such that if the school board in that district wants something then who are we to make a decision for them? Who is Representative Barnes? Does she live in the DeSalle area? Does she live in the Austin area? she plan to move there? Then who is she to make a decision about the lives of these people? I think VOU\*VE overstepped your bounds. You know, I really think you\*ve overstepped your bounds when you're going to make decision about children who are not yours. You're going to take that responsibility from the parents and the And, yet, when these children have children, you vote against Bills that help support them. I urge vote."

Speaker Greiman: "Lady from St. Clair, Ms. Younge, one minute to explain your vote."

Younge: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. The thing that me about this Bill is the fact that it flies right in the face of our democratic principles. Our the proposition that the will of the majority shall prevail. But that will shall not î n interfere or be negative or injurous to the rights of the minority. I think this is a clear situation in that prevails at two levels; one, on this House floor and, two, in the neighborhoods where a lot young

66th Legislative Day

June 23, 1987

women need to be instructed about how not to become pregnant. I think that the socio-economic prejudices that we have in this country are prevalent in this debate and are injurious to the rights and responsibilities. And, therefore, I think this Bill greatly damages our democracy, and I vote 'no' for those reasons."

Speaker Greiman: "For what purpose do you seek recognition. Mr. Williams?"

Williams: "To explain my vote."

Speaker Greiman: "You spoke in debate."

Williams: "Is that..."

Speaker Greiman: "You spoke in debate, Sir. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 67 voting 'aye', voting \*present\*, and the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Young, has asked for a Verification of the Affirmative Roll Call. Mr. Clerk. Yes, Ar. Matijevich, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Matijevich: "Before we go into that, I've been asked bν White. the leader of the great Jesse White tumbling team. in celebration of his birthday, there's a great cake over here on his desk and you're all welcome to have a Well. Jesse wants to introduce his team: and. while Jesse is walking up to introduce them, he's my seatmate and anybody... we've all heard the saying that one person one man can make a difference. One person like Jesse White can make a difference. He is going to be the subject of an I said, in <u>lime</u> magazine... or <u>Newsweek</u>, rather, this weekend, the next edition as one of the heroes, I guess, in the country. He's been on Good Morning America. He's been on <u>Cable News</u>. He's been subject of a documentary. I want to introduce a man who we know who has done so much for the youth, who's going to

June 23, 1987

make an introduction himself, my seatmate, Jesse White."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Matijevich, we are sort of in the middle of a Roll Call here. If Mr. White could just wait a few moments, we'll certainly be with him. Thank you. Ms. Hasara, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Hasara: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. May I please have leave to be verified?"

Speaker Greiman: "Yes, Mr. Young. Mr. Young indicates... yes."

Hasara: "Thank you."

Speaker Greiman: "Excuse me. Ladies and Gentlemen, I'm not sure who's in the center aisle, but I'd like all those who do not have passage to this floor to withdraw. We are taking a verification. Please withdraw from the aisles. Clear the aisles right now. Mr. Christensen, what purpose are you seeking recognition?"

Christensen: "Verify."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Christensen asks leave to be verified.

Yes, you have leave, Sir. And Mr. Piel."

Piel: "Leave to be verified."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Piel and Mr. Mays wish to be verified. Mr. Young, is that alright? Alright, Mr. Clerk, proceed with the Verification of the Affirmative Roll."

Clerk "Poll of the affirmative. Ackerman. Leone: Barger. Brunsvold. Barnes. Black. Buqielski. Capparelli. Christensen. Churchill. Cowlishaw. Daley. Daniels. DeJaegher. DeLeo. Deuchler. Doederlein. Farley. Flinn. Giglio. Giorgi. Goforth. Granberg. Hallock. Hannig. Hartke. Hasara. Hensel. Homer. Keane. Krska. Kubik. Laurino. Leverenza Matijevich. Mautino. Mavs. McAuliffe. McCracken. McGann. McNamara. Mulcahey. Novak. O'Connell. Robert Olson-Panayotovich. Parke. Bernard Pedersen. William Peterson. Petka. Phelps. Piel. Pullen. Rea. Regan. Ryder. Saltsman. Stange.

66th Legislative Day

June 23, 1987

Stephens. Tate. Terzich. Van Duyne. Weaver. Wennlund. Williamson. Wojcik. Wolf. And Mr. Speaker.

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Young, questions of the Affirmative Roll."

Young: "Representative Laurino."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Laurino. Mr. Laurino in the chamber? How is Mr. Laurino recorded?"

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

Speaker Greiman: "Remove Mr. Laurino."

Younge: "Representative DeJaegher."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. DeJaegher. Mr. DeJaegher is at the rear wall."

Young: "Representative Van Duyne."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Van Duyne. Mr. Van Duyne. Mr. Van Duyne in the chamber? How is Mr. Van Duyne recorded?"

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

Speaker Greiman: "Remove Mr. Van Duyne."

Young: "Representative Stange."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Stange is in his chair."

Young: "Representative Krska."

Speaker Greiman: "I'm sorry, Ar. who?"

Young: "Krska."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Krska. Mr. Krska. How is Mr. Krska recorded?"

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

Speaker Greiman: "Remove Mr. Krska."

Young: "Representative Barger."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Barger is in his chair."

Young: "Representative Granberg."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Granberg. Mr. Granberg in the chamber?

He's at the rear of the chamber."

Young: "Representative Panayotovich."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Panayotovich. Mr. Panayotovich. Is Mr. Panayotovich in the chamber? How is the Gentleman

66th Legislative Day

June 23, 1987

recorded?"

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

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Panayotovich... remove Mr. Panayotovich from the Roll Call. Mr. Van Duyne has returned to the chamber. Restore Mr. Van Duyne. Proceed."

Young: "Representative DeLeo."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. DeLeo. Mr. DeLeo. Is Mr. DeLeo in the chamber? Mr. DeLeo. How is Mr. DeLeo recorded?"

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

Speaker Greiman: "Remove Mr. Deleo from the Roll Call."

Young: "Representative Bugielski."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Stephens asks leave to be verified. Mr. Stephens, you have leave. I'm sorry. Who was the last?"
Young: "Representative Deuchler."

Speaker Greiman: "Ms. Deuchler. Ms. Deuchler in the chamber?

She's at the rear of the chambers."

Young: "Representative Frederick."

Speaker Greiman: "Ms. Frederick. Ms. Frederick is voting 'no'."

Young: "Representative Bugielski."

Speaker Greiman: "Representative Bugielski. Representative
Bugielski in the chamber? He's here at Mr. Berrios' desk."

Young: "Representative Churchill."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Churchill is at his desk."

Young: "Representative Hennlund."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Wennlund is in the center aisle."

Young: "Representative Richmond."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Richmond is voting 'no'."

Young: "Representative Flinn."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Flinn. Oh. Mr. Klemm. Mr. Klemm is voting

\*present\*."

Young: "Flinn, Monroe Flinn."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Flinn. Mr. Flinn. Hr. Flinn is in his chair. Mr. DeLeo has returned. Restore the Gentleman to

66th Legislative Day

June 23, 1987

the Roll Call."

Young: "Representative Mulcahey."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Mulcahey. Mr. Mulcahey is at the rear of the chamber."

Young: "No further questions."

Speaker Greiman: "On this question there are 64 voting 'aye', 39

voting 'no', 6 voting 'present', and this Bill, having

received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared

passed. And now, Mr. White, for what purpose are you

seeking recognition?"

White: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I hope that I'm not in violation of the rules, but, if I am, I hope that at this point in time you will excuse me. In the gallery to my left, and I guess it's over the Democratic side. I have some young men who reside in and around the Cabrini Green Homes, they call themselves the Jesse and they were here earlier this afternoon to perform for the House, for the Senate and for ladies gentlemen who were visiting Springfield. I want you to know that out of the 28 years I've had this program. these young men have gotten themselves in trouble with the law. It's been my effort to combat juvenile delinquency. And I also want you to know that the few dollars that go into this program help young people to grow tall and straight. I'd like And S0 • now. Ladies and Gentlemen. to welcome to Springfield the Jesse White Tumblers."

Speaker Greiman: "Thank you. On this Order appears... On the Order of State Administration Third Reading appears Senate Bill 382, Mr. Steczo. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 382, a Bill for an Act to amend the
Illinois Municipal Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

66th Legislative Day

June 23, 1987

- Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, Steczo: "Thank vou. Senate Bill 382 amends the Municipal Code with relation to fire commissioners and expands the period for seeking review of a suspension imposed by the Chief αf the Department from 24 hours to five calendar days and limits those suspension to five calendar days. In addition, there was an Amendment adopted dealing with the City of Rockford allows the police chief to be able to appoint up to six officers as deputy chief or assistant deputy chiefs. If there are any questions, Ar. Speaker, I'll be glad to answer those. Otherwise, I move for the passage..."
- Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Cook. Mr. Steczo. moves for Senate Bill 382. And on that, is there any Dassage of discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?\* All in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 94 voting 'aye'. 7 voting \*no\*\* 'present'. This Bill. having received Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Πn this Order appears Senate Bill 454. Mr. Giglio, do vou wish to proceed on that Bill? Out of the record, Mr. Giglio?"
- Giglio: "Well, I wanted to... Mr. Speaker, there's an Amendment and I don't know if it's been distributed. If it has, I'd like to ask leave of the House to bring it back."

Speaker Greiman: "Yes, Mr. Giglio."

Giglio: "Mr. Speaker, would you take the Bill out of the record?"

Speaker Greiman: "Yes, of course. On this Order appears Senate

Bill 688. Mr. McPike, did you wish to proceed? 688. Mr.

Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 688, a Bill for an Act to amend the

66th Legislative Day

- June 23, 1987
- Workers' Compensation Act. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Madison, Majority Leader
  McPike."
- McPike: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is a shell Bill. The purpose of the Bill will be to put it in a Conference Committee and hope that we'll have an agreement on workers' compensation. Move for the passage of the Bill."
- Speaker Greiman: "Gentleman from Madison, Mr. McPike, moves for the passage of Senate Bill 688. There being no... Yes, Mr. McCracken, the Gentleman from DuPage."
- McCracken: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is also for purposes of seeing if we can work out an agreement, and this will be the vehicle for that. Thank you."
- Speaker Greiman: "Question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?" All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed vote Voting is open. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 107 \*ave\* . 2 voting 'no', none voting 'present'. Bill. having received the Constitutional Majority. is declared passed. On this Order appears Senate Bill hereby 731. Mr. Clerk. Mr. Giorgi, do you wish to proceed? T \* m Mr. Giorgi. 731. Out of the record. Mr. Giorgi, sorrv. for what purpose are you seeking recognition?"
- Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, to explain that that Bill validates a tax
  levy for Cook and for Aurora and I understand another city
  needs to be validated, so I'm going to hold the Bill up
  till we get the other city's Amendment ready."
- Speaker Greiman: "Fine. Thank you. On this Order appears Senate
  Bill 742. Out of the record. On this Order appears Senate
  Bill 1115. Mr Rice, did you wish to proceed on 1115?

  1115? Out of the record. On this Order appears Senate

66th Legislative Day

- June 23, 1987
- Bill 1138, Ms. Wojcik. Out of the record. On this Order appears Senate Bill 1266, Mr. McNamara. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1266, a Bill for an Act to add to the Illinois Fairness in Lending Act. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. McNamara. Mr. McNamara, out of the record now? Alright, out of the record. On this Order... Now, on the Order of Economic Development, Special Order, Second Reading appears Senate Bill 1. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill #1, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act in relationship to export development. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."
- Speaker Greiman: "Are there any Motions with respect to Amendment #1?"
- Clerk Leone: "There are no Motions filed."
- Speaker Greiman: "Are there any Floor Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #2 is being offered by

  Representatives McCracken and Churchill."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. McCracken, on Amendment #2."
- McCracken: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Amendment would eliminate from the Bill the two year income tax exemptions to export trading companies which can be given by this authority in pursuit of its encouraging export trading. I move its adoption."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. McCracken, moves for the adoption of Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 1. And on that, the Gentleman from Macon. Mr. Dunn."
- Dunn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House.

  I rise in opposition to Amendment #2. We talk a lot in

  Illinois about what we're trying to do to attract business.

June 23. 1987

to attract new industry to the State of Illinois to improve economic climate to make things better for the people who live and work in Illinois. Senate Bill 1 and what it does in its present form is to those Bills. provide for an exemption from corporate income tax in the State of Illinois for two years, for those who are willing to come here and get in the export trade business they can foster the encouragement of overseas business that help us all. You and I both know that people don't just walk in and open up shop. They need some incentives from the corporate income tax. Floor Amendment \$2 would delete the provision about the income tax and gut the Bill. and I urge a \*no\* vote and defeat of this Amendment \$2.™

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Lake, Mr. Churchill."

Churchill: "Thank you. Ar. Speaker. I rise in support of this The first time that the Revenue Committee met Amendment. this year, we were fortunate enough to hear an address The Speaker came in to tell us that we should the Speaker. pursue a course this year that would continue to grant whether they be t٥ personal people. tο corporate people, or to other organizations. The anv rationale for what he said was that the state has to make a choice between either increasing taxes or eliminating exemptions. In this particular situtation, we're granting an exemption which doesn't have to be granted. It's exemption which is going to be expensive to the state. It's an exemption which, even without the exemption. the rest of this program can continue forward. I think the Speaker may have been correct when he first came in and said we should not grant any new exemptions. I think that it's up to us to make sure that we hold the line, not money that we spend, but the exemptions that we grant. So, I think that this is a fine Amendment that we

66th Legislative Day

June 23, 1987

should place on this Bill at this time."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from McLean, Mr. Ropp."

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

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

- Ropp: "Representative, does this Amendment deal with existing trading companies who are dealing with exporting products from Illinois, or is this for the intent for new companies that currently are considering exporting but really not innovated yet?"
- McCracken: "The qualifications are included in our analysis, and the organization has to satisfy the hasic aim o f encouraging and expanding export trade. The activities undertaken will be a significant factor and contribute significantly to encouraging export trade. The exemption will serve as a significant incentive, and export trade opportunities will be improved and initiated particularly for small and medium sized producers."
- Ropp: "Well, is... let's say a company like Cargill or Continental, would they be affected either by the Amendment or the Bill?"
- McCracken: "I believe that they could be. It may be possible that they would be eligible for this exemption."
- Ropp: "Well, I think it's pretty important for those companies that are currently trading and are doing quite well, I certainly would comply with the Amendment that they should not be... that their tax not be excluded, because I think they're already established. I think the intent of the Bill is to provide an incentive for new companies, and maybe this incentive is the only thing that does it, so that's why I'm trying to get a basis as to whether or not the Amendment applies across the board or if the Amendment only applies to those companies who, as of today, are not involved in trading, but should the Bill become law, they

66th Legislative Day

June 23, 1987

would be affected by this Bill, and then your Amendment would have some bearing on whether or not that incentive is there or if it isn $^{\circ}$ t. $^{\circ}$ 

McCracken: "... Standing is is that it would not have to be only new companies."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Macon, Mr. Dunn, for what purpose do you seek recognition? Alright. Mr. Young, the Gentleman from Cook."

Young: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Greiman: "He indicates he will."

Speaker Greiman: "Yes."

Young: "Would this Amendment leave any incentives in the Bill for new companies locating in the State of Illinois?"

McCracken: "Yes."

Young: "What incentives would remain in the Bill?"

McCracken: "Well, you know, the entire Bill provides incentives for this purpose."

Young: "Well, it's my understanding the Bill sets up a program and that the incentives are tax related incentives, and I was wondering what incentives might be in your version of this Bill, or do we just have a program with no incentives?"

McCracken: "No, but the... if you're asking are there any other direct economic incentives, no."

Young: "To the Amendment, Mr. Speaker. This Amendment appears to be one that would, in fact, leave the program meaningless. This program is set up according to Representative Dunn to have DCCA induce companies to come to Illinois who might not otherwise come to Illinois, and inductions, so to speak, are the reasons that those companies come would be on incentives. We give Illinois companies incentives in other areas. I think this is a good Bill and a bad Amendment to a good Bill because it will remove any

June 23, 1987

incentives that this state has been known to give in other areas of the state to other companies who we tried to induce to the state to bring new business to this state. We've given tax incentives to Diamond Star. We'll give all kind of incentives to the super conductor/super collider, and I don't see why we want to take away the tax incentives that Representative Dunn has in this Bill, and I urge a 'no' vote on the Amendment."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Fulton, Hr. Homer."

