81st Legislative Day

November 5, 1987

- Speaker Breslin: "Ladies and Gentlemen, the House will come Can you hear me? Can anyone hear me? No. Ladies and Gentlemen, the House will come to order. The hour o f 10:00 having arrived. Members will be in their seats. Guests in the gallery are invited to ioin us for The Chaplain for today will be the Raverend Sievingo Pastor of Trinity Lutheran Edinbura. Reverend Sieving is a guest of Representative Karen Hurara. Hasara, excuse me. She's not here."
- Reverend Sieving: "Good morning. Let us pray. Oh merciful Father in Heaven, who holds in Your hand all the power and authority of man. And who has given the government punish the wrongdoer and to praise them that authority to do well. We humbly ask that You would graciously bless the men and women of this House who determine the laws of great state with the wisdom and insight needed to perform their tasks. Enlighten and defend them and grant them compassion and understanding, that under their leadership the people of this state would be quarded and directed in peace and unity, through Your Son, our Lord Jesus Christ. Amen."
- Speaker Breslin: "We will be led in the pledge today by Representative Ropp."
- Ropp et al: "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United

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

 one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice

 for all."
- Speaker Breslin: "Roll Call for Attendance. Ladies and it is the plan of the House to stand at ease Gentlemen. until the hour of 10:30. So, for those Members who are still in their, across the way, you need not rush. Representative Sutker, for what reason do you rise?"

81st Legislative Day

November 5. 1987

Sutker: "Madam Speaker, a matter of personal privilege, if I may at this time with your consent and the leave of the House. I've been trying to introduce, on an individual basis. Representative that succeeded Alan Greiman from my town of Skokie, Illinois. Unfortunately, I haven't been able around to every one of you and introduce you to him aet individually and he to you. But, Ladies and Gentlemen House, I want to do so at this time, at this moment of PASP because feel that we have. in the new Representative, an outstanding leader of our community. He's a young and talented lawyer. Some of you may know him if you're devotees of television game shows because he outstanding winner on Jeopardy. He wouldn't share his winnings with his committeeman, but... and that's not reason he's here. Others may not know him from that television series but know him in your townships because he was the township attorney for Niles Township for over 10 And still others may know him because he has been vears. the subject matter of three different suits since his selection。 lawsuits that is to save since his selection in July of 1987. And before he was seated here, he's been i n a number of courtrooms contesting his right to be here. But you know ha's here. I want you all to know him because I know, among you, he will make dear friends and lasting friends. T know he respects this institution and I know you will take pride in him as he will be honored to be part I'd like at this time, if I may, to introduce to you, Louis Lang, the Representative from the First Legislative District and my good friend and mν voung protege."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Lang."

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Sutker, Madam Speaker, Members and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. It's very humbling to be here

81st Legislative Day

November 5, 1987

This is my fifth day of attendance here and before vou. I've learned quite a bit already. I've also learned some of the things that all of you told me I would not learn for time. I'm working on all of them. I'd like to thank you all for making me feel welcome so far, particularly. Staff of the House, all the Members of the House. like to thank Representative Sutker, my good friend for his good wishes and for all the good wishes you have given intend, while I'm here, to work with all of you to reach for lofty goals for the citizens of the State of Illinois. Goals that recognize that the state is filled with people, people that need the help of the General Assembly. And T for those goals with you as the Representative will work before me, Representative Greiman worked for those Let's create a state that cares with you. education of its young, the security of its elderly and the health of all. And I pledge to you and to my district and the citizens of the State of Illinois, my best all efforts. Thank you very much."

Speaker Breslin: "Thank you, Representative Lang. Mr. Clerk, would you take the roll call, please. Representative McCracken, are there any excused absences from your side of the aisle?"

McCracken: "No."

Speaker Breslin: "There are no excused absences Republican side of the aisle. Are there any excused from the Democratic side o f the aisle? Giglio, would you Representative come to the enuiboa please? Representative Giglio, are there any excused absences on the Democratic side of the aisle?"

Giglio: "Hadam Speaker, let the record show that Representative Madigan is excused."

Speaker Breslin: "Thank you. Take the Attendance Roll Call, Mr.

81st Legislative Day

November 5, 1987

On this question there are 116 answering the roll Clerk. call. A quorum is present. Okay, Ladies and Gentlemen, repeat again, the House will stand at ease until the hour of 10:30. Thank you. Ladies and Gentlemen, the House will come to order. Ladies and Gentlemen, the House is prepared to begin on the Regular Calendar on our regular order of business. All lobbyists and those not entitled to the House floor, should leave now. We will begin with Amendatory Veto Motions that appear on page 5 of your Calendar. The first Bill is Representative Ryder's Billa Senate Bill 478. Mr. Clerk, read the Motion, please."

Clerk O'Brien: "Motion. I move that the House concur with the Senate in the acceptance of the Governor's specific recommendations for change to Senate Bill 478 by adoption of their Amendment."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I would move to accept the amendatory veto. It was a minor change and I believe that it is appropriate. And I, therefore, ask for its acceptance."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved to accept the amendatory veto of Senate Bill 478. And on that question, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Will the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Breslin: "He will."

Leverenz: "You indicated that there was a change, and obviously

it is a change because it's an amendatory veto. Would you

explain it for us?"

I would be Rvder: "Certainly. glad to do that. It adds an effective date of January lst, 1988, which is helpful to have an effective date on a Bill. Especially. one that we're considering. It also corrects some technical drafting errors, of which I am not totally

81st Legislative Day

November 5, 1987

familiar, except that they are primarily and totally technical. And adds a provision to the current act which were omitted from the legislation by error. So these... the three items, the effective date, the technical and the other portion that was omitted by error, were the only changes."

Leverenz: "Thanks."

Ryder: "My pleasure."

Speaker Breslin: "Is there any further discussion? Hearing no further discussion, the question is, 'Shall the House accept the specific recommendations for change in Senate Bill 478? 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 record. On this question, there are 111 voting 'ave', none voting 'no' and none voting 'present'. And the House does accept the specific recommendations for change in Senate Bill 478. having reached the required Constitutional Majority. The next 3111 is Senate Bi 11 523. Representative Lou Jones. Clerk, read the Motion."

Clerk O'Brien: "I move that the House concur with the Senate in the acceptance of the Governor's specific recommendations for change to Senate Bill 523 by adoption of their Amendment."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Jones."

Jones: "Thank you, Madam Speaker and Members of the House. I move to accept the Governor's Amendatory Veto of Senate Bill 523. The Governor's Veto deleted the new program for general assistance, which had been added to the House by a House Amendment. The Bill, as vetoed, is returned to its original form and now simply requires that the Department of Public Aid inform recipients of their eligibility for programs at the time of their initial interview. I

81st Legislative Day

November 5, 1987

therefore move that we accept the Governor's specific recommendations for change. $^{\Box}$

- "The Lady moves to Speaker Breslin: accept the Governor's Amendatory Vato. And on that question, is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall the House accept the specific recommendations for change in Senate Bill 523?' All those in favor vote 'ave', all those 'no'. Voting is open. Sixty votes required. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question. are 113 voting 'aye', none voting 'no' and none there voting 'present'. This Motion, having received Constitutional Majority, the House does accept the specific recommendations for change of the Governor. The next Bill is Senate Bill 809. Representative Frederick. Clerk, read the Motion."
- Clerk O'Brien: "I move that the House concur with the Senate in the acceptance of the Governor's specific recommendations for change to Senate 3ill 809 by adoption of their Amendment."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Frederick."

Frederick: "Yes, thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen the Houses I move that we do accept the Governor's Bill 809. Amendatory Veto on Senate That Bill is the Psychologist Licensing Act, which passed out of the House and the Senate by an overwhelming majority. However, reached the Governor's desk, some problems emerged with some other professional groups in this state. As a of that, the Governor has extended the current Psychologist Licensing Act one year and puts the Bill we passed without effect until we can work out the proplems. I move that we do accept the Governor's Amendatory Veto."

Speaker Breslin: "The Lady has moved to accept the amendatory

81st Legislative Day

November 5. 1987

veto on Senate Bill 309. And on that question, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Cullerton.

Cullerton: "Yes, will the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Breslin: "She will."

Cullerton: "Representative, would you care to speculate as to why
the Governor didn't just outright vato the Bill?"

Frederick: "Hell, it would have been a tragedy, because the psychologists present licensing act sunsets in December of this year. And so, that would be a travesty in my opinion."

Cullerton: "Alright. So, one assumes then that we need a registration act for psychologists?"

Frederick: "Pardon me?"

Cullerton: "Your premise is that you think it's a good thing to have psychologists registered..."

Frederick: "Yes, I absolutely do."

Cullerton: "I see. And why didn't the Governor make changes in the act to reflect his concerns with it?"

Frederick: "Actually, it seems to me, that I remember that the Illinois Hospital Association and some other counseling groups found that they were impacted pretty negatively by the Bill as we passed it out of the House and Senate, and for that reason, the Governor agreed with all the parties concerned, that we would defer action until we could work out the problems with those groups. Which then he deferred any effective date for one year."

Cullerton: "There's two registration acts involved, is that correct? The Psychologist Registration Act, which was to expire the end of this year."

Frederick: "Right."

Cullerton: "There's also the Clinical Psychologist Registration

Act."

Frederick: "Right."

81st Legislative Day November 5, 1987

Cullerton: "When was that to expire?"

Frederick: "This year also."

Cullerton: "Both of them were to expire at the same time?"

Frederick: "Yasa"

Cullerton: "And he extended both of them until... the Clinical Psychologist, until January 1st, 1989?"

Frederick: "Right. Right. This is to buy the time that is
necessary to negotiate all the differences between all the
professional groups that had problems with the Bill."

Cullerton: "Fine. Thank you."

Speaker Breslin: "Is there any further discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall the House accept the Governor's specific recommendations for change in Senate Bill 8097. All those in favor vote 'aya', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Sixty votes are required. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 113 voting 'aye', none voting 'no' and none voting 'present'. This received the required Constitutional Majority, so the Motion is adopted and the House accepts the Governor's specific recommendations for change. Senate Bill 1113. Representative Countryman. Happy Birthday, Representative Out of the record. 1228. Countryman. Senate Bill Representative Slater. Clark, read the Motion."

Clerk O'Brien: "I move that the House concur with the Senate in the acceptance of the Governor's specific recommendations for change to Senate 3ill 1228 by adoption of the following Amendment."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Slater."

Slater: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Senate Bill 1225 creates the Conservation Enhancement Act. The Governor exercised amendatory veto powers to take out the provisions which provided for the sale of bonds to finance the provisions of

81st Legislative Day

November 5, 1987

this Bill. I believe under the situation that we have in state government and current fiscal restraint, that the amendatory veto is the proper move on the part of the Governor and I move that we do accept the amendatory veto of the Governor in relation to Senate Bill 1228."

Speaker Breslin: "You have heard the Gentleman's Hotion. He moves to accept the amendatory veto. Is there anv discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall the House accept the Governor's specific recommendations change in Senate Bill 1228?* All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Sixtu votes are required. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk On this question, there are 113 will take the record. voting 'aye', none voting 'no' and none voting 'present'. Motion has received the required Constitutional Majority, so the Motion is adopted and the House accepts the specific recommendations for change of the Governor. The next Bill is Senate Bill 1243. Representative McPike. Do you wish to proceed with this Motion? Read the Motion, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "I move that the House concur with the Senate in the acceptance of the Governor's specific recommendations for change to Senate Bill 1243 by adoption of their Amendment."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative McPike."

McPike: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I move to accept the Governor's recommendations for change on Senate Bill 1243.

The Governor Amendments eliminates the back door referendum provisions which were added. The Governor states that the back door referendum provisions generally present, restrict local governments from pursuing projects not supported by the public at large. However in this case, he states and he's correct, that the local unit of government is going to

81st Legislative Day

November 5, 1987

be under an order from the federal EPA mandating to bring their community up to EPA standards. And for that reason, he thinks that current law is more acceptable. I'll be glad to answer any guestions."

- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved to accept the amendatory veto of the Governor on Senate Bill 1243. And on that question, the Gentleman from Logan, Representative Olson."
- Olson: "Excuse me, Madam Speaker. I didn't want to address this particular issue."
- Speaker Breslin: "I'll come back to you. Representative McCracken, on this issue."
- McCracken: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Houses I agree with the Sponsor of the bill that amendatory veto is warranted. But I don't want anyone to walk away from here thinking that this is the entire job we should have done. A lot of our communities, of the 236 threat of sanctions from the EPA, have taken it upon themselves to already bond for the necessary money to those infrastructure improvements. A number of them have done so either with referendum or without. This going to help all 236 of those communities. not He had considered in the Spring Session a revolving loan funda And even the loan fund would not have helped a number of the communities who have already undertaken, by themselves, to make these changes to conform with EPA requirements. not a total solution. Don't think that this vote is going to make all of your communities hannva T + nothing to access the \$350.000.000 in federal funds that are available if we take some affirmative action. He could have put out that fund necessary to access the federal We could have bonded for it. monev. It would have been a relatively nominal amount of money to do that. We haven't

81st Legislative Day

November 5, 1987

done it. There's plenty of blame to share with everybody, not just Democratic or Republican. But, this is not the entire answer. And when your constituents ask you what you did for them, this isn't going to be enough. We should be considering ways to get that other money."

- Speaker Breslin: "There being no further discussion, the question is, 'Shall the House accept the specific recommendations for change in Senate Bill 1243?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Sixty votes are required. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 106 voting 'aye', 6 voting 'no' and 3 voting 'present'. This Motion has received the required Constitutional Majority, so the Motion is adopted and the House accepts the Governor's specific recommendations for change in Senate 3ill 1243. Representative Olson, for what reason do you rise? Representative Olson?"
- Olson: "Madam Speaker, on Senate Bill 809, I thought I had pushed my button but it was called to my attention, it didn't register. Show me as an affirmative on 809."
- Speaker Breslin: "The record should reflect that Representative Olson wishes to have been recorded as voting 'aye' on Senate Bill 809."

Olson: "Thank you."

- Speaker Breslin: "Senate Bill 1314. Representative Kulas.

 Clerk, read the Motion."
- Clerk O'Brien: "I move that the House concur with the Senate in the passage of Senate Bill 1314, the Governor's specific recommendations for the change notwithstanding."
- Kulas: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the
 House. The Senate Bill 1314 is the Bill that deals with
 the Office of Coordination of Gang Prevention. He
 discussed this Bill yesterday. There was some

81st Legislative Day

November 5. 1987

misunderstanding from the other side of the aisle on what the amendatory veto did. He've discussed these matters. And I would move to override the Governor on the amendatory veto.

- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved to override the Governor's Amendatory Veto on Senate Bill 1314. And on that question, the Gentleman from DuPage, Representative McCracken."
- McCracken: "Thank you. I spoke to Senator Dunn, who apparently is the Senate Sponsor of this Bill, yesterday and said it would be alright to recall the Bill. Since then, I've been told that there is a substantial budgetary impact on these contested provisions regarding the amendatory veto. So, I'd just like to ask the Sponsor, is he aware of any fiscal impact statement? Is he aware of any cost estimates?"
- Kulas: "There was a fiscal impact note filed in the Senate and there was no fiscal impact on this Bill. No appropriation."
- McCracken: "Have you seen the note and it says nothing? It says
- Kulas: "The Senate Sponsor told me there's no... there was a fiscal note filed. There was no money on there."
- McCracken: "Okay. Thank you."
- Speaker Breslin: "There being no further discussion, the question 'Shall the House override the specific recommendations of the Governor on Senate Bill 1314? All those vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Seventy-one votes This final passage. are required. is The question is. 'Will this Bill pass, the veto οf the Governor all voted who wish? Seventy-one notwithstanding? * Have votes are required. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 76 voting 'aye', 38... 77 voting 'aye', 38 voting 'no' and 1 voting 'present'. And this Bill.

81st Legislative Day

November 5. 1987

having received the Extraordinary Hajority passes, the veto of the Governor notwithstanding. Senate 3ill 1335. Representative O'Connell. Clerk, read the Motion."

Clerk O'Brien: "I move that the House concur with the Senate in the acceptance of the Governor's specific recommendations for change to Senate Bill 1335 by adoption of their Amendment."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative O'Connell."

O'Connell: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. The Senate Bill 1335 creates the Computer Crime Prevention Law. The Governor's Amendments... Amendatory Veto actually strengthens the Bill and I would move to accept the changes that the Governor's made. Specifically, they where that he struck the definition of vital services or operations and replaced it with more specificity in defining whatee what constituted the aggravated computer tampering. He also made changes with regards to property forfeiture provisions that there now does not have to be any proof of financial in order to assert the allegations of computer crime. He also changed the reference to prima facie evidence and replaced it with more legally correct terminology of presumption. rebuttable And finally. thev... the Governor's changes changed the establishment of the value of the offenders property to the time of arrest. than the time of sentencing. This would avoid post-arrest transfer of assets by the defendant in the action. would move to accept the Governor's changes and be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved to accept the amendatory veto of the Governor. And on that question, is there any discussion? There being no discussion, the question is, 'Shall the House accept the specific recommendations for change in Senate Bill 1335?' All those

81st Legislative Day

November 5, 1987

in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Sixty votes are required. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the On this question, there are 114 voting 'aye', none record. voting 'no' and none voting 'present'. This Matian the required Constitutional Majority. Motion is adopted and the House accepts the Governor's recommendations for change. Senate Bill 1513. specific Representative Capparelli. Clerk, read the Motion."

Clerk O'Brien: "I move that the House concur with the Senate in the acceptance of the Governor's specific recommendations for change to Senate Bill 1513 by adoption of their Amendment."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Capparelli."

move to accept the Capparelli: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I Governor's recommendations. He made Some technical I understand that it's agreed on both sides of changes... aisle. And Ī move to . accept the recommendations on House Bill... Senate Bill 1513."

"The Speaker Breslin: Gentleman has moved to accept Governor's Amendatory Veto. And on that question, is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall the House accept the specific recommendations for change in Senate Bill 1513?' All those in favor vote 'aye', al1 opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Sixty votes are Representative Parke. one Representative Parke does not wish to speak. 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 Motion has received the required Constitutional Majority. so the Motion is adopted and the House accepts the specific recommendations for change. Representative Lang?

81st Legislative Day

November 5, 1987

Representative Lang? Representative Lang? We plan to go to Total Veto Motions now, on page 3. On page 3 on your Calendar appears Total Veto Motions. Representative Leverenz, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

Leverenz: "Madam Speaker, is there someone taking a tour?"

- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Lang has just returned to the chamber. Representative Lang, did you find Katie Shapiro? Representative Sutker should have filled you in about this, Representative Lang. Your committeeman didn't do good by you. Representative Johnson, for what reason do you seek recognition?"
- Johnson: "To announce the 43rd Birthday of my seatmate and good friend. Everybody's good friend, Representative John Countryman. And also I guess he's asked me to extend to the rest of the House an invitation to share in this incredible Birthday cake here, that's been created for him together with some DeKalb chocolates and other things. So, Happy Birthday."
- Speaker Breslin: "Happy Birthday, Representative Countryman. The first Bill appearing on page 3 on your Calendar, under the Order of Total Veto Motions, is Senate Bill 454.

 Representative Giglio. Clerk, read the Motion."
- Clerk O'drien: "I move that the House concur with the Senate in the passage of Senate Bill 454, the veto of the Governor notwithstanding."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Giglio."

