33rd Legislative Day

May 2, 1989

- Speaker McPike: "The House will come to order. The Chaplain for today is Reverend Leah Pogemiller from the Verona and Mazon United Methodist Churches. Reverend Pogemiller is a guest of Representative Weller. The guests in the balcony may wish to rise and join us for the invocation."
- Reverend Pogemiller: "Let us bow our heads in prayer. Gracious and wonderful Creator, we thank You for Your abiding presence in each of our lives. We pray that Your spirit will guide us. We pray that Your spirit will help us to discern the decision that we must make. We ask that You will continue to bless and to keep us, as well as our family and our friends, and those residents of the State of Illinois who have called us forth to serve in their name. We ask that you continue to be with all the residents of this great State, so that we may be a people who will be a people who will contribute to this great Nation. For all your many blessings, we thank You in the Name of Jesus Christ. Amen."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Ropp, we missed you on Friday.

  But if you'd lead us in the Pledge of Allegiance today,

  we're glad to see you here."
- Ropp: "I was outside the door."
- 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 McPike: "Roll Call for Attendance. Republicans have excused absences, Representative Piel."
- Piel: "No, excused absences today, Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker McPike: "Thank you, Representative Matijevich."
- Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, let the record reflect the excused absence due to a death in the family of Representative

33rd Legislative Day

May 2, 1989

Lovana Jones."

- Speaker McPike: "Take the Roll...take the record, Mr. Clerk. 116

  Members answering the Roll Call. A quorum is present.

  Representative McCracken."
- McCracken: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wanted to bring to the Chair's attention and ask for a correction, apparently House Bill 2761, sponsored by Representative Kubik..."
- Speaker McPike: "Would you repeat. Excuse me, would you repeat that number?"
- McCracken: "2761. I've got the Committee Reports here. I'll bring them up after I'm done. On Wednesday morning, House Bill 2761, was passed out of the Committee on an eleven, two to six vote. The next day the Calendar, well the next day for some reason the Bill was not reported out of the Committee to the floor. The following day the Bill then again appearing on an Executive Committee Calendar. Later that same day but certainly not by the time it published and reprinted as being in the Executive Committee. the committee reconsidered that vote, reconsidered the vote on a subsequent day, reconsidered the vote with a number of Members being excused, or I should say replaced by other Members. Essentially, what appears happened is that the majority was uncomfortable with this Bill passing out and so it had to pack Committee to move to reconsider the Bill on a subsequent date. That action, Sir, if not violative of the letter of our rules, is clearly violative of the spirit of our rules. In addition, I contend that a Motion to reconsider on a day subsequent to the days passage is not effective. It's null The Bill should be reported to the floor on and void. Second Debate, and Friday, when I was not recognized, I was trying to make this point. Apparently, we'll have to have Representative Ropp here on a regular basis so that we can

33rd Legislative Day

May 2, 1989

get heard. I'd like you to rule today, Mr. Speaker, and I don't have to play to the partisian crowds or to the press. All we want is a little justice. We want this Bill reported out on Second Reading. The Motion to reconsider was null and void and if you are afraid of the Bill or if you don't want to pass the Bill, vote against it. Do not pack the committees and make Motions to reconsider on subsequent days. Please put it on Second Reading and may we have a response."

Speaker McPike: "Representative McCracken, the Chair is not clear as to which rule you are stating has been violated.

Representative McCracken."

McCracken: "A Motion to reconsider can be considered only on the day of the original vote."

Speaker McPike: "This was the Executive Committee?"

McCracken: "Yes, it was."

Speaker McPike: "Had the Committee adjourned or recessed?"

McCracken: "I don't know."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I didn't see Representative

Terzich, but what happened was that on Wednesday..."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Matijevich, Representative Terzich is here."

Matijevich: "Alright, well let me, while he is collecting his thoughts, I'm on that committee and on Wednesday evidently the Representative Giglio had told the Committee Chairman that he had wanted to move to reconsider the vote. That was at the end of the meeting. The meeting was in a recess meeting and when we called the recess meeting on Friday, that was the earliest that the Motion to reconsider could be heard. We had not adjourned. We were in recess and that's when the Chairman went through with Representative Giglio's Motion to reconsider. So, I think, Representative

33rd Legislative Day

May 2, 1989

Terzich will indicate to you that's exactly what happened."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Ryder. Representative...there are a number of lights on if they want to comment on this or some other subject matter...on this alright, Representative McCracken."