Homer: "Thank you. Mr. Speaker. I would join the last speaker in vote to the Amendment and respond to a statement that was made on the other side with respect t o the representations... or the testimony that Speaker Madigan gave to the House Revenue Committee Session concerning the issue of whether or not the General Assembly ought to be passing additional exemptions from our tax laws with respect to businesses. As I read this Bill. and as I understand Senator Severns has plainly stated for the purpose of legislative intent when the Bill was called in the Senate, we're talking here about only new companies. No existing Illinois business authorized this tax exemption. We're talking strictly. Bill, about new companies that would come to Illinois induced by this exemption, where there would be a two the income tax. Thereafter, that company exemption from ostensibly would pay the full amount of taxes as would anv other company. So, I believe this to be an exception to the stated policy that the Speaker enunciated at that time. He was concerned. I believe, with the issue of exemptions to existing businesses where the net effect would not be the inducement of new business. but would rather simply be the loss of revenue to the State of Illinois. Here, if it is the Sponsor's intent to limit i t

June 23, 1987

for a limit of two years, I think that businesses good objective, that certainly is verv and T would that we defeat the Gentleman's Amendment, which suggest would basically gut the purposes of the Bill for the matter of legislative intent. the House, same issue that was addressed by Senator Severns in the So, I would urge a 'no' vote on the Amendment so Senate. that the Sponsor can get the Bill to Third Reading."

Speaker Greiman: "There being no further discussion, the Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. McCracken, to close."

McCracken: "Thank you. Mr. Speaker. There are number of incentives left in this Bi 11. There are a number special assistance provisions in this Bill for qualified companies. In addition, a qualified company, under Act, can apply for loans as well as have this preferential treatment as to its income tax for two years. The fact ηf the matter is, in the past, this decision whether to exempt order to induce business to locate in Illinois has been made on a case by case basis by this Bodv. This would allow the export authority to make that decision in its discretion, once the minimum thresholds for qualification been made, and I might add that these qualifications are subjective in nature. They are not necessarily something which can be measured objectively, which gives us some feeling of comfort in how this exemption is going to be used, and it could be a very substantial exemption from income taxation to have a company to locate here. There is to say that a very large company could not locate in Illinois for purposes of getting this exemption when the fact of the matter is that its Illinois operations mav constitute small part of its business. a verv So. there incentives. there are substantial are substantial assistance left in this Bill, but I believe this income tax

June 23. 1987

exemption is something which should he 1eft t n the Legislature on a case by case basis. If this Bill becomes law, let the export authority come back and say, 'These are the companies that qualifv. This is why they qualify. This the anticipated revenue that we will not realize as result of granting the exemption and let us act in coordination with our budgetary and appropriations process. This does not gut the Bill. I suggest that the authority should be coming back to us on a case by case basis for this exemption, and I move its passage and ask for Call vote."

Speaker Greiman: "The question is. \*Shall the Amendment he adopted? All those in favor signify by voting \*aye\*, those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted Mr. Clerk, take the record. wish? On this question. there are 48 voting 'aye', 60 voting \*no\*. vatina and the Amendment fails. Are there further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment &3. offered by Representatives

McCracken and Churchill."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. McCracken."

McCracken: "Okay. Thank you, Ar. Speaker. Amendment 33 deletes that portion of the Bill which requires the export council study the feasibility and develop plans for a world What is left in the Bill by this Amendment trade center. is its other study which it is to undertake, and that is to assist the private sector in exporting matters to assist in establishment of private export trade companies and to participate in joint export trade company ventures. Wе felt that it was not inappropriate to study these matters but to specifically require a study of the feasibility to develop plans for a world trade center, at least at this

June 23, 1987

point, is a bit too ambitious, I think. I can't really see what significance this study could have relative to that issue. It seems to me that that's clearly an economic issue which is going to be decided by the market place. If some part of the state can support a trade center of this magnitude, it's going to happen or not happen, but a study's not going to make it happen. More appropriately, the study that is left in by Amendment #3 is something more appropriate to this council, and I ask the adoption of Amendment #3."

- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. McCracken, moves for the adoption of Amendment \$3 to Senate Bill \$1. And on that, the Gentleman from Macon, Mr. Dunn."
- Dunn: "Thank you, Ar. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House.

  I rise in opposition to Amendment... Floor Amendment #3 to
  Senate Bill 1. Floor Amendment 3 would seek to greatly
  reduce the scope and the impact of this fine legislation.

  It talks about creating a state operated export trading
  center. We're talking about the possiblity of a world
  trade center, and I just simply ask for the defeat of this
  Amendment."
- Speaker Greiman: "The question is. 'Shall the Amendment adopted?\* A11 in favor signify by saying 'aye', those opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'nos' have it. and the Amendment fails. Are there further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #4, offered by Representative

  McCracken."
- Speaker Greiman: "Withdrawn. Further Amendments."
- Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Greiman: "Third Reading. On this Order appears Senate
  Bill 591. Mr. Steczo, 591? Out of the record. On this
  Order appears Senate Bill 1249. Mr. Mautino? Out of the

66th Legislative Day

- June 23. 1987
- record. On this Order appears Senate Bill 1400. Out of the record. The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Giglio."
- Giglio: "Thank you, Ar. Speaker. The Democrats would like to recess so we can have a caucus immediately in room 114."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Democrats request a caucus in Room 114 for approximately one-half hour. Mr. Giglio, is that enough?"
- Giglio: "That's enough time."
- Speaker Greiman: "One half hour. Mr. McCracken?"
- McCracken: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To announce a Republican conference in 118 immediately for about one half hour."
- Speaker Greiman: "Alright, Ladies and Gentlemen, both Parties are going to go into conference. There will be a Democratic conference in Room 114, a Republican conference in room 118. We will be recessed for one half hour. We will return in one half hour. Thank you, Ladies and Gentlemen. The House now stands in recess until the hour of 3:00. On page 2 of the Calendar on Special Order of Business appears the Order of Public Health. And on that Order of Business on Second Reading appears Senate Bill 85. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 85, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Marriage and Dissolution of Marriage Act. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment &1 was adopted in Committee."
- Speaker Greiman: "Are there any Motions with respect to Amendment #1?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed."
- Speaker Greiman: "Are there any Floor Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment \$2, offered by Representative
  Wojcik and Pullen."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Lady from Cook, Ms. Wojcik, on Amendment #2."

June 23, 1987

Wojcik: "Yes, Ar. Speaker and Members of the House, Senate Bill... Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 85 states that in each hospital, licensed under this Act, every patient between the ages of 13 and 55 inclusive shall be tested for exposure to the HIV virus or any other identified causative agent of Acquired Immuno Deficiency Syndrome. The reason for this Amendment is because of the seriousness of the AIDS spreading the way it is and also because of the fact that there are many tests going on today and AIDS beginning to run rampant, and we are trying to control it. There will be no additional cost with this Amendment. The test would be handled immediately and it would be handled with the same blood letting that is when you are admitted to the hospital. I ask its favorable passage."

Speaker Greiman: "The Lady from Cook moves for the adoption of Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 85. And on that, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

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

Leverenz: "Two questions. Who does the test and who pays for the test to be done?"

Wojcik: "The lab would do the testing as you enter the hospital,
and it would be the same fee that you would pay originally.

There's no additional cost."

Leverenz: "Thank you."

Speaker Greiman: "Yes, Ms. Wojcik."

Wojcik: "Mr. Speaker, I ask that this Amendment be passed."

Speaker Greiman: "There being no further discussion? The question is, 'Shall the Amendment be adopted?' All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', those opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment's adopted. Are there further Amendments?"

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

June 23, 1987

Pullan.

Speaker Greiman: "The Lady from Cook, Ms. Pullen, on Amendment

Pullen: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment 33 would require the Department Corrections to provide for testing of inmates o f correctional institutions at a time ₩hen thev are first admitted to the prison or when they are infirmary for regular medical checkups, for the AIDS virus. This is a concept that has today been endorsed by the house of delegates of the American Hedical Association. Although I certainly do not agree with all of their actions. pleased to see that they have endorsed prisoner testing. think that it is particularly important because of the fact that in our prisons. inmates are double celled, and I believe that without testing prisoners for AIDS. we are Russian Roulette with those who are not infected. I move its adoption."

Speaker Greiman: "The Lady from Cook, Ms. Pullen, moves for the adoption of Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 85. And on that, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Levin."

Levin: "Would the Lady vield?"

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

Levin: "Representative, does the Department of Corrections have a position on this Amendment. In Committee, they testified against this concept, and I recall when there was a similar Amendment filed to one of your House Bills, that that Amendment was pulled, and the representation was made by Representative Goforth that the Department of Corrections was in opposition to that Amendment. Is the department still in opposition?"

Pullen: "If I may answer, the Department was opposed to this when it was originally discussed in Committee and when it was

June 23, 1987

originally discussed during the House process. I spoke with their legislative liaison a few moments ago in the back of the chamber. I did not specifically ask whether the department has a position on it, but I will tell you that I have the clear impression that department has shifted in its position, if in no other way than in believing that it's going to come and they mav well try to work it out so that it's acceptable."

Levin: "To the Amendment, Ar. Speaker."

Speaker Greiman: "Proceed, Sir."

Levin: "We heard extensive testimony in the Human Services Subcommittee on this particular proposal, and I would point out, unlike many of the other proposals that have been presented on this House, this one was withdrawn to the House Bill because of the opposition of the Department Corrections. We heard from the Medical Director of the Department of Corrections that this proposal would absolutely devastate their ability to deal with prisoners and to deal with the AIDS epidemic, that a study that conducted suggested that where, in fact, there was no testing, the prisoners were told, assume everybody else that institution has AIDS. Take preventative actions. they did. But there was a study where theve in facte tested some and segregated them, and separated those with AIDS from those that didnot. And what they found was those who had tested negative engaged in the kind of behavior you didn't want them engaged in. They figure they were supermen. They figured they didn't have AIDS. Thev figured those prisoners around them didn't have AIDS, so they could violate the rules of the prison. They could engage in various kinds of sexual conduct and share needles and things like that. And it encouraged them to do exactly the kinds of conduct we don't want them to do, that by

66th Legislative Day

June 23, 1987

contrast, where there was not testing, where there was not segregation, the prisoners acted more responsibly, they were deterred from the kind of conduct we don't want them to commit. This is why, in Committee, Dr. Shansky, the Medical Director of the Department of Corrections testified vehemently in opposition to this proposal. I would urge a "no" vote."

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

Cullerton: "Yes, would the Sponsor yield?"

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

Cullerton: "Representative Pullen, I apologize. We don't have our file here, and I'm trying to determine whether or not... I'm trying to determine what your Amendment does.

Is it similar to a previous House or Senate Bill?"

Pullen: "It's similar in intent. It is not similar in scope. in that it limits prisoner testing, unfortunately, in my opinion, but it's a start. It requires the Department o f Corrections to test prisoners when they are committed initially, and to test prisoners when thev take medical checkups, so unlike the House proposal that the previous Gentleman spoke about, this does not require testing of all current prison inmates, which I think is regrettable, but necessary."

Cullerton: "So, when they're admitted to the prison, they'd be tested."

Pullen: "That's right."

Cullerton: "And then, what does your Bill... Amendment call for them to do after they test them?"

Pullen: "It does not call for them to do anything. I would hope that the Department of Corrections would be responsible enough to use the information to protect prisoners who are not infected from those who are, because that's the idea of finding out, but it does give the Department of Corrections

- June 23 1987
- the direction that they have the responsibility to find out."
- Cullerton: "So, you want them to... you would expect them to isolate those who were tested positive from those who did not test positive?"
- Pullen: "My personal preference is that they set up a celling system so that they would not double cell a positive with a negative. There are some people who suggest that there should be distinct institutions set up or that distinct wings of institutions set up. That is not my proposal, and it is something that I believe can be the future according to financial needs and that in sort of thing, but I do think it's irresponsible even want to know, so that we end up having prisoners double celled with other prisoners whose infected status no one knows."
- Cullerton: "Alright. Now, does this Bill... or Amendment, that is... require that the prisoner be informed as to the results of the test?"
- Pullen: "That isn't included in this Amendment. It certainly isn't precluded."
- Cullerton: "So, it's not required. It's not... there's no... "Pullen: "It is not required."
- Cullerton: "Okay. Now, this is a different twist. This particular issue is a different twist to the AIDS question, in that the Department of Corrections, when I chaired a Subcommittee in Chicago on this issue, the Department of Corrections came in through their Dr. Shansky, and they were very vehemently opposed to this... to any testing, and it wasn't out of... if you'll let me editorialize for a second... it wasn't out of humanitarian principles or even a desire to stop the spread of AIDS. It was based on a... totally, it seemed to me, based on a desire to help control

June 23, 1987

prison population. We have 19,000 beds in the system. We are very much overcrowded. We probably should have about 25,000 beds, and they have a real concern about control of the prison population. They testified that they - not in these words - but they testified that they'd like everybody to think that they can get AIDS, because if everybody thinks they can get AIDS in a prison. going to cut down on the amount of sexual contact. that Representative Goforth was... I know he was present at Subcommittee, and I think that he had even offered an Amendment like this to a Bill and then withdrew it upon reflection of the testimony. I would assume that the Department is still opposed to this, even though it same as the House Bill that we spoke of earlier, I would assume that based on the same theory that thev testified to in Committee, they're opposed to it. Now . whether you think that's a good idea or not, that everybody in prison should be under the fear that if they have some kind of sexual contact with another prisoner, they might get AIDS. Whether you agree with that or not is matter, but I think that it's clear that the Department of Corrections would be opposed to the Amendment for desire to help control the prison population. Representative Pullen, if I could ask vou one more question. Representative Pullen, if I could ask you one more question."

Pullen: "You're finished with your speech now, so you're back to asking a question."

Cullerton: "Right."

Pullen: "Okay."

Cullerton: "That wasn't... that was a statement, not a question of you. It was... a rhetorical question. What do you want to do this for? What is... in other words, what are your

June 23, 1987

goals, knowing now what the Department or accepting for a second what I ve stated as the Department's philosophy, what are your goals with this particular Amendment?"

Pullen: "Well, Sir, I have a great deal of difficulty accepting the Department's philosophy, and there are many reasons have difficulty accepting that, not the least of which is that the study that Dr. Shansky says that he's basing the on does not exist, from what I could tell. informed me that this study was done by Dr. John University. that it relates to behavior modification with respect among drug abusers to AIDS and when the legislative research unit attempted testing. to find that study for me, they could not find any study on behavior modification among drug abusers with respect and they specifically called Dr. Polk and AIDS testing. asked him about it, and he said he had never done any such studv. So. that troubles me to begin with. It also troubles me. Representative, that the Department οf Corrections. on June 1, began a new rule. That is, their new rule went into effect June 1, that had previously the Department's rule with respect to communicable disease said that the Department shall remove inmates communicable disease from proximity to other inmates, and their new rule says the Department may remove inmates with It doesn't even say specifically a communicable disease. so the Department now can mix prisoners with measles AIDS. with other prisoners if they want to, under their rule, problems with the Department's philosophy to begin with, but my intent on this is what I said it was, that it is the responsibility of the Department of Corrections and the State of Illinois to at least find out who tests positive because those who are tested positive are presumed to be capable of transmitting this disease

June 23, 1987

order to protect uninfected inmates from those who are infected, particularly because we have double celling, as the rule, in Illinois institutions."

Cullerton: "Okay. One more quick question, then. What would you do with an inmate who has been identified as having AIDS when that inmate is... comes time for that inmate to be released? Would your Amendment address what the public policy should be with regard to that information?"

Pullen: "No, it does not."

Cullerton: "Would you suggest that they should be in some way
restricted in their... in their release date or in where
they can be released to?"

Pullen: "I haven't given a great deal of thought to this. This

Amendment was not suggested by Secretary Bill 'Bennett',

and I don't know that I agree with him on that, but this

Amendment does not address that question."

Cullerton: "Alright. Thank you very much."

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

White: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Amendment is an outgrowth of a Bill that I passed out Judiciary Committee a few weeks ago, and because of the... our busy schedule, the Bill was not called. I stand in support of this measure because I think it's only fitting and proper that we protect society from those individuals who have contracted AIDS prior to going into prison or while they were in prison. I think it's only fair for them to get tested prior to their release forewarned or counseled as to how they are to conduct their again, I think this is a fine lives thereafter. Sa Amendment. I'm not so much concerned about the Bill as whole, but the Amendment is good."

Speaker Greiman: "There being no further discussion, the Lady from Cook, Ms. Pullen, to close."