Giglio: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 454 was the Bill that amends the Barber and Cosmetology Act. This is the Bill that we talked about where... where it creates the Esthetician Act. These are the people who, as you know, is like one step below the cosmetologist who does the scalp and who does the skin work. These group of people will be able to just perform

81st Legislative Day

November 5, 1987

the work on the body, the massage, the cleaning and the stimulation of the skin. It's a Bill, I think, it is well needed in Illinois because not only will it create aoina to take the additional burden off the cosmetologist who does everything. It passed the Senate overwhelmingly and the Governor in his message to override I think, somewhat was misinformed. He didn't think schooling attached, which there really is. other than that. I don't really know why. plus the fact that if you remember there was something in there about the Farm Guarantee Implement Act. So, with that, if there would be any questions, I would be happy to answer. Ιf ask for a favorable vote for a total veto... or total override."

- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman... the Gentleman has moved to override the Governor's Veto on Senate Bill 454. And on that question, the Gentleman from Kankakee, Representative Novake"
- Novak: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Members of the Representatives. Amendment 07 of 454 was, as we. know, was debated at quite length, at extensive length this past Spring Session. And it was overwhelmingly accepted. And I ask every Legislator in here to also vote for this override because it is a very important Amendment for the farm industry and the farmers of the State of And I thank you for your support."

Speaker Breslin: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Parcells." Parcells: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, Bill is a little bit dangerous in one area. I don't know if you've read it very carefully, but it allows the Esthetician to do full body massage, in which they really have not been trained. It would also put a lot people... it would also put a lot of people out of

81st Legislative Day

November 5, 1987

business. It allows for eyelash bleaching. There's a lot of things in the body of this Bill that the Governor had every reason to veto. It is giving too much power to people who have not been properly educated in certain areas. And it would eliminate some people who have been educated in a certain area. For instance, if, you know, films are big in Illinois now. He're doing a lot of some of those film companies, when they bring their makeup artist with them, they would have to licensed in this state. And it's liable to cut down on the number of films that they make here, if they think they have to get everybody licensed that comes with them. think the Governor was right in vetoing this. And I recommend that you do not override the veto."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Morgan, Representative Ryder."

"As much as I am reluctant to stand up and disagree with Ryder: my colleague on this side, I would urge my ... the remainder of the colleagues to seriously look at supporting the override of the total veto. There's some important legislation in here concerning farm implements. Same important legislation that is important to those of us in downstate Illinois. Especially those who represent constituents. As to the cosmetology portion of the Bill, I don't believe that that is a serious objection and as a result, I think that the Bill merits our support. And would urge my colleagues to support the Motion to override."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Giglio, to close."

Giglio: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I just want to say, I think it's going to create some jobs. And one of the speakers alluded to the film industry, that's one of the reason why we want this Bill because we're doing a lot of film work in

81st Legislative Day

November 5, 1987

Illinois that they used to do in Hollywood. We're making a lot of pictures and we need these people. And I think... it's... it's good for Illinois. And I would ask for your favorable support."

Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 454 pass the veto of the Governor notwithstanding? A11 those vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Seventy-one votes are required. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 90 voting 'aye', 22 voting 'no' and none voting 'present'. This Motion, having received the required three-fifths majority, is adopted. The next Bill is Senate Bill... The next Bill is Senate Bill 504. Representative Black. Mr. Clerk, read the Motion. Excuse me, Representative Black. Representative Black."

Black: "I believe Representative Rea now has this Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Rea."

Clerk O'Brien: "I move that the House concur..."

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

McCracken, for what reason do you rise?"

McCracken: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I would like to introduce a former Representative on our side of the aisle. Nord Swanstrom. Nord."

Speaker Breslin: "Welcome Nord."

Clerk O'Brien: "I move that the House concur with the Senate in the passage of Senate Bill 504, the veto of the Governor notwithstanding."

Speaker Breslin: "Rapresentative Rea."

Rea: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Motion is jointly sponsored by Representative Black and myself. This is a Bill on Coroners' Training.

It got hung up in the last minute vetoes and was mistakenly

81st Legislative Day

November 5, 1987

thought that there would be a cost it. tο What this amounts to is a Coroners' Training Bill that does not require additional funding and is within the resources of the Illinois Local Government Law Enforcement Officers Training Board, who would conduct the training on a regular basis. And they will be conducting regional training, which would also eliminate any overnight lodging, those types of things. It passed out of the House substantial vote. I don't recall the exact number. it passed out of the Senate 44 to 7. And the Bill has been overridden by the Senate 49 to 4. I would ask for your 'aye' vote in overriding the veto."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved to override the Governor's Veto of Senate 3ill 504. And on that question, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Yes, will the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Breslin: "He will."

Cullerton: "He will not?"

Speaker Breslin: "He will."

Cullerton: "Okay, thank you. Representative Rea, what did the Governor's message say with regard to what the Governor thought at the time that he vetoed the Bill, the cost would be?"

Rea: "Representative Cullerton, I don't have that figure here

Cullerton: "I wondered if Representative 3lack might be able to answer that question..."

Rea: "Representative Black, yes."

Cullerton: "Madam Speaker, if we could ask Representative Black
to answer a question for me. He's the original Sponsor of
the Bill. Perhaps he can answer a question."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Black, in response to a question."

81st Legislative Day

November 5, 1987

- Black: "Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. I believe the Governor stated a cost of 100,000 to 150,000 dollars."
- Cullerton: "And Representative Black, is it your understanding, as Representative Rea indicated, that... that upon further inquiry you have determined that it will not cost that amount or rather has the Governor decided that maybe we have 100 to 150 thousand dollars to spend on this program?"
- Black: "A very intriguing question. I have not heard from the Governor, so I don't think his position has changed. What we... we have heard from the Local Governmental Law Enforcement Officers Training Board, stating that they have the resources to conduct this training to professionalize coroners, would not have to ask the GRF to absorb any of the training costs. And it is for that reason that I join Representative Rea in asking for this override."
- Cullerton: "So in other words, there are no state funds that will be needed to pay for this course?"
- Black: "That is my understanding. I'm not foolish enough to sit here and tell you that that would never be the case. But I think in the fiscal '88 that would indeed be the case."
- Cullerton: "Did the locals indicate that to the Governor prior to the veto of the Bill?"
- Black: "I really don't know whether they made that position clear or not, Representative."
- Cullerton: "Thank you."
- Speaker Breslin: "Is there any further discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 504 pass, the veto of the Governor notwithstanding?' Representative Rea wishes to close. Proceed, Sir."
- Rea: "Let me also add that the Illinois Coroners Association brought this Bill to us and they are very supportive of it.

 And I might mention that, yes, the Illinois Local Government Law Enforcement Officers Training Board has told

81st Legislative Day

- November 5, 1987
- us that they do have the resources to do this without any additional revenue whatsoever at this time. So I would ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Breslin: "The question is, "Shall Senate Dill 504 pass, the veto of the Governor notwithstanding?" All those in favor vote "aye", all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Seventy—one votes are required. Representative Deuchler."
- Deuchler: "I know it's against the rules, but I would like to acknowledge your students, your students from around the state, from the Illinois Math/Science Academy up in the Speaker's gallery. I know that many of them will be talking to you throughout the day. They are here and they're your students."
- Speaker Breslin: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 80 voting 'aye' 30 voting 'no' and 2 voting 'present'. So this Motion, having received the required three-fifths majority, the Motion is adopted. Senate Bill 670. Representative Davis. Clerk, read the Motion."
- Clerk O'Brien: "I move that the House concur with the Senate in the passage of Senate Bill 670, the veto of the Governor notwithstanding."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Daviso"
- Davis: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. We are asking for concurrence with the Senate in overriding the Governor's Veto for Senate Bill 670. This Bill only asks that personal care assistants, who only earned \$3.35 per hour, be paid every two weeks, rather than on a monthly basis. Very often, even on a monthly basis, these checks arrive late. We are fortunate in the House to earn much more than \$3.35. These workers provide services to the disabled, helping to get them up in the morning and

81st Legislative Day

November 5, 1987

off to work. These workers provide care for people who would otherwise be placed in nursing homes. And we feel that they certainly deserve to be paid every two weeks. rather than on a monthly basis. The turnover rate is about very often because the workers receive late payment for their services. We want to keep or have a stable force, people who are halping the disabled helping... continue to work and stay off the welfare rolls. We want to keep a stable work force in order to keep people out of nursing homes, which would be much more cost effective for the state. Please consider the earnings of \$3.35 per hour. They receive no overtime. And we*re asking to help override this veto. Thank you."

- Speaker Breslin: "The Lady has moved to override the Governor's

 Veto of Senate Bill 670. And on that question, the

 Gentleman from DuPage, Representative McCracken."
- McCracken: "Thank you. Madam Speaker. I rise in opposition to this Bill. Of all of the things that we've been forced prioritize, forced tο this one should not present too much of a problem. It's a good idea, but we're not talking about paying these anv people more or less monev. It's a question of paying them twice a month instead of once a month. I suppose we would all prefer a twice a month check and I suppose that is more common in the private sector. But to process these twice a month rather than once a month, will cost the state least \$150,000,000 and that's the reason for the veto. Not that we shouldn't have the goal of going to twice month payments. But we are not talking about taking the bread out of anyone's mouth. And the expense incurred result of a decision of this type, will be incurred by the Department strictly for administrative reasons. spending of money will not do any housekeeper any good.

81st Legislative Day

November 5, 1987

There is no new money for the housekeeper. It's only a question of twice a month instead of once a month. He are not forced to take anyone's money by a virtue of this vote. I think that... again, like all of the proposals, I suppose, it's well intentioned, but it just isn't the time. And frankly, in the hierarchy of values, this should not be one that passes. Thank you."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative

Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Madam Speaker, spoken like a gentleman that can make til the end of the month, the previous speaker. These people are paid very weakly, very weakly. And they just have too much month at the end of the paycheck. I would hope that you would vote green to override the Governor's to extend a helping hand to those that are trying to work, rather than not to work. Vote green on Senate Bil1 670."

Speaker Breslin: "There being no further discussion, Representative Davis to close. Excuse me, Representative McCracken."

McCracken: "We get paid once a month as Representatives..."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative McCracken."

McCracken: "... And I know Representative Leverenz gets paid the same way."

Speaker Breslin: "Your name was not used in debate, Sir."

McCracken: "I know, thank you,"

Speaker Breslin: "Representative... and that has spurred further discussion. No. Representative Davis, to close."

Davis: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. If we were earning the minimum wage, as these personal care workers are earning, then we too might be very concerned about receiving a paycheck only once a month and often that is late. If the Department of Rehabilitation Services is using a feathered pen and ink,

81st Legislative Day

November 5, 1987

then we might say the cost was prohibitive. But recognizing this Department to be efficient and operating on the basis of the 20th century, they're using computers and it is only a matter of reprogramming that computer for a two week paycheck, rather than a one month paycheck. And we urge an override of this yeto. Thank you."

- Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 670 pass, the veto of the Governor notwithstanding?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Representative Hasara, one minute to explain your vote. Representative Hasara. Hasara."
- Hasara: "Thank... thank you, Madam Speaker. I wanted to make evervone aware that we passed a similar Bill for Southern Illinois University this spring, and I have had many of constituents working at the Med School, who have come to me trying to get this Bill repealed, because when they are changing over from the monthly to the biweekly system, they feel that they're losing money. Actually it's heina deferred. But, they are very concerned about the lapse for a temporary period of time and they are very upset with the Bill. So. I wanted to make you aware that it looks very anad on paper, but there are some problems constituents."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Williams, one minute to explain vour vote."
- Williams: "Okay, I just hope that the Nembers of this Body will really be thoughtful in their vote on this particular piece of legislation, because, you know, it's hard enough for us on the once a month business and we not making minimum wage, even though some of you may feel that way. But, the point is is that it's just tough. It's just plain and common sense. A person who gets paid once a month, who is making minimum wage has very little ability to make that

81st Legislative Day

November 5, 1987

dollar stretch the way you'd like. I believe it just a matter of... it's more than a matter convenience, in some instances it's a matter of whether ٥r you have to go an extended week with little or nothing to eat, unable to feed your children, send them to school. Basic necessities are what we're talking about. And if you're talking about minimum wage, it's just hard to manage money on a month long basis. So. I would hope that you consider this and be humane and give us those green votes. Thank you."

- Speaker dreslin: "Have all voted who wish? Seventy-one votes are required. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 61 voting 'aye', 52 voting 'no' and none voting 'present'. And the Motion fails. Senate Bill 687. Representative Mautino. Clerk, read the Motion."
- Clerk O'Brien: "I move that the House concur with the Senate in the passage of Senate Bill 687, the veto of the Governor notwithstanding."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Mautino."

Mautino: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate Bill 687 - and the total veto of the House. Governor should be overridden. Two weeks ago in this with the excellent support of Representative John Countryman, we overrode the Governor's Veto and sent legislation to the Senate. May I make this emphatic, there is no state money in this project and proposal. entrepreneurship education provisions are now being funded by private enterprise. There has been three companies that have provided the funds for the establishment of the entrepreneurship education, which is an ongoing provision at Northern Illinois University. Let me repeat, we did not file a motion to override Northern's budget. There's no

81st Legislative Day

November 5. 1987

state money. But because of the way that taxes are provided and write-offs are provided for corporations, this makes a very beneficial program for Northern Illinois University and the entrepreneurship education. And I move for the override of the Governor's Total Veto that this House previously accomplished with the House Bill doing the same thing."

- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved to override the Governor's Veto on Senate Bill 687. On that question, the Gentleman from Adams, Representative Mays."
- Mays: "Thank you very much. Will the Gentleman yield for a question?"
- Speaker Breslin: "He will."
- Mays: "What was the action that we took two weeks ago in this chamber?"
- Mautino: "We passed it out, I believe the vote was about 100 to
- Mays: "What... I really... then why are we taking up this piece
- Mautino: "Because the Senate has not taken action on the House
 Bill. Representative Countryman would like to have Senate
 Bill 687 overridden so that it can be established and I
 agree with his evaluation. This is Senator DeAngelis's
 Bill in the Senate."
- Mays: "Now, there's a section of the Bill that says that the state program or the state financial obligation will not exceed \$250,000."
- Mautino: "Yes, that's true."
- Mays: "That's where we're getting a \$250,000 cost here. You're saying that we don't have anything in there from the state at this time. And you won't ask for anything from the state for this purpose."
- Mautino: "That's exactly correct. We did not move to reestablish

81st Legislative Day

November 5, 1987

the funding under the Board of Regents. We were not doing so. We have funds from three corporations for establishing the program. There's no state funds in this 3ill."

Mays: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from DeKalb, Representative

Countryman."

- Countryman: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Briefly, I've had the opportunity to speak with the people at Northern Illinois University that are working on this program. They've asked us to override this so that they have the enabling legislation. They have three foundations which are willing to come up with this money. This will be private money. don't intend to come back and ask this to be public Ыe funded. And we suggested to them that they take the whale It's a great program. He voted this out program private. two weeks ago. I ask for your 'aye' vote."
- "There being no further discussion, the question Speaker Breslin: is, 'Shall Senate Bill 637 pass, the veto of the notwithstanding? All those in favor vote 'ave', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Seventy-one votes Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who required. wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, are 112 voting 'aye', none voting 'no' and none there This Motion, having voting 'present'. received the required three-fifths majority, the Motion is adopted. next Bill is Senate Bill 804. Representative Ryder. Clerk, read the Motion."
- Clerk O'Brien: "I move that the House concur with the Senate in the passage of Senate Bill 804, the veto of the Governor notwithstanding."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Thank you. This Bill requires some information to be given concerning the side effects of the DPT shots and it

81st Legislative Day

November 5. 1987

was suggested by some constituents, not necessarily of mine, but around the State of Illinois, that had a problem.

There has been a veto and I would ask that it be overridden.

- "The Gentleman has moved to Speaker Breslin: averride the on Senate Bill 804. Governor's Veto Is there discussion? Hearing none, the question is, * Shall pass, the veto of the Governor notwithstanding? All those in favor vote 'ave'. all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Seventy-one votes are required. Have a11 voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this guestion, there are 101 voting 'aye', 7 voting 'no' and 1 voting 'present'. This Motion. required three-fifths majority, having received the is adopted. The next Bill is Senate Bill 834. Representative Saltsman. Clerk, read the Motion."
- Clerk O'Brien: "I move that the House concur with the Senate in the passage of Senate Bill 834, the veto of the Governor notwithstanding."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Saltsman."

- Saltsman: "Yes, this is a very important labor-management Bill that we discussed quite thoroughly in the spring the o f vear. And there has been some changes made in the the way that administration of the grants and the department is required to form its operation. And it affects the areas of the Egyptian Area Labor-Management Decatur, Danville, Peoria, Southwestern Illinois Council. Leadership Council, Kankakee County, Aurora, south-suburban Chicago. I ask for the cooperation and support of this override."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved to override the Governor's Veto on Senate Bill 834. And on that question, the Lady from Cook, Representative Didrickson."

you, Madam Speaker, Members

81st Legislative Day

November 5. 1987

of the House.

This Bill did indeed get debate on the House floor spoken in opposition to it before. The Governor did have the good sense to veto this because it expands labor-management councils across the state. And it relieves... the original Bill had... was for start up for three years. If we override the Governor's Veto, what you are doing here is vou are savina. indefinitely, on into perpetuity, you are going to fund all of the labor-management councils up to the tune of at least a hundred grand the third year and on and on and on. are not the dollars there for it, which is why the Governor vetoed this. I f you don't have one of those labor-management councils in your area, you're not going to have a chance to get one. Let me tell you for example. have listed here, and I believe Representative Saltsman just named a number of them, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 of them. Иe appropriated \$297,300 this year for 10. I ask you, are you going to be able to, with that small appropriation, or even what you might expect next year. be able to have labor-management council when we are going to continue to fund those that are already in existence and have used up seed money? It's a bad Bill. It's a bad precedent. that We ought to keep it where it was originally, and let all of us in on a piece of pie. I ask for a 'no' vote Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Macon, Representative Dunn," Dunn: "Thank you• Madam Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the I rise in support of this legislation. House. Ыe in State Illinois are trying to paint a good picture to o f outsiders to make ourselves more attractive, to ask for and to seek business for our state, to see to it that want to come to our state, to make ourselves enticing to them. One of the things that outsiders always ask is, what

81st Legislative Day

November 5, 1987

will be the situation with regard to the labor issue? number of communities across the state. where there are mixtures of blue-collar and white-collar, there have been labor-management committees spring up. These committees been formed out of a realization by both labor and management that something needs to be done have been working on a shoe string with essentially no budget, trying to get some thinas done. brought the opposing sides together, which for Thev have generations and generations has not been possible. He have opened the door to a new era with these committees and if we slam that door shut by defeating this legislation, we are sending a signal that we really don't care to improve labor-management conditions in the State of Illinois. This a wonderful piece of legislation with a very, very modest price tag. And it should be supported by evervone in this Assembly. And I urge an 'aye' vote on this good piece of legislation."

Speaker Braslin: "The Gentleman from Adams, Representative Mays," Mays: "Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. We've had this before us, both substantively and budget-wise for a couple of years now. Ιt was always my understanding that conceptionally this was to get these guys off the ground, help them get started and get up and running and then would become self-sufficient so that if the idea's a good idea, other areas of the state may want to adopt a similar and they could be then eligible for some start up It would seem to me that in funding, too. this o f tight fiscal constraint, very WP have set priorities. And I know there are priorities and there not priorities, but it would seem that most of the people. or this particular Sponsor, has no priorities at all. That he simply wants to spend, spend, spend. And we i t saw

81st Legislative Day

November 5, 1987

yesterday, we're going to see it again and again and again today. I would suggest a 'no' vote is the appropriate vote. Let's let some other people get in on this program if it's a good idea, and I doubt that. But if it is, let them get in and get some funding too. Urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Saltsman to close."