McCracken: "I think they want to comment on this, but let me address that issue. I think I can save us all a lot of trouble we don't have to demagogue the issue. We just want it put on Second Reading. Whether the committee was recessed or adjourned is immaterial. You reported out on that same day, the first day that the committee met last week, you reported out to the floor, all other Bills that had been favorably passed upon that day. You had a Committee Report which was read into the record the next Whether the Committee had recessed or adjourned is immaterial. The only Bill missing from that Committee Report read into the record was 2761. You then reconsidered on a subsequent date after the first results had been read into the record and moved to Second Reading on the floor. You then reconsidered this Bill. Whether its recessed or adjourned is immaterial and the proof of it is that your own people your committee reported to the floor all Bills had been voted on favorably that first day. So any purported distinction between recess and adjournment is immaterial and the proof of it not only is the rule that requires reconsideration votes to be made on the same day as the Bills original vote, not only is that ... required by our rules, but you even acted upon that first Committee's hearings as if it were final action. Because you reported into the record for Second Reading all other Bills from that day. Let's just put it on Second Reading and put this behind us."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Piel."

33rd Legislative Day

May 2, 1989

Piel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, just to give a little bit of clarification. In the committee, I asked the question and it was told to me that there were quite a few Bills that were not reported out. Well, come to check that there was only one Bill. It happens that a situation that if a committee is recessed, if you do vote them out you've got to vote them all out. I'll wait till you get off the phone, Mr. Speaker, because I would like your comments on this."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Piel is not finished, Mr. Electrician."

Piel: "Basically, what happened, Mr. Speaker, was that a Bill was reported out and then two days later, a Motion to reconsider, when all the Bills that were reported out came out to the floor. It's completely in a violation of the rules I mean we tried bringing this up in Committee. would not even listen to it. Now I don't know what the problem is with the Bill. I don't have the slightest idea what the problem is with the Bill. But what the whole situation is, hey fine, the votes are over there, I mean I can count. Kill the Bill on Third Reading, don't call it, I mean that's been done before too never call it for a vote, if its a major problem to somebody. But the whole thing is abiding by the rules, Mr. Speaker. The rules obviously were completely violated in that committee. And just to give you an example, we had four or five people who were replaced in Committee I never got a complete answer on what the situation was in Committee as far as the people voting on a reconsideration vote, when they were substituting for somebody else. And if you'll remember, Speaker, you were in the Committee. You were filling Mr. in for Representative Martinez. You leave the Committee, a couple minutes later Representative Stern comes in to

33rd Legislative Day

May 2, 1989

replace Representative Martinez. You had already replace Representative Martinez, and she said well the Chairman said well that's the way its gonna be I'm sorry that's not the way. If she replaces you, that's fine. I mean you did look a little pale that morning Jim, and I understand, I understand. But that was the way they felt, that it was just going to be replacing Representative Martinez. type of a situation. I mean it was going to...and then to add insult to injury, after their reconsideration vote, which was a violation of the rules, passed, they never allowed, there was another Motion for a reconsideration and that was out of order, that was out of order. Speaker, it's obviously a flagrant violation of the rules. Let's bring the thing out to Second Reading and will you move on with the rest of the business of the day."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Kubik."

Kubik: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. You know I've appeared before a lot of Commitees in this General Assembly and previous General Assemblies and we all know what the process is, we all go into Committee and we have Bills voted up or down. But this is the first time that I've gone into a Committee, had a Bill voted up, left the Committee and find out two days later that it was not reported to the floor. I would bring to the Chair's attention...is that Representative McPike or Martinez in the Chair?...that the Chairman signed the report, the Committee report and it was deleted from the report that went to the floor, and I don't know what this says about the process. Does it say that once one has gotten a vote in Committee, and it has been reported favorably out, we've gotta take that copy of that report and take it all the way to the Clerk's office and make sure that it gets to the Clerk's office? Mr. Speaker, I know we're all here to

33rd Legislative Day

May 2, 1989

represent our constituents and we don't agree on a lot of issues, but I think what bothers me about this process is, I really can't get angry about what's happened. All I can say is that I'm kind of disappointed, very disappointed, because even though we have differences of opinion in this General Assembly there has got to be some basic trust between Members in order to make legislation move. There's got to be some rules. And in this case any semblance of rules have been violated. This Bill is not a Republican or Democratic Bill. As a matter of fact, Representative O'Connell was the Sponsor of this Bill last year, so you know it's not just a Republican Bill, but I would think that..."