66th Legislative Day

June 23, 1987

- Pullen: "Thank you. Mr. Speaker. I will simply thank the previous Gentleman for his comments, but I hate to tell him this. He's talking about the next Amendment. It is also an Amendment relating to prisoner testing, and I would you all to consider the Representative's remarks with respect to the next Amendment rather than this one, in case influences you, because I don't want anyone misunderstand him because of the importance of his concern in this issue. This Amendment does not deal with prisoners being released. That's the next one. This Amendment... and I do appreciate the Gentleman's support on it. This Amendment would require the Department of Corrections test for AIDS infection. inmates when thev admitted to the... when they are being committed to the penitentiary or when they are going to regular medical checkups in the Department of Corrections so that Мe can protect uninfected prisoners from those who are infected. I urge its adoption. Thank you."
- Speaker Greiman: "The question is. \*Shall this Amendment A11 those in favor signify by saying 'aye', those opposed 'no'. Ιn the opinion of the Chair, the \*aves\* have it. The Amendment\*s adopted. Are there further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #4, offered by Representative Pullen."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Lady from Cook, Ms. Pullen, on Amendment #4."
- Pullen: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is the Amendment that was spoken of a moment ago. It would require the Department of Corrections to test prisoners for AIDS virus no later than 60 days prior to their release on parole or mandatory release or final discharge or pardon so that there would be an opportunity

June 23, 1987

for the prisoner who is infected to understand that he is infected, that he is capable of transmitting this infection, and to be counseled concerning the implications of that so that when he goes out into society, he will be, hopefully, careful of his conduct. I appreciate the support of the House on the previous Amendment, and I would appreciate support on this one as well."

Speaker Greiman: "The Lady from Cook, Ms. Pullen, moves for the adoption of Amendment #4 to Senate Bill 85. And on that, the Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Yes, will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Greiman: "Indicates she will."

Cullerton: "Representative, in your Amendment, the term 'final discharge' is used. What does that mean?"

Pullen: "The end of the sentence, the release from prison."

Cullerton: "Okay. And what is the Department of Corrections'
position on 'this here' particular Amendment, as
Representative Stearney used to always say."

Pullen: "I do not have an official position from the Department on this. It is my understanding that the Department has worked up similar language to this, which I do not yet have in my possession, but, unofficially, I am informed that they have accepted the concept that this is going to be necessary."

Cullerton: "Okay, so as I understand the Amendment, requires AIDS testing of committed persons no later than 60 days prior to their release. So, just before their final discharge, they would have to take this test, and then disclosure of the test results would be limited to the subject of any person authorized by the subject to receive the results — the spouse of the subject, employees of health facilities if the health facility is authorized to receive the results, the Illinois Department of Public Health and the U.S Center

June 23. 1987

Disease Control. a health facility which uses. distributes processes. preserves or the subject's body parts or semen, health facilities staff committees or accreditation or health care service review organizations. any person authorized to receive such results by court order after a finding of, quote, 'compelling need', and finally, funeral directors and embalmers. I can understand first eight, but the ninth one, the funeral directors and embalmers, what is the theory behind disclosing the of a AIDS test taken from a prisoner to a funeral director or embalmer?"

- Pullen: "Well, it's only... it is limited to the requirements labeling the body of a deceased person who is known or suspected to have a communicable disease so that funeral directors and embalmers can protect themselves from possible infection while they are doing their trade. And Sir. where this would come into effect would only be if someone's last day in prison was on a cart. T f someone in prison. then they would be tested before thev... before the body is shipped."
- Cullerton: "Oh, so in other words... I see. It's only... It's only if they're deceased, then, that they would have to notify a funeral director or an embalmer."
- Pullen: "Yes, because it's only in accordance with the requirements of the Illinois Department of Public Health for labeling the body of a deceased person."
- Cullerton: "I see. I thought perhaps if... the way I understood it, if someone had purchased a preneed funeral or had, in some way, contracted with a funeral director for, you know, to handle his funeral when he dies, that if a positive AIDS test was determined, that you'd want to notify that funeral director even prior to need, since that's where the body would eventually end up."

66th Legislative Day

June 23. 1987

Pullen: "I very much doubt that the Illinois Department of Public

Health would ever include preneed funeral services in their

body labeling requirements."

Cullerton: "But they could if... "

Pullen: "And they do not now."

Cullerton: "But if they were to, they have to do it by rule."

Pullen: "They won't."

Cullerton: "I see. Okay. Well, that pretty much explains what that Amendment does. This is sort of a follow up to your previous Amendment where... so now these two Amendments taken together, then, would require AIDS testing when you first come into custody, and 60 days prior to your release, and..."

Pullen: "When you first come into the penitentiary and 60 days

prior to release."

Cullerton: "Okay, so it's... "

Pullen: "Yes, and it would also include 60 days prior to release

for those who are now in the penitentiary who would not be

tested on intake because they're already there."

Cullerton: "What's the effective date of this Amendment, or the Bill as amended?"

Pullen: "The Bill as amended has an effect... has an immediate effective date."

Cullerton: "Okay, and so, there would then be a certain segment

of the prison population that would not have to be tested

for AIDS still. Those who are there..."

Pullen: "They would not have to be... there would be a percentage that would not have to be tested while they're there, but they would have to be tested before they leave."

Cullerton: "So that anyone sentenced to life imprisonment would not have to be tested for AIDS, ever."

Pullen: "Unless he went in for a regular medical checkup."

Cullerton: "Or if they were pardoned."

66th Legislative Day June 23, 1987

Pullen: "Or if they were pardoned, right."

Cullerton: "Just prior to final discharge."

Pullen: "Right."

Cullerton: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Greiman: "Further discussion? There being none, the Lady from Cook, Ms. Pullen, to close."

Pullen: "I appreciate the interest in this Amendment, Mr.

Speaker, and I urge its adoption."

Speaker Greiman: "The question is, "Shall the Amendment be adopted?" All in favor say "aye", those opposed "no". In the opinion of the Chair, the "ayes" have it. The Amendment is adopted. Are there further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Greiman: "Mr. Clerk, has there been a fiscal Note filed on this?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Fiscal Note has not been filed."

Speaker Greiman: "Then the Bill will remain on the Order of Second Reading. On this Order appears Senate Bill 100.

Mr. Clerk. Mr. White, do you wish us to proceed on 100?

Out of the record? Alright. On this Order appears Senate Bill 482. Out of the record. On this Order appears Senate Bill 550. Mr. Cullerton, do you wish to proceed? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 550, a Bill for an Act to amend an

Act in relation to schools. Second Reading of the Bill.

No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Greiman: "Are there Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Greiman: "Third Reading. On this Order appears Senate
Bill 561. Mr. Berrios, do you wish us to proceed? 561.

Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 561, a Bill for an Act to amend the Nursing Home Care Reform Act. Second Reading of the Bill.

66th Legislative Day

- June 23, 1987
- Amendment &1 was adopted in Committee."
- Speaker Greiman: "Are there Motions with respect to Amendment
- Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed."
- Speaker Greiman: "Are there any Floor Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment \$2, offered by Representative

  Ryder and Wojcik."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Morgan, Mr. Ryder, on
  Amendment #2. Amendment #2 is withdrawn. Are there
  further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Cullerton, on Amendment \$3."
- Cullerton: "Withdraw that. please."
- Speaker Greiman: "Withdrawn. Are there further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #4, offered by Representative

  McCracken."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Ar. McCracken.
  Withdrawn. Are there further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #5, offered by Representative
  Wojcik."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Lady from Cook, Ms. Wojcik. Withdrawn.

  Are there other Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #6, offered by Representative

  Berrios."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Berrios."
- Berrios: "Floor Amendment #6 is a technical Amendment putting it into the right Code."
- Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from Cook moves for the adoption of Amendment &6 to Senate Bill 561. On that, is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall the Amendment be adopted?' All in favor 'aye', opposed 'no'.

June 23, 1987

In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Are there further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Greiman: "Third Reading. On this Order appears Senate
Bill 561. Ms. Barnes, do you wish... I'm sorry. 651.

Ms. Barnes, do you wish to proceed on 651? Mr. Clerk,
read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 651, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act in relation to sexually transmittable disease control.

Second Reading of the Bill. Amendments #1 and 4 were adopted previously."

Speaker Greiman: "Are there any Motions with respect to those
Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Greiman: "Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Greiman: "Third Reading. On this Order appears Senate Aill 771. Mr. White, do you wish to proceed on 771? Out of the record. On this Order appears Senate Bill 886. Out of the record. On this Order appears Senate Bill 942, Mr. Rice. Out of the record. On this Senate Bill 993. Mr. Preston. do you wish to proceed? 993. Out of the record. On this Order appears White, do you wish to proceed? Mr. Senate Bill 994. Mr. Clerk. read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 994, a Bill for an Act to amend the
Illinois Public Aid Code. Second Reading of the Bill.

Amendment \$1\$ was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Greiman: "Any Motions with respect to Amendment #1?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Greiman: "Are there any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments?"

Speaker Greiman: "Third Reading. On this Order appears Senate

June 23, 1987

Bill 995. Mr. White, did you wish to proceed on that?

Mr. Clerk. read the Bill.

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 995, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Public Aid Code. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Greiman: "Are there Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Greiman: "Third Reading. On this Order... Mr. White, did you wish to have 771 called also? Alright, Mr. Clerk, read the Bill. 771."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 771, a Bill for an Act in relation to the bodies of deceased persons who had AIDS. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment \$1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Greiman: "Are there Motions with respect to Amendment 81?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Greiman: "Are there any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Greiman: "Third Reading. Mr. White... has a Fiscal Note been filed?"

Clerk O'Brien: "A Fiscal Note is filed."

Speaker Greiman: "Third Reading, then. Yes, Mr. Preston, did you wish to take 993? Alright, Mr. Clerk, 993. Read the Bill."

Clerk D'Brien: "Senate Bill 993, a Bill for an Act to amend the Community Mental Health Act. Second Reading of the Bill.

Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Greiman: "Are there any Motions, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Greiman: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Greiman: "Third Reading. Now... Yes, excuse me. With

June 23. 1987

respect to Senate Bill 771, we moved that Bill to the Order of Third Reading. The Bill is on the Consent Calendar, so with leave of the House, we will return the Bill to the Consent Calendar. Leave is granted. And now, Ladies and Gentlemen, let us consider Public Health Bills that have been on Second and moved to Third today that we, up to now, could consider under our rules. Accordingly, Mr. Clerk, on this Order appears Senate Bill 651. Mr. Clerk, would you read the Bill?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 651, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act in relation to sexually transmissible disease control.

Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Barnes: "Thank you. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill..."

Speaker Greiman: "Excuse me, Ms. Barnes. Please, let us give the
Lady your attention. Members should be in their seats.

The aisles should be cleared. The aisles should be
cleared. And now, proceed."

Barnes: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 651 addresses the AIDS problem, and it is the most comprehensive effort to protect the public health and safety of the citizens of Illinois by reporting, tracing and treating people with a sexually transmissible disease. I would ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Greiman: "The Lady from Cook, Ms. Barnes, moves for the passage of Senate Bill 651. And on that, is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Yes, would the Sponsor yield?"

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

Cullerton: "Representative, what Amendments are on this Bill?"

Barnes: "I didn't hear you, Representative."

Cullerton: "Would you yield for a question?"

66th Legislative Day

June 23, 1987

Barnes: "Yes, Representative."

Cullerton: "What Amendments have been adopted on this Bill?"

Barnes: "Amendment #1 had been in Committee, but last Thursday, as you recall. Representative Cullerton, the Department of Public Health, the Chairman and the Spokesman for the Health Committee, Senator DeAngelis and myself worked for about six hours, and he came to a consensus, and then an Agreed Amendment. And that provided that persons with a sexually transmissible disease shall report for complete medical treatment to a licensed physician or local health department as required by the Department of Public Health. No person shall be examined treated for a sexually transmissible disease, except as provided... "

Cullerton: "Whoa, whoa, whoa, whoa. I just... "

Barnes: "... For by rules and standards developed by the

Department of Public Health. It also requires that the

Department of Public Health formulate criteria, standards

and procedures regarding the identification and contact of

any person to be interviewed or subject to examination and

treatment."

Cullerton: "Thank you for answering my question. Which

Amendments have been adopted on the Bill?"

Barnes: "Amendment #4."

Cullerton: "Right. Now, with regard to Amendment #4, I have a question for you. Maybe I'm not reading this properly, but Amendment #4 starts off by saying that it deletes all of Subsection E in Section 5. Is that what Amendment #4 did?"

Barnes: "Representative, could you repeat that, please?"

Cullerton: "Yes. There's a Section &5 called 'Contact
Investigation', okay? And Section 5, which started in the
original Bill on page 3. And there's Subparagraphs (a),
(b), (c), (d) and (e). And (e) said, 'Any person who

- June 23 1987
- knowingly or maliciously disseminates any false information or report concerning the existence of any sexually transmittable disease under this Section is guilty of a Class A misdemeanor.
- Barnes: "That has been removed from the Bill. That was part of the compromise, Representative."
- Cullerton: "Alright, so what did (e) do before it was... what did that mean before it was deleted?"
- Barnes: "Well, before it was removed, it meant that a person could be guilty of a Class A misdemeanor, which would mean one year in jail or a one thousand dollar fine."
- Cullerton: "Okay, so this was... this went to the issue of... as

  to... if someone didn\*t cooperate with the Department of

  Public Health, they could have been guilty of a Class A

  misdemeanor, and that\*s what you removed. Is that

  correct?"
- Barnes: "That is correct."
- Cullerton: "Okay. Now, you started to read or elaborate on what

  Amendment #4 did, and you called it an Agreed Amendment, by
  the way. What do you mean by Agreed Amendment?"
- Barnes: "What I meant by an Agreed Amendment was that the Senate Sponsor, Senator DeAngelis; the Chairman of the Health Committee, Jesse White; the Spokesman, Kathleen Wojcik; myself, the House Sponsor; the two men from the Department of Public Health met and agreed on the Amendment. That's what I mean by 'Agreed Amendment."
- Cullerton: "Okay. Now, if you could answer this question.

  There's some concern that people have expressed concerning the Section 7(b). 7(b) deals with the issue of quarantine and isolation, and it says, 'No person may be ordered to be isolated and no place may be ordered to be quarantined except with the consent of such person or owner of such a place or upon the order of a court of competent

June 23, 1987

jurisdiction, and upon proof by the Department by clear and convincing evidence that the public's health and welfare are significantly endangered by a person with a sexually transmittable disease or by a place where there is a significant amount of sexual activity likely to spread a sexually transmittable disease, and this can be done by a court upon proof by the Department. What does that... What is that designed to... What is that aimed at, Section 7(b)?"

- Barnes: "Well, to begin with, Representative, I would like to make it clear that that is more moderate powers than the Department of Public Health has right at this moment. They have the right and the power to quarantine and isolate whenever they feel that the threat the condition presents is so great as to warrant isolation, and it's for sexually transmittable diseases which are syphilis, gonorrhea and pelvic inflammatory diseases, and now that will include AIDS."
- Cullerton: "And has that ever been done by the Department, in the history of the state?"
- Barnes: "Yes, they have, but not recently. The only time they
  would quarantine right now, Representative, if they had a
  person that was really a danger to public health and to
  society and they didn't receive any cooperation and the
  person didn't want to receive the proper treatment, then
  they would isolate him in his home."
- Cullerton: "I'm not talking about a quarantine of a person, I was just curious about what kind of places you had in mind when it allows for the shutting down of an entire place..."
- Barnes: "Well, we have never had... they have never experienced that yet, but I would assume the way we're all into this health and trying to take care of our bodies, that it would a some kind of a health club."

June 23, 1987

Cullerton: "So they could shut down, say, the East Bank Club, if they felt that..."

Barnes: "Well, if they found that the disease was spreading rampantly through the Bank Club... East Bank Club, then they would quarantine, but the owner would have the option to appeal the quarantine. I'm sure that the two Irishmen that own the East Bank Club, if they found out that they were disseminating and spreading the AIDS disease, they would be most cooperative, Representative Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Okay. So, the big change, then, to Amendment @4 was

the... removing that Section that... and it called for a

misdemeanor offense if you fail to disclose."

Barnes: "That is correct."

Cullerton: "So, what does that leave you if you don't have any penalty to impose upon people if they fail to disclose?"

Barnes: "Well, it's voluntary contact tracing, and the Department, I will think will set up the proper criteria, they will use the proper confidentiality systems that they already have in place for other sexually transmissible diseases, and I... that was the fear of some of the Representatives about the Class A misdemeanor and that's why we removed that."

Cullerton: "Thank you. Ar. Speaker, I have no further questions, other than to... one more. With regard to the issue of prisoners, as I understand, this Bill, this would authorize the Department of Public Health to enter into any state prison. Is that correct?"