Saltsman: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. In order to qualify, it has to be an agency that's been in operation for vears. not a new one starting up just to suck up state funds and to go back to the local community for these matching previous speaker was wrong. grants. The This is a good investment for the State of Illinois. It's an educational It's one that helps promote our labor image with management. Everyone that I know of is for this a couple of people in this General Assembly. excent just We deserve to have as good a vote as they had in the Senate and I ask for your support in this legislation. not an appropriation Bill. It's a structure of the agency. Bill here does not appropriate anv monev. strictly a good structure. It's defining the way structure of these agencies are going to be set up and there's not one dollar bill in this Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 834 pass. of the Governor notwithstanding?' All those in the veto favor vote 'ave', all those opposed vote 'no'. Seventy-one votes are required. Representative Hicks, one minute to explain your vote. Gentleman opportunity. Have all voted who wish? declines the all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. Πn this question there are 61 voting 'aye', 45 voting 'no' and 3 voting 'present. And the Motion fails. Senate Bill 883. Representative Klemm. Clerk, read the Motion."

Clerk Leone: "I move that the House concur with the Senate in the

81st Legislative Day

November 5. 1987

passage of Senate Bill 883, the veto of the Governor notwithstanding. $^{\rm n}$

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Klemm."

Senate Bill 883 corrects. Klemm: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, I think, something that the General Assembly did in there several years ago. He were concerned about consolidation districts in Illinois. And we said that school districts that voluntarily consolidate, because thev some debts on their books that we would have some supplementary district reorganization and annexation grant monies to allow them to at least start their new venture together on a firm footing. But what we ended up doing was having a technical quirk in the language of the Eill, a school district if a county treasurer were to penalized distribute their tax receipts at a different neriad οf time. What Senate Bill 883 does is to clearly state when the monies and when the debts will be determined as of June 30th-And that if early tax distributions were made they came late, that would not be considered a penalty against those school districts. The Governor vetoed Bill only because it was going to cost between 200 to 300 thousand dollars only. But it was dollars that really we. in honestv. owed these school districts. I understand there are nine school districts in the State of Illinois involved. None of them are, I might add, in my district itself. The reason I'm sponsoring the Bill is because fair and honest approach to allow school districts to do their reorganization as we intended it to he I supported... I mean I appreciated your support on this. The Bill passed unanimously in the House, unanimously in the Senate. It was overridden without a dissenting vote in the Senate two weeks ago. It's necessary to correct the language today so that schools districts can continue to do

81st Legislative Day

November 5. 1987

their voluntary consolidation. And certainly if you support being fair and trying to allow schools to continue to grow, we would appreciate your affirmative vote, and I'd be happy to answer any questions you may have."

be happy to answer any questions you may have."

Speaker dreslin: "The Gentleman has moved to override the Governor's veto of Senate Bill 883. And on that question, the Lady from Cook, Representative Braun."

Braun: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, A question of the Sponsor. Representative Klemmo we have been debating over the last few months, funding for education generally in the State of Illinois. And indeed there was an issue before this time we met having to do with overrides of the the last Governor's vetoes on the school aid formula. Now if fund schools and keep them open and pay schools going to for the task that they undertake pursuant to our guess my question to you is, Representative, are you also supportive of restoration of the general state aid the payments that Governor cut out o f the budget addition tο this supplemental aid for few school. districts in...in downstate or in your area?"

Klemm: "Well, I don't think the two issues are really compatible in some respects, because very honestly we all — you — two weeks ago supported this very concept and voted for it. And I want to thank you for it. Representative Homer spoke on it because it's a bipartisan effort. This is something that obviously we said we would do for schools and because of the interpretation of the law, the State Board said it wasn't clear in the statutes. They also support the Bill. So what we're trying to do now is not necessarily trying to pump in new dollars of state aid or take away from others, what we're trying to do really is to correct a wrong that we all, in the General Assembly, including the State Board of Education, acknowledges we wrote the

81st Legislative Day

November 5, 1987

So what we're trying to do is resolve that. It has nothing to do with whether I support state aid. Yes. think should support more money for Мe schools. Absolutely. I served as a Board of...a President Board of Education for many years. So, I mean if you want my answer, yes, I think we should give more for schools, that question really shouldn't be the basis of how we vote on this issue. This issue is, I think, strong to stand on its own merits. And I want to thank you again for your support on this very issue two weeks ago."

Braun: "Well, Representative, I think you know also that I have been a strong supporter of the schools and of education in I'm just afraid that we are bifurcating the state. and splitting up our efforts when indeed we ought to focus on the funding issues generally. The big funding issues. rather than peeling off a bit of money here and a bit of money there...in behalf of specific and special issues and special interests. I'm not suggesting that there's anything wrong with that. I agree with you that certainly, to the extent that we have made a commitment to education. we should fulfill it. But I would just encourage you to consider that we have failed so far to fulfill many of our commitments to education and that we should at least be consistent in our approach to these funding issues."

Klemm: "The whole issue, as you know, about consolidation is really to say..."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Klemm, that was not a question.

That was the Lady's statement."

Klemm: "I thought it certainly was a question. It was not a question?"

Speaker Breslin: "It was not."

Klemm: "Alright."

Speaker Breslin: "We'll go now to Representative Homer from

81st Legislative Day

November 5, 1987

Fulton."

Homer: "Thank you, Madam Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen. rise to support the Gentleman's motion and point out that the total cost of fulfilling the pledge that we made for consolidation under this Bill is \$300,000. Two hundred twenty-seven of it. I might mention, would benefit particular school district where I represent. And it's really nothing but correcting a deficiency in the A few years ago we passed some incentives for school districts to consolidate, and one of them said where one of districts looking at consolidation had a greater deficit than the other, that the state would agree to infuse a one-time payment that would erase the deficit of district. the poorer school. Hell. that was the circumstance where I represent when farmington and Yates City decided to put a referendum on the ballot asking the voters whether or not to consolidate. And in promoting or putting information out on that, they relied upon the incentives that were in the state law including the one that would erase the deficit of the poorer school district. Yates City. Well, it just so happened, these two particular school districts were in different counties, and the Knox County Treasurer made an early distribution of tax monies to Yates City prior to the new fiscal year, the monies which should have been distributed after the school year. What that did was distort beginning of the balance sheet so as to make it appear that Yates City's deficit had been erased when it really hadn't. And so just because of a...of the happenstance, early distribution of tax monies, the way that the Bill was written would disqualify that consolidated school district from getting what they thought was rightfully theirs and what the people voting on the referendum believed was going to be theirs.

81st Legislative Day

November 5. 1987

But there was a technical deficiency in the Illinois law. So what Representative Klemm here has is a Bill that would clarify Illinois law to say that we're not looking at some fictitious or phony balance sheet tabulation to determine these incentives. We're looking at the real deficit of the school districts, which is after all candidly what the Legislator... Legislature intended when we passed the original law. So to prevent an injustice from occurring, I would urge all the Members to support the Gentleman's motion to override the Amend...the veto on this Bill."

- Speaker Breslin: "There being no further discussion, the question 'Shall Senate Bill 883 pass, the veto of the Governor notwithstanding? All those in favor vote 'ave', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Seventy-one votes required. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this auestion there are 92 voting "aye", 18 voting 'no' and 1 voting *present*. So this motion having received the required three-fifths majority is adopted. Senate Bill Representative Hannig. Clerk, read the motion."
- Clerk Leone: "I move that the House concur with the Senate in the passage of Senate Bill 1057, the veto of the Governor notwithstanding."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative ∺cCracken, for what reason do you rise?"
- McCracken: "He have another distinguished guest on our side of the aisle, former Representative Judy Koehler. Judy."
- Speaker Breslin: "Helcome Representative. Representative
 Hannig."
- Hannig: "Yes, thank you, Madam Speaker, Members of the House.

 Senate Bill 1057 was introduced because of some rule

 changes with the Department of Aging. And I'm aware of at

 least one situation where a individual who had been

81st Legislative Day

November 5, 1987

employed by and working with the community care program for over ten years has now been informed that because she does not have a college education, that she will no longer be able to perform those services that she has done so well at providing for the last ten years. What this proposal would basically say that in those...in this specific situation that individuals such as this lady would be grandfathered in. And grandfathering is something that traditionally in order to allow individuals who have dο provided outstanding service for the State of Illinois continue in that capacity while at the same time raising the educational standards so that new people when they come on board can indeed meet... need some higher standards that the agency may feel that in the long run would benefit the So what this Bill basically does and what this citizens. override would do would be to put in law a provision of the law to grandfather in individuals who have already provided satisfactory services to our community care programs. something that we traditionally do in almost everything when we change the rules in the State of Illinois for those individuals that are working there. And I can't see why it is not being done in this case. And it will be done in this case if we override the Governor's veto on this Billa And I would ask for your 'yes' vote."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved to override the Governor's veto on Senate Bill 1057. And on that question, the Gentleman from Lee, Representative Olson."

Olson: "Hill the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Breslin: "He will."

Olson: "Gary, in our analysis the Governor indicated that he would have vetoed this because it would create a bad precedent with regard to the Joint Committee on Administrative Rules policies. How would you address that

81st Legislative Day

- November 5, 1987
- issue? In other words, you're familiar with JCAR and how we work and we represent both the House and Senate. How would you respond to that?"
- Hannig: "Well, I am familiar with the JCAR process. All I would say is that we have set that agency up in order to review the rules, but that does not mean that we don't also have the authority to act on our own. In fact that's what we would be doing here, if we would pass this, we would be establishing a new law."
- Olson: "Alright, but would this be establishing precedent for other agencies?"
- Hannig: "Well, I think any agency always has the right to come to
 the Legislature and ask that we introduce a piece of
 legislation to do this or that or the other regardless of
 what JCAR may rule. So in that respect, I don't think that
 we're going to see any other agencies do anything different
 from what they already do."
- Olson: "Thank you. To the Bill very briefly, Madam Speaker. I
 would suggest that we support the Governor's veto motion of
 this legislation. I think most of us are familiar with the
 non-partisan nature of Joint Committee on Administrative
 Rules. And I think this would be precedential and not in
 the best form."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative

 McCracken. And Representative Braun in the Chair."
- McCracken: "Thank you, Hadam Speaker. I also rise in opposition This would effectively prohibit our legislative overview of the rules process. T t Pluor nat allow for the promulgation of any rules as a matter of law. I think it's a very unwise precedent and in fact is much more than just a request by an agency for legislation. Really what it is is a request by the agency or...I shouldn't say it's by the agency, because the agency

81st Legislative Day

November 5, 1987

opposes this Bill. It's a request by department vendors that they be grandfathered in and that JCAR in effect lose any authority over the promulgation process, because the Department would not be able to promulgate on this area of law. So I think it's much more than a simple request of the agency. The agency is opposed to it. And it would effectively strip us of any oversight authority relative to this issue. And I just think it's unwise."

- Speaker Braun: "Is there further discussion? There being none, the Gentleman from Macoupin to close. Representative Hannig."
- Madam Speaker, Members of the House. Hannig: "Yes, thank you, I'm not really sure why the JCAR issue's even being raised. We're in the process now that as elected No dv and as elected officials, we have seen a piece of legislation move through the process, pass the House and the Senate, be overridden in the Senate and now move here to the with this action today we can actually enact it into The JCAR committee which is set uр tο legislation simply makes recommendations to the Legislature, and we ultimately have to decide whether we will enact them or not. But the final authority for enacting legislation in the State of Illinois is granted to the legislative Body. And we have that authority today piece of legislation, to address a problem that exists, and to basically try to help some individuals who have served this state well for a period of many years and are now being told that because of Some administrative changes that they're going to be out of business. This law and this Bill simply addresses that and tries to put some equity and fairness into the system and do ₩hat we. have traditionally done in almost every change that I m aware of, that is to give these individuals their grandfathering

81st Legislative Day

- November 5, 1987
- authority. And for that reason I believe that we should override the Governor's veto. And I'd ask for your support."
- Speaker Braun: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1057 pass, the veto of the Governor notwithstanding?' The voting is op?n. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? It takes seventy-one votes. Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 55 voting 'aye', 47 voting 'no'. The motion fails. Senate 3ill 1226. Representative Phelps.
- Clerk Leone: "I move that the House concur with the Senate in the passage of Senate Bill 1226, the veto of the Governor notwithstanding."
- Speaker Braun: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Saline, Representative Phelps."
- Phelps: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the 1226 is an effort to try to restore something that we lost in the Department of Aging. The legislation passed in 1984 that set up a network of demonstration abuse projects to determine for the Legislature the extent of elder abuse in the state. During this period there's been demonstration projects several and programs set throughout the state. All the area agencies, I think, have some sort of abuse programs to some degree involved Aging Department requires it. But the ... this particular Bill is trying to protect the immunity clause that some of these investigators and people, constituents or citizens who report abuse to the social services personnel, medical personnel, the aging network personnel, law enforcement. And we had this protection until ٥f this year. And now we need to restore that provision. The Governor did veto the total Bill because he

81st Legislative Day

November 5, 1987

said it was new legislation that possibly could require some appropriation. But we are just interested in restoring that the people who do report abuse problems for the aging, that we give them immunity and liability if they are... do exercise that right. So we appreciate your support for the override."

- Speaker Braun: "The Gentleman has moved to override the Governor's veto on Senate Bill 1226 and on that is there any discussion? The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from DuPage, Representative McCracken."
- McCracken: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to the override. This demonstration project which was created or created in '84 and had a two year reporting history was not necessarily demonstrated proof of the necessity of this The cost of this program is estimated at 1.2 program. million dollars GRF. Those of you who voted against education and made many of those other tough regarding the budget, I think, have to realize that this is not as high on the priority list, or shouldn't be on the priority list, as some of those more very elementary necessities which the state is required to provide. Нe made some hard votes on those issues. And I think we have to sustain this veto. because it is required in our attempts to prioritize and equitably allocate that money which is available. This is not one of those high priority items. And I think it should not be overridden."
- Speaker Braun: "Is there further discussion? The Lady from Sangamon, Representative Hasara."
- Hasara: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I am a member of the Citizens

 Assembly on Women, and we have been addressing

 Representative DeJaegher's Resolution on the older women

 and had a full day of hearings on elder abuse in the

 Capitol about two weeks ago, and I think that the need for

81st Legislative Day

November 5, 1987

this Bill indeed has been proven by the demonstration projects. I was informed this morning by people that there actually is no money attached to this particular Bill. And that the hope of this Bill being overridden could provide some federal funds that could become available and for that reason. I do support the legislation. Thank your?

Speaker Braun: "Is there further discussion? There being none, the Gentleman from Saline to close."

Phelps: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I would like Representative Hasara's comments are exactly correct. The . . . there is no intent to provide money at this time for this provision. Funding will be needed probably in the future if this program is much more comprehensive in But right now the two year protection clause that nature. had for those constituents, citizens or field workers that already have salaries without new appropriations reports of elder abuse need the protection, the immunity in order to be able to enhance the program already in place. And this is not asking for money at all. It's just giving those people who might hesitate if they did not have the protection, now could have the immunity And I think we're talking about priorities. clause. disagree. I think the elderly is one of the big priorities all of us have. So I appreciate your support."

Speaker Braun: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1226 pass, the veto of the Governor notwithstanding?' All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted? Representative Deuchler, for what reason do you seek recognition? Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Representative Phelps, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

Phelps: "Madam Speaker, I'd like to explain my vote."

Speaker Braun: "Proceed."

81st Legislative Day

November 5, 1987

- Phelps: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen, we are real close here. I want to reiterate that there really is no sneaky idea of putting money or anything in. This...the field workers that are out there now that hear elder abuse cases being reported, it could be your mother and father or grandfather or something and until we get further developed, this program, just give them the protection, the immunity that they need, to not hesitate to report some wrong goings...wrongdoings. And I think that that's the Christian thing we'd want to do. It doesn't have any money all in it. And just...just think about it. at appreciate your support."
- Speaker Braun: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 71 voting 'aye', 38 voting 'no'. Representative McCracken."

McCracken: "For a verification."

- Speaker Braun: "The Gentleman requests a verification of the Roll. And Representative Phelps asks for a poll of the absentees. Representative Matijevich, for what reason do you rise?"
- Matijevich: "Madam Speaker, I want to introduce on this side of the aisle a close friend of mine, a friend of all who served with him, the former Parliamentarian here and Member, Mike Getty, Judge Mike Getty, whose son is being sworn into the Bar today. Judge Getty."
- Speaker Braun: "Mr. Clerk, proceed with the verification."
- Clerk Leone: "A poll of those Hembers not voting.

 Representatives Rice. Tuerk and Wait."
- Speaker Braun: "Proceed with the poll of the affirmative votes."
- Clerk Leone: "Poll of the affirmative. Berrios. Black. Bowman.

 Braun. Breslin. Brunsvold. Bugielski. Capparelli.

 Christensen. Cullerton. Curran. Currie. Daley. Dayis.

81st Legislative Day

November 5, 1987

DeLeo. Dunn. DeJaegher. Farley. Flinn. Flowers. Virginia Frederick. Giglio. Giorgi. Goforth. Hannig. Hartke. Hasara. Hicks. Homer. Huff. Jones. Kubiko Kulaso Lango Laurinoo Keane. Krska. Leflore. Leverenz. Levin. Martinez. Matijevich. Mautino. McGann. AcNamara. McPike. Morrow. Mulcahev. Novak. O'Connell. Phelps. Rea. Richmond. Ronan. Saltsman. Satterthwaite. Shawa Steczoa Sterna Sutker. Terzich. Duyne. White. Turner. Van Meaver. Williams.

Speaker Braun: "Any questions of the affirmative? Representative

McCracken."

Williamson. Holf. Anthony Young and Wyvetter Younge."

McCracken: "Representative Morrow?"

Speaker 3raun: "Representative Charles Morrow? The Gentleman is in the aisle. Excuse me, Representative McCracken.

Representative Black, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

Black: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Would you please change my vote to present."

Speaker Braun: "Change Representative Black's vote to present.

Further questions of the affirmative."

McCracken: "Representative DeLeo?"

Speaker Braun: "Representative DeLeo? Is the Gentleman in the chamber? Representative DeLeo? The Gentleman appears not to be in the chamber. Remove him. Remove his vote."

McCracken: "Representative Daley?"

Speaker Braun: "Representative Daley? The Gentleman's in the rear of the chamber."

McCracken: "Representative Laurino?"

Speaker Braun: "Representative Laurino? Is the Gentleman in the chamber? Representative DeLeo (sic — Laurino)? He appears not to be. Remove his vote."

McCracken: "Representative Shaw?"

81st Legislative Day November 5, 1987

Speaker Braun: "Representative Shaw? Representative Shaw? Is the Gentleman in the chamber? He appears not to be.

Remove his vote."

McCracken: "Representative Farley?"

Speaker Braun: "Representative Farley? Is the Gentleman in the chamber? He appears not to be. Remove his vote."

McCracken: "Representative Huff?"

Speaker Braun: "Representative Huff? Representative Huff? Is the Gentleman in the chamber? He appears not to be.

Remove his vote."