Speaker McPike: "We have Representative McCracken on a point of order. Representative Kubik. Oh yes, someone has the Speaker's gavel."

Kubik: "Maybe Representative Martinez has it."

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Clerk, would you find out who took the Speaker's gavel. Could we have some attention here, thank you, thank you Representative Kubik, to continue."

Kubik: "Okay, well as long as we're missing the gavel, maybe you can find the Bill too, as long as we are looking around for it. But the point is Rep...Mr. Speaker, that I think the situation has gotten pretty sad when can't even pass a Bill out and be sure that it's going to be reported on the Calendar. There is something wrong with what's going on and with the rules of the House if we can't even be sure that when we get a Bill passed out fair and square that it goes to the floor. This can happen to anyone and I would certainly appreciate a ruling from the Chair with regard to this issue and as to why it shouldn't be on Second Reading and thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Kubik, I will give you a ruling

33rd Legislative Day

May 2, 1989

as soon as I recognize all the Republicans that want to speak on this. Representative Parcells."

Parcells: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think we should all know that we have somebody that is clairvoyant in our midst. Because on Friday, or late on Thursday night or early Friday morning before any committees meet, we print the House Calendar. Well, somebody must have known that we were going to reconsider this matter because we have on the Calendar for Executive Committee at 8:10, House Bill 2761. Now while this is being delivered to us, we already are reconsidering it. Now the person that is clairoyant here must have known that this was going to pass and I think that's just wonderful that we had this in mind before we even printed the Calendar. We knew exactly what we were going to do. We were going to take advantage of minority to prove a point. This is absolutely ridiculous. Some strange things have gone on in this Committee this year, and there is no reason for it. If you want to kill the Bills, bring them to the floor, kill them. But do not do things that are absolutely against the rules in taking advantage of the majority and making monkeys out of your own side of aisle, because they're not happy to do this. They wouldn't want their done to this Bill when it had been voted out. And for heaven's sakes, don't be making mistakes like putting it on a Calendar before it's even been voted on. I would ask that in the future things that are voted out, if the Majority side doesn't like them, then kill them on the floor but don't be reconsidering motions that have long since been signed out of the Committee. was signed out properly, and later stopped. We all know it. You all know it, and we would ask that you follow the rules of the House. Thank you."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Pullen."

33rd Legislative Day

May 2, 1989

Pullen: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. As a Member of the House Executive Committee, as one who had voted against the Gentleman's Bill when it first passed, I vigorously protest the reconsider. Despite my feelings about the Bill. the Gentleman was shabbily treated by the Executive Committee in a manner that none of us would like to see happen to ourselves. He had no notice that there would be an attempt to reconsider the vote by which his Bill passed out Committee two days previously. He had no reason to understand that he should be in committee that day to protest and protect his own rights, if he could. He had no way of appealing to the Committee. The Chairman had signed the Committee Report indicating that this Bill had indeed cleared Committee on a 'do pass' Motion. He had signed that report and he had delivered it to the Clerk's office. That Bill was no longer in the custody of the Executive Committee when that Committee Report on that Bill was delivered to the Clerk's office, and yet suddenly it reappeared. Interestingly, while we were debating it, Members of the Committee asked to have the Roll Call from the previous day read and we were told that the records pertaining to the Bill weren't in Committee, they were the Clerk's office. Well, if that is the case, clearly the Bill was no longer in the province of the Committee. had been reported to the Clerk's office and therefore the House. This was a violation of the rules, and it was extremely unjust and unfair. In another action in the Committee that day, two different Members were appointed to replace one Committee Member who was not present in another breakage of the rules. A Member was appointed to replace once Member, voted on one Roll Call and left and a second Member was appointed to replace the same Member who had