Barnes: "That is correct."

Cullerton: "And that decision would be made by the Department of
Public Health... the Director and the Department of Public
Health?"

Barnes: "That is correct."

Cullerton: "Does it require cooperation with the Department of

June 23, 1987

Corrections?"

Barnes: "I would assume that interagency agreements are, you know, done on a... done in the best interest of the citizenry."

Cullerton: "What about... pardon me for a second, if I could ask
you about the issue of confidentiality as it's found in
this particular Bill? We have other Bills dealing with
AIDS that deal with the issue of confidentiality. How does
this particular Bill deal with that issue?"

Barnes: "The information would only be released, like many times in the case of that cancer Bill that I had sponsored, I think, about a year ago. It would only be released for statistical, medical or epidemiology purposes, and all identified information would be stricken."

Cullerton: "Where is... where are you reading from?"

Barnes: "Pardon me?"

Cullerton: "Where are you reading from? Are you reading from the Amendment or the Bill or the analysis?"

Barnes: "I am reading from the Senate analysis, Representative."

Cullerton: "Okay. Now, as I understand it, maybe since it was amended and maybe this answers my question, on the original Bill on page 14, the issue of the records of the Department of Public Health and disclosure were... would be covered under the Illinois Sexually Transmittable Disease Control Act. Is that still the way the Bill reads?"

Barnes: "Yes."

Cullerton: "And that is... Is that this new Act that we're passing?"

Barnes: "Yes, it is,"

Cullerton: "Okay. So, where in the Bill does it spell out the...
the issue of confidentiality?"

Barnes: "Just a second, Representative. I know it's in here. I know it has an exemption from the Freedom of Information

66th Legislative Day

June 23, 1987

Act. I just have to find it. I think on page 14, the portion that you are relating to indicates the Department of Public Health would respect the confidentiality."

Cullerton: "I see. So, confidentiality is covered under Section

8 of the Bill, right?"

Barnes: "Yes."

Cullerton: "Okay. And then, how did the Amendment change...

Amendment #4, how did that change Section 8?"

Barnes: "It didnot touch it at all, Representative."

Cullerton: "How about Amendment #1? Did that change Section 8?"

Barnes: "Nothing has touched confidentiality. That has been agreed from day one on this Bill."

Cullerton: "Well, let me refer, then, to page 6 of the Bill, line

30. And if you could tell me whether or not Amendment #1

amended Section 8."

Barnes: "When you're... it says, it may in a medical emergency,

but only to the extent necessary to protect the health or

life of a named party."

Cullerton: "Right. That was struck?"

Barnes: "Yes."

Cullerton: "Okay. So, confidentiality... the only part of confidentiality that was changed was that particular Section."

Barnes: "That is correct."

Cullerton: "That was done through Amendment #1, and that was an Agreed Amendment as well, right?"

Barnes: "That is correct."

Cullerton: "And why was that Section removed? Why was that done?"

Barnes: "It just tightens up the confidentiality,

Representative."

Cullerton: "I know. I'm just wondering why you amended it."

Barnes: "It was just meant to further protect the confidentiality

66th Legislative Day

June 23, 1987

that the Department has asked for."

Cullerton: "Okay. Thank you very much for answering my questions."

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

Levin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Greiman: "Indicates that she'll yield for guestions."

Levin: "Representative, Section 6 of the Bill provides..."

Barnes: "Representative, when you're addressing the different Sections, would you please call out the page number? It would be easier for me."

Levin: "Page 4 of the Bill."

Barnes: "Alright. Thank you."

Levin: "Okay. Alright. In the original version, it provides that the Department and its authorized representatives may examine or cause to be examined, persons reasonably believed to be infected with... or to have been exposed to a sexually transmitted disease. Has that language been changed by any of the Amendments that were adopted?"

Barnes: "No."

Levin: "Okay. Has there been a definition of 'exposed' added to the Bill?"

Barnes: "No."

Levin: "So, in other words, we have no definition of exposure in this Bill so that exposure can mean anything. It can mean that if you are on a train, a public train, with somebody who has AIDS, that the Department of Public Health can require every single person on that train to be tested. Is that an accurate reading of that provision?"

Barnes: "No, it is not, Representative. Exposure is a medical term that is alway used as a common definition."

Levin: "But there's no definition here of exposure, and if you're in the same room with somebody or the same train or if you

66th Legislative Day

June 23. 1987

have a child in a school and there's one child in that school that has AIDS, you might be exposed. There's no definition here that limits what that means. There was an attempt in Amendment 2 to require exposure to mean what is medically found, but that Amendment was taken off this Bill. It seems to me that anybody who's in the same room or the same train or the same school can be required to be tested because they've been exposed."

Barnes: "If he wants to establish that as legislative intent, it's his business..."

Levin: "Well, let me ask another question, then."

Speaker Greiman: "Proceed, Sir."

Levin: "Is there. in the Bill, an expressed exception for research? One of the major concerns that's been expressed to me is that this is going to dry up research, except for federal research where there are expressed limitations which override state law. Is there any exception in here for research? I mean. it seems to me our object is to find a cure for this disease, and if we're doing the opposite, if we're going to open up the research to public exposure. weere notes. we're going to have the opposite effect of what we want."

Barnes: "There is another Bill, and I believe it's Senate Bill 100, that addresses the research."

Levin: "But this Bill requires mandatory testing and mandatory reporting in the number of contacts. I mean... You know. this Bill itself doesn't seem to have an exception for research."

Barnes: "It's strictly made for statistical purposes, just like other transmissible diseases, and I answered that when Representative Cullerton asked. Statistical purpose and medical or epidemiologic information."

Levin: "Okay. Now, Section 4, and I know Section 4 has been

- June 23, 1987
- amended, but the amended version of Section 4, as I read it, still requires the reporting of positive results, both by a doctor and by a laboratory. Is that correct?"
- Barnes: "Remember, Representative... oh, is Section 4 on page 2?

  Yes."
- Levin: "Correct, but I'm looking at Amendment #1, which I think
  has some new language, but it's not substantially
  different."
- Barnes: "The answer would be 'yes'."
- Levin: "Okay. So, a laboratory technician who is not particularly qualified, doesn't understand the ramifications of a test, can interpret it, still has to report it. Is that correct?"
- Barnes: "The Department, to begin with, Representative, professionals. The Department shall adopt rules specifying the information required in reporting a sexually transmissible disease. The method of reporting and specifying the minimum time period for reporting. in adopting such rules, the Department shall consider the need for information, protections for the privacy confidentiality of the patient, and the practical abilities in the laboratories to report in a reasonable fashion."
- Levin: "So, the answer is "yes". It seems to me that the lab is required. Finally, I know Representative Cullerton touched upon this, why don't... why didn't you accept current Department procedures with respect to quarantine? What's wrong with the current procedures that have been used for every other sexually transmitted disease?"
- Barnes: "They currently, Representative, as I have stated before
  to another Legislator in his questioning, this is far more
  moderate than what the Department is already doing."
- Levin: "To the Bill, very briefly, Mr. Speaker."

June 23, 1987

Speaker Greiman: "Proceed, Sir."

Levin: "While this Bill is certainly well intentioned from point of view of what the Sponsor intends to accomplish. I think it is objectively the worst Bill that we have seen in the last 10 years in this Illinois General Assembly as far what it will accomplish. I think what it will do is to significantly change the life style and the kind of society we have. George Orwell wrote a book called '1984'. 1987, and it seems that 1984 has arrived three years As well intentioned as this Bill is, it will the opposite consequences from what the Sponsor It will drive underground voluntary testing which intends. is exactly the wrong thing to do, and I'm sure what is intended by the Sponsor. It will force people who want to be tested, not to do it publicly because the results are going to have to be transmitted to the state, there's going to be contact tracing of other previous relations. already begun to see this happen in anticipation of this legislation, where patients with AIDS have gone to their doctors and have requested their files back because of fear intrusion into their privacy and confidentiality. want to encourage voluntary testing, we want to be able tο how many people have this disease, we want to be identify able to treat those individuals, provide them with counseling and other treatment that's necessary. This will accomplish exactly the opposite consequence. It will make it more difficult and moreover, without an exception it will do exactly the opposite of what we want to do in finding a cure. It will make it more difficult to find a cure. It will mean that we will not have research the State of Illinois. We will not participate in dealing with this most deadly disease, this 14th Century So, I suggest that this is a terrible Bill.

June 23, 1987

deserves to go down."

Speaker Greiman: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Mr. Hensel."

Hensel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move the previous question."

Speaker Greiman: "Well, since no one is seeking recognition, it

will not be necessary. The Lady from Cook, Ms. Barnes, to

close."

Barnes: "Thank vou. Hr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate Bill 651 is one of the most comprehensive Bills to protect the public from sexually transmmissible disease. We're concerned about the public health by providing regulations and welfare treatment. The Illinois Department of Public Health shall have to show, by a preponderance of evidence, that a real and present danger to the people of Illinois is taking place. Contact tracing is not new. It is already in place and being implemented Colorado, Minnesota, South Carolina, Florida bv and Wisconsin. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is your opportunity to let the citizens of Illinois know that are really concerned about AIDS. There are many bachelors today that are finally getting married because they want to of safe sex. There are more people being concerned about AIDS than cancer. Hardly a week can go discussions that you don't have a vour friend, a relative or someone dear to you that has cancer. Don't let that happen to us with this AIDS problem. This is a comprehensive Bill. I would ask you to be concerned about public health and welfare of the citizens of Illinois, and I would ask you to vote 'aye' on Senate Bill 651."

Speaker Greiman: "The question is, "Shall this Bill pass?" All those in favor signify by voting "aye", those opposed vote "no". Voting is open, and this is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question,

June 23, 1987

there are 86 voting 'aye', 23 voting' no', 3 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority... Mr. Capparelli? Mr. Capparelli votes 'aye'. Accordingly, on this question, there are 87 voting 'aye', 23 voting 'no', 3 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Breslin in the Chair.

Representative Piel, for what reason do you rise?"

Piel: "Just to announce, Madam Speaker, that we are honored by the Lieutenant Governor George Ryan's presence on the House floor."

Speaker Breslin: "We are. And Representative Tom AcAaster was here a moment ago also. Here he is, right here. Welcome both former Members. The next Bill is on the Order of Public Health Second Reading is Senate Bill 1022.

Representative Berrios. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1022, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Health Finance Reform Act. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. Representative Kulas, for what reason do you rise?"

Kulas: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Lieutenant Governor Ryan, as a former Member of the Royal Order of Mushrooms, wanted to know how late we're going to work tonight."

Speaker Breslin: "7:00."

Kulas: "Thank you."

Speaker Breslin: "The next Bill is Senate Bill 1235,

Representative Ryder. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1235, a Bill for an Act to amend the

Mental Health and Developmental Disabilities

66th Legislative Day

June 23. 1987

Committee Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1295.

Representative Matijevich? Representative Matijevich.

Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1295, a Bill for an Act to amend the
Illinois Controlled Substance Act. Second Reading of the
Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment 31, offered by Representative

Matijevich."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Yes, Madam Speaker, the Bill determines if monies in the Juvenile Drug Abuse Fund may be spent on prevention and education, and the Amendment adds that three instances inadvertently omitted wherein fines are deposited in the Juvenile Drug Abuse Fund should be included, the Cannabis Control Act, Narcotics Profit Forfeiture Act and Criminal Code. Therefore, this is a technical Amendment drafted by the Department of Alcoholism and Substance Abuse, and I move for its adoption."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment &1 to Senate Bill 1295. And on that question, is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall Amendment &1 be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1449,

Representative Kulas. Clerk, read the Bill."

66th Legislative Day

June 23. 1987

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1449, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act in relation to the registration of underground storage tanks. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1475,

Representative Currie. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1475, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Pesticide Act. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1482,
Representative McPike. Representative McPike. Out of
the record. Senate Bill 1502, Representative Ryder.
Clerk. read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1502, a Bill for an Act to amend the

Illinois Nuclear Safety Preparedness Act. Second Reading

of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Any Floor Amendments?"

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

Ryder."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. This Amendment represents the agreement... agreed status of this Bill, and it sets fees, indicates that the fees will be in effect throughout the rest of this decade, and provides that in the event the fees are in excess of the actual amount of work done, that they will not be carried over from one year to the next, and I ask for the adoption of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1502. And on that question,

June 23, 1987

is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question...
hearing none, the question is, 'Shall Amendment &1 be
adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed
say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it,
and the Amendment is adopted. Are there any further
Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

- Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. The next Order of Business,

  Ladies and Gentlemen... excuse me. With leave of the

  Body, I'd like to go back to Senate Bill 886 on this same

  Order of Business under Public Health Second Reading.

  That's Senate Bill 886, Representative Hannig. Clerk, read

  the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 886, a Bill for an Act to provide for the establishment of a rural health care systems unit within the University of Illinois. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #1, offered by Representative Wojcik."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Hojcik. Hithdraw #1. Are there any further Amendments?"

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

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Hannig."

- Hannig: "Yes, thank you, Madam Speaker, Members of the House.

  Amendment #2 is strictly a technical Amendment that was advised that I adopt by our Democratic staff, and I move for its adoption."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved the adoption οf Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 886. And on that question, is Hearing none, discussion? there any the auestion \*Shall Amendment #2 be adopted?\* All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the

66th Legislative Day

- June 23. 1987
- Chair, the 'ayes' have it and the Amendment is adopted.

  Are there any further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative

  Hannig."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Hannig."
- Hannig: "Please withdraw #3."
- Speaker Breslin: "Withdraw #3. Are there any further
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #4, offered by Representative

  Hannig."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Hannig."
- Hannig: "Yes, thank you, Madam Speaker, Members of the House.

  This Amendment would apply the provisions of the Bill to Southern Illinois University as opposed to the University of Illinois, and would provide that the University maintain a rural regional health assistance unit to provide technical assistance to the health care providers in rural areas, and I ask for its adoption."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment &4 to Senate Bill 886. And on that question, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Cullerton."
- Cullerton: "Yes, will the Sponsor yield? Would the... did the
  University of Illinois not wish to be included in the...
  under the provisions of the Bill?"
- Hannig: "Yes, Representative, the University was opposed to the Bill, it was my understanding, when it came over, and so in order to accommodate them, we've asked that Southern Illinois University in Carbondale do it."
- Cullerton: "I assume they are not opposed to the Bill, that being Southern Illinois University... Southern Illinois. They're in favor of it."
- Hannig: "I'm not aware they're in opposition to the Bill at all."

  Cullerton: "Well, they've got time, then. It's only Second

June 23, 1987

Reading, right?"

Hannig: "Well, we'd like to move it to Third, but we certainly can always accommodate all our universities."

Cullerton: "Okay, thank you."

Speaker Breslin: "No further discussion, the question is, 'Shall Amendment #4 be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. Ladies and Gentlemen, the next
Order of Business is Public Health Third Reading. The
first Bill is Senate Bill 80, Representative Steczo.
Third... Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 80, a Bill for an Act to require reimbursement to the arresting authority for providing medical and hospital services to an arrestee. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Steczo."

Steczo: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Members of the House. Bill 80 is an attempt to address a problem with regard payment of medical services by persons who are in Presently, state law provides that custody. county officials, when a person is incarcerated in a county, and when those medical services exceed 2,500 dollars, that that person may be reimbursed or their county may be reimbursed their medical provider may be reimbursed by Department of Public Aid when there's no other insurance or other benefit program which the person can utilize. includes the term \*arresting authority\* which means that municipalities now may be reimbursed for the same costs. would answer any questions. This Bill... "

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

June 23, 1987

is there any Senate Bill 80. And on that question. discussion? Hearing none, the question is, •Shall Senate Bill 80 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 95 voting 'ave'. 17 voting 'no', and none voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 630. Representative Greiman. Representative Greiman. Out of the record. Senate Rill 722. Representative Ronan. Clerk, read... Representative Wojcik for what reason do you rise?"

- Wojcik: "Yes, I was talking and somebody inadvertently told me my light was on, and I wanted to vote 'yes' on that last Bill."
- Speaker Breslin: "That last Bill was Senate Bill 80, and Representative Hojcik was recorded 'no' and wishes to have been recorded 'aye'. The record... the transcript will reflect that."
- Wojcik: "Thank you."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Wennlund was of the same circumstance. He wishes to have been recorded as "aye" on Senate Bill 80. Senate Bill 722. Representative Ronan.
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 722, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Public Aid Code. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Ronan."
- Ronan: "Thank you, Madam Speaker and Members of the House.