McCracken: "Representative Keane?"

Speaker Braun: "I'm sorry. Would you repeat that?"

McCracken: "Representative Keane?"

Speaker Braun: "Representative Keane? Is the Gentleman in the chamber? Representative Keane? Yes, he's in the rear of the chamber."

McCracken: "Okay. Representative Ronan?"

Speaker Braun: "Representative Ronan? Is the Gentleman in the chamber? Representative Al Ronan? He appears not to be.

Remove his vote."

McCracken: "Representative Rea?"

Speaker 3raun: "Representative Jim Rea? The Gentleman is in the rear of the chamber."

McCracken: "Representative Williams?"

Speaker Braun: "Representative Williams? Representative Paul Williams? Is the Gentleman in the chamber? He appears not to be. Remove his vote."

McCracken: "Representative Novak?"

Speaker Braun: "Representative Novak? Representative Novak? Is

the Gentleman in the chamber? He appears not to be.

Remove his vote."

McCracken: "Representative Granberg?"

Speaker Braun: "Representative Granberg? The Gentleman is in the

81st Legislative Day

November 5, 1987

center aisle. Representative Ronan has returned. Return his vote. Representative Williams has returned. Return his vote."

McCracken: "Williams isn't off."

Speaker Braun: "Williams."

McCracken: "Oh, alright. Okay, nothing further."

- "Representative Farley has returned. Speaker Braun: Return Representative Giglio, I don't think your vote was challenged. Any further questions of the affirmative? No further further? There questions of are DO the affirmative. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 65 voting 'aye', 38 voting 'no'. And the motion fails. On the Order Total Veto Motions appears Senate Bill 1267-Representative Flowers? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill. Read the motion."
- Clerk Leone: "I move that the House concur with the Senate in the passage of Senate Bill 1267, the veto of the Governor notwithstanding."
- Speaker Braun: "Excuse me, Representative McCracken, for what reason do you seek recognition?"
- McCracken: "I think Representative McNamara was looking for recognition. He has the next Bill."
- Speaker Braun: "Oh! Forgive me, Representative McNamara. You're exactly right. Hould you mind since we're on 1267, we'll proceed with that and then come back to yours immediately. My eyes skipped over. Okay. Representative Flowers will proceed. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill. The Lady from Cook, Representative Flowers."
- Flowers: "Madam Speaker, Lad...Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I choose to override the Governor's veto for Senate Bill 1267. It's merely asking the ICC to do a study of the costs for the consumer rates for those consumers who are on life supporting machines. And I would

81st Legislative Day

November 5, 1987

urge your 'aye' vote for Senate Bill 1267."

Speaker Braun: "The Lady has moved to override the Gover...the
veto of the Governor on Senate Bill 1267. And on that is
there any discussion? The Gentleman from DuPage,
Representative McCracken."

McCracken: "Hould you...would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Braun: "She indicates she will."

McCracken: "I understand this was not the subject of a particular veto message. It was one of those stricken en masse, right?"

Flowers: "Right. You're absolutely right."

- McCracken: "Okay. Would you tell me whether there's any cost
 associated with this? I mean has anyone estimated the cost
 of the study which will be required?"
- Flowers: "No, there's no estimated cost at all. I'm sure that
 the ICC could find a couple of people in their department
 to do a study of how much it would cost to save these
 people lives."
- McCracken: "Alright. And what is it that the study is about?

 What is the subject matter of the study?"
- Flowers: "The subject matter is the rates. The rate in which the residents or either the consumer would have to pay. Just like the utility company have summer rates where they go up higher, well we're asking them to consider a different type of rate for people who are on respiratory machines, dialysis machines and any other life supporting machines."
- McCracken: "So there is a statement that the particular persons or subject of these what are called life support consumer rates are identified in the Bill? Or is it up to the department to promulgate rules or to arrive at its own definition of who these persons are?"
- Flowers: "It specifies in the Bill respiratory, dialysis machines and any other life support machines. Anything that a

81st Legislative Day

November 5, 1987

person's life is dependent upono"

McCracken: "And are the utilities in question heat and cooling utilities, or would it include telephone or...?"

Flowers: "That...no, it does not."

McCracken: "It does not include telephone?"

Flowers: "No."

McCracken: "It would be just heat and light?"

Flowers: "No, no, it's just for the light. The electrical bill."

McCracken: "Okay. So it's the electric bill for that...for those machines. Alright, thank you."

Speaker Braun: "Is there further discussion? The Gentleman from Adams, Representative Mays."

Mays: "I see that the study is supposed to be submitted to this

Assembly by March 1st of *38. Is that correct? What kind

of a...how big of a study are you looking for? Just in a

specific area or...?"

Flowers: "No, I'm not looking for a specific area. I'm looking for a study that will give us an idea about how we can save these people lives."

Mays: "Okay, I don't know that this is a bad idea, but I do know, and I don't know what the Commerce Commission's position might be on this issue, because they may well want to do it. I do know that they've got four major rate cases in front of them right now. They are allocating a lot of resources internally to try to come up with the facts and figures on those rate cases to counter whatever the utility companies are coming up for. And I frankly would believe that if they've got any extra money, that's where it ought to go, rather than this place. And for that reason, I would urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Braun: "Is there further discussion? There being none, the Lady from Cook to close. Representative flowers to close."

81st Legislative Day

November 5, 1987

- Flowers: "Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is a life-saving Bill. I would merely urge your 'aye' vote in order to help me override the Governor's veto of Senate Bill 1267. He're talking about saving people lives here. I would again urge your 'aye' votes."
- Speaker Braun: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1267 pass, the veto of the Governor notwithstanding?' All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative LeFlore, for what reason do you seek recognition?"
- Leflore: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I would hope that more people would take this under consideration. He're talking about people's lives, you know this is a very serious matter. I mean it really doesn't cost that much money. So let's give a few more green votes on the board."

Speaker Braun: "Representative Leverenz."

- Leverenz: "Thank you. Madam Speaker. I think it's silly not to try to override and succeed in overriding Senate Bill 1267. the Governor's veto. We're going to do this if we have to do it by line item for the Illinois Commerce Commission. doubt that they would do it with General Revenue Funds So we will...if we don't get a sufficient of votes, maybe we will just cut the Illinois Commerce And we will find the money for what I Commission's budget. important project that Representative consider a verv Flowers has here. So I'd ask for a few more votes and just aet the job done. Otherwise you're pulling the plug on these people."
- Speaker Braun: "Is there further discussion? The Lady from St.

 Clair, Representative Younge. The Lady from Cook,

 Representative Davis."

81st Legislative Day

November 5, 1987

- Davis: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the a freshman Legislator, I find it interesting As certain group of people are opposed legislation that is of a positive effect for the children. I find it interesting that these same Legislators opposed to any legislation that helps the developmentally I find it disabled. interesting that Legislators are also opposed to anything that helps our elderly. And here again they are opposed to those who on life support systems. I think the people who send them here ought to take a good hard look at what these people do support."
- Speaker Braun: "Is there further discussion? There being none, the Clerk shall take the Roll. Take the record. On this question there are 64 voting 'aye', 46 voting 'no'. And the motion fails. Senate Bill 1266. Representative McNamara. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill (sic motion)."
- Clerk Leone: "I move that the House concur with the Senate in the passage of Senate Bill 1266, the veto of the Governor notwithstanding."
- Speaker Braun: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative

 McNamara."
- McNamara: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Members of the House. Senate Bill 1266 tried to answer an apparent problem we have in the mortgage industry. That is when you commitment or a file for a commitment for a loan, that they should within sixty days either give you the commitment, or forget it and give your money back. The Governor's veto explains that the delay is not a feasible thing and that it would cause problems for both the borrower and the institution. I have to take exception to that because I have on the file that Germania Mortgage Corporation gives them money back nine-day approval

81st Legislative Day

November 5, 1987

Ŧ guess they are under guarantee. federal lending practices. If a mortgage corporation can give you a nine-day approval guarantee, I do not see why the savings institutions in Illinois can't and loan give VOU sixty-day guarantee. We have all had constituents who have the problem. The constituents have reported to us that the institutions have been locking them up for a hundred to a hundred twenty days, et cetera. Ιf thev*re looking for a mortgage here in Illinois, let's have a reasonable period to do it in sixty days, because if do that... if we don't do this, the Federal Government will certainly step in and at some point foresee other situation that all institutions must give that guarantee. I urge the override of the Governor's veto."

- Speaker Braun: "The Gentleman has moved that the House override the veto of the Governor on Senate Bill 1266. And on that is there any discussion? The Gentleman...the Chair recognizes the Gentleman from St. Clair, Representative Flinn."
- Flinn: "Well. Madam Speaker, I relunctantly rise to oppose the Gentleman's motion. I speak to you not only as Chairman of Financial Institutions * Committee but as an individual Legislator too. This does indeed leave some doubt as to whether it applies tο federal savings and loan And if it does not, it would be a terrible disadvantage to state charters. I think before we override the Governor on this issue, we should make doubly sure it state chartered savings does not put the and loan associations at a disadvantage. And I plan to vote no."
- Speaker Braun: "Is there further discussion? The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Piel."

 Piel: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Somewhat to elaborate on the previous speaker's

81st Legislative Day

November 5. 1987

comments, I think the thoughts of the Sponsor of the motion are well intended, but I think what the problem that many times unforeseen to the lending institution whether it be bank. saving loan, mortgage house, when certain situations arise that are beyond their control, this sixty-day time limit is exceeded. Many times. and Gentlemen, for a bank, savings and loan, mortgage house get a report from a company, and lots of times the only way they can get it is through the mail. It's not bad 50 they can get the initial information through computer. but lots of times they will not be able to get this information through computer. And it would have to come from a written report. This could take anywhere fortv...thirty forty-five days to get the information to And then beyond then, then they have to verify the person's credit, income and mortgage and loan history from different institutions and different businesses. at times what they have to do, especially when it comes to the area, it takes anywhere from fifteen to thirty days because they have to send in written requests. Very. verv seldom will a company verify a person's employment and income over the phone. They have to do it by written And we're talking about a time frame here that request. lots of times it would put the lending institution disadvantage. Now to sort of reiterate on previous speaker said. It... the Bill does not specifically state, chartered institutions. The innuendo is there that it state chartered institutions is would definitely put them at a strong, strong disadvantage, because your federally chartered mortgage companies, banks and savings and loans would be exempt from this don't think that that was the intent of the Bill, but it does state basically that they'll be state chartered

81st Legislative Day

November 5. 1987

institutions which your federal ones would be exempt from. Ladies and Gentlemen, I think, you know, the name of game is when a person is applying, they're applying to get this loan on a specific piece of property and what to happen is we're going to get to the fifty-fifth, fifty-sixth day and the person is going to be rejected. to...if the Governor's override...veto is overridden. what's going to happen is the people are going to be rejected because of a lack of information. T F do not have all this information back where they cannot sit here and say yes we will make the loan to you, if they don't have it back, they're just going to reject the and tell the people that they can't give them the loan because of lack of information available, and it's still in So they would lose the loan, they would the mail. their money back, but they would lose the loan. Thev're basically starting at square one. So I would ask at time i f we could give a 'no' vote on the override motion. Thank vou."

- Speaker Braun: "Is there further discussion? The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Lake, Representative Matijevich."
- Matijevich: "Madam Speaker, I probably am not speaking directly this issue, but we in the Legislature sometimes have to make public notice of problems that we see in government. because it relates to this issue, I want all the Members of the House to be aware of what happened district. In my district I have a Northshore Savings and Loan Association. About a month ago a Northshore Savings Loan Association from Wisconsin applied to do business in the State of Illinois. And the Commissioner that actually is branching. In other words, they used an old 1893 law. I think the Commissioner did wrong

81st Legislative Day

November 5, 1987

I have a vehicle that I want to put on a Bill if mvself. we get a banking Bill out. This is a very drastic situation that occurred. It is unfair to all the savings and loan associations in Illinois. They cannot branch Wisconsin now. And they...the Association in Nisconsin had no public hearings or anything. This is a very. to make very critical situation that occurred. And I wanted the to be aware o f it. This is also unfair to our Illinois banks. And I want to say it now because Commissioner. I know. hears what is said on this House floor. Commissioner, I think you did wrong. You tell you did it under your authority, and you couldn't do anything else. I think you did it improperly. And if need be, I'm even going to have an investigation of what done and how it was done."

Speaker Braun: "Is there further discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative McNamara."

McNamara: "Thank you. The arguments that we heard was that it would put the state chartered savings associations at a disadvantage. Quite the contrary It puts us at an advantage. He have the advantage true. of saying that a person will know whether or not they have their money within sixty days. Already we have seen from the ad in the Springfield paper that a federally chartered going to give you a money back nine-day approval guarantee. That certainly would put our will happen is, the people will go to disadvantage. What the state savings and loans first because they know the answer. Because they know they can get those can aet In the argument as far as it will put our lenders dollars. at a disadvantage, can you...an agreement according to this Bill can be agreed upon that should the paperwork delayed, there is nothing in this Bill that says that the

81st Legislative Day

November 5, 1987

customer and the bank can't extend that agreement for an additional sixty days should that be the problem. It is a good consumer Bill. It is a good Bill for the people And people simply feel that if they are state. rejected only because they don't have the information, reality what has occurred in many times across this state is that they have been rejected because the loan institution wishes to hold on to those consumer dollars and use those dollars. This is an excellent consumer issue to protect our people. I urge for the Governor's override."

- Speaker Braun: "The Gentleman has moved to override the veto the Governor on Senate Bill 1266. The question is, *Shall 12...Senate Bill 1266 pass. the veto of the Governor notwithstanding? All in favor vote *aye*, opposed vote *no*. The voting is open. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take On this question there are 45 voting 'aye', 46 the record. voting 'no'. And the motion fails. Senate Bill 1384. Representative Van Duvne? The Gentleman from Will. Representative Van Duyne. Mr. Clerk, read the motion.
- Clerk Leone: "I move that the House concur with the Senate in the passage of Senate Bill 1384, the veto of the Governor notwithstanding."
- Speaker Braun: "The Gentleman from Will, Representative Van
- Van Duyne: "Yes, thank you, Madam Speaker. This is a Bill that was...came out of Senator Rock's township study group, and it was presented to the Township... Counties and Township Committee where I became the Sponsor. And the belief is that the municipalities have the right to have a planning commission, that the counties have the right to have a planning commission and therefore the townships are kind

81st Legislative Day

November 5. 1987

of...sort of left out in the cold. The original Bill incorporated the mile and a half jurisdiction into other townships which we thought was a little bit unnecessary gave somebody living in one end of the township a seven and a half mile jurisdiction in order to force the county board into a three-quarters majority vote. took that out, but we really didn't see any reason why that the townships would not be allowed to have a commission if they saw fit. Now the Governor's message of total veto, he said it was an overlapping and duplicative exercise, but nevertheless, if you deny the townships tvoe the right to have a planning commission, it is a sort of a of their rights also. So I see nothing wrong with ita It may be duplicative in one sense of the word. it does give the townships a right to name some people but to a planning commission and have some right to say what is going on within their township only. And I want to stress that we did take out the mile and vou a half jurisdiction into other people. So we don't see where it infringes on anybody other than their own right. would ask for your support...the Governor's veto notwithstanding. And I'd appreciate your 'ave' vote."

- Speaker Braun: "The Gentleman has moved to override the Gover...the veto on Senate Bill 1384. And on that is there any discussion? The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from DuPage, Representative #cCracken."
- McCracken: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Let me first say that I don't necessarily care how the vote goes on this. If you have township people who want it and you feel that's a good reason to vote for it, that's fine. But strictly as a matter of public policy, I cannot imagine that this makes any sense at all. Counties currently have authority over unincorporated areas,

81st Legislative Day

November 5, 1987

municipalities currently have some authority over unincorporated areas that which is within a mile and a half of their borders. As the Governor observes, zoning law complex and not for the least because you have these overlapping authorities. This Bill would create third overlapping authority. Townships which could plan and zone in unincorporated areas. Now the mile and a half to be taken out or taken out, but that proposed doesn't solve the inherent problem in giving a third jurisdiction over overlapping areas of authority currently in law. The trend in zoning should be away this multiplicity of jurisdictions. It should be toward a simplification of that. And this is a step in the wrong direction. And if you don't feel that you have any political considerations, I'd ask you to consider vote."

Speaker Braun: "Is there further discussion? There being none, the Gentleman from Hill to close."

Van Duyne: "Yes, Representative McCracken, in our area of the state, what you said was true. Cook County, Will County, some of the most...more populated areas, or urban areas But when you get away from the state, it's true. metropolitan area of Chicago, you run into a highly And it covers miles and miles section of our real estate. and miles of empty space where there really jurisdiction. Sure the county does have its right to zone, you made a misstatement, I believe, where you say it's a duplicative effort in the sense that they do have to zone and they do not. As of now the county makes the zoning. All the township...the township really has no representation as a bonafide structure. The cities do. the counties do, but the townships don't. And even though it's very important in the urban areas, when you get a

81st Legislative Day

November 5, 1987

little bit further out of the Chicago area, it does become a popular issue and one, maybe necessarily duplicative, but also necessary. So I think the people from downstate may want this. It's not important to the people in the urban areas as I said. But in the rural areas it does become a kind of an important tool for the townships to have some say over what their...over their own destinies. So I would appreciate an 'aye' vote."

- "The Gentleman has...the question is. Speaker Braun: Senate Bill 1384 pass. the veto ٥f the Governor notwithstanding?* All in favor vote 'ave', opposed vote *no*. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk On this question there are 75 voting will take the record. 'ave', 23 voting 'no'. This motion having received the three-fifths majority is adopted. required Representative Parcells, for what reason do you seek recognition?"
- Parcells: "Madam Speaker, could you please record me as 'aye' on that?"
- Speaker Braun: "The record will reflect your intention to vote
 aye. Senate Bill 1393. Representative Hannig? Mr.

 Clerk, read the motion."
- Clerk Leone: "I move that the House concur with the Senate in the passage of Senate Bill 1393, the veto of the Governor notwithstanding."
- Speaker Braun: "The Gentleman from Macoupin."
- Hannig: "Yes, thank you, Madam Speaker, Hembers of the House.

 Senate Bill 1393 would create the Toxic Waste Strike Force.

 And a little bit predictably it was vetoed by the Governor,

 because he felt that it would be a great idea but it would

 not be a program that he felt we could fund under the

 current fiscal situation. But the fact is that in those

 areas, for example, like Los Angeles County where they've

81st Legislative Day

November 5, 1987

already set up their own strike force, the program has generated that agency over \$2,000,000 in fines and penalties during the first two years of operation. comparison in Illinois for all the time that we've enforced our laws, we've generated only \$366,000. So obviously it's apparent that a well-run, well-operated Toxic Waste Strike Force not only can help the citizens of the State of Illinois to have a safer, cleaner environment, but it can generate the additional monies that will be necessary also to run the operation. So this Bill has already overridden in the Senate with 38 positive votes and today I would ask for your support so that we can override it in the House and make this Illinois law. Appreciate vour 'yes' vote."

Speaker Braun: "The Gentleman has moved to override the Governor's veto on Senate Bill 1393. On that is there any discussion? The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from DuPage, Representative McCracken."

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

Speaker Braun: "She (sic - he) indicates she (sic - he) will."

McCracken: "Representative, there is currently in existence what's known as a Hazmin Unit as a part of the State Police. Is that right?"

Hannig: "Yes, I'm familiar with that."