33rd Legislative Day

May 2, 1989

originally been replaced. I personally have never seen that done before I don't know whether it has been or not but I certainly think that it is against the rules, that second substitute for the Member who was absent did remain in the Committee and cast votes for much of the day, including a vote, I believe, on this particular Motion. But regardless of the substitute issue, which is in itself wrong, that committee was used that day in a manner which shamefully trampled on the rights of one of the Members of this House and of the people who sent him here. just as many votes to get here as anyone else in the House. Probably more than many of us, and the people in his district have the right to be represented in this body, and not to expect that their Members are lower than someone else's. This was absolutely unjust and Mr. Speaker, I call upon you to rule that it has been improperly done and that that Bill was indeed reported to the House, because Committee Chairman filed a signed report in the Clerks office as having passed that Bill to the House. Once it hit the Clerk's office, it is no longer in the province of the Committee, and was not eligible to be reconsidered, and I ask you to make a ruling on that."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Stephens. This is the last Member seeking recognition."

Stephens: "Well, thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. When the Speaker finds out that you've lost his gavel there is going lots of trouble. Okay, well I'm glad you got a replacement there. It's ironic that we are losing things today as we lost things last week. As a Member sitting on the Committee last week, I replacing another was The usual fine leadership that we get in Representative. that committee was, was lacking somewhat. The Bills were In fact we asked for the Roll Call. reported out.

33rd Legislative Day

May 2, 1989

asked the disposition of all the other Bills that had been acted on and we were told they are not here. They're in the Clerk's office. Well if they weren't here and they were in the Clerk's office, here being the Committee, we question how it could be possible, Mr. Speaker, how could you possibly cover that paper trail and not have that Bill reported out. We also wonder about the significance of the Bill and why you would be so interested, but you know I thought back and this happens just about every year about this time. There will be a couple of other slight injustices done, as you call them, slight because you're building a track record. So that the press is lulled to sleep, you like to violate our rules early in the process, violate our rights early in the process, so that later when you really need to violate our rules and really need to violate our rights, it goes unnoticed or less noticed by the press. You may have lulled them to sleep, Mr. Speaker, but we are ever tentative, ever attentive to the way that your ruling process, and your abuse of the process continues to trample on the rights, not just of the Republicans, because certainly this is not an afront to only Republicans, this is an afront to every Legislator who sits on every Committee wondering whether when his Bill is passed out, indeed if that's going to be the final disposition of the Bill. Mr. Speaker, we plead with you, Let us know what the rules are. to follow the rules. We'll live by them and we challenge you, Mr. Speaker, to do the same."

Speaker McPike: "Representative McCracken, Representative Kubik,
Representative Pullen, and others that spoke, the Chair is
prepared to rule on this. No. The Committee Chairman
signed an individual Roll Call sheet. There were
app...Representative Pullen, the Committee Chairman signed

33rd Legislative Day

May 2, 1989

an individual Roll Call sheet. That day there were approximately forty Bills passed out of Committee. The Committee Clerk, because of the work load, prepared an accumulative Committee Report, which the Clerk of the House uses to read into the record with approximately twenty Bills on that report. Although forty Bills were heard, the Clerk did not prepare an accumulative Committee Report for the final twenty Bills. The Bill in question, 2761, not one of the twenty reported out, there were twenty reported out. There were twenty not reported out. The Clerk of the House read into the record, from the Committee Report, the same thing the Clerk reads from every other Committee Report, and that is an accumulative Committee Report signed by the Chairman. That was read into the record. Those twenty Bills were reported to the floor. The other twenty Bills were not reported to the floor. The Committee was in recess, doesn't make any difference if it was in recess for five minutes or overnight. The Committee was in recess. The Bill was in the control of Committee. It was a proper Motion, and the Bill stays in Committee. So the Chair would rule that your point is not well taken, Representative McCracken. And on that Representative Kubik."

Kubik: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A question of the Chair, inquiry of the Chair."

Speaker McPike: "Proceed."