  Senate Bill 722 is an amendment to the Public Aid Code,

  adds some money to their budget for capital improvements

  for the nursing home industry. It's a very important issue

  that we address this Session. I'll be glad to answer any

  questions."

66th Legislative Day

June 23, 1987

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 722. And on that question, the Gentleman from Morgan, Representative Ryder. Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Would the Sponsor yield, please?"

Speaker Breslin: "He will."

Ryder: "Representative, you indicated that this Bill was obviously an important one or else you wouldn't have been sponsoring it. Is there a price tag with this?"

Ronan: "There's some discussions right now on what the total cost would be on the legislation."

Ryder: "Do those total costs come to about 13 million?"

Ronan: "Well, that's up for debate. It appears that Public Aid set that level on it. I'm not sure that they are completely accurate. I would assume during the next fiscal year as the Bill is implemented, probably it would cost quite a bit less than that for the next fiscal year."

Ryder: "Basically, this Bill is... simply stated, the Bill causes increase in the reimbursement rate to nursing homes, paid by the Department of Public Aid."

Ronan: "Yes."

Ryder: "And is this effective during the coming fiscal year?"

Ronan: "Yes."

Ryder: "To the Bill."

Ronan: "Proceed."

Ryder: "Thank you. The problem with the Bill that the honorable Sponsor of this legislation has presented is, it will cost, in Fiscal '88, 13 million; in Fiscal '89, 14 million; and Fiscal '90, almost 16 million. While I happen to be personally very much in favor of the concept of increasing this item, especially for public aid recipients that are in nursing homes, we just increased the capital cost portion of this legislation, or this formula, last year, significantly, and that portion has and will be returning

June 23. 1987

nursing home operators and owners, a significant amount of revenue this current fiscal vear and future As a result, we're coming back and adding to that. As I said, I am in favor of that. However, the problem that we\*re talking about a 13 million dollar increase during this fiscal year, an increase that I°m not sure have the dollars to pay, so until I have some idea of what... where we're going to be obtaining these funds, we're going to finance it, I'm afraid that this Bill may be a little bit ahead of its time, and I would ask people to vote accordingly. Thank you."

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

Currie: "Thank you, Madam Speaker and Members of the Houses I, too, rise in reluctant opposition to this Bill. nursing home industry will, under legislation adopted last year, find itself 13 million dollars richer at taxpayer expense... from taxpayer funds in the coming fiscal by virtue of automatic cost of living increases, the public aid line item for nursing home... the expenditures increased as well. For us, at this point, to add an additional 13 million dollars. I think is a 13 expense we cannot afford. If and when Members of this chamber decide to vote 'yes' on the Governor's increase program, then perhaps 13 million dollars of the new money should go to nursing homes, but we haven't made that decision yet, and it seems to me inappropriate for us to talk about a 13 million dollar additional hike for item in one of our budgets. In addition, Madam Speaker and Members of the House, nothing in this 13 million dollars guarantees better quality in nursing home care across the Nothing guarantees that the homes that would have state. access to this money are the homes that are doing job to protect and care for our most vulnerable residents.

June 23 1987

We have a QUIP program, a quality incentive program that operates through this very same Department of Public Aid. That program says that the homes that do a good job will be recompensed at a higher rate. If we want to spend more money, if we have more money to spend, that would be a better place and a better way to spend it than a straight out flat grant increase for all homes, way above our fiscal capacity at this point. I think fiscal constraint should be the order of the day, and I think anybody who is not prepared to say 'yes' to the Governor's tax hike increase today, ought to be voting red."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Ronan to close."

Ronan: "Thank you. Madam Speaker. T think there's some misinformation that\*s been stated concerning this legislation. We all know that there's a serious funding crisis right now in the nursing home industry in the state. think this legislation is going to go a long way to improve some of the capital needs in that industry. I think it's important, even though it is a tight fiscal year, and I happen to be one of the Legislators of addressing the revenue issue by coming up with additional dollars, I think still we have to look the people of the State of Illinois, and I think o f this Bill will go a long way in improving our nursing system. That's why I urge as many 'aye' votes as possible on Senate Bill 722."

Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 722 All those in favor vote "aye", all those opposed vote "no". open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On are 4 voting 'aye', 97 voting 'no', and 8 question. there This Bill, having failed to receive the voting 'present'. necessary Majority, is declared lost. Senate Bill 772.

June 23, 1987

Representative Williams. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 772, a Bill for an Act requiring the attachment of pamphlets about fetal alcohol syndrome to marriage license. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Williams."

Williams: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Senate Bill 772 amends the Illinois Marriage and Dissolution of Marriage Act. It requires that the County Clerks in each county, along with marriage licenses, distribute to each couple, a free pamphlet explaining the Fetal Alcohol Syndrome. It's an attempt to try to alert young couples going into marriage, the seriousness of alcohol, especially its effect upon the young children that they may have, and an attempt that we may be able to at least save some lives. I urge its adoption."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage o f Senate Bill 772. And on that question. is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, \*Shall Senate 772 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 On this question, there are 104 voting and 5 voting 'present'. "no" This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared Senate Bill 972, Representative Stange. Clerk, passed. read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 972, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act concerning certain rights of medical patients. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Stange."

Stange: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the
House. Can we take this out of the record for a minute?"

Speaker Breslin: "Out of the record. Senate Bill 1454,

June 23, 1987

Representative Ryder. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1454, a Bill for an Act to amend the

Civil Administrative Code of Illinois. Third Reading of
the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. This Bill allows the
Department of Public Health to contract with banks for the
redemption of food instruments such as, women, infants,
children, nutrition, the Wick Program and others. And I
would urge the adoption of this Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 1454. And on that guestion. is there anv discussion? Hearing none, the question is, \*Shall Senate Bill 1454 pass?\* All those in favor vote \*ave\*. all 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 112 voting 'aye', none voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The next Bill ... the next Order of Call is Education, Second Reading. The first Bill is Senate Bill 968. Representative Representative Johnson. Out of the record. Senate **Bill** 977. Representative Cowlishaw. Clerk. read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 977, a Bill for an Act to amend sections of the School Code. Second Reading of the Bill.

Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Breslin: "Are there any Motions or Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Breslin: "Any Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

Breslin: "Third Speaker Reading. Senate Bill 1080. Representative Keane. Representative Keane? Out the record. Senate Bill 1095. Representative Levin.

June 23, 1987

Representative Levin? Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1095, a Bill for an Act to amend sections of the School Code. Second Reading of the Bill.

No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative

Cowlishaw."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Cowlishaw."

- Cowlishaw: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'm sorry for the delay. Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. underlying Bill has to do with the State Board of Education being able to verify, by actual on site inspections, the attendance records that are submitted to the State Board by the school districts throughout Illinois. Apparently, there has been some problem, or at least there is a perception that there may be a problem, with attendance records being falsified. In discussions of this became apparent that there is only one school district where there is. apparently, a potential possible problem, and that is in the City of Chicago's schools. Since that is the cause of the problem, all this Amendment does, is to make the provisions of this Bill apply only to the City of Chicago schools. And I move for the adoption of Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1095."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Lady has moved for the adoption of Amendment &1 to Senate Bill 1095. And on that question, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Cullerton."
- Cullerton: "Yes, thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Representative Cowlishaw ... of the ... to the Sponsor of the Amendment. I would think that if you don't agree with the Bill, that you would simply not vote for. If you don't think that the State Board of Education should have the authority. They're not required to ... If

June 23. 1987

you don't think they should have the authority to conduct on site auditing of the verification of attendance records, then that's fine, you could simply vote against the Bill. It does affect the ... I believe, the School Aid Formula. And think it is something which the State Board would take in ... into account, in determining where they should But I find it a little bit insulting, that ... go. especially that, since you are viewed as a leader issue of Education, that you would offer an Amendment that restricts it to Chicago only. because I think it sends it's a bad message. You know, that 'You people there don't know how to keep your records. He know how records throughout the rest of the State. So. for that reason. I would assume that the ••• unless there's some agreement that you have with the Sponsors of the Bill that is beyond me, where they only want it to apply t o Chicago, that would surprise me. But I think the tone of the Amendment is somewhat insulting. And so, in absence of an explanation to the contrary, I would stand in opposition to the Amendment."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Cullerton, I don't believe you asked a question. You just made a statement. But, if you're expecting a response, I think that's ..."

Cullerton: "No. I would not expect a response."

Speaker Breslin: "Okay. Then on the question of the adoption of the Amendment, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Levin."

Levin: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would rise in opposition to the Amendment. To give a little background on the legislation and where it's coming from. A couple of years ago, when we passed the Education Reform Package, part of that was the Education Partnership Act, that provided for research into education

June 23. 1987

Some of that research was conducted by DePaul included somebody I think many of us know. University and Father Charlie Kyle. And what was uncovered through of that research, was that there were questions in terms of attendance figures in the Chicago Board of Education system. And this legislation was proposed, in order to able to look more closely at ... you know, to see if there were any problems, because one of the things discovered is, we're trying to deal with dropouts and the system seemed to be discouraging people from staving school beyond the three months that is used for purposes of computation οf school aid. So, 'I think the correct. in that the legislation ... the was the Chicago system. But clearly, why should it be limited? We know... We think WP have problem in Chicago and we want to deal with that problem. But. it seems to me, the State Board should have the authority. In fact, arguably, they have the authority now, the intent of the legislation is to clarify that authority, make sure they do. They should have authority to do such verifications anywhere in the State. We don't know if there's a problem in downstate place else in the State of Illinois. And if we limit this. result. but it may hurt another it will accomplish our school district, where they have a problem now and where problem comes up in the future, if the Board is not given the same authority. Again, we think that the authority now to do this. In consultations with them, they're not totally sure. And this legislation, the basic Bill is intended to clarify that. would rise in opposition because it seems to me, the authority should not be limited to one school district this State."

66th Legislative Dav

"Thank

Cowlishaw:

June 23, 1987

"Representative Cowlishaw, to close." Speaker Breslin:

vou. Madam Speaker. There is absolutely no intention for this Amendment to be even approaching that could be described as insulting, as one of the former speakers mentioned. The fact is. that currently, the State Board of Education visits every school district in Illinois on a cycle that runs about once every two to three years, to audit the attendance data. in fact, the State Board of Education, without changing any current provisions of the School Code, has the authority to do this throughout Illinois DOW. **A11** this would do. particularly if it is amended as I have suggested, would be to empower the State Board of Education to check on those attendance figures more frequently in the City of Chicago, than elsewhere. And since the study, that resulted in, or inspired the legislation, which was University's Chicago area study, exclusively looked into whether this might be a problem in the City Chicago οf schools, and determined that, indeed, it may be. Then it seems to me, that it is useless to try to solve a that does not exist statewide. That study has detected that there is a problem, or a least a possible problem Fine, then let us district. address that problem in that one school district, by giving the State Board of Education the right to make those checks more frequently in that district. This Amendment. i f it is or if the Bill is adopted, does not change the adopted. authority of the Board, the State Board to visit all school districts every two to three years. What I am that we should pinpoint solving the problem. Let's solve the problem where it occurs, not elsewhere. And I ask for a Roll Call vote on this Amendment."

Breslin: "The question is, Speaker \*Shall Amendment bе

June 23, 1987

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 49 voting 'aye', 61 voting 'no' and 1 voting 'present'. And the Amendment fails. Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "There are no further Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. With leave of the Body, I'd

like to go back to Senate Bill 1080, Representative Keane's

Bill. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1080, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. Second Reading of the Bill. There are no Committee Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Any Floor Amendments?"

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

Representative Turner."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Turner, on Amendment #1."

Turner: "Thank you, Madam Chairman and Members of the Assembly.

Amendment & includes Cosmetology Schools which have been nationally accredited for three years in this Bill. The accreditation for 1500 Cosmetology School program hours is rigorous, and only approximately 1/2 of the 185 Cosmetology Schools operating in Illinois will qualify. The Bill, as it is presently designed, without Cosmetology Schools, covers 39 schools, 29 of which are located in Chicago, 4 in suburban areas and 7 in downstate. This Amendment would bring all Cosmetology Schools into compliance with the State Scholarship Grant Program."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment &1 to Senate Bill 1080. And on that question, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Keane."

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

Speaker Breslin: "He will."

66th Legislative Day

- June 23, 1987
- Keane: "How many more schools ••• How many more proprietary schools will this bring into the Bill?"
- Turner: "It would include 78, of the 178 Cosmetology Schools in Illinois."
- Keane: "If you look at your Amendment, it does not ... it does not limit it to Cosmetology. You say, any proprietary school requiring a license issued by R & E."
- Turner: "Could he repeat ... Could you repeat the question again.

  Representative?"
- Keane: "You do not ... as I read the Amendment, it does not limited to Cosmetology Schools."
- Turner: "No, it actually would take in all proprietary schools offering courses that would become licensed within the Department of Registration and Education. So, it is not limited to Cosmetology Schools, you're correct."
- Keane: "To the Bill ... or to the Amendment. What we're attempting to do with the basic Bill, is to provide for those proprietary schools, who are licensed by the Board of Higher Education, or by the State Board of Education, to provide them with scholarship assistance. This Amendment would open it up to any school, any proprietary school that has come in and been approved, or received licensing from R & E, which tremendously broadens the Bill and would do away with any impact that the Bill would have. And I would resist the Amendment. I would ask for a "no" vote."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from ... The Gentleman from McLean, Representative Ropp."
- Ropp: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
- Speaker Breslin: "He indicates he will."
- Ropp: "Representative, with the understanding now that this is much broader, do you feel that ... well, can you tell me how many potential additions will come into this particular program?"

June 23, 1987

Turner: "Well, we feel that it would include ... it would probably include another 4,000 students, is what we anticipate would come into the program. So, in terms of students, I think that's a better number to talk with."

"Okay, let's say 4,000 students, with the understanding Ropp: the main Bill indicates, that the funding would be no higher than 10% of the Scholarship Commission. Certainly. point, you're really diluting the whole intent of the program. And it would seem, at this point. unwise to add this particular section, now bringing in some 4,000 new students into this program, and I would urge the Body to vote against this Amendment, and let's get operation in high gear, and then take another look at whether or not we want to add another 4,000 students at some later point."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Fulton, Representative Homer, on the Amendment."

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

Speaker Breslin: "He will."

Homer: "Representative Turner, Cosmetology Schools that now have a contractual agreement with a local community college, would a student enrolled in that program be eligible for the Scholarship Award, so long as the Cosmetology School is affiliated with the community college?"

Turner: "It would be those students not eligible, or is not enrolled in a community college program, so would be eligible for these funds."

Homer: "Well, thank you and Madam Speaker, to the Bill. The reason I asked that question is, that under current law, where a Cosmetology School has a contractual agreement with a community college, those students are now eligible to receive the Scholarship ... the Illinois State Scholarship Grants. Whereas, students who attend Cosmetology Schools

June 23, 1987

that offer an identical curriculum, but not affiliated with a community college, are not eligible for the grant. Bill itself, would purport to enlarge the scope of the Scholarship Program, to make the Program eligible students that enter Vocational Proprietary Programs. And right now, that would mean there are 39 schools that that would cover under the Bill, without the Amendment. Out of those 39 schools, and for all downstaters. I think should take note, out of those 39 schools covered by the Bill, without the Amendment, 28 of those schools the City of Chicago 4 are located in the suburbs, and only 7 of those schools are located downstate. But with the Gentleman's Amendment, that distribution would change so that there would be 35 Cosmetology ... a total of 35 schools downstate that would be covered under amended. So, I think downstaters ought to take a good look and support the Gentleman's Amendment, if for no other reason, then for that reason alone. But the Amendment goes. I think, beyond that with its merits. If you look at that would be covered under the 39 schools those schools under the Bill, without the Amendment, you find that schools here that deal with welding, have that are secretarial schools, court reporting schools, automotive schools, data processing, computer program. Why are those schools so different than cosmetology schools? Cosmetology schools have a very strict regimented requirement. Thev require 1500 hours worth of program it;s rigorous, and it's understanding that only, approximately 1/2 of the 185 cosmetology schools in Illinois, would now qualify, because the Amendment limits the eligibility to those cosmetology schools, which have been nationally accredited for the past three years. So, the Amendment is tightly drawn. I think it's a very reasonable Amendment. It broadens the scope of

June 23, 1987

the Bill in a much more equitable way than it would be otherwise. And I would urge support for the Gentleman's Amendment."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Turner, to close,"

Turner: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Assembly. I think the previous speaker, Representative Homer, said it adequately. This Bill would bring geographic equity to proprietary schools throughout the State. It's for that reason that I rise and ask your favorable support of this Amendment."