McCracken: "And that function is to investigate criminal violations of the EPA and other related statutes. Is that correct?"

Hannig: "I think so."

McCracken: "Okay. Would you agree then that what you propose is in large part a duplication of this unit that's already in existence?"

Hannig: "Well, this Bill would bring the Illinois EPA, the State

Police agency that you talked about, the Attorney General's

81st Legislative Day

November 5. 1987

Office, local State's Attorneys and basically all the groups together in an effort to try to provide one Toxic Waste Strike Force in the state. So the State Police would only be a part of it."

- McCracken: "Okay. It's correct also though isn't it that in fact there already is this cooperation among those agencies?

 Isn't there already known as a Chem-Hit Task Force which is composed of the Cook County State's Attorney, State Police, Attorney General and the EPA?"
- Hannig: "Well, that may be true, Representative. I'm...I can't say for sure."
- "Okav. To the Bill, Madam Speaker. This appears AcCracken: be duplicative of a program already in existence. an...there has been a price tag put to this, but this relates only to the State Police and does not relate those other units of government which would be included in Representative Hannig's Bill. And that price tag is over 1.3 million dollars. In light of the fact that it is already duplicative of a function that the State Police currently provide and in light of the fact that there already is on the books this example of cooperation the various agencies described in this Bill. I submit that that is duplicative of ... of what is already the case. And I think that given the price tag and the duplicative nature of this proposal that we should not endorse it."
- Speaker Braun: "Is there further discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Morrow."
- Morrow: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Members of the House. I rise in support of Senate Bill 1393. This is one of the few Bills that we have a chance to vote on that will gain revenue for us. All of the other Bills that we have voted on have been to take away revenue. One of the previous people to get up to rise against the Bill stated about the

81st Legislative Day

November 5, 1987

cost. If our EPA or IEPA was doing its job. collect or assess fines to more than cover the cost of this As Representative Hannig stated, in Los Angeles program. County alone they levied over \$2,000,000 worth of over the last three years. Here over the last three years, we've only levied \$366,000 in fines. We've only been able collect \$280,000 in fines. This Bi 11 the . . . Fraternal Order of Police has asked the Governor to sign this Bill into law. They sent him a letter in August. He vetoed it. I urge that we vote to override the Governor's veto on this Bill, because of the fact that we need to send a message out to those who have these dump sites that we will not tolerate this type of condition Thank you." here.

- Speaker Breslin: "Is there further discussion? There being none, the Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Macoupin to close.

 Representative Hannig."
- Hannig: "Yes, thank you, Madam Speaker, Members of the House. the argument against this proposal was that there is already such an agency in existence, but my ouestion would be is if there's such an agency and such cooperation, why do they have such lax enforcement of the law? Why have received \$366,000 in fines? Why can't the whole we only State of Illinois generate even what Los Angeles can if there's such good cooperation? The truth is that here in Illinois we don't have a coordinated strike Иe don't have people who are agressively pursuing toxic waste polluters. What we have is a patchwork network that sometimes works and sometimes does not. lihat this Bill would do is provide overall coordination and provide for a total effort in an area that is very important to us as a state. So I say today if you believe that it's important that we prosecute and catch the toxic waste

81st Legislative Day

November 5. 1987

dumpers in the State of Illinois, if you feel that it's important that we have a safe, clean environment for the next generation, and if you think that it's important that we can generate additional fees for the State Treasury, for all these reasons, you should be voting 'yes' for this Bill. This Bill's supported by the labor groups in this state, by environmental groups and the Illinois Public Action Council. All these groups feel that it's important. And I would ask for you to share with us and vote 'yes' for this proposal."

Speaker Braun: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1393 pass, the veto of the Governor notwithstanding? All in 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. all voted? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clark will take the record. On this question there are 66 voting 'aye', 42 voting 'no'. Representative Martinez. for reason dο vou seek recognition? Representative Hartinez would like to be recorded as voting *aye*. Representative Panayotovich like to be recorded as voting 'ave'. Is there anyone seekina recognition? Yes, Representative Slater? Representative Slater would like to be recorded as voting *no** Further changes? Representative Countryman, for what reason do you seek recognition? The Gentleman would like to be recorded as voting 'no'. Further changes? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 66 voting 'aye', 44 voting "no". And the motion fails. Senate Bill 1412. Representative O'Connell? Mr. Clerk. read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "I move that the House concur with the Senate in the passage of Senate Bill 1412, the veto of the Governor notwithstanding."

Speaker Braun: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative

81st Legislative Day

November 5, 1987

O'Connell."

O'Connell: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Senate Bill 1412 raises the maximum sentence for first degree murder from 40 60 years and increases the maximum extended sentence for murder from 80 years to 100 years. Now, first degree murder, the elements of first degree murder are that the act be intentional and that it be done with knowledge will cause death or great bodily harm. The elements for extended term sentence for murder are that done in an extremely heinous or heinous and brutal fashion. The only reason, justification that the Governor given for vetoing Senate Bill 1412 was a prognosis on his part that it would increase cost for the Department Corrections And that there would be more length in terms in prison. Now mindful of the Governor's concern for think there is budgetary restrictions, I an equally compelling responsibility on our part to make certain judges who are rendering these sentences for convicted murderers, I underline convicted murderers, are given greater latitude. My understanding are that in the last year, 25% of those individuals who were convicted of first degree murder were given the uppermost maximum penalty. that is of 40 years. Now that's one out o f everv four individuals that are convicted of first degree murder are given the maximum sentence. It would seem to me that is evidence that we are not giving our judges sufficient latitude so that these penalties can be enhanced. You must remember that individuals who are convicted of murder qualified for parole within one-half the period of time that they serve. So it's conceivable that an individual who is convicted of first degree murder and given a 20 year sentence can be freed and on parole in 10 years time. Similarly, that individual that received the maximum

81st Legislative Day

November 5, 1987

penalty of 40 years for an act where there was an intentional act on the part of the perpetrator to kill someone, and in fact does kill someone, they can be out on the streets in 20 years. So that 20 year old murderer can theoretically be out on the streets when he is 40 years of age. I think that we all owe it to the citizens of this state and our constituencies to at least provide some greater latitude for the judges for extending their terms. I'll be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Braun: "Is there any discussion? The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Klemm."

Klemm: "Will the Speaker... or will the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Braun: "He indicates he will yield."

Klemm: "What was the Governor's reason for totally vetoing this particular Bill, Representative O'Connell?"

O'Connell: "Well, as I said, it was the prediction that it would require a greater cost for the Department of Corrections."

Klemm: "In what way?"

O'Connell: "I'm sorry?"

Klemm: "In what way? How would it increase the cost of the Department of Corrections?"

O'Connell: "He estimates that it would result in an 18% increase in the length of stay for those affected, that is first degree murderers and murderers convicted of a heinous murder, that it would require a new 750 bed prison over a 3 year period beginning in 1993. Now that's his prediction."

Klemm: "So in other words, we probably could have saved the state
money if we turn all those people who are convicted of
first degree murder free. Hould that be correct?"

O'Connell: "Precisely."

Klemm: "And I don't think anybody in the General Assembly would be prepared to save tax dollars by turning convicted

81st Legislative Day

- November 5, 1987
- criminals of first degree murder free. Would you think we would have that much common sense not to...to at least reject that, right?"
- O'Connell: "I would think... I would hope we'd have enough common sense not to do that."
- Klemm: "So we're...then we're really debating whether how much we want to spend to protecting the public from convicted murderers and trying to balance the budget or if we should really depend on protecting the citizenry to the fullest extent of the law. Isn't that correct?"
- O'Connell: "Well, I think we are acting upon a projection.

 Representative. And I think that the projections of the
 Governor may or may not be correct. What we are dealing

 with, that we're certain of, is the reality that crime in

 the streets is rampant in many areas of the state."
- Klemm: "Well, from my side of it, I tend to agree with you and I think we should be overriding the Governor's veto on this.

 I don't think he can put a dollars and cents in protecting our citizens and I commend you for it. Thank you."
- O'Connell: "Thank you."
- Speaker Braun: "Is there further discussion? The Chair recognizes the Lady...the Gentle...the Lady from Lake.

 Representative Stern."
- Stern: "Madam Speaker and Members of the House, I believe that there is a subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee meeting now on the question of sentencing, which will hope to bring some consistency to the hodge-podge of laws now on the books. And I would urge us not to keep adding little increments to every crime, however dreadful, and this is certainly heinous in the interest of protecting the public. Let's let the subcommittee meet and give us its results and we can bring standards and consistency to the laws of Illinois on sentencing. I think that is of the greatest

81st Legislative Day

- November 5, 1987
- importance. And though I have all kinds of respect for the Sponsor, I urge you to vote 'no' on this for the time being."
- Speaker Braun: "Is there further discussion? The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Cullerton."
- Cullerton: "Yes, would the Sponsor yield?"
- Speaker Braun: "He indicates he will."
- Cullerton: "Representative O'Connell, Representative Klemm's questions confused me a little bit. Is this 3ill designed to correct a situation where murderers are going free and that this 3ill is designed to keep murderers from going free?"
- O*Connell: "Well... I think what it... what it... what it does do
 is it expands the period of time in which they'd have to
 stay in a prison and therefore, limit the amount of
 individuals who would be out on parole at a relatively
 short period of time."
- Cullerton: "I see. So, it's your understanding then that the purpose of this Bill is to keep people in prison for a longer period of time?"
- O'Connell: "For those people that are convicted of first degree murder or murder for an extended term."
- Cullerton: "So do you agree with the Governor's assessment that
 this would in... cause an 18% increase in the length of
 stay for those prisoners affected?"
- O*Connell: "I don't think that you can give any empirical numbers as to what it will cost. I think clearly, and in further response to your question, that the logic would follow that you are keeping people in prison longer and that, yes indeed, it would be somewhat of an additional cost to society."
- Cullerton: "Yeah, in other words, the purpose of the Bill is to

81st Legislative Day

November 5, 1987

keep people in prison longer so if it didn't keep people in prison any longer then it wouldn't have any effect. So, the question is how many... how many... what percentage increase in the length of stay do you predict this Bill will... that you're trumpeting here, would result in? How many more... what percent increase would we have in the length of stay in your opinion as the Sponsor of the Bill?"

- O'Connell: "Well, as the Sponsor of the Bill, I am not in a position to give you any figures to base your vote on."
- Cullerton: "Assuming, arguendo, that the Governor's predictions are correct, and that it does increase by 18% the length of stay for those prisoners affected, is it... would it be true then that we would need a new 750 bed prison?"
- O'Connell: "I can't answer that. That's his allegation. That's not mine."
- Cullerton: "Okay. So, assuming for the sake of argument that we would need a new 750 bed prison, I understand that, I think just a few days ago, we broke ground on a new prison that is 750 beds. And I understand that it cost \$40,000,000 to pay for that prison. Does that sound like a reasonable figure to you for the cost of a 750 dollar... 750 bed prison?"
- O'Connell: "Well, first of all, I think, whether that's reasonable for the cost of a prison, I don't know. It would depend on the size of the prison and how many..."
- Cullerton: "Basically, what you're saying though is that, you think this is an important enough Bill that even if it does cost \$40,000,000 for a new prison, it's still worthwhile?"
- O'Connell: "Well, capital development is going on throughout the state all the time, whether it be for prisons, for schools, or whatever. I think that there's a compelling interest on the part of society to keep convicted murderers in prison for a longer period of time. And that the cost, the cost

81st Legislative Day

November 5, 1987

to society is accordingly. And in terms of your figures, the Department of Corrections, themselves, say that the cost of a 750 bed prison would be, over a period of 3 years and would not begin until 1992. So, we're not talking about an immediate cost factor. Certainly, there's going to have to be prisons built eventually, simply through attrition."

- Cullerton: "Alright now let me ask you about this extended term, how this thing works. Apparently if someone is sentenced to first degree murder, the... right now, the maximum sentence is 40 years, but they can be sentenced under what's called an extended term. Is that right?"
- O'Connell: "That's correct."
- Cullerton: "Under what circumstances is someone eligible to be sentenced to an extended term?"
- O'Connell: "Alright. First of all, if he has... when a defendant is convicted of a felony, and it doesn't just have to be murder, but if he was convicted within the past ten years of a greater class felony, that is one element to wherein the extended term could occur. Secondly, if the offense was accompanied by exceptionally brutal or heinous behavior indicative of wanton cruelty. So when a child is abducted and brutally murdered that clearly would qualify that defendant for an extended term, which presently is 60 years. This Bill would raise that to 80 years."
- Cullerton: "Hell, I think that the extended term maximum is 80 years now, isn't it? And this Bill raises it to 100?"
- O'Connell: "I'm sorry. You're right. It's 80 years and it raises it to 100 years."
- Cullerton: "Okay. So, do you know what percentage of people who are convicted of first degree murder are eligible for the extended term?"
- O'Connell: "Hell, we know what the...those that actually received

81st Legislative Day

- November 5, 1987
- it. I have no figures as to who are eligible. I'm sorry.

 Yeah. In fiscal year *86, 15% were extended... were given extended sentences."
- Cullerton: "They were sentenced to it. out, there is perhaps a lot more that were eligible that did not receive it."
- O'Connell: "Well, that may be true. But one thing is important to remember, that there is a range. So you can be convicted of extended murder and given an extended term and that can range from 40 to 80 years now."
- Cullerton: "Right. Okay, Madam Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, just to the ... briefly to the Bill. At least can give the Governor credit for being consistent. has vetoed Bills this Session based on the cost And I certainly have no problem incur on the state. with supporting an increase in the minimum for these sentences Normally, as long as you're willing to also realize it's going to result in a lot of costs. The prison system right now is overcrowded. So even under the current law, there's not enough beds. So I would suggest we need a new \$40,000,000 prison right now, this Bill would require us to build a second one. think that we had that much money around. But if we do, when you vote for things like this, you have to realize that you have to pay for it later on. And if you don't think you want to end up spending \$40,000,000 for prison, then you might not want to vote for the Bill."
- Speaker Braun: "Is there further discussion? The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative McCracken."
- McCracken: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise in support of the Bill. And I agree that there are cost implications. But they're not going to happen in this period of a budget crisis. Any cost implications are many years down the line. He're not talking about new beds being used up,

81st Legislative Day

November 5. 1987

we're only talking about those beds being used for longer periods of time. Certainly, the turnover is going bе But only over a vary long period of time. less. He · re talking about people who are going to be sentenced term which is now up to 60 years to a term up to 100 years. they're not going to serve all that of course, but the practical effect is not going to be felt immediately. This Bill does not implicate any cost considerations in the or... in the current budget or even budgets in the current next few years. I do admit that this is going it's going to be a marginal cost cost factor. think think that the public policy factor, And I and the importance of protecting society against these perpetrators is something which is very justified and support."

- Speaker Braun: "Is there further discussion? There being none, the Gentleman from Cook to close, Representative O'Connell."
- O'Connell: "Thank you. Madam Speaker. Just in closing. T do have to consider a couple of factors. First of all. as Representative McCracken has said and has been stated in any requirements for a this debate. new prison. even according to the Department of Corrections' own figures, would not occur until 1992. So what we're talking about in specifics as to cost, we're talking orojections. The Governor is projecting. The Department of Corrections is making projections. But we're dealing in reality today. And the reality is that the incidence violent crime in this state is not on the wane. It is on the increase. We have to give our judges a much to address these heinous and violent crimes that are being perpetrated on our citizens on a daily basis. And if we can keep an individual in prison 10 or 20 years

81st Legislative Day

November 5, 1987

longer than what is presently the case, then I think it's incumbent upon us to do so. And in terms of the cost factors, we don't know for certain what the cost factors are in terms of dollars. We're going to need a new prison eventually anyhow. That won't occur at least until 1992. But we do know that the cost in terms of daily lives is significant now. And we must do something about it. And I ask for the override of 1412."

- Speaker Braun: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage of Senate
 Bill 1412, the veto of the Governor notwithstanding. All
 in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. The voting is
 open. Representative Breslin in the Chair."
- Speaker Breslin: "Seventy-one votes are required. Have all voted Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will who wish? the record. On this question, there are 88 voting 'aye', 22 voting 'no' and 2 voting 'present'. This motion having received the required three-fifths majority, the motion is adopted. Ladies and Gentlemen, that completes the Total Veto Motions. Calendar under We are now going to House Calendar Supplemental #1. Senate Bill 714. Representative Barnes and O'Connell. Hha ic aoina to present this Bill? Representative Barnes? This Bill is on Third Reading, Mr. Clerk. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 714. A Bill for an Act in relation to civic centers. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Barnes."

Barnes: "Thank VOU. Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 714 originally had dealt with It has been amended, and I believe that it Heritage Canal addresses the Moline area which is Representative Sieben's district. Is he on the floor? I thought perhaps he would like handle this. Well, thank you very much, Representative Leverenz. I would like then to defer since

81st Legislative Day

November 5. 1987

we have had several meetings on this particular Bill. And
we have come to a compromise, and I will defer to
Representative DeJaegher. Since it's his district."

- DeJaegher: "Consideration. As Jane explained, this Bill has been put in the proper form. We have discussed this Bill previously. I believe that the Bill for all intents and purposes is now an agreed Bill. And I do want to express my appreciation on how we were able to resolve I said before, the Bill has particular problem. And as been debated adequately before. Hopefully that you will give us a green vote. Thank you."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Lady has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 714 on Third Reading. Ιs there anv Hearing none, the guestion is, 'Shall Senate Bill 714 pass?* All those in favor vote 'aye', all *no* . annased vote Voting is open. Bill requires seventy-one votes for passage. Take the Roll Call. On this question there are 110 voting 'aye', none Clerka voting 'no' and 2 voting 'present'. This Bill, received the required extraordinary majority, passes. next Bill on the same Calendar under the Order o f Non-concurrences is Senate Bill 961. Representative Hoffman and Cowlishaw. Representative Cowlishaw, in the absence...Representative Cowlishaw? In the absence of Representative Hoffman. I would ask you to handle this Bill. I understand that you intend to refuse to House Amendments the tο this Representative...Representative Cowlishaw is handling the 3i11 as hyphenated Sponsor. Senate Bill 961. а Representative Cowlishaw."
- Cowlishaw: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'm sorry about the delay.

 I move to nonconcur in Senate Amendment #1 to Senate Bill
 961."

81st Legislative Day

November 5, 1987

Speaker Breslin: "The Lady has moved to refuse to recede from the
House Amendments to Senate Bill 961. And on that question
is there any discussion? Here...the Gentleman from Cook,
Representative Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Would you yield for a question?"

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

Cullerton: "What are those Amendments that we're refusing to concur with?"

Cowlishaw: "I'm trying to find them, Representative. If you'll just give me a moment."

Cullerton: "I think there was Amendment .: l. Only one Amendment was adopted as I recall."

Cowlishaw: "I believe that House Amendment @1, which it was adopted by a voice vote, allows local governments to request the Illinois Department of Transportation to perform ground water studies in addition to traffic impact studies."

Cullerton: "And that seems to you like a good idea and we shouldn"t back away from it?"

Cowlishaw: "I think it's an excellent idea."

Cullerton: "And that's why you're refusing to non....you're..."

Cowlishaw: "That is correct."

Cullerton: "....to recede from it."

Cowlishaw: "That is correct."

Cullerton: "Okay. Well I'll go along with you on that. I think it's a good idea."

Cowlishaw: "Thank you, John."