Kubik: "Mr. Speaker, I have a copy of the Committee Action Report on the reconsideration Motion in my possession, and I just wondered whether the Committee Motion was in order, if there is no second to the reconsideration Motion shown on the Committee Report. In this case on 2761, the reconsideration Motion has been made by Representative Giglio, but since I wasn't there that morning I was

33rd Legislative Day

May 2, 1989

interested in seeing who was the second, and low and behold there is no second either."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Kubik, your point is not timely.

Had it been raised at that time, it would have been timely.

It is not timely."

Kubik: "It would have been nice."

Speaker McPike: "It is not timely."

Kubik: "But I wasn't there at that time."

Speaker McPike: "It is not timely. Representative McCracken."

McCracken: "I move to overrule the Chair and I have a number of bases for that: one; I incorporate by reference the point just made by Representative Kubik, and if your recent comment was to the effect or do I...I take your recent comment to mean that if it had been considered it would have changed the outcome. I'll let someone correct that impression, but I think since Representative Kubik's point is now my point by reference and I am timely by virtue of a proper Motion which is before the body, you reconsider your ruling and save us the embarrassment of having to overrule you with a record Roll Call. that ten of your colleagues over there see the justice in our position and I'm sure they will vote with us. Secondly, I think the points you make relative to the facts of this don't really have any bearing on the Parliamentary issue before us. The question is, 'can a Motion to reconsider be made on a subsequent Legislative Day, regardless of the status of the Committee, regardless of whether the Bill was read into the record properly or not on the House floor'? Now, rule 73 governs Motions to reconsider. Motions to Reconsider either must be made on the same day as the vote or notice must be given that day of the Motion to be made the next legislative day in order for it to be reconsidered. It is not timely.

### 33rd Legislative Day

May 2, 1989

immaterial whether the Committee was recessed. It is immaterial whether the Committee Report including this Bill was read into the record for Second Reading. Rule 73 is quite clear. It is acknowledged that Representative Giglio made that Motion not until Friday, that it was made not until Friday after the original vote had been made on Wednesday. As a matter of fact, Roberts Rules of Order is instructive on this as well. There is another point order on this issue. To the extent that Motions to reconsider are not addressed as to the Committee Membership, I want to point something out to the Chair, and to the Membership of this Body, pay attention if you don't think the rules of procedure are important. You can be victimized by it as well as us, and the point is this, when the Motion to reconsider is made it is in order only where there is an identity of all parties voting on prevailing side, not the maker of the Motion but all Members who made the original vote according to Roberts Rules of Order, may be the same...must be the same people who voted on the Motion to reconsider, and for Parliamentarian, I refer him to Roberts Rules of Order, the recent edition, 82 and quote, 'a most page reconsideration of a vote shall be allowed, regardless of the time, only when every Member who voted with the majority is present when the reconsideration is moved,' and Sir, that did not happen, because in the Friday committees it had been packed with different Members in order to determine the outcome of this Motion to reconsider. The Motion to reconsider, one, is out of order, because it wasn't done timely pursuant to our own rules, two, it wasn't done with an identity of Membership pursuant to Roberts Rules, which in the absence of our rules on controls, and three, it was not proper for the reasons

33rd Legislative Day

May 2, 1989

stated by Representative Kubik. Let's end the sham. Vote with us on this Motion. Put the issue behind us. Let's not get hung up on one Bill, but what we're fighting for, if you refuse to give us our day, is more important than one Bill. If you vote against us, the whole process is impugn. The integrity of the process is in jeopardy. If you vote with us, all you have to do is vote against the Bill later on Second Reading."

- Speaker McPike: "You have heard Representative McCracken's

  Motion, Representative McCracken. Representative

  Matijevich on the Motion."
- Matijevich: "Well, Mr. Speaker, and Members of the House. I believe that the Speaker has properly ruled what happened was that a Member of a Committee where a Bill was under consideration wanted to reconsider that committee was in a recess meeting, but the important thing is that there is nothing in our rules that dictates that a Chairman of a committee has to report all of the Bills immediately. I was Chairman οf the Appropriations Committee and the Executive Committee and at that time, I remember the Executive Committee had a heavy volume of Bills, and you just couldn't get them all out at one time. So that sometimes you reported out some Bills as finished that work load and then finished the work load later. So I believe that the Speaker has ruled properly would urge the Members on this side of the aisle particularly to vote no on the Motion 'shall the Chair overruled?'"
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Piel, on Representative McCracken's Motion."
- Piel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Could we have a little bit of order, Mr. Speaker, now that you've got the gavel back?"