Breslin: "The question is, \*Shall Speaker Amendment 81 adopted?\* All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed All those in favor vote \*aye\*, all those opposed sav 'no'. vote \*no\*. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. Representative AcCracken, for reason do vou rise?"

McCracken: "Verification of the Affirmative."

Speaker Breslin: "On this question, there are 58 voting 'aye', 53

voting 'no' and 1 voting 'present'. Representative Keane

asks for a Poll ... okay ... There has been a request for a

verification. Would you poll the Affirmative, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Poll of those voting on the Affirmative. Bowman. Breslin. Brunsvold. Christensen. Countryman. Cowlishaw. Davis. DeJaegher. DeLeo. Deuchler. Dunn. Flinn. Flowers. Giorgi. Granberg. Hannio. Hartke-Kubik. Hensel. Hicks. Homer. Jones. Krska. Kulas. Laurino. Leverenz. Levin. Martinez. Matijevich. Morrow. Mulcahev. McNamara. Novak. Parke. William Peterson. Phelps. Piel. Preston. Rea. Rice. Richmond. Saltsman. Satterthwaite. Shaw. Slater. Steczo. Van Duyne. White. Stern. Sutker. Turner. Williams. Williamson. Wolf. Anthony Young and Wyvetter Younge."

66th Legislative Day

June 23. 1987

Speaker Breslin: "Any questions of the Affirmative, Mr. McCracken?"

McCracken: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Representative Piel?"

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Piel? Representative Piel is in the Chamber. Any further questions?"

McCracken: "Oh. I was waiting for the response."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman is here. The Gentleman is in the Chamber."

McCracken: "Oh, I'm sorry. Representative Krska?"

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Krska? Representative Krska?

The Gentleman is not in the Chamber. Remove him from the Roll Call."

McCracken: "Representative Leverenz."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Leverenez? Representative Ted Leverenz? The Gentleman is not in the Chamber. Remove him from the Roll Call."

McCracken: "Representative Novak."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Novak is in the Chamber."

McCracken: "Representative Dunn."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Dunn is in the Chamber."

McCracken: "Representative Farley."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Farley? He's voting 'no'."

McCracken: "Representative Hartke."

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

McCracken: "You've moved Representative Hartke. Representative Shaw?"

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Shaw."

McCracken: "Representative Hicks?"

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman is in the Chamber.

Representative Hicks? Representative Hicks? The Gentleman is not in the Chamber. Oh, yes, the Gentleman is in the Chamber. Representative Williamson rises to change her vote from "aye" to "no". Change Representative Williamson

66th Legislative Day

June 23, 1987

from 'aye' to 'no'. Mr. Clerk, Williamson. Yes, Linda Williamson, from 'aye' to 'no'. Proceed, Mr. McCracken."

McCracken: "Representative Capparelli?"

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Capparelli? Representative Capparelli?"

McCracken: "He voted 'no', I'm sorry."

Speaker Breslin: "Voted 'no'."

McCracken: "Representative Slater?"

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Slater is in the Chamber.

Representative Piel changes his vote from 'aye' to 'no'.

Representative Turner?"

Turner: "At the appropriate time, Madam Chairman, I'd like to seek the verification of the Negative ..."

Speaker Breslin: "Very good, Mr. McCracken."

McCracken: "Representative Flinn?"

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Flinn, Monroe Flinn? The Gentleman is in his seat. Representative Deuchler? Representative Deuchler changes her vote from 'aye' to 'no'."

McCracken: "Representative Mulcahev?"

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Mulcahey is in the Chamber."

McCracken: "Let's see. Representative Van Duyne?"

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Van Duyne is in his chair. Any further questions?"

McCracken: "Nothing further."

Speaker Breslin: "There's a Poll of the Negative. Hr. Clerk,
please Poll the Negative."

Clerk Leone: "Poll of the Negative. Ackerman. Barger. Barnes. Black. Bugielski. Capparelli. Churchill. Cullerton. Curran. Currie. Daley. Daniels. Deuchler Didrickson. Doederlein. Ewing. Farley. Virginia Frederick. Gialio. Giorgi. Greiman. Hallock. Hasara. Hoffman. Hultgren. Keane ..."

66th Legislative Day

June 23, 1987

Speaker Breslin: "Excuse me, Mr. Clerk. Representative Turner,
Representative Currie ask leave to be verified. The Lady
has leave. Proceed, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Kirkland. Klemm. Laurino. Mays. McAuliffe.

McCracken. McGann..."

Speaker Breslin: "Excuse me, Hr. Clerk. Representative Regan changes his vote from 'no' to 'aye'. Proceed, Hr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "O°Connell. Robert Olson. Panayotovich. Parcells.

Bernard Pederson. Petka. Piel. Pullen. Ronan. Ropp.

Ryder. Sieben. Stange. Stephens. Tate. Terzich. Hait.

Weaver. Wennlund. Williamson. Wojcik and Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Breslin: "Do you have any questions of the Negative,

Representative Turner?"

Turner: "Representative Barnes."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Barnes is in the Chamber."

Turner: "I'm sorry. Representative Giglio."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Giglio. Frank Giglio. Is the Gentleman in the Chamber? He is not. Remove him from the Roll Call."

Turner: "Representative Farley."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Farley is in the Chamber."

Turner: "Representative Stange."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Stange is in the Chamber."

Turner: "Representative Wait."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Wait is in the Chamber."

Turner: "Representative Churchill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Churchill is in the Chamber.

Representative Kulas changes his vote from 'aye' to 'no'.

Change Representative Kulas."

Turner: "Representative Panayotovich."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Panayotovich? The Gentleman is not in the Chamber. Remove him from the Roll Call."

Turner: "Representative ... Representative Cullerton."

66th Legislative Day June 23, 1987

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Cullerton is in the Chamber."

Turner: "Representative Capparelli."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Capparelli, I think ...

Representative Capparelli is in the Chamber."

Turner: "Representative Ackerman."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Ackerman is in the Chamber."

Turner: "Representative Ryder."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Ryder is in the Chamber."

Turner: "Representative Curran."

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

Turner: "Representative Ronan."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Ronan is in the Chamber."

Turner: "Representative O'Connell."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative O\*Connell? Representative
O\*Connell is not in the Chamber. Remove him from the Roll
Call."

Turner: "Representative Mays."

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

Turner: "Representative Ewing."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Ewing? Tom Ewing. The Gentleman is not in the Chamber. Remove him from the Roll Call."

Turner: "No further."

Speaker Breslin: "On this question ... Representative Curran, for what reason do you rise? Representative Curran changes his vote from 'no' to 'aye'. Representative Kubik changes his vote from 'aye' to 'no'. Representative McCracken, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

McCracken: "Verification of the Affirmative, Madam Speaker."

Speaker Breslin: "You've already done that, Sir. You've already

done that, Sir. No, Sir. Once you have a verification,

the verification is finished. On this question, there are

- June 23, 1987
- 53 voting 'aye', 52 voting 'no' and 1 voting 'present'.

  And the Amendment is adopted. Are there any further

  Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment \$2, offered by Representatives

  Satterthwaite and Weaver."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Satterthwaite."
- Satterthwaite: "Madam Speaker and Members of the House. This Amendment is one that will provide some consumer protection, so that if we are going to start students who go to proprietary schools, we will have some assurance that those programs are worthwhile programs, that will in fact, end up in having the person trained for good purpose and some position, which they ... in which they can be employed. I would be happy to respond questions, but suggest simply that what we are trying to do with this Amendment, is to guarantee a quality program that will not be simply a rip off of the taxpayers of the State of Illinois, by having people go through a turnstile, going in and out of the programs."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Lady has moved for the adoption of
  Amendment #2. And on that question, the Gentleman from
  Cook, Representative Keane."
- Keane: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise in opposition to this Amendment, Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 1080. Basically, we would increase the bureaucracy by setting up an Illinois Vocational Training Promotional Authority to do what Illinois State Scholarship can do without any problem. you are for bureaucracy, and you want to set up another which will duplicate what agency. Illinois State Scholarship Commission now does, vote for the Bill vote for the Amendment. If you don't, please vote 'no' on Amendment #2."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from McLean, Representative

June 23. 1987

Ropp.

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

Speaker Breslin: "He indicates he will. She indicates she will."

Ropp: "Representative, currently, doesn't the Illinois State
Scholarship Commission and also the U.S. Office of
Education require some guidelines for these schools to
operate and function under right now?"

Satterthwaite: "I'm sorry. You're saying the U.S. Office of Education?"

Ropp: "Yes. Don't these schools that are in operation right now, have some guidelines that they must follow, in order to be either, let's say, approved or accredited or able to operate in the State of Illinois?"

Satterthwaite: "Well, the guidelines are really very minimal that they operate under. And some of the schools are very good schools and have high standards. Others have very poor standards. First of all, of course, the primary difference between the proprietary schools and those schools that currently qualify for scholarship funds for their students, is that proprietary schools are for profit. we want to guarantee against, is having a for profit institution just come in with a program that will provide them for additional taxpayers dollars, without some assurance that they are going to educate students. One o f problems that has arisen, when the federal government opened the Pell Grants to proprietary institutions. there was a high incidence of found that improper procedure. So that we had students being accepted. were not really qualified for the program to begin with. We had high turnover and dropout rates. So that after payment was made, the student was not able to complete their course, and obviously then, was not a student could become educated and be prepared to take a job. So

- June 23. 1987
- these conditions in this Bill, are simply to give us some assurance that the students will be getting a high quality program and will be able to complete that program.
- Ropp: "You mentioned that these schools are for profit. Am I to assume then, that private schools and public schools are for loss?"
- Satterthwaite: "They are not for profit. They are simply trying to get sufficient funding to be able to carry on the educational program. And that's the distinction. This will provide the for profit institutions with additional funds."
- Ropp: "One final question then. Are these guidelines and requirements that are being proposed in this Amendment, more restrictive or less restrictive, than those current schools, who, let's say, are private schools and receive State dollars from the Illinois Scholarship Commission?"
- Satterthwaite: "Well, I don't think that we have ever demanded the same standards of the not for profit schools, or not for profit enterprises in the State, as we do for for profit enterprises. This would simply guarantee us that we were not providing for profit institutions with a lot of money that was not being utilized for State purpose. The State's purpose is to make these people employable. And that's why I think we need some guarantees that the for profit motive does not override the educational mission of the institution."
- Ropp: "Well, to the Bill. I would hope that we would not, by the consideration of this Amendment, assume that the same kind of responsibility is not so entwined within the private school system within our State. And that, I guess, I think we really see more students who go to these proprietary schools are really going to, in fact, prepare themselves for going into some job, more so, probably a higher

June 23, 1987

percentage, ultimately end up employed versus those who attend a so-called not for profit school. And, I guess, I would urge the Body to strongly consider it and really not support this Amendment. That really places more restrictions on State dollars and the usage of Scholarship Commission Funds, than any other school, and I just think we need some equality. And this Amendment does not provide for that equality."

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

Daley: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Breslin: "She will."

Daley: "Representative, you indicated that in the Amendment, about quality education. Could you answer, how is quality education? Is that certification of the school? Could you explain that a little further, please."

Satterthwaite: "The requirement is that these would be programs
that have been approved by the Board of Education or by the
Board of Higher Education for the last three consecutive
years."

Daley: "Thank you."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative

Hoffman: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in opposition to this Amendment. This Amendment, by creating the Illinois Vocational Training Promotional Authority. sets uр another agency in State As many of you know, who have looked area of training and education for employment, you know we already have 12, 13 ... 12 or 13 agencies which were It is very confusing. involved in this area. There is a great deal of overlap. There is а great deal o f duplication, and I'm inclined to think that when the study of the Intergovernmental Cooperation Committee Commission

June 23, 1987

gets into place, we'll find that we can redirect a lot of resources to areas where they can be much more productive.

In my judgement, by adding another authority on top of what already exists, is counterproductive, and I rise in

opposition to this, obviously well intended Amendment."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Satterthwaite, to close." Satterthwaite: "Madam Speaker and Hembers of the House. indicated before, the intent of this Amendment, is really separate out the process. bν which we approve proprietary schools. The for profit schools should. have different standards to meet, and we also feel that the different board helps to make them separate what we do with the public and private schools in the State of Illinois, which already have access to scholarship funds through the Illinois State Scholarship Commission. The Federation of Independent Colleges and Universities in the have strongly supported the proposal that is before you now in Amendment #2. And they are suggesting that, it necessary to have a different board that would look at these programs in a different light from what normally funded through the Higher Education System of the State of Illinois. They are particularly concerned portions of this Amendment that deal with the consumer protection aspects. And let me read some of those to for instance. One of the conditions that the proprietary school would have to meet, is to indicate that they sufficient resources to sustain the operation for a 12 month period. Obviously, if it is a program that does have sufficient funding to be an ongoing institution, you are not going to be able to complete the obligation to the students who enroll in those programs. We also want them to have a fair and prompt resolution of student

concerning instructional programs, the business affairs of

June 23 • 1987

the institution, etc. And we're asking for a pro rata So that if a student enrolls and decides refund policy. after three days that there has been false advertising program, or a misrepresentation of what that program can do for a student, they can drop out, without having the institution keep a high percentage of the tuition fees and fees that are paid by taxpayers to help that student get their education. We think that these are necessary conditions so that we will be able to provide funding for students, who, are indeed, getting an appropriate education through a proprietary school, but would weed out those that may not be adequately presenting what they can do for the student, or the program quality that will be offered by that institution. And for that reason, I suggest to you that if we are going to extend grants into the proprietary school area, these consumer protections are very much needed and ought to be a part of the Bill, and I solicit your support."

Speaker Breslin: "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 25 voting 'aye', 84 voting 'no' and 1 voting 'present'. And the Amendment fails. Are there any further Amendments?"

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

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Weaver."

Weaver: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #3 alleviates some of the problems that were associated with Amendment #2, by keeping the same controls over the proprietary school, but instead of establishing a separate bureaucratic authority, keeps the

66th Legislative Day

June 23, 1987

administrative powers vested in the Illinois State
Scholarship Commission. I would be happy to answer any
questions you might have."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment &3 to Senate Bill 1080. And on that question, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Keane."

Keane: "A question of the Sponsor, please."

Speaker Breslin: "Proceed."

Keane: "Is this the Amendment that the Federation of Independent

Colleges and Universities has asked to be put on the Bill?"

Weaver: "Yes, Sir."

Keane: "Let me ask you ••• Has ••• Do the colleges and universities within the Federation, develop a full written description of the governance and control of their corporate organization? And is that published?"

Weaver: "That I don't know."

Keane: "Well, let me tell you. It's not. They don't. Item \$2.

Do they employ administrative personnel with qualifications equal to, or exceeding those required for Illinois secondary school administrative personnel?"

Weaver: "I can't answer for their operation."

Keane: "I'll tell you. They don't. Item #3. Do thev submit evidence that they have enough resources to sustain their operation for 12 months? They don't. I'll answer. Have they got a procedure for the fair and prompt resolution of student grievances that is common to all schools? Do they have the same refund policies that they're asking the proprietaries to have? They don't. Did thev admit the students on the same thing?"

Weaver: "These questions are really easy. I wish you'd slow down a little bit, so I could write these answers down."

Keane: "Well, I'll tell you what. We went over all of these and we said ... I said, as Sponsor of the Bill, we'll accept

June 23, 1987

these Amendments, if you'll live by the same Amendments.

And they won't. And for that reason, I don't know how you can say that there's one set of standards for someone else, but there's a different set for me. And on that basis, I would ask my colleagues to vote 'no' on Amendment 33."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Weaver, to close."

- Weaver: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen we are on the verge of establishing a new system of scholarships, which could amount to. based upon FY levels, as much as \$18 million dollars. It is my position, that if we're going to spend, or at least consider spending kind of money, to support students who are going to profit for profit schools, that we ought to at least have some controls over what kind of schools we allow State money to be going into, and what kind of control that thev exert over their students. I really think we need to take a careful look at where State money is being spent in these tight days of budgetary crunch and tax proposals. T support this Amendment, and ask for a 'green' vote on this Amendment. Thank you."
- Speaker Breslin: "The question is, "Shall Amendment @3 be adopted?" All those in favor vote "aye", all those opposed vote "no". Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Representative Turner, one minute to explain your vote."
- Turner: "Thank you, Madam Chairman and Members of the Assembly. rise in support of this Amendment. I think that it is a good Amendment in terms of protecting to make sure that the schools, that are proprietary schools that are operating here in the State, would have parameters in which certain controls and guidelines would be set up. I think that it's a good Amendment. It provides tutorial assistance for those kids who aren•t doing very well in the various programs. And I just think that it is something that's a

June 23, 1987

good safeguard, and it should be adopted by this Assembly."