Speaker Breslin: "Is there any further discussion? The question is, 'Shall the House refuse to recede from the House Amendments to Senate 3ill 961?" All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it. And the House refuses to recede from the House Amendments to Senate 3ill 961. The next

81st Legislative Day

November 5. 1987

3ill is Senate Bill 1377. Representative Young. Senate Bill 1377. The Gentleman wishes it to be out of the Ladies and Gentlemen. going to the Order record. Conference Committee Reports, which appear on the back side Supplemental Calendar Ol, appears Senate Bill 822. Sir. Representative Countryman. Proceed, Representative Countryman. Countryman."

Countryman: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 822, does two things. The report recommends that the Senate concur in House Amendment #1 and the Bill be further amended as follows: It provides that a trustee given notice of an account under an existing Section of the notice of accounting is liable to the beneficiaries for any breach of fiduciary duty by the trustee in connection with the account. The underlying Bill says, and it clears up a point in some case law that's somewhat confusing tο trustees, trustee...excuse me, that an executor of an estate only has to give notice to a trustee and not to a beneficiary. unless that beneficiary posesses a present vested interest and is not an heir and legatee in the estate. the language that's been added in the Conference Committee Report was originally in the Senate version of the R:11. We have now amended it and they have concurred in the Senate Amendment 31....or in the House Amendment #1. recommend the adoption of this report."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved that the House accept Conference Committee Report &1, to Senate Bill 822. And on that question is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt the First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 822?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. This is final passage. The record, Mr. Clerk. On this

81st Legislative Day

November 5, 1987

question there are 112 voting 'aye', none voting 'no' and none voting 'present'. This Bill having received the required Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. On Senate Bill 1326. Representative Ronan is the Sponsor. Representative Ronan. Is the Gentleman in the chamber? With leave of the Body, I'll take that out of the record and come back to it when we can. Under Speaker's Table....

- McCracken: "Thank you. I know that we're moving in agreement in lots of matters, but why don't we just go through the calendar instead of jumping around?"
- Speaker Breslin: "Because there is not agreement on some of the other matters. Unless you..."
- McCracken: "Well, let's call them and vote them up or down.

 We're all set."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative McCracken..."

McCracken: "Do we expect to reach agreement? Is that it?"

Speaker Breslin: "I think that's what they're working on."

McCracken: "Okavo"

- Speaker Breslin: "So, under Speaker's Table, House Resolution 825. Representative LeFlore. Would you read that Resolution? Representative LeFlore."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 825, creates a bipartisan special home Committee on inmate rights. Rules Committee recommends be adopted."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative LeFlore. This is your Resolution, Sir. It has already been read."
- LeFlore: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, House Resolution 825 will Committee, create an Investigation bipartisan Investigation Committee investigate to the penal institutions. This Committee will consist members, four appointed by the Majority Leader and four by the Minority Leader. I find that this Committee is

81st Legislative Day

November 5, 1987

necessary, because we have some activities going on in our penal institutions that is not really conducive to the"

Speaker Breslin: "Excuse me, Representative LeFlore. Again, there is a request that the Bill (sic) be taken out of the record and we will come back to it."

LeFlore: "Thank you."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Ronan has returned to the chamber. With leave of the Body, I'll go back to Senate Bill 322 under Conference Committee Reports. Excuse me, that was Senate Bill 1326 under Conference Committee Reports. Representative Ronan."

"Thank you, Madam Speaker and Members of the House. Ronan: move that the House accept the first Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1326. This is a legislation that we've worked on with the Attorney General's Office to clean up some of the abuses in the travel industry. numerous cases pending right now in the Illinois court system concerning travel agencies that misrepresent thev provide the consumer in this state. And I feel this legislation is going to go a long way in improving an industry that needs more regulation at the present time. Be glad to answer any questions concerning the Conference Committee Reporte

- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved that we adopt the First
 Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1326. And on
 that question, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative
 Terzich."
- Terzich: "Yeah, Representative Ronan, what does the Conference

 Committee Report do? I mean, what do it do?"
- Ronan: "We had some minor changes that we wanted to put in the legislation. They were recommendations that came forth from the travel industry."

81st Legislative Day November 5, 1987

Terzich: "Did you check with Representative Capparelli?"

Ronan: "Yes, I did."

Terzich: "Does he approve of this?"

Ronan: "Absolutely."

Terzich: "Okay."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Dupage, Representative

McCracken."

McCracken: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Since we're calling the Bill, is this something we've all agreed to?"

Ronan: "Yes."

Speaker Breslin: "He've agreed to call it."

McCracken: "Okay."

Speaker Breslin: "Members should vote their conscience."

McCracken: "But, I'm just trying to figure out, you know, the movements we're making on the calendar. You said we're moving around because there are agreed Bills. Is this an agreed Bill?"

Speaker Breslin: "No, Sir. This is an agreed... it... there is an agreement to call this Bill."

McCracken: "Oh, is that what we refer to..."

Speaker Breslin: "Members..."

McCracken: "...when we say there's an agreement, that we agree to call it or that we agree to pass it?"

Speaker Breslin: "That I am not sure, Sir."

McCracken: "Okay."

Speaker Breslin: "I make no recommendations to this Assembly as the Chair."

McCracken: "Okay. Hill the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Breslin: "He will."

McCracken: "This is a June 30th Conference Committee Report and the Republican Senators didn't sign it. I'm sure the answer to that is they weren't given an opportunity, right, in the haste of the moment?"

81st Legislative Day November 5, 1987

Ronan: "To my knowledge, Representative, they were tired."

McCracken: "Okay."

Ronan: "And I think, let me check, I think that Senator

DeAngelis's pen wasn't working."

McCracken: "Okay."

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

McCracken: "No, no, I'm not done."

Speaker Breslin: "Oh."

McCracken: "Has the Senate already passed this? Was this voted on in June, by the Senate?"

Ronan: "Yes, it was."

McCracken: "And they..."

Ronan: "In fact, it came out overwhelmingly and Senator

DeAngelis's pen is now working, if you're concerned about

that."

McCracken: "Okay. Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative
O'Connell."

O'Connell: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise in support Senate Bill 1326. This Conference Committee represents an agreement between the Attorney General and the legitimate travel industry. It does not apply to travel agents who are members in good standing of the airline reporting corporation and are officially appointed by an air or sea carrier to sell transportation and write transportation Those individual and reputable travel agents are already under regulatory control and this does not apply to It also does not apply to tour operators who are bonded and have liability insurance to protect consumers from defaults and insure what they will get in refunds. So in effect, this imposes no burdens on the legitimate travel agent, but is directed at the scams perpetrated by fast buck travel sales promoters who offer too good to be true

81st Legislative Day

November 5. 1987

vacation packages that are neither good nor true. It's modeled after a California law. And in light of some of the revelations of late of these fast buck artists, I think Senate Bill 1326...is, is well deserving of our positive vote."

- "There being no further discussion the question Speaker Breslin: is. 'Shall Senate... shall the House adopt Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1326?* A11 those in favor vote 'ave', all those opposed vote Voting is open. This is final passage. Have all voted who The Clerk will take the record. On this question. wish? there are 114 voting "ave". none voting *no* voting 'present'. And the House does adopt the First Conference Committee Report to Senate Bill 1326. Under the Order of Motions on this page, appears House Resolution 662 by Representative O'Connell. Representative O'Connell. you wish to proceed with this Resolution? A motion on this Read the motion, Mr. Clerk." Resolution? Yes.
- Clerk O'Brien: "I move to discharge State Government

 Administration from further consideration and advance to
 the Speaker's Table."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative O'Connell."
- O'Connell: "Could you take it out of the record please, Madam

 Speaker?"
- Speaker Breslin: "Out of the record. Representative O'Connell is now recognized again on House Resolution 662."
- O'Connell: "Thank vou. Madam Speaker. Some time 200. Governor in an effort to adhere to budgetary restrictions, some lavoffs in the Department of Revenue. And while the layoffs may appear to be a responsible budgetary act. people that were laid off were those Revanue employees the who are... ware given the mandate to collect delinquent It seems to me that if we are trying to make taxes.

81st Legislative Day

November 5. 1987

certain budget cuts, we should make every possible effort to enhance revenues. In 1984, \$830,000,000 remained unpaid and uncollected. In 1985. the total of uncollected and unpaid taxes increased to 847,000,000. In 1986, the total to \$906,000,000. That's \$906,000,000, almost \$1,000,000,000 this year, that remains uncollected. Now. \$1,000,000,000 could satisfy the \$62,000,000 that the schools want, could satisfy the 10,000,000 that Mental Health wants, could satisfy the money that day care wants. All of the needs that have been presented to us during this Veto Session and this past legislative session, all fiscal needs could be met if we were only able to collect the money that is rightfully due the state. So what did we do, the Department of Revenue do? They discharged 200 o f people that are mandated to seek out and collect those unnaid taxes. I submit, Ladies and Gentlemen, that that is VETV prudent thing to do. And ic counterproductive. Now , you may ask, well what will it cost to bring back those people? The cost is \$2.000.000. its face, I would probably share many of your objections to spending another \$2,000,000. But this is not an expenditure. This is a needed investment. If we want get a return on the uncollected and unpaid tax, which can, with vigorous collection attempts, can be resolved bringing the money back to us, we need to invest 2,000,000 to collect almost one billion, billion I would ask you to join with me in a Resolution. urging that those 200 revenue collectors be brought back to payroll and do what they were hired to do, collect the millions and almost billions of dollars that are unpaid. would ask for your support in this House Resolution Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved to discharge State

Government Administration from further consideration

٥f

81st Legislative Day

November 5, 1987

House Resolution 662 and advance this Bill (sic) to the Order of the Speaker's Table. Is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall the House, by use of the Attendance Roll Call, discharge the State Government Administration Committee of House... further consideration on House Resolution 662 and advance this Bill (sic) to the All those in favor say 'ave', all those Speaker's Tabla? opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'aves' And this Bill (sic) will be discharged from the it. Committee and placed on the Order of the Speaker's Representative O'Connell, had you intended to call this immediately, on the Speaker's Table? This The Bill (sic) is now... you were Resolution rather? recognized to present a motion."

O'Connell: "Certainly. Yes."

- Speaker Breslin: "Mr. Clerk, can he proceed without having a...
 it on the Calendar? Okay. Does the Gentleman have leave
 for immediate consideration of House Resolution 662?
 Hearing no objection, the Gentleman has leave. Read the
 Resolution, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 662, offered by Representative O'Connell."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative O'Connell. Representative O'Connell, you're going to have to tell us what this Resolution does and convince us to vote for it."
- O*Connell: "Okay, as I just said in my earlier diatribe, we are bringing back those 200...we are encouraging the Governor and the Director of the Department of Revenue to hire back those 200 employees that were employed by the Department of Revenue for the purposes of collecting unpaid and uncollected taxes. As I stated earlier, there is nearly \$1,000,000,000 in the State of Illinois that remains uncollected and unpaid. The people that were mandated to

81st Legislative Day

November 5, 1987

collect those monies, were 200 employees of the Department of Revenue that were laid off during the spring of this year, in an effort to curb the budgetary problems. I would submit, and I said it earlier, that we are not expending the money to bring them back, but we are investing the money in order to bring back the... almost \$1,000,000,000 that remains uncollected."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of House Resolution 662. And on that question, the Gentleman from DuPage. Representative McCracken."

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

Speaker Breslin: "He indicates he will."

McCracken: "Representative, what was the cause of these layoffs?

They occurred before the end of the last fiscal year,

before we had adjourned, is that right?"

O'Connell: "I believe that's correct."

McCracken: "And they were done in anticipation of a reduced budget for the current fiscal year?"

O'Connell: "That is my understanding. Yes."

McCracken: "And in fact, after the veto and as far as we know,

there has been no change to date that lesser amount was in
fact ultimately appropriated?"

O'Connell: "I'm sorry, Representative. They were laid off this year, not last year. So, this fiscal year."

McCracken: "Okay. The notice was given before the beginning of the fiscal year when they were laid off, at or about the beginning of the new fiscal year. And that was done because in the amount appropriated for the current fiscal year, those 200 employees could not be accommodated, is that right?"

O'Connell: "That is my understanding, that this fiscal year budget could not accommodate 200 people."

McCracken: "And if we... well say the Governor were to take us to

81st Legislative Day

November 5. 1987

heart on this and reinstate the employees, where would he get the money to pay them?"

O'Connell: "Well, I think he would get the money from the money that is presently owed the state now."

McCracken: "Okay. Thank you. To the Bill (sic)."

Speaker Breslin: "Proceed."

- "It's a very appealing position, that if we bring back McCracken: billion dollars people we will get a 00 relatively modest investment. But there's no direct correlation between the number of employees and the amount of money recovered. Certainly there is some man hours involved and to that extent there may be a relationship between the two. But it isn't true that just because you bring them back you're going to necessarily recover billion more dollars. A lot of those dollars are in litigation. And the manpower does not necessarily speed up the litigation. It's an advisory Resolution. I understand it has some political value. I just observe that it just isn't that important to the state."
- Speaker Breslin: "Is there any further discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall House Resolution 662 be adopted?'

 All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote...

 excuse me, Representative O'Connell, to close."
- O'Connell: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I think it's important to point out that the revenue collectors collect according to recent audits. Three times the amount of money that we are spending on salary. So the ratio is 3 to 1 that we're collecting. So there is a return on this investment. So I would ask for your support."
- Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall the House adopt House Resolution 662?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. This Bill (sic) requires a majority of those voting on the question in

81st Legislative Day

November 5, 1987

order to be adopted. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 82 voting 'aye', 30 voting 'no' and 2 voting 'present'. And House Resolution 662 is adopted. Representative Van Duyne, for what reason do you rise?"

- Van Dyne: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, for an announcement. I have some copies of some speeches for Veterans Day, November the lith. One has to do with education and one has to do with the pride of the Legionnaires and the Veterans. And if anyone needs copies of these, I have them on my desk. So feel free to come by and take one, or two."
- Speaker Giglio: "For what purpose does Representative Wojcik seek recognition? Representative Wojcik, the Lady from Cook, do you seek recognition? Ladies and Gentlemen, on Supplemental Calendar \$1, appears Senate Bill 1115. Representative Braun. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill. 1155."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1155, amends the Civil Administrative

 Code of Illinois. First Conference Committee Report."

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

Braun: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of House. The underlying Bill here and the underlying issue of the Conference Committee Report, is one that I hope you will...we will pass unanimously from this House when it is properly presented before us. However, this version of the Conference Committee Report still has a technical defect in it and so I'm going to ask all of you to support rejecting this Conference Committee Report, this iteration of the Conference Committee Report, so that we can have a It is simply a technical matter. second one prepared. There is no disagreement over the substance of the There is no disagreement or opposition as far as I'm aware, to the substance of the Bill. It is simply a technical matter that needs to be cleaned up. And I'd like to have

81st Legislative Day

- November 5, 1987
- this Conference Committee Report rejected and a Second Conference Committee appointed."
- Speaker Giglio: "Further discussion? Hearing none, the guestion all those in favor of the First Conference Committee Report being rejected, say 'aye', those opposed 'nay'. the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it and the First Conference Committee Report is rejected and a Second Conference Committee Rep...Conference ъe called. Requested. On Supplemental Calendar #1. appears Bill 916. Representative Olson. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 916, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation of fishing, hunting and trapping. First Conference Committee Report."
- Speaker Giglio: "Representative Olson."
- Olson: "Mr. Speaker, I move the House refuse to adopt the First

 Conference Committee Report and that a second...and

 request a second Conference Committee."
- Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman asks that the House reject the First Conference Committee Report and a Second Conference Committee be accepted. On that question, all those in favor...appointed. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', those opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it and the First Conference Committee Report is rejected and a Second Conference Committee be appointed."
- Olson: "Tnank vou."
- Speaker Giglio: "On Supp...Calendar, Supplemental 2, appears

 House Bill 1923. Representative Steczo. Mr. Clerk, read

 the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1923. Motion. I move to take from the table, suspend Rule 79(e) and place on the calendar on the Speaker's Table, Conference Committee Reports."

81st Legislative Day

November 5. 1987

- Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Steczo."
- Steczo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I would just move to take House Bill 1923 from the table and place on the Order of Conference Committee Reports. I believe that there is no opposition to this motion and I would ask for an affirmative vote."
- Speaker Giglio: "Any discussion? The Gentleman from DuPage,

 Representative McCracken."
- McCracken: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I concur in the motion. It is my understanding from Representative Steczo and from Representative McNamara, that they will delete from the final version the "Robbins" bail-out portion of the Bill and that's agreeable to us."
- Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman asks that House Bill 1923 be taken from the table and suspend Rule 79 and place on the calendar on Speaker's Table, on Order of Conference Committee Report. Do we have leave for the Attendance Roll Call? Leave. Leave is granted and the Bill will be so reported. Introductions, First Reading."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2909, offered by Representative Keane, for an Act to amend Sections of the Revenue Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 2910, Kulas, a Bill Act to designate a day to be observed as for an Ukranian-American Day. First Reading of the Bill. Bill 2911, Lang, et al, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Revenue Act. First Reading of the Bill. 2912, Farley, et al, a 3ill for an Act to amend Sections of the Revenue Act. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 2913, Keane, et al, a Bill for an Act in relation to increases in property tax levies. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 2914, Capparelli, et al, a Bill for Act in relation to increased property tax levies. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill 2915, Panayotovich, et al,

81st Legislative Day

- November 5, 1987
- a Bill for an Act in relation to tax rate procedures of municipalities over 500,000 inhabitants. First Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Giglio: "Representative Matijevich. Is Matijevich in the chamber? Would you please come to the podium, please? Representative Matijevich. The House will come to order. On page 6 of the Calendar, on Motions, appears House Bill 2852. Representative Frederick. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "I move to take from the table, suspend Rule 79(e) and place House Bill 2852 on the calendar, Speaker's Table, Conference Committee Report. Motion by Representative Virginia Frederick."
- Speaker Giglio: "You heard the motion. Take from the table, suspend Rule 79 and place on the Calendar on the Speaker's Table on the Order of Conference Committee Reports. On that question, the Gentleman from DuPage, Representative McCracken. Hearing none...No discussion. Is there leave to adopt...to use the Attendance Roll Call? Hearing none, leave is granted. The motion is adopted. On Supplemental #2, appears House Bill 2712. Representative Wolf. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'3rien: "Motion. I move to take from the table, suspend

 Rule 79(e) and place House Bill 2712 on the calendar under

 Speaker's Table, Conference Committee Reports."
- Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman moves that the House Bill 2712 be taken from the table and suspend Rule 79 and place on the calendar under Speaker's Table, on the Order of Conference Committee Reports. Any discussion? Hearing none, leave to use the Attendance Roll Call? Leave is granted. House Bill 2712 be so reported. Representative Matijevich, would you please come to the podium? Supplemental 32, appears House Bill 1055. Mr. Clerk read the Bill."

81st Legislative Day

November 5, 1987

Clerk O'Brien: "Motion. I move to take from the table, suspend

Rule 79(e) and place House Bill 1055 on the calendar, Order

of Speaker's Table, Conference Committee Report."

Speaker Giglio: "The Lady from LaSalle, Representative Breslin," Breslin: "Ladies and Gentlemen. I intend to move to take this Bill from the table and then ask for immediate consideration of this Conference Committee Report. which passed the Senate as a Conference Committee Report, came over to the House and we adjourned before we had time to consider it. I do intend, once the Bill gets to us, to move that we do not accept the First Conference Committee Report and ask for a Second Conference Committee. that in mind, Mr. Speaker, I would move that we So with take House Bill 1055 from the table and put this Bill on the Speaker's Table and ask for immediate Order of consideration."

Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman from DuPage. Representative McCracken."

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

Speaker Giglio: "She indicates she will."

McCracken: "Representative Breslin, I take it you have an idea what the Second Conference Committee Report will look like.

Would you explain that for us?"

Breslin: "Correct. The First Conference Committee Report contains what at the time was an agreed to Amendment, dealing with procedures for evacuation in the case of hazardous waste spills. The agreement on that Bill has fallen apart. I intend to take that procedure, that whole Bill out of the Conference Committee Report and leave the remaining Bill which deals with a Sanitation Act for migrant farm workers in the Bill. And that has been... is the only thing left in it that would be agreed to."

McCracken: "Okay. And how does this amend the original law which

81st Legislative Day

November 5, 1987

we passed in the last session, I believe?"

Breslin: "The original Bill was my Bill that has already passed the Senate and gone to the Governor and been signed."

McCracken: "No. No. I mean you originally passed a Field Worker's Sanitation Act some time ago."

Breslin: "Yes."

McCracken: "This amends that Acto"

Breslin: "Yes."

McCracken: "And how does it amend that Act or how would you propose to amend it in Conference Committee Report #2?"

Breslin: "We propose to give the department greater authority, so
that they can do inspections and do so at their discretion,
so that we significantly cut down on the costs to the
department. It is drafted in a manner in which we have
approval from the Department of Public Health and all other
parties concerned as I understand it."

McCracken: "Okay. And the detasselers are being removed from the coverage of the Act?"

Breslin: "That is correct."

McCracken: "And has there been a...or does the administration have a position on this Bill? Has there been a cost identified?"

Breslin: "The cost identified from the Department of Public

Health is that there will not be an increased cost, since
they have the discretion now to pick and choose which sites
need inspection."

McCracken: "Alright. And the EPA is out entirely, so there will not be any EPA costs of administration?"

Breslin: "That's correct."

McCracken: "Okay. Thank you. He have no objection."

Speaker Giglio: "Alright. The Lady moves that we take House Bill 1055 from the table and suspend Rule 79 and place on the Order of Conference Committee Report. That will require a

81st Legislative Day

- November 5. 1987
- voice vote...or by the leave to use the Attendance Roll Call. Any questions? No questions. Leave is granted. Now the Lady requests that the...that the First Committee Report be rejected and a Second Conference Committee be adopted. Second Conference Committee be appointed."
- Breslin: "That is correct, Mr. Speaker. I would move now that
 this Bill, which is on the Order of Conference Committee
 Reports, be heard immediately and that we reject this
 Conference Committee Report and that I ask for a Second
 Conference Committee."
- Speaker Giglio: "You heard the motion. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', those opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it and a Second Conference Committee be appointed."
- Breslin: "Thank you."
- Speaker Giglio: "Supplemental Calendar ...2, appears House Bill 2065. Representative Van Duyne. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "I move to take from the table, suspend Rule 79(e)

 and place House Bill 2065 on the calendar under Speaker's

 Table, Conference Committee Reports."
- Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman from Will, Representative Van

 Duyne."
- Van Duyne: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, thank you. I move to take from the table and the plan is to reject Conference Committee Report #1 and ask for a Conference Committee Report #2 and then we'll have a Roll Call vote. So I'd like to have leave of the House to use the Attendance Roll Call."
- Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman asks leave to take House Bill 2065 and move from the table and suspend Rule 79 and place on the Order of Speaker's Table and reject the First Conference Committee Report and then later ask for a second one to be appointed. And on that question, the Gentleman

81st Legislative Day

November 5. 1987

from DuPage, Representative McCracken."

McCracken: "The plan, Representative, is to put in a provision for Senator Ralph Dunn. Put in your provision, which is currently in the First Conference Committee Report. And that will be the extent of the Second Conference Committee Report. Okav. Thank you."

Van Duyne: "Yes."

- Speaker Giglio: "Alright. The question is. *Shall House 3i11 2065 be taken from the table, suspend Rule 79 and place on calendar under Speaker's Table on the order the o f Conference Committee Reports?* İs there leave for the Attendance Roll Call? Hearing none, leave is granted and motion carries. Now Representative Van Duyne moves that the First Conference Committee Report...."
- Van Duyne: "Yes. I move that we hear it immediately and the

 First Conference Committee Report be denied and ask for a

 Second Conference Committee Report."
- Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman moves that the First Committee Report be rejected and Second Conference Committee be appointed. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', those opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it and the motion carries. On Supplemental Calendar 31, appears Senate Bill 943. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 943, a Bill for an Act to amend the

 Private Detective and Private Securities Act. First

 Conference Committee Report."
- Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman from Madison, Representative McPike, moves that the First Conference Committee Report be rejected and a Second Conference Committee be appointed.

 On that question, hearing none, all those in favor signify by saying 'aye', those opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it and the motion is adopted.

81st Legislative Day

- November 5, 1987
- •••Have your attention for a minute and welcome one of our distinguished Clerk's who was with us for a number of years, the Honorable Fred Selcke. Fred Selcke. On Supplemental Calendar #1, appears House Bill 2748. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2748, a Bill for an Act in relation to fees of recorder's and county clerk's. First Conference Committee Report."
- Speaker Giglio: "Representative Flinn moves that the House reject the First Conference Committee Report and that a Second Conference Committee be appointed. On that question, hearing none, leave to use the Attendance Roll Call? A11 those in favor signify by saying...all those in favor signify by saying "aye", those opposed 'nay'. The First Conference Committee Report is rejected and a Second Conference Committee be appointed. Supplemental Calendar appears House Bill 1616. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative O'Connell. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1616, a Jill for an Act to amend the

 Mobile Home Landlord and Tenant Rights Act. First

 Conference Committee Report."
- Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative O'Connell."
- O'Connell: "Thank you, Ar. Speaker. House Bill 1616 is directed to those mobile park landlords who have mandated that the mobile home park tenant or the owners of the individual mobile home units, remove their own television antennas in lieu of a master antenna service which may or may not provide what is commonly referred to as cable TV. The main thrust of this Bill is that an individual unit owner has a property right in his or her television antenna. And this Bill simply precludes or prohibits the park owners from requiring that those individual tenants be forced to remove

81st Legislative Day

- November 5, 1987
- their own television antennas. I'd be happy to answer any questions and I would hope that everyone can support me in this Conference Committee Report."
- Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman moves that the House do accept the First Conference Committee Report on House Bill 1616. This passage. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk. take On this question there are 95 voting *yes* and recorda none voting 'present'....and none voting 'no' and 5 voting And the House does adopt the First Conference Committee Report to House Bill 1616. And this Bill hν extraordinary majority and this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Representative Mautino."
- Mautino: "Is that board still open? Vote me 'no'. That's a bad Bill."
- Speaker Giglio: "Record...let the record show that Representative Mautino wishes to be recorded as voting 'no'. On Supplemental Calendar #1, appears Senate Bill 1322. The Lady from Cook, Representative Wojcik. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1322, a Bill for an Act to amend and repeal certain Sections of the Illinois Clinical Laboratory

 Act. First Conference Committee Report."
- Speaker Giglio: "The Lady from Cook moves that the House refuse the First Conference Committee Report and that a Second Conference Committee be appointed. And on that question, hearing none, we have leave to use the Attendance Roll Call? All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', those opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it and a Second Conference Committee Report...or Conference

81st Legislative Day

November 5. 1987

appointed. House will will be come to order. Representative Matijevich ... Representative Matijevich moves the posting rules be waived, so that House Bills 2713 and 2715 be heard in the Rules Committee which will meet in back of the House chamber in the Speaker's conference room. Is there leave for the House to have the Rules Committee to meet immediately in the Speaker's office? Hearing is granted. Will the House Rules Committee please retire to the back of the chamber in the Speaker's for the ... Speaker's office for the Rules Committee meeting? Representative Ryder moves that the House Bill Alright. 2004 will be heard tomorrow morning in Jud. I. That 's 2004。 House Bill 2004. Does the Gentleman have leave to suspend the posting rules so this Bi 11 can bе heard tomorrow morning in Judiciary I? A11 those in favor 'aye', those opposed 'nav'. signify by saying In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it. And the Bill will be heard tomorrow in Jud. I. Committee Report."

- Clerk O'Brien: "Committee on Rules has met and pursuant to Rule 29(c)3, the following Bills have been ruled exempt: House Bills 2713, 2715 and 2797. Signed, John Matijevich, Chairman."
- Speaker Giglio: "On page 2 of the calendar under Constitutional Amendments, Third Reading, appears House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment @1. Helen Satterthwaite. Mr. Clerk, read the Resolution. The Gentleman from Macon, Representative Dunn."
- Dunn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I hope all Memoers of House Judiciary I Committee will, within earshot, will listen, because we're going to cancel the House Judiciary I Committee meeting tomorrow. There was one piece of legislation assigned to the Committee and arrangements have been made with the Sponsor

Blst Legislative Day

November 5, 1987

to have a hearing on that legislation at a later date. There was a Bill assigned, the posting waived earlier today and it is my understanding that the Sponsor understands we will take care of complying with rules with regard to that Bill at a later date also. So, House Judiciary I Committee which is scheduled to meet tomorrow morning, will not meet, the meeting is canceled. Thank you."

- Giolio: "Representative Satterthwaite...Representative Speaker Satterthwaite, House Resolution 1 and 2 ٥n the Constitutional Amendments, or 1 and 6, have to be read into the record in their entirety. And the House is going to go into perfunct in a short while and we'll do that and then tomorrow morning we'll take it up. Alright. the n n appears House Joint Resolution calendar Constitutional Amendment St. Mr. Clerk. read the Constitutional Amendment, please,"
- Clerk "House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment O'Brien: Resolved, by the House of Representatives of Eighty-Fifth General Assembly of the State of Illinois, the Senate concurring herein, that there shall be submitted to the electors of the State for adoption or rejection of the general election next occurring at least six months after the adoption of this Resolution, a proposition to amend Section 1 of Article III of the Illinois Constitution to read as follows: Article III. Suffrage and Elections. Section l, voting qualifications. Every United States citizen who has attained the age of 18 or any other the United States for voting in State required by elections and who have been a permanent resident of this State for at least 30 days, preceding any election shall have the right to vote at such election. The General Assembly by law may establish registration requirements and require permanent residency in an election district not to

81st Legislative Day

November 5, 1987

exceed thirty days prior to an election. The General Assembly by law may establish shorter residence requirements for voting for President and Vice-President of the United States. Schedule. This amendment shall take effect immediately upon its approval by the electors. Third Reading of the Constitutional Amendment."

Speaker Giglio: "The Lady from Champaign, Representative Satterthwaite."

Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Constitutional Amendment would bring the Illinois Constitution into compliance with the Federal Constitution, the Amendment 326, that gave 18 year-olds the right to vote. And also with the practice that has been in effect since 1972, as a result of court decisions indicating that long durational residency requirements are inappropriate. We would not see any change in what happens in election procedures, but I believe that we should bring Constitution into compliance with what doing, especially as we require our students in school study the Constitution. It is most inappropriate for them to read a Constitution saying that they do not have the right to vote until they are 21, when in fact they can vote The House has passed this Amendment at least at age 18. twice before, but it has always come too late in the session for the Senate to act upon it. And that is why I'm hoping that we will pass this Amendment today, in time for the Senate to act and have this issue go to ask for your support would in House Joint Constitutional....House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment #1.ª

Speaker Giglio: "You heard the Lady's motion. And on that question the Gentleman from DuPage, Representative McCracken."

81st Legislative Day November 5, 1987

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

Speaker Giglio: "She indicates she will."

McCracken: "I don't know the answer to this. Consult with Jack over there and see if he can give it to you. Is there a situation under which the Illinois age of 21 would control in an election, or is it true for all purposes that we are prohibited from making an age other than 18 for any election?"

Satterthwaite: "It's my belief that because the U.S. Constitution extends voting privileges to people who are 18, that we cannot prohibit that at the state level."

McCracken: "What does Jack say?"

Satterthwaite: "He's shaking his head yes."

McCracken: "Is that Jack's belief too? Okay. How much will the referendum cost? Has there been an estimate on that?"

Satterthwaite: "Not that I am aware of. I would..."

McCracken: "Hell there is...there is a cost associated with it though, would you agree?"

Satterthwaite: "Well any time a Constitutional Amendment is proposed, it is required that that be circulated to the voters of the state. And so I am sure that there would be some printing costs. We usually have more than one issue on the ballot and so I would assume that the incremental costs would be very slight if we have more than one issue on the ballot."

McCracken: "Well so far, there will be no other issue on the ballot but this, if it passed. Is that correct?"

Satterthwaite: "There are other proposals before us on the calendar."

McCracken: "Alright, but there are none that are going to be on the ballot as of this time?"

Satterthwaite: "That's right. I think whatever the small costs would be, however, it is important that we not mislead our

81st Legislative Day

November 5, 1987

citizenry in their rights to vote."

McCracken: "Yeah. I'm sure they're emotionally scarred for life when they read the book that says 21 instead of 18. I've no doubt about that. To the motion...or to the proposed Constitutional Amendment."

Speaker Giglio: "Proceed, Representative McCracken,"

McCracken: "I really don't know the answer. I suspect the answer There is no situation in which we can prohibit yes. voting by those over 18. And if that's true, then there is no practical effect to this Constitutional Amendment. suspect that our young children when they reach 18, can accept the fact that when they read the Constitution, says have to be 21, that they will understand, that they aren't scarred for life. And I'm sure they will trauma. In fact, if this measure doesn't anything, why are we going to spend the money proposition? In all Constitutional Amendments, which reach the Secretary of State is required the ballot. tο print...print a pamphlet setting forth the referendum and also explaining the pros and cons to each proposition. He circulates...at the last Amendment, he circulated five hundred thousand of those pamphlets. And if you don't think those are expensive to print, they in fact are, there is a substantial cost associated with thisa Nobody with it, but on the other hand it disagrees is a meaningless gesture and it's a waste of money. And it may That's a good point. Representative Barger thinks it may fail. So I think all prudence dictates that we not take that chance."

Speaker Giglio: "The Lady from Champaign to close."

Satterthwaite: "Well, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, we've had our little fun. But you will recall, that also this is the year that we are reviewing the State Constitution to

81st Legislative Day

November 5. 1987

see whether it is necessary for us to call another Constitutional Convention, to make revisions if we in fact find that our Constitution is outdated. I would suggest to legislative body, we should initiative where we know that the Constitution is outdated and bring it up to date and alleviate any necessity calling a Constitutional Convention, which would be far more costly to the citizens of the State of Illinois circulating an Amendment for them to consider ballot. Our election rights are very basic our democratic form ٥f government and it T is. think. misleading for us not to give the students of our Illinois correct information about how they can Constitution the vote and not to have in that Constitution the provision for the residency requirement. And I would ask for the support of the Members in passing this Resolution."

- "The question is, 'Shall the House adopt Speaker Giglio: House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment #1? All those in favor vote 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. The votina open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted wish? Mr. Clerk. take On this question there are 85 voting 'ves'. 23 voting 'no'. voting 'present'. And the House does adopt House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment el. Supplemental Calendar #3. Under Motions, appears House Bill 2713. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Motion. I move to take from the table, suspend

 Rule 79(e) and place on the calendar on Speaker's

 Table...House Bill 2713 and place on the Speaker's Table,

 Order of Conference Committee Reports."
- Speaker Giglio: "Representative Terzich moves that House Bill 2713 be taken from the table and suspend Rule 79 and place it on the calendar under Speaker's Table, on the Order of

81st Legislative Day

- November 5, 1987
- Conference Committee Reports. Does the Gentleman have leave? Leave to use the Attendance Roll Call? Hearing none, leave is granted. On Supplemental 3 of the calendar, appears House Bill 2715. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "I move to take from the table, suspend Rule 79(e)

 and place House Bill 2715 on the calendar, on Speaker's

 Table, Conference Committee Report."
- Speaker Giglio: "Representative wolf moves that House Bill 2715

 be taken from the table and that Rule 79 be suspended and

 placed on the calendar under Speaker's Table, on the Order

 of Conference Committee Reports. Does the Gentleman have

 leave? Leave for the Attendance Roll Call? Leave is

 granted. Under Motions, appears House Bill 2797.

 Representative Goforth. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Motion. I move to take from the table, suspend

 Rule 79(e) and place House Bill 2797 on the calendar under

 Speaker's Table, Conference Committee Reports."
- Speaker Giglio: "Gentleman asks that House Bill 2797 be taken from the table and that Rule 79 be suspended and placed calendar under Speaker's Table, on the Order o f Conference Committee Reports. Does the Gentleman have leave? Leave for the Attendance Roll Call? Leave is ...Representative Hultgren in the chamber? granted. Ωn the calendar, Supplemental #3, appears House Resolution 904. Take the Bill out of the record. Ar. Clerk. Supplemental ₽3, Conference Committee Reports. Representative Frederick, House Bill 2852. Mr. Clerk the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2852, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Act on the Aging. First Conference Committee Report."
- Speaker Giglio: "The Lady from Lake, Representative Frederick."
 Frederick: "Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of

81st Legislative Day

November 5. 1987

the House. I move the House accept the First Conference Committee Report on House Bill 2852. The Senate receded from Senate Amendment 1 and the other change is that will take effect upon becoming law. The Bill itself Act simply increases the voting members on the Alzheimer's Task Force by two people and includes that one physician and one member should be professor а o f higher ed. ī gerontology and move WP accept the Conference...the First Conference Committee Report on House Bill 2852."

- Speaker Giglio: "The Lady moves that the House do adopt the First Conference Committee Report on House Bill 2852. And on that question, all those in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed 'nay'. This is final action. those The voting is Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who open. wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On. this question there are 114 voting 'yes', none voting 'no', none voting 'present'. And the House does adopt the Conference Committee Report on House Bill 2852. And this having received the Constitutional Majority i s hereby...hereby declared passed. This...bv an extraordinary majority of 71-Senate 2111 916. Representative Olson. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 916, a Bill for an Act concerning regulation of fishing, hunting and trapping. Second Conference Committee Report."
- Speaker Giglio: "The... Representative Olson. The Gentleman from Logan."
- Olson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 916 has been in Conference Committee limbo since we adjourned in the spring. And it's been amended and reamended and deamended, but what we have today is an Amendment to the Wildlife Code. It authorizes the Department of Conservation to sell

81st Legislative Day

November 5, 1987

federal migratory bird hunting and conservation stamps. We know those as federal duck stamps. The proceeds from these sales, minus certain administrative expenses, will be remitted to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Services. I urge adoption of this Committee Report."

- Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman moves that the House do adopt the First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 916. And on that question, all those in favor signify by voting those opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk. take the record. On this question there are 115 voting 'yes', none voting 'no', none voting 'present'. And the House does adopt the First Conference Committee Report to Senate Bill And this Bill having received the extraordinary majority is hereby declared passed. Under Motion, appears House Resolution 904. Representative Hultgren. Mr. Clerk, read the Resolution."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Motion. I move to bypass Committee and place on the...House Resolution 904 on the Speaker's Table for immediate consideration."
- Speaker Giglio: "The ... Representative Hultgren."
- Hultgren: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. I'd ask favorable consideration of the motion. I think the Resolution is noncontroversial and it's in the interest of the utility consumer, urging the Congress of the United States to adopt HR 2858."
- Speaker Giglio: "You heard the motion. Does the Gentleman have leave? Leave by the Attendance Roll Call? Hearing none, leave is granted. The Gentleman asks now for immediate consideration of House Resolution 904. Mr. Clerk, read the motion."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 904, offered by Representative Hultgren."