  Speaker McPike: "Yes, would everyone give Representative Piel

33rd Legislative Day

May 2, 1989

their attention."

Piel: "I don't think it's necessarily a situation of giving me attention, Mr. Speaker. I think it's a situation of hearing what's going on in debate. Thank You, Mr. Speaker..."

Speaker McPike: "Representative, are you...

Piel: "Pardon me."

Speaker McPike: "I wasn't, were you addressing the Chair?"

"No, you said to give me some attention. I said they don't Piel: necessarily have to give me attention, but it would be good if they heard what was going on in debate. Mr. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Ladies and Gentlemen, I heard innuendos that this is like a partisan have situation, this is not partisan whatsoever. If you have a Bill that somebody doesn't like, in this case it seems like more the Chairman of the Committee, than anybody else, but if they don't like it you don't know for sure if your Bill is going to get out, if its going to be read into the record on the House floor. This Bill should have been read into the record. It was the only Bill, 'the only Bill not reported out,' because after further consideration they didn't like the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, today it is one Member, tomorrow it could be you. don't look at Representative McCracken's Motion as a partisan issue. It is not a partisan issue. It's an issue that deals with the heart and soul of the rules of this House, the rules that we are governed by and the rules have been trampled on. Today it happened to one individual. Tomorrow it could happen to you. Vote 'yes' on this Motion and stop this from ever happening again. Thank you, very much."

Speaker McPike: "Could we have some attention? The question is.

Representative McCracken."

33rd Legislative Day

May 2, 1989

McCracken: "On the Motion, I wish to close briefly."

Speaker McPike: "Proceed."

McCracken: "Let me remind everybody the book is right here. rules provide that when our rules don't cover something and Roberts Rules do, it is covered by Roberts Rules, and we are to rule accordingly. Not only does Roberts Rules say that there must be an identity of Membership on the Motion to reconsider, but actually did you know that the United States Congress does not allow Motions to reconsider Committee? Now what's good enough for the United States Congress ought to be good enough for us, and ask yourself why do they not allow Motions to reconsider in Committee. Haven't you got the right to rely on the committee action? Do you have to be at the whim of the Chairman? Think of the implications of Representative Matijevich's argument. The Chairman could refuse to report your Bill to Second Reading. The Chairman in his own discretion unilaterally could decide not to report the Bill to the floor. You win in Committee, you lose with the Chairman. That's..that's the implication of that argument. And is it just to be able to reconsider a vote when different people are voting the Motion to reconsider than decided the original issue. Is that just? Doesn't that seem to you to be the reason for the rule in the first place? When reconsider, it should be the same people voting. regardless of all the other facts that the other side of the aisle contest in this particular case, what is uncontested is this, it is different people, it was a packed committee to vote the Motion to reconsider, a packed committee. Now, just because it happened to a Republican today, doesn't mean it won't happen to you tomorrow. stand up for the process. This is not a partisan issue. Stand up and say we will not be dictated to, and vote

33rd Legislative Day

May 2, 1989

overrule the Chair."

- Speaker McPike: "We have a Motion to overrule the Chair.

  Question is, 'Shall the Chair be overrule?' Those in favor
  of overruling the Chair, vote 'aye', those opposed vote
  'nay'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The
  Clerk, will take the record. Representative Olson, I'm
  sorry. Representative Olson, explain your vote."
- Olson: "Excuse me, Mr. Speaker, I would like to make reference to our conference as soon as this vote is over."
- Speaker McPike: "Oh, thank you. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Motion, there are 51 'ayes', 64 'nos' and the Motion fails. Representative Olson is requesting a Republican Caucus. We intend to adjourn in just a few minutes. The Republican Caucus will be held immediately upon adjournment in Room 118. It will be approximately one hour, one hour and the Committees, two o'clock Committees then will convene at 2:15. And we would advise all the Chairman not to begin the Committees until the Republican Caucus is over and the Republicans have showed up and we would ask the Republicans if they could keep the Caucus to one hour, we would certainly appreciate it. Now, for an, I've got about five people seeking recognition, Representative Hasara."
- Hasara: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I move to waive the posting requirements in the Education Committee for House Bill 2274. It has been cleared with both sides of the aisle.