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

- Bowman: "Yes, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House.

  This is a good Amendment. There is ... there are a couple of big differences between the average proprietary school and the average of institution of higher education as we normally understand that term. What is the dropout rate? The dropout rate in these proprietary schools is very much greater, and their refund policy, specifically, very much worse. And protection like this is very much needed, in order to make sure that this Bill will work properly and will not be an embarrassment to the General Assembly."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Satterthwaite, one minute to explain your vote."
- Satterthwaite: "Madam Speaker and Members of the House. The people who were opposed to the last Amendment because it administrative bodv set UD new for processing applications for these grants, ought to be supporting this piece of legislation. This is still through the Illinois State Scholarship Commission. Ιt provides for bureaucracy. Ιt does provide some protection for the consumer. What we have are reports that show that dropout rates often exceed 75% of the students enrolled in these programs, partially because a nonresponsible proprietary school can give misleading advertising and information about their programs, and once the student gets there, they decide that it really isnot going to be helpful to them and they drop out. Now, if that is ..."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Satterthwaite, bring your remarks to a close."
- Satterthwaite: "If it is a case that 75% of the students drop out after the first few days of the program, we certainly don't

- June 23. 1987
- want taxpayers dollars to be wasted on that student and given to the proprietary school. We should be supporting these consumer Amendments."
- Speaker Breslin: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 54 voting 'aye', 56 voting 'no'. And Representative Bowman asks for a verification of the Negative. Poll the Negative, Hr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "Poll of the Negative. Ackerman. Barnes. Braun.

  Capparelli. Churchill. Cowlishaw. Curran. Daniels.

  Deuchler. Didrickson. Ewing. Farley. Virginia Frederick.

  Giglio. Giorgi..."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Bowman, for what reason do you
- Bowman: "Could you ask the Clerk to speak up, or turn up his ...

  the volume a little bit, because I can't hear."
- Speaker Breslin: "Okay, Mr. Clerk, they're having difficulty hearing the names. Proceed, Sir."
- Clerk Leone: "Continuing with the Poll. Goforth. Granberg. Hallock. Hensel. Hicks. Hoffman. Keane. Klemm. Laurino. Leverenz. Mautino. Mavs. McCracken. McNamara. Mulcahey. O\*Connell. Panayotovich. Parcells. Parke. Bernard Pederson. William Peterson. Petka. Phelps. Piel. Rea. Regan. Ronan. Ropp. Rvder. Sieben. Stange. Stephens. Tate. Van Duyne. Wennlund. Williamson. Wojcik and Wolf. No further."
- Speaker Breslin: "Any questions of the Affirmative (sic Negative), Mr. Bowman? Representative Bowman? Excuse me, Representative Shaw changes his vote from 'present' to 'aye'. Representative Flowers changes her vote from 'aye' to 'no'. Representative Van Duyne changes his vote from 'no to 'aye'. Representative LeFlore changes his vote from 'aye' to 'no'. Representative Ewing asks leave to be

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

66th Legislative Day

June 23, 1987

verified. Representative Ewing. The Gentleman has leave. Representative Novak asks 1 eave t n he verified. Representative Novak. we are only verifying the Negative and you had voted positively. Representative Shaw changes for second time, from 'aye' to Representative Jones. Representative Jones. Would VOL turn on Representative Jones. How do you wish to vote, Representative Jones? Your microphone is on."

Jones: "No."

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

Change Representative Davis from 'aye' to 'no'.

Representative Stange asks leave to be verified.

Representative Bowman, do you have any questions?"

Bowman: "Yes, what's happening?"

Speaker Breslin: "The Negative."

Bowman: "Okay, let's try it. Representative Panayotovich."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Panayotovich is voting 'no'. Is the Gentleman in the Chamber. He is not. Remove him from the Roll Call."

Bowman: "Flinn."

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

Bowman: "Leverenz."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Leverenz is voting 'no'. Is the Gentleman in the Chamber? He is not. Remove him from the Roll Call."

Bowman: "Okay. Mulcahey?"

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Mulcahey is in his chair, shouting."

Bowman: "Ronan."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative who?"

Bowman: "Al Ronan."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Ronan, Al Ronan is voting 'no'.

Is the Gentleman in the Chamber. He is not. He is in the

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

66th Legislative Day

June 23, 1987

Chamber."

Bowman: "Okay, Representative Farley?"

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

Bowman: "Oh, indeed he is. Representative Giglio?"

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Giglio? Representative Giglio is voting 'no'. Is the Gentleman in the Chamber? He is not. Remove him from the Roll Call. Any further?"

Bowman: "Churchill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Churchill is in the Chamber."

Bowman: "Did we determine Giglio?"

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Giglio was taken off of the Roll
Calle"

Bowman: "Okav. No further questions."

Speaker Breslin: "On this question, there are 51 voting 'aye', 57

voting 'no' and none voting 'present'. And the Amendment

fails. Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "There are no further Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. The next Bill is Senate Bill 1096, Representative Hartinez. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1096, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "There are none."

Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1194,

Representative Flowers. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1194, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act
to authorize school boards and welfare centers to sponsor
community school lunch programs. Second Reading of the
Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment \$1, offered by Representatives

McCracken and Cowlishaw."

June 23, 1987

Speaker Breslin: "Representative McCracken or Cowlishaw.

Representative McCracken, on Amendment #1."

McCracken: "Yes, thank you, Madam Speaker. Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1194 would insure that funds for this purpose are distributed equitably throughout the State. This would require that no school district may receive more than 10% of the funds appropriated for this program. I think it's, frankly, a Bill which downstaters, as well as collar county Representatives, should take a careful look at. This is merely for the purpose of insuring that there is statewide distribution of funds, if there are any appropriated for this program. I move its adoption."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage ... or
the adoption of Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1194. And on
that question, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative
Young."

Young: "Will the Sponsor vield?"

Speaker Breslin: "He will."

Young: "Does your ••• Representative, does your Amendment take into any account that different areas of the State may have different student pregnancy rates?"

McCracken: "No."

Young: "So, if one area of the State had totally used up its 10%, but still had a large number of pregnant students, and another area had not used up its 10%, but didn't have pregnant students, your Amendment doesn't take that account in any manner, does it Representative?"

McCracken: "No."

Young: "Okay. To the Amendment, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentleman of the House. This is a horrible Amendment.

It's meant to kill the Bill. I would point out that earlier today, we voted on birth control in school clinics.

This Body decided that birth control in school clinics

June 23. 1987

should be outlawed, now we have a Bill here dealing with meals for pregnant students. And this Amendment would, basically, gut the Bill. I urge a 'no' vote."

- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Preston."
- Preston: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the I know the Sponsor of this Amendment to be House. decent person. He is well meaning. He is well intended. And I am also convinced, that in his heart of hearts and in his conscience, if he were to spend the time thinking about what this horrible Amendment does, he could not remotely be supportive of it. This Bill is so vitally important, and important to those who want to for the people of Illinois. It's providing nourishment for pregnant women who are about to have children. this, what is called prenatal care, you end up having children who are underweight. Low birth weight babies are sickly babies, and they end up costing the taxpayers a hundred times more dollars than, what amounts to pennies bν comparison, to provide some additional nourishment to women in her pregnancy. This not only saves money, it saves lives. It saves the children, who otherwise would be sickly and underweight. This Amendment destroys what is, otherwise, an excellent Bill. And it just must be rejected. And Mr. McCracken, I would like "no" to see you voting on vour terrible Amendment."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Williams."
- Williams: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I, too, rise in opposition
  to this Amendment. In all due respect to a very, what I
  would call well learned Sponsor, this is... epitome of
  cruelty. I think, what we have here is a situation where,

June 23. 1987

early as he stated, this Body voted to refuse to 2110W contraceptives. This Body. basically. has come on as saying 'Yes, you must have children. Yes, you must do all of these things if you're in the situation. even feed you now. We won't even provide the nourishment. Because in my area. I'm certain, when you look at going to happen, it will easily be more than one area with 10%. This is an attempt to kill this Bill. This And I would hope that the Sponsor would cruel Amendment. take some time and rethink this. And I urge a 'no' vote on this Amendment."

Speaker Breslin: "Mr. McCracken is recognized to close."

McCracken: "Thank you. Madam Speaker. I am humbled by all of the compliments I have received from my learned colleagues. think the Amendment is one which merits However. I do serious consideration. The point of the Amendment is kill the Bill. The point of the Amendment is to insure distribution throughout the State. The proponent the Chicago Board of Education. They want State funds for this purpose. I'm not saying that we shouldn't use State funds for this purpose, but if we are going to do particularly in the first year of a program, which depends upon General Assembly appropriations. well have an experience that is valid statewide. And the only way we get a valid experience statewide, is to insure distribution statewide. Otherwise, there is no accounting for this money where it will go. Now, the Gentlemen on the other side of the aisle make а point out the details of which are not cited. Chicago's got the largest population. but let's get statewide experience in this appropriation. Let's find out what affect it has, or what need there is in other parts of the State, and not go blindly with the Chicago Board of

June 23, 1987

Education's Bill. And that's why this Amendment is offered, not to kill the Bill, but to determine whether or not there's a statewide need. It's State funds. And let's see if it's necessary on a statewide basis. And I move its adoption."

- Speaker Breslin: "The question is, "Shall Amendment #1 be adopted?" All those in favor vote "aye", all those opposed vote "no". Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Cullerton, one minute to explain your vote."
- Cullerton: "Yes, so that there's, I hope, no confusion. I'm sure Representative McCracken, the Sponsor did not mean to misrepresent. This does not insure statewide distribution. This says that no county should get any more than 10% of the funds, even though one county has more than 50% of the population. It's an absolutely insulting Amendment. It's the worst one I think he's come with. UP or dreamed up this year. It should be defeated."
- Speaker Breslin: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 53 voting 'aye', 60 voting 'no' and none voting 'present'. And the Amendment fails. Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

- Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1197,

  Representative Davis. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1197, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Are there any Motions or Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "There are no Motions nor further Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. Ladies and Gentlemen, the next

Order of Business is Education, Third Reading. We would

- June 23, 1987
- like to take one Bill which needs to be brought back from Third to Second. We want to do this before we adjourn. That Bill is Senate Bill 440, Representative Bowman's Bill. Clerk. read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "On page three of your Calendar, Senate Bill 440, a

  Bill for an Act to amend the State Comptroller Act. It's

  on the Order of Third Reading."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Bowman asks leave to return this
  Bill to the Order of Second Reading for the purposes of
  presenting a Motion. Does he have leave? Hearing no
  objection, the Gentleman has leave. What is your Motion,
  Mr. Rowman?"
- Bowman: "I move to table Amendment 31, which was placed on the Bill, was offered by me in Committee, and I can now anticipate the Bill will have trouble in the Senate with this Amendment on, and so as not to waste everybody's time, I now move to table that Amendment."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman moves to table Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 440. Δnd on that question, is there discussion? Hearing none, the question Amendment #1 be tabled?\* All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair. the have it. And Amendment #1 is tabled. Consent Calendar, Mr. Clerk. Excuse me. We'll move ... Are there any other Motions or Amendments filed on Senate Bill 440. Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Leone: "There are no further Motions nor Amendments."
- Speaker Breslin: "Then move the Bill back to Third Reading. Can you read the Consent Calendar now, please."
- Clerk Leone: "Consent Calendar. Senate Bill 359, a Bill for an Act in relation to local and district libraries and State Revenue Sharing. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 771 has been passed to Third previously. And Senate Bill

June 23, 1987

1342, a Bill for an Act to amend the Real Estate License Act. Second Reading of the Bill.  $^{\rm m}$ 

- "Third Reading. Ladies and Gentlemen. Speaker Breslin: to stay in to do these Education Bills on aoina to have Third Reading, unfortunately. We thought we could by 7:00. but we haven't moved enough Bills for our quota So we're going ... If we move very quickly, and for today. listen carefully, perhaps we can do this in The first ... The first Bill on Special Order is Education. 8111 187<sub>\*</sub> Representative Mulcahev. Out of the Senate Bill 440, Representative record. Bowman. Clerk. read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 440, a Bill for an Act to amend the State Comptroller Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Bowman."

- Bowman: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the We just got through tabling Amendment 81. The Bill clean as it came over from the Senate and it's It simply specifies that noncontroversial. State employees who may be paid according monthly, rather than a semi-monthly schedule, subject to the University Civil Service which are not System. I believe it affects only about 500 employees the State, and all of them at S.I.U. I move it's passage."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 440. And on that question. is there Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall Senate All those in favor vote 'aye', Bill 440 pass?\* all opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 109 voting ... 111 voting 'aye', none voting 'no'. none voting 'present'. Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is

- June 23, 1987
- hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 441. Representative Homer. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "On page seven of the Calendar, Senate Bill 441, a

  Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. Third Reading of
  the Bill."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Homer."
- Homer: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. This legislation would amend the School Code to provide that the District Superintendent President of the School Board, would report at each regular meeting, any request that have been filed since the last regular meeting, under the Freedom of Information Act. The Bill also would, in other than the Chicago District. provide that when a party is denied access to inspect or copy any public record, which is in violation of the Freedom of Information Act, that that party may request the assistance of the State's Attorney for the county in which the denial was made, and that the State's Attorney may, in his or her discretion, intervene on behalf o f the agreed party. Ī would ask for your favorable consideration."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 441. And on that question, the Lady from DuPage, Representative Cowlishaw."
- Cowlishaw: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The Amendment that was added to this Bill, requires that if a State's Attorney is requested to do so, that that individual must file a suit. because of information having been denied to someone by a school district. Before we vote on this Bill, I hope that all colleagues are aware, that not only do school boards oppose this legislation, so do State's Attorneys. The fact that this Bill makes a requirement o f Attorneys, who most of whom are quite busy enough as it is.

June 23, 1987

And the fact is, that it also sets up a brand new procedure under the Freedom of Information Act. And this is really important. The Freedom of Information Act should apply equally and in exactly the same ways, to all units of government, all taxing bodies. This sets up a procedure the Freedom of Information Act that applies only to schools. No other unit of local government. No other taxing body. Only schools. For that reason, and that alone, this Bill should be defeated."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Homer to close."

- Homer: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Let me say very briefly, that contrary to what was just attested to. this does not mandate any State's Attorney anywhere to file a Freedom of Information Act violation. The Bill, very clearly, says that the State's Attorney may file. It's totally discretionary with each State's Attorney. I would urge your support for the Bill."
- Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 441 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? Representative Homer, one minute to explain his vote."
- Homer: "Well thank you. Madam Speaker. Yes, it is true that the limited to School Codes. That's because the Bill Rill initiated and offered by the Illinois was Education Association. I would suggest that if there are Members who concerned about other units of government, that they introduce their Bill. That's hardly a reason to vote against this Bill. It is limited in scope to School Board and School Code matters. The Bill is totally discretionary with respect to each State's Attorney, as to which matters proceed. And I would simply ask that there be more \*green\* votes put up on the board."

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

66th Legislative Day

June 23, 1987

- Speaker Breslin: "Only vote your own switches. There will be a request for verification on this Roll Call. voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 58 voting \*aye\*, 46 voting \*no\* and 10 voting \*present\*. An d the Bill fails. Senate Bill 597, Representative Sieben. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill. Excuse me, Representative Homer, for what reason do you seek recognition? Representative Homer."
- Homer: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I would ask leave to put the Bill on the Order of Postponed Consideration."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman asks leave to put the Bill on the
  Order of Postponed Consideration. Does he have leave? The
  Gentleman has leave. Senate Bill 597. Clerk, read the
  Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 597, a Bill for an Act to amend sections of the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Sieben."
- Sieben: "Thank you, Hadam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 597 amends the School Code and permits two or more unit districts to establish a Cooperative High School Attendance Center to serve all students in the unit district. This Bill has a joint ... or bi-partisan Sponsorship. It received good support in the Senate, and I would urge a "yes" vote on this Bill."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 597. And on that question, is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Cullerton."
- Cullerton: "Inquiry of the Chair. How many ... What Amendment are on this Bill? If any?"
- Speaker Breslin: "Amendments \$1 and \$2 are on the Bill. 3, 4 and 5 were not presented."

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

66th Legislative Day

June 23, 1987

Cullerton: "Amendment #3 is not on the Bill?"

Speaker Breslin: "No, it is not. No, it is not."

Cullerton: "I would inquire ••• Okay• and this is Second Reading?

This is Third Reading•"

Speaker Breslin: "That's correct."