81st Legislative Day November 5, 1987

- Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman from Warren, Representative Hultgren."
- Hultgren: "Yes, Hr. Speaker. House Resolution 2858 pending in the Congress of the United States would petitions for rate increases be treated in the same manner as petitions for rate decreases. Right now, rate increases are handled within a six-month period of time, whereas petitions for rate decreases have taken years. And this is to say that the petition to decrease should be handled in the same expeditious manner. I think it's appropriate for the Congress to pass this and would urge the General Assembly to adopt this Resolution urging the Congress to do 50."
- Speaker Giglio: "You heard the Gentleman's motion. All those signify by voting 'aye', those opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. 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 110 voting 'yes', voting 'nay' and none voting 'present'. And the House does adopt House Resolution 904. Supplemental Calendar #2. Supplemental Calendar 22 • appears House Bill 99. Representative Curran. Mr. Clerk, read the motion."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Motion. I move to take from the table, suspend

 Rule 79(e) and place House Bill 99 on the Speaker's Table

 under Conference Committee Reports."
- Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman moves that the House take from the table House Bill 99 and suspend Rule 79 and place on the calendar under Speaker's Table, on the Order of Conference Committee Report. Does the Gentleman have leave? The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative McCracken."
- McCracken: "We object to leave, Mr. Speaker. It'll require a
- Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman from Sangamon, Representative

81st Legislative Day

November 5, 1987

Curran."

Curran: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. He are doing this to accomplish the joint purposes of the Department of Children and Family Services, Illinois Action for Children and the Cook County State's Attorney."

Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman asks that the House take from the table House Bill 99. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'... The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative McCracken."

McCracken: "Hill the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Giglio: "He indicates he will."

McCracken: "Representative, do you have plans to amend HB 99 so that it will not be in its current form? Is that it?"

Curran: "That is correct."

McCracken: "What are your intentions in that regard?"

Curran: "Right now, I understand there's an agreement between the Illinois Action for Children and the Cook County State's Attorney's Office, in terms of something they want to do about a one year inspection rule. And I believe that is also in agreement with the Department of Children and Family Services."

McCracken: "And that's what the Bill will be?"

Curran: "That will be primarily what the Bill will be. There may

be one or two other small items in there, but that's

primarily what we intend to do."

McCracken: "So the portion of the aill that is currently objectionable to DCFS, will not..."

Curran: "That is correct."

McCracken: "...be resurrected."

Curran: "That is correct."

McCracken: "Okay. Thank you. We don't have any objection."

Speaker Giglio: "The question is, 'Shall the House adopt the motion?' Is there leave to adopt the Attendance Roll Call?

- 81st Legislative Day November 5, 1987

 Hearing none, leave is granted. Resolutions."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 902, offered by Representative McGann. 905, McPike. 906, McGann. 907, Black. 909, Hasara. 910, Madigan, et al. 912, W. Peterson. 913, Keane."
- Speaker Giglio: "Representative Matijevich, on Agreed
 Resolutions."
- Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, these are all agreed on from both sides of the aisle. And I move the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions."
- Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman moves that the House adopt the Agreed Resolutions. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', those opposed 'nay' and the Resolutions are adopted.

 General Resolutions."
- Clerk O'3rien: "House Resolution 911, offered by Representative

 Flowers and Leverenz."
- Speaker Giglio: "Committee on Assignments. On page 2 of the Supplemental...I mean Supplemental Calendar 32, appears
 House Bill 1923. Hr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1923. The Bill appears on Conference

 Committee Report...First Conference Committee Report."
- Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman from... Steczo moves that the House refuse to accept the First Conference Committee Report and a Second Conference Committee be adopted...appointed. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', those opposed 'nay' and the motion is adopted. The Gentleman from St. Clair, Representative Flinn."
- Flinn: "Well, Mr. Speaker, if you're looking for something to do,

 I have on Supplemental Calendar #1 on the back page, 2748,

 which is a very simple one. We can do it now, if you wish?"
- Speaker Giglio: "Representative, the report is not passed out yet. That's the reason why we're not going to that."

81st Legislative Day

November 5, 1987

- Flinn: "Hell it's been passed out about three hours ago. I got one on my desk about three hours ago. Hould you like to have a copy of it, Mr. Speaker?"
- Speaker Giglio: "I believe you do have a copy. It's unfortunate,

 Representative, but there's no other Representative that
 has your copy."
- Flinn: "Hell, mine was passed out along with others and I didn't pick it up someplace else. The pages gave it to me. But if you want to skip it, fine. If you've got some other reason to skip it, skip it."
- Speaker Giglio: "You will be... Mr. Strutz. Is Mr. Strutz in the chamber? Has the...has the Bill been passed out?

 Supplemental Calendar 04. Representative Terzich. House Bill 2713. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2713, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Pension Code. First Conference Committee Report."
- Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative

 Terzich."
- Terzich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move that we adopt Conference Committee \$1. What it does is, it provides that the age discrimination come in compliance with the Judges Retirement System and I would move for its adoption."
- Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman moves that the House accept the First Conference Committee Report on House Bill 2713 and on that question, the Gentleman from DuPage, Representative McCracken."
- McCracken: "Is this another one of those deals that nobody let me in on? We don't have this. I thought he was going to refuse, or ask for a Second Conference Committee. I thought this was a vehicle."

Terzich: "What's a vehicle?"

McCracken: "It is a vehicle?"

81st Legislative Day

November 5, 1987

Terzich: "No. What is a ve...I don't know what a vehicle is."

McCracken: "Oh. You don't know. Hell put."

Terzich: "This Conference Committee Report just applies to the age discrimination with regard to Judges and that's the only change. Everyone signed off on it, Representative."

McCracken: "I don't understand. What does it do?"

Terzich: "Mr. Cullerton would like to talk to you in a little bit. We'll take it out of the record."

Speaker Giglio: "Take the Bill out of the record, Mr. Clerk. On Conference Committee Report appears Senate Bill 1155. The Lady from Cook, Representative Braun. Representative Braun in the chamber? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate 3ill 1155, a Bill for an Act to amend the Civil Administrative Code of Illinois, Second Conference Committee Report."

Speaker Giglio: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Brauno"

Braun: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. this is the Bill which we...it's come up now twice today. This is the Conference Committee Report on the issue of the collection and of information having to do with and acts of ethnic intimidation by the State Police. The Department does not oppose the Bill. We have at this point numerous supporters of the Bill. There is no opposition to it. The Second Conference Committee Report was prepared because the first one had technical Essentially, the Bill now, as conformed and corrected, that our own Department of Law Enforcement will collect and disseminate information relating to criminal offenses which are acts Ωf terrorism and ethnic intimidation. That's all the Bill does. That's all the Conference Committee Report requires and in fact Conference Committee Report makes it clear that there is no cost, other than will be reimbursed by federal funds to the

81st Legislative Day

- November 5. 1987
- implementation of this legislation, so I encourage your support for the Second Conference Committee Report to Senate Bill 1155."
- Speaker Giglio: "The Lady moves that the House dο adopt Second Conference Committee Report on Senate 3ill 1155 and on that question, all those in favor signify hy voting 'aye', those opposed 'nay'. This is final action. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 89 voting 'yes', 23 voting 'no' and none voting 'present'. And the House does adopt the Second Conference Committee Report to Senate Bill 1155. And this Bill having received Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Conference Committee Reports appears House Bill 2713. Supplemental Calendar 34. Ar. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House 3ill 2713. A Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Pension Code. First Conference Committee Report."
- Speaker Giglio: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative Terzich."
- Terzich: "Yes. Once again I would like to adopt Conference
 Committee Report (1), and what it does is simply remove the
 age discrimination under the Judges Retirement System and
 there is no cost factor on this Bill."
- Speaker Giglio: "The question is, 'Shall the House adopt
 Conference Committee #1 to House Bill 2713?' And on that
 question, the Gentleman from DuPage, Representative
 McCracken."
- McCracken: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It was the title that threw
 me off. I thought it was a pension Bill. I've read the
 Conference Committee Report and it deletes everything and
 inserts in lieu thereof the immediate repeal of the Judges
 Mandatory Retirement System. So, I'm in support of this."

81st Legislative Day

November 5. 1987

- Speaker Giglio: "Alright. The question is. 'Shall the House adopt the Second (sic - First) Conference Committee Report to Senate Bill 1155 (sic - House Bill 2713)?* All those in signify by voting 'aye', those opposed 'nay'. voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 113 voting "ves". voting 'no', none voting 'present'. And the House does adopt the Second (sic - First) Conference Committee Report and this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority. Extraordinary, is hereby declared passed. The Gentleman Curran. from Sangamon, Representative Representative Curran. Representative Curran, the Gentleman from Sangamon on a motion."
- Curran: "Mr. Speaker... Speaker, I move to refuse to accept

 Conference Committee Report &1 on House Bill 99 in order to

 keep my bargain with the other side of the aisle. And set

 up Conference Committee Report &2 on House Bill 99."
- Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman moves that the House refuse to accept the First Conference Committee Report on House Bill 99 and a Second Conference Committee Report... or a Second Conference Committee be appointed. All those in favor say 'aye', those opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the motion is adopted. The record... the Senate Bill 916, the House did adopt the Second Conference Committee Report by extra Majority on Senate Bill 916. Resolutions."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 903, offered by Representative

 McNamara, with respect to the memory of Robert Bob Hicks.

 And House Resolution 908, offered by Representative Kubik,

 with respect to the memory of Frank 'Lhotka'."
- Speaker Giglio: "Representative Matijevich moves that the House adopt the Resolution. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', those opposed 'nay'. The Resolution is adopted.

81st Legislative Day

November 5, 1987

Allowing the Clerk time to receive messages from the Senate, the House will remain in Perfunctory Session. And Representative Matijevich moves that the House stand adjourned until 9:30 tomorrow morning. Allowing the Clerk, again, to receive the messages from the Senate, the House will remain in Perfunctory Session. Representative Van Duyne, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

- Van Duyne: "Thank you, Ar. Speaker. I just want to remember...
 remind all the Members of the County and Township Committee
 that we are meeting immediately upon adjournment in 118.
 All we need to do is get a quorum and take our Interim
 Study Eills into consideration. It'll take us five
 minutes, if you'll just go immediately down there, we will
 be done in five minutes."
- Speaker Giglio: "You heard the Gentleman's request. And now Representative Matijevich moves again that the House now stand adjourned until 9:30 tomorrow, November 6th. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', those opposed 'nay'. The House stands adjourned until tomorrow morning at 9:30."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Introduction and First Reading. House Bill 2916. offered by Representative Pullen. A Bill for an Act tο amend Sections of an Act in relation to the prevention of certain communicable diseases. First Reading of the Rill_ House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendments, Third House Joint Resolution Constitutional Amendment resolved, by the House of Representatives of the eighty-fifth General Assembly of the State of Illinois, the Senate concurring herein, that there shall be submitted to the electors of the State for adoption or rejection at the general election next occurring at least six months after the adoption of this Resolution, a proposition to amend Sections 2 and 5 of Article IV of the Constitution to

81st Legislative Day

November 5, 1987

Article IV, the Legislature, as follows: Section 2. Legislative Composition. (a) One Senator shall be elected from each Legislative District. Immediately following each decennial redistricting, the General Assembly by law shall divide the Legislative Districts as equally as possible into two groups. Beginning with the 1992 general election, Senators from the first group shall be elected for terms of four years and six years and Senators from the second group shall he elected for terms of six years and four years. The Legislative Districts in each group shall bе distributed substantially equally over the State. (b) Each District shall bе divided into two Representative Districts. One Representative... one Representative shall be elected from each Representative District. Immediately following each decennial redistricting, the General Assembly by law shall divide the Representative Districts as equally as possible into three election, groups. Beginning with the 1992 general Representatives from the first group shall be elected for of four years, four years and two vears: Representatives from the second group shall be elected for years, two years and four terms of four vears: and Representatives from the third group shall be elected for four years and four years. terms of two vears. The Representative Districts in each group shall be distributed substantially equally over the State; however, in no case shall a Legislative District assigned to the first group of Legislative Districts contain a Representative District assigned to the third group of Representative Districts, nor shall a Legislative District assigned to the second group of Legislative Districts contain a Representative District assigned to the first group of Representative Districts. (c) To be eligible to serve as a member of the

81st Legislative Day

November 5, 1987

General Assembly, a person must be a United States citizen, at least 21 years old, and for the two years preceding his election or appointment a resident of the district which he to represent. In the general election following a redistricting, a candidate for the General Assembly may elected for... from any district which contains a part of the district in which he resided at the time αf the redistricting and reelected if a resident district he represents for 18 months prior to reelection. Within thirty days after a vacancy occurs, it shall be filled by appointment as provided by law. If the vacancy in a Senatorial or Representative office with more than twenty-eight months remaining in the term, the appointed or Representative shall serve until the next general election, at which time a Senator or Representative shall be elected to serve for the remainder of the If the vacancy is in any other Representative or Senatorial office. the appointment shall be for the remainder of the term. An appointee to fill a vacancy shall be a member the same political party as the person he succeeds. member of the General Assembly shall receive compensation as a public officer or employee from any other governmental entity for time during which he is in attendance as member of the General Assembly. No member of the General Assembly during the term for which he was elected appointed shall be appointed to a public office which shall been created or the compensation for which shall have been increased by the General Assembly during that Section 5. Sessions. (a) The General Assembly shall convene each year on the second Wednesday of January. The General Assembly shall be a continuous body from the second Wednesday of January of one odd-numbered year until the second Wednesday of January of the next odd-numbered vear.

81st Legislative Day

November 5. 1987

The Governor may convene the General Assembly or the (b) Senate alone in special session by a proclamation stating purpose of the session; and only business encompassed purpose, together with any impeachments ٥r confirmation of appointments shall be transacted. Special sessions of the General Assembly may also be convened by joint proclamation of the presiding officers of issued as provided by law. (c) Sessions of each house of the General Assembly and meetings of committees, joint committees and legislative commissions shall be open to the public. Sessions and committee meetings of a house may be closed to the public if two-thirds of the members elected to that house determine that the public interest so requires; and meetings of joint committees and legislative commissions may be so closed if two-thirds of the members elected to each house so determine. Schedule. This Amendment takes effect upon its adoption by the electors of State, with application to the terms of General Assembly members elected at the 1992 and subsequent general elections. Third Reading of the Constitutional Amendment. the Constitutional Amendment will be held on Third Reading Messages from the Senate. A message from the Senate by Ms. Hawker, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate has passed a Bill the following title, in the passage of instructed to ask concurrence of the House of Representatives to-wit: Senate Bill #1268, passed by the Senate November 5, 1987. Linda Hawker, Secretary. Senate Bills, First Reading. Senate Bill 1268, a Bill for an Act to amend the Public Utilities Act. First Reading of the Bill. A message from the Senate by Ms. Hawker. Secretary. I • m Mr. directed to inform the House of Representatives, the Senate has refused to concur with the

81st Legislative Day

November 5, 1987

House in the adoption of their Amendments to a Bill of the following title, to—wit: Senate Bill \$1229, House Amendments \$1 and 2, action taken by the Senate November 5, 1987. Linda Hawker, Secretary. A message from the Senate by Ms. Hawker, Secretary. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has concurred with the House in passage of 3ill of the following title, to—wit: House Bill \$911, together with the attached Senate Amendment \$1, passed the Senate as amended November 5, 1987. Linda Hawker, Secretary. There being no further business, the House now stands adjourned."

REQ STORE PRINT DO DOCUMENT NAME OPER GROUP COMMAND DATE COPY HIDTH DEPTH ERROR T110587 15 0 pj 02/19/88 1 66 78

02/23/88

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

PAGE 1

NOVEMBER 05, 1987

HB-0099	MOTION	PAGE	103
HB-0099		PAGE	109
	CONFERENCE	PAGE	90
HB-1055		PAGE	88
	CONFERENCE	PAGE	92 105
	CONFERENCE	PAGE PAGE	85
HB-1923	CONFERENCE	PAGE	91
HB-2065		PAGE	90
HB-2712		PAGE	87
HB-2713		PAGE	99
HB-2713		PAGE	106
HB-2713		PAGE	108
HB-2713	OUT OF RECORD	PAGE	107
HB-2715		PAGE	100
	CONFERENCE	PAGE	92
HB-2797		PAGE	100
	CONFERENCE	PAGE	100
HB-2852		PAGE	87
	FIRST READING	PAGE PAGE	86 86
	FIRST READING FIRST READING	PAGE	86
	FIRST READING	PAGE	86
	FIRST READING	PAGE	86
	FIRST READING	PAGE	86
	FIRST READING	PAGE	86
	FIRST READING	PAGE	110
\$9-0454	VETO ACTION	PAGE	15
SB-0478	VETO ACTION	PAGE	4
	VETO ACTION	PAGE	18
	VETO ACTION	PAGE	5
	VETO ACTION	PAGE	21
	VETO ACTION	PAGE PAGE	25 71
	THIRD READING VETO ACTION	PAGE	27
	VETO ACTION	PAGE	6
	CONFERENCE	PAGE	74
	VETO ACTION	PAGE	28
	VETO ACTION	PAGE	31
\$3-0916	CONFERENCE	PAGE	85
SB-0916	CONFERENCE	PAGE	101
	CONFERENCE	PAGE	91
	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	72
	VETO ACTION	PAGE	36
	CONFERENCE	PAGE PAGE	84 107
	CONFERENCE VETO ACTION	PAGE	40
	VETO ACTION	PAGE	8
	VETO ACTION	PAGE	9
	VETO ACTION	PAGE	50
SB-1267	VETO ACTION	PAGE	46
	FIRST READING	PAGE	113
	VETO ACTION	PAGE	11
	CONFERENCE	PAGE	93
	CONFERENCE	PAGE	76
	VETO ACTION	PAGE	13 55
	VETO ACTION VETO ACTION	PAGE PAGE	58
	VETO ACTION	PAGE	62
	VETO ACTION	PAGE	14
	MOTION	PAGE	79
	ADDPTED	PAGE	84
	RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	81
	RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	75
HR-0825	OUT OF RECORD	PAGE	76

02/23/88 15:12

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

PAGE 2

NOVEMBER 05, 1987

HR-0904	MOTION	PAGE	102
HR-0904	ADOPTED	PAGE	103
HR-0904	RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	102
HJR-0001	THIRD READING	PAGE	95
HJR-0006	THIRD READING	PAGE	110

SUBJECT MATTER

HOUSE TO GOOD DESCRIPTION OF THE PARTY OF TH		
HOUSE TO ORDER - REPRESENTATIVE BRESLIN	PAGE	1
PRAYER - REVEREND SIEVING	PAGE	1
PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE	PAGE	1
ROLL CALL FOR ATTENDANCE	PAGE	1
COMMITTEE REPORTS	PAGE	94
AGREED RESOLUTIONS	PAGE	105
GENERAL RESOLUTIONS	PAGE	1 0 5
DEATH RESOLUTIONS	PAGE	109
ADJOURNMENT	PAGE	110
PERFUNCTORY	PAGE	110
MESSAGES FROM SENATE	PAGE	113
MESSAGES FROM SENATE	PAGE	113
MESSAGES FROM SENATE	PAGE	114
PERFUNCTORY - ADJOURNMENT	PAGE	114