  It was simply an error on the part of staff."
- Speaker McPike: "The Lady moves to waive the posting requirements on House Bill 2274. Are there any objections? Hearing none. The Attendance Roll Call will be used. Representative Mulcahey are you familiar with this? No. Representative Hasara did you clear it with the other side. You did not. You did. She did. Alright, hearing no objections, the Attendance Roll Call will be used. The

33rd Legislative Day

May 2, 1989

Motions carries. Representative Mautino."

Mautino: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I too move to waive the appropriate rules so that House Bill 2441 can be heard in the our Registration Regulations Committee. It's been cleared through the other side through Representative Regan."

Speaker McPike: "Representative who."

Mautino: "Regan, the Minority Spokesman."

Speaker McPike: "Thank you, thank you. House Bill 2441, you've heard the Gentleman's Motion, is there any objections?

Hearing none, the Attendance Roll Call will be used. The Motion carries. Representative Harris."

- Harris: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I would move that, ask leave of the House to consider House Resolution...waive the posting requirements to consider House Resolution 324 in the Executive Committee. I have talked to the Chairman of the Executive Committee and gotten his agreement."
- Speaker McPike: "The Gentleman moves to waive the appropriate rules so that House Resolution 324 could be heard in Executive. Is there any objection? Hearing no objection, the Attendance Roll Call will be used. The Motion carries. Representative Kulas."
- Kulas: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I would move that we waive the posting rules on House Bill 1811, so that it may be heard in the Energy, Environment and Natural Resources Committee. Its been cleared with the other side and I would so move."
- Speaker McPike: "Gentleman moves to waive the rules so that House

  Bill 1811 may be heard in Energy Environment. Any
  objections. Representative Ewing, do you object?"

Ewing: "No."

Speaker McPike: "Hearing no objections, the Attendance Roll Call will be used, and the Motion carries. Representative Ewing."

33rd Legislative Day

May 2, 1989

Ewing: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would like to waive the posting rule for House Bill 271. I've talked with the Committee Chairman and I think it's satisfactory with him."

Speaker McPike: "Which committee?"

Ewing: "Representative Saltsman in Roads and Bridges."

Speaker McPike: "Right, the Gentleman ask to waive the rules, the posting rules on House Bill 271. Any objections? Hearing none, Attendance Roll Call will be used, and the Motion carries. Representative Terzich."

Terzich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. I would like to waive the posting requirements on House Bill 2517, so it may be heard in the Mobile Home Subcommittee this evening. And this has been cleared with the other side of the aisle."

Speaker McPike: "The Gentleman moves to waive the posting requirements on House Bill 2517. Hearing no objections..."

Terzich: "Mr. Speaker, that Subcommittee is going to meet at five p.m."

Speaker McPike: "That's in the Executive Committee."

Terzich: "Yes."

Speaker McPike: "You've cleared this with the other side?"

Terzich: "Yes, the Subcommittee is going to meet at five p.m. in Room 122A."

Speaker McPike: "Hearing no objections, Attendance Roll Call will be used and the Motion carries. Representative Wolf."

Wolf: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Request leave of the House to place House Bill 1355 in Interim Study. The Bill is now in Public Utilities Committee."

Speaker McPike: "The Gentleman asks leave. Is this your Bill
Representative? The Gentleman asks leave to put House Bill
1355 in Interim Study. Leave granted. Hearing no
objections, Attendance Roll Call is used and the Motion
carries. Representative Currie."

33rd Legislative Day

May 2, 1989

- Currie: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I'd ask leave to suspend the posting requirements for House Bill 73 to be heard in both the Sales Tax Subcommittee and the full Revenue Committee tomorrow, May 3rd and for House Bill 1407, so that it might be heard in the Real Estate Subcommittee and the full Revenue Committee again tomorrow, May 3rd."
- Speaker McPike: "Has this been cleared with the Republican side?