Cullerton: "Okay, sorry. Thank you."

Speaker Breslin: "The question is, "Shall Senate Bill 597 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 113 voting 'aye', none voting 'no' and none voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 857, Representative Kirkland. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 857, a Bill for an Act to amend sections of the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Kirkland."

Kirkland: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. This Bill amends the School Code and allows State reimbursements for School District transportation claims to be deposited in the District's Transportation Fund. or in the Fund from which expenditures were made. The change is needed because in 1985. this General Assembly authorized transportation related building and maintenance costs to be claimable as direct costs in the annual claim by local districts for State reimbursement. However. those ... some of those costs, when paid by the local districts, do not come out of transportation fund, but rather come out Education or Operations Building and Maintenance Funds. And this Bill would simply allow the reimbursement to put the monies back in those specific local funds."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 857. And on that question, is there any

June 23, 1987

discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 857 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 112 voting 'aye', none voting 'no' and none voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 875, Representative Satterthwaite. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 875, a Bill for an Act to provide for
Illinois College Savings Bonds. Third Reading of the
Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Satterthwaite."

Satterthwaite: "Madam Speaker and Members of the House. This is
the College Investment Bill that we have worked on for some
time. It provides for a Board that can suggest other means
of savings, but it also provides for the general obligation
College Savings Bonds to be issued by the State. I ..."

Speaker Breslin: "The Lady has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 875. And on that question, is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, \*Shall Senate Bi11 All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. Πn this question, there are Ill voting 'aye', none voting 'no' none voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Bill 896, Representative Satterthwaite. Clerk, read Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 896, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Satterthwaite."

Satterthwaite: "Madam Speaker and Members of the House. This is

June 23, 1987

a Bill that amends the program we adopted last year for the students who graduate in the top quarter of their class and wish to become teachers. This expands the program, so that they can receive that teacher education in either a public or private institution in the State. And I move for its adoption."

- Speaker Breslin: "The Lady has moved for the passage of Senate

  Bill 896. And on that question, the Lady from DuPage,

  Representative Cowlishaw."
- Cowlishaw: "Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House.

  This is an excellent Bill, and it limits the amount of the scholarship if the student attends a private school, to the average of what the tuition and fees would be if that student were attending a public university. I think it is time that we made available, this opportunity for students who attend private, as well as public schools. I commend the Sponsor for the Bill and urge a "yes" vote."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Lady has moved for the ... The question is,

  \*Shall Senate Bill 8 ... Excuse me, the Gentleman from

  McLean, Representative Klemm, on the Bill."

Klemm: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Breslin: "She will."

Klemm: "Just out of curiosity, Representative. Why do we limit our State Scholarships that we allow, only to State Universities, if in fact, we are deciding to expand the teachers scholarships to both State and private universities?"

Satterthwaite: "If I understood your question correctly, what the
Bill does is to expand the Scholarship Program so that the
student could attend either the public or private
institution."

Klemm: "I understand that. I was just curious. Why don't we do
the same thing with our scholarships for students that you

June 23, 1987

award, or your General Assembly scholarships are only to State Universities. I was just curious, why did you limit it to this ... I mean, why would the concept be, if you want to support your State Universities, you support State Universities. Why have you drifted aside and said now let's go the farthest. It doesn't bother me. I was just curious if you have a philosophical reason."

Satterthwaite: "Okay. This Bill has nothing to do with the General Assembly scholarships."

Klemm: "I know that. I realize that."

Satterthwaite: "I think ... I think what you will find, however, is the General Assembly scholarship does not provide any money to fund it. It is, in fact, a waiver. And so if the public institutions in the State want to give a waiver of tuition, I'm sure that we could entertain that in another piece of legislation. This provides for actual payment."

"The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 896 Speaker Breslin: pass? All those in favor vote 'ave'. all those opposed vote 'no'. open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted Voting is who wish? The Clerk will take the record. are 103 voting 'aye', 4 voting 'no' and 1 question. there voting 'present'. This Bill, having received Representative Wait votes 'ave'. So there are 104 voting \*aye\* and none voting \*no\*. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 898, Representative Braun. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill. Excuse me. Representative Capparelli wishes he had voted "aye" on the last Bill. That was Senate Bill 896. Read 898, Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 898, a Bill for an Act to amend sections of the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Braun."

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

June 23. 1987

House. This Bill is for the Joint Committee on Elementary and Secondary Sports. I would urge your support of the legislation. At the present time, there are a few substantive changes in the law incorporated in the legislation."

Speaker Breslin: "The Lady has moved for the passage of 898. And on that question, is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. this question. there are 106 voting 'aye', 4 voting 'no' and 1 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The next Order o f Business i s the Order State Administration, Second Reading. First Bill is Senate Bill We have one Bill we want to aet to. Okav? Senate Bill 47. Representative McPike. Out of the record. Senate Bill 266. Representative Novak. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 266, a Bill for an Act to amend the
Illinois Highway Code. Second Reading of the Bill.

Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Breslin: "Any Motions or Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Breslin: "Any Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "No Floor Amendments. Has a Fiscal Note been filed?"

Clerk O'Brien: "A Fiscal Note is filed."

Speaker Breslin: "The Bill moves to Third Reading. Agreed Resolutions."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Joint Resolution 69, offered by Representative Braun. Senate Joint Resolution 70, Klemm.

June 23, 1987

House Resolution 603, Curran. 604, McPike; 606, Johnson; 607, Johnson; 610, Black; 611, DeJaegher; 612, DeJaegher; 613, DeJaegher; 614, DeJaegher; 615, DeJaegher; 616, DeJaegher; 617, DeJaegher; 618, DeJaegher; 620, Deuchler and Klemm; 622, Ewing; 624, Panayotovich; 625, Countryman.

- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Matijevich, on the Agreed

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

  We have examined the Resolutions. They are all

  congratulatory and agreed to. And I 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', all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Agreed Resolutions are adopted. General Resolutions."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Joint Resolution 104, offered by Representative Levin; House Resolution 619, Ronan; House Resolution 623, Wyvetter Younge."
- Speaker Breslin: "Committee on Assignments. Death Resolutions."

  Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 605, offered by Representative

  Johnson, with respect to the memory of Margaret L. Gills.

  House Resolution 608, offered by Representative Johnson,

  with respect to the memory of Eva Hanson. House Resolution
  609, offered by Representative Johnson, with respect to the

  memory of Lyle H. Franks. House Resolution 621, offered by

  Representative Shaw, with respect to the memory of Richard

  Clark Haley."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Matijevich moves the adoption of the Death Resolutions. All those in favor say "aye", all those opposed say "no". In the opinion of the Chair, the "ayes" have it. And the Death Resolutions are adopted.

  Ladies and Gentlemen, before more people leave, the time

June 23, 1987

for coming back into Session has been changed. So. tell your friends, who have already left, when we adjourn today, will be coming back tomorrow at 10:00 instead of 9:00. In addition to that, the Rules Committee Meeting will delayed from 8:50 to 9:50. So, tell your friends and colleagues who have already left about this change. and Gentlemen. in Perfunctory Session. when we leave this the Clerk will read into the record for a second evening. time, all Appropriation Bills, and then hold those Bills on Second Reading. the Order of So . at this Representative Matijevich moves that this House stand adjourned until 10:00 a.m. tomorrow. allowing time for the Clerk. Wetre anina to hold that Motion for a moment, Ladies and Gentlemen. Okay, Representative Matijevich renews the Motion that the House stand adjourned until 10:00 a.m. tomorrow. allowing time for the Clerk Session. All those in favor say 'aye', all Perfunctory those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the have it. And this House stands adjourned until The Rules Committee will meet at 9:50 10:00 a.m. tomorrow. tomorrow morning. 9:50."

Clerk Leone: "A Message from the Senate by Ms. Hawker, Secretary. am directed to inform Representatives that the Senate has concurred in the House of Representatives in the passage of the following titles, together with Amendments which Amendments I have printed by adoption of which, I am instructed to ask Senate and concurrence of the House of Representatives to with: 612, 655, 671, 679, 692, 708, 717, 724, 606 • 758, 759, 760, 766, 768, 774, 775, 779, 780, 781, 785, 790, 799, passed the Senate as amended, June 23, 1987. Linda Hawker. Secretary.\* A further Message from the Senate by Ms. Hawker, Secretary. 'Mr. Speaker, I am directed

June 23, 1987

House of Representatives that the Senate has concurred in the House in the passage of the following Bills, together with Amendments and adoption of which, I am instructed to ask concurrence ٥f the House o f Representatives, to wit; House Bills 378, 393. 420. 421 428 464 478 505 508 521 529 546 552 420 819 842. 848. 857. 805. 873. 881. 915 and 932, passed the amended. 23. 1987-Senate as June Linda Hawker. Secretary. • On the Order of Second Reading, Senate Bill ••• Senate Bill 48, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the various State agencies. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 49. a Bill for an Act making appropriations Second Reading of various State agencies. the Bill. Senate Bill 52, a Bill for an Act making appropriations various State agencies. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 237, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Auditor General. Second Reading of the Bill. a Bill for an Act making appropriations for Second Reading of the Bill. Higher Education. Senate Bill 284, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Board State Colleges and Universities. Governors of Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 285, a Bill for appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of certain retirement systems. Second Reading 286, a Bill Bill. Senate Rill for an Act making the appropriations Illinois to the State Scholarship Commission. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 287. a Bill for an Act making appropriations to Reading of the Bill. Second Senate Bill 288, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Illinois Community College Board. Second Reading the Bill. οf 290. a Senate Bill Bi 11 for an Act making certain the Board of Trustees of the University appropriations to

June 23, 1987

Second Reading of the Bill. of Illinois. Senate Bill 291, provide for Bill for an Act to the ordinary and Southern Illinois contingent expenses o f University. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 292, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent of State Universities Civil Service expenses System. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 315, a Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Budget in the Executive Office of Governor. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 316. a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent the Civil Service Commission. expenses of Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 317, a Bill for an Act appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Department of Conservation. Second Reading of the Bill. Bi11 318. a Bill Act Senate for an making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses o f State Emergency Services and Disaster Agency. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 319, a Bill appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Environmental Protection Agency. of the Bill. Senate Bill 320, a Bill for an Act Reading making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Department of Financial Institutions. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 321, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the Office of the State Fire Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 322, a Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Office of the Governor. Second Reading of Senate Bill 323, a Bill for the Bill. an Act appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Historic Preservation Agency. Second Reading the Bill. Senate Bi11 324, Bill for а an Act making

June 23. 1987

appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses Department αf Human Rights. Second Reading of the Rill .. Senate Rill 325, а Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Human Rights Commission. Second Reading of the Bill. 326. a Bill for an Act making appropriations Bi 11 for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Industrial Commission. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 327. a Bill for an Act making appropriations for contingent expenses of the Department of Insurance. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 328. a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Judiciary Inquiry Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 329, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Liquor Control Commission. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 330. a Bill for an appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Local Labor Relations Board. Second Senate Bill 331, a Bill for an Act Reading οf the Bill. making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Military and Naval Department. Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 332, a Bill Act appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Department of Mines and Minerals. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 333, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Pollution Control Board. Second Reading of Senate Bill 334, the Bill. a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses the Property Tax Appeal Board. Second Reading of the Bill. Bill 335, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Office Public Counsel. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 336, a Bill for an Act making appropriations the

June 23, 1987

ordinary and contingent expenses of the Illinois Racing Board. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill Bill for an Act to make appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses for the Department of Registration and Education. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 338, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Department of Revenue. Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 339, a Bill Act appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Office of the Commissioner of Savings Loan. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 340, a Bill making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the State Labor Relations Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 341. a Bill for an appropriations for the ordinary and contingent Act making the Department of Transportation. expenses of Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 342, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent of the Illinois Arts Council. Second Reading of Senate Bill 343, a Bill for an appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Department of Alcoholism and Substance Abuse. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 344, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Department of Children and Family Services. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 345, a Bill for an making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Illinois Educational Labor Relations Board. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 346, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Medical Center Commission. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 347, a Bill for an Act appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of

June 23, 1987

the Department of Public Aid. Second Reading of the Bill. a Bill for an Act making appropriations Senate Bill 348. for the Governors Purchase Care Review Board. Second the Bill. Senate Bill 349, a Bill for an Act Reading making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Department of Rehabilitation Services. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 363, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent of the State Comptroller. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 417, a Bill for an Act making reappropriations to the Department οf Transportation. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 343, a Bill for an Act making certain appropriations. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 580, a Bill for an Act appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses the Office of State Treasurer. Second Reading of the Bill. Ri 1 1 38 ... correction ... Senate Bill 783, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Department Commerce and Community Affairs. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 784, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Board of Higher Education. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 785, a Bill for Act making appropriations to the State Board of Education. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 835, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Department Public ٥f Health. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 836, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Department Corrections. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 839, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Secretary of State. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1464, a making Bill for an appropriations to the Illinois Act Asbestos Abatement Authority. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1348, a Bill for an Act making appropriations

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

#### 66th Legislative Day

June 23, 1987

for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Office of Commissioner of Savings and Loans. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 434, a Bill for an Act making appropriations. Second Reading of the Bill. Being no further Business, the House will now stand adjourned until tomorrow, June 24th, at the hour of 10:00 a.m."

01/11/88 11:08

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

PAGE 1

JUNE 23, 1987

DONE 234 1701		
SB-0001 SECOND READING	PAGE	40
SB-0063 THIRD READING	PAGE	14
SB-0080 THIRD READING	PAGE	82
SB-0085 SECOND READING	PAGE	48
SB-0266 SECOND READING	PAGE	127
SB-0359 SECOND READING	PAGE	118
SB-0382 THIRD READING	PAGE	37
SB-0440 RECALLED	PAGE	110
SB-0440 THIRD READING	PAGE	119
SB-0441 THIRD READING	PAGE	120
SB-0484 SECOND READING	PAGE	11
SB-0550 SECOND READING	PAGE	61
SB-0561 SECOND READING	PAGE	61
SB-0597 THIRD READING	PAGE	122
SB-0651 SECOND READING	PAGE	63
SB-0651 THIRD READING	PAGE	65
SB-0688 THIRD READING	PAGE	38
SB-0722 THIRD READING	PAGE	83
SB-0771 SECOND READING	PAGE	64
SB-0771 THIRD READING	PAGE	118
SB-0772 THIRD READING	PAGE	87
SB-0857 THIRD READING	PAGE	123
SB-0875 THIRD READING	PAGE	124
SB-0886 SECOND READING	PAGE	80
SB-0896 THIRD READING	PAGE	124
SB-0898 THIRD READING	PAGE	126
SB-0943 SECOND READING	PAGE	12
SB-0957 SECOND READING	PAGE	7
SB-0977 SECOND READING	PAGE	88
SB-0993 SECOND READING	PAGE.	64
SB-0994 SECOND READING	PAGE	63
SB-0995 SECOND READING SB-1005 SECOND READING	PAGE	64
SB-1009 SECOND READING	PAGE PAGE	11
SB-1022 SECOND READING	PAGE	13 77
SB-1080 SECOND READING	PAGE	93
SB-1095 SECOND READING	PAGE	89
SB-1096 SECOND READING	PAGE	113
SB-1194 SECOND READING	PAGE	113
SB-1197 SECOND READING	PAGE	117
SB-1235 SECOND READING	PAGE	77
SB-1295 SECOND READING	PAGE	78
SB-1304 SECOND READING	PAGE	2
SB-1342 SECOND READING	PAGE	119
SB-1449 SECOND READING	PAGE	79
SB-1454 THIRD READING	PAGE	88
SB-1475 SECOND READING	PAGE	79
SB-1502 SECOND READING	PAGE	79

## SUBJECT MATTER

HOUSE TO ORDER - REPRESENTATIVE GREIMAN	PAGE	1
PRAYER - FATHER GRANT	PAGE	ı
PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE	PAGE	1
ROLL CALL FOR ATTENDANCE	PAGE	1
MESSAGE FROM SENATE	PAGE	2
RECESS	PAGE	48
HOUSE RECONVENES - REPRESENTATIVE GREIMAN	PAGE	48
AGREED RESOLUTIONS	PAGE	1.27
GENERAL RESOLUTIONS	PAGE	128
DEATH RESOLUTIONS	PAGE	128
ADJOURNMENT	PAGE	129
PERFUNCTORY SESSION	PAGE	129
MESSAGE FROM SENATE	PAGE	129

01/11/88 11:08

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

PAGE 2

JUNE 23, 1987

SUBJECT MATTER

PERFUNCTORY SESSION - ADJOURNMENT PAGE 135