  House Bill 73 and House Bill 1407 to be heard in Revenue

  Committee. Any objections to the Lady's Motion? Hearing

  none, the Attendance Roll Call is used, and the Motion

  carries. Representative Breslin."
- Breslin: "Mr. Speaker, I'd ask to waive the posting requirements for House Bill 2817, so this can be heard in Consumer Protection tomorrow, It has been cleared with Representative Klemm and Representative McCracken."
- Speaker McPike: "Thank you, Representative. The Lady's Motion is to waive the posting requirements on House Bill 2817. there any objections? Hearing none, the Attendance Roll Call is used and the Motion carries. Further announcements. Further announcements. Any announcements? Alright, hearing none, the Republicans will have a Caucus immediately in Room 118. The 2:00 committees will meet at 2:15. The committees will not start until the Republicans show up, and we would ask the Republicans to Caucus to one hour. Thank you for your cooperation. Representative Young moves that the House stand adjourned until tomorrow at the hour of 12:30 p.m.. All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Leaving Perfunctory time for Committee Reports, the House stands adjourned. I have one other announcement, if everyone would just listen for a second. There is a request to announce that the Gridiron dinner will be held

33rd Legislative Day

May 2, 1989

on Wednesday, May 24th, Wednesday, May 24th, and tickets are twenty-five bucks."

Clerk O'Brien: "Committee Reports. Representative Chairman of the Committee on Consumer Protection. to which the following Bills were referred, action taken April 26th, 1989, reported the back with same the following recommendations. 'Do pass' House Bill 1514, 'Do pass as amended' House Bill 1825 and 2148. 'Interim Study Calendar', House Bills 878, 538 and 2211. Representative Kulas, Chairman of the Committee on Energy, Environment and Natural Resources to which the following Bills were referred, action taken April 26, 1989, reported the same back with the following recommendations. 'Do pass as amended' House Bill 154, 'Do pass Short Debate Calendar' House Bill 1670 and 1250. 'Do pass as amended, Debate' House Bill 258. Interim Study Calendar, House Bills 898, 1076, 1376, 1377 and 1410. Representative Satterthwaite, Chairwoman of the Committee on Higher Education, to which the following Bills were referred. action taken April 26, 1989, reported the same back with the following recommendations, 'Do pass' House Bill 42 and 1012, 'Do pass as amended' House Bill 1191 and 1192. Representative Dunn, Chairman from the Committee Judiciary I, to which the following Bills were referred, action taken April 26, 1989, reported the same back with the following recommendations. 'Do pass' House Bill 611 and 249, 'Do pass as amended' House Bill 1833, 572 and 2286. 'Do pass Short Debate' House Bill 1042, 'Do pass as amended Short Debate' House Bill 1107. 1691 and 1653. Representative Hannig, Chairman from the Committee on State Government Administration to which the following Bills were referred, action taken April 26, 1989, reported the same back with the following recommendations. 'Do pass'

# 33rd Legislative Day

May 2, 1989

Bill 1434, 1784, 1456 and 1442. 'Do pass as amended' House Bill 38 and 1899. 'Do pass Short Debate' House Bills 1657. 2003, 2032, 2031, 1493 and 1473. 'Do pass Consent Calendar' House Bill 1286. Representative Preston, Chairman of the Committee on Consumer Protection to which the following Bills were referred, action taken April 27, 1989, reported the same back with the following recommendations. pass' House Bills 296, 1415 and 1927. 'Do pass as amended' House Bill 1115. 'Do pass Short Debate' House Bill 2243 and 1888, 'Do pass Consent Calendar' House Bill 1123, 'Do pass as amended Consent Calendar' House Bill 603. Interim Study Calendar' House Bills 50, 135, 688, 1184 and 1753. Representative Homer, Chairman of the Committee Judiciary II, to which the following Bills were referred, action taken April 27, 1989, reported the same back with the following recommendations. 'Do pass' House Bill 8752, 2264 and 2662. 'Do pass as amended Short Debate' House Bill 643. Representative McGann, Chairman of the Committee on, Select Committee on Mental Health, to which the following Bills were referred, action taken April 27, 1989, reported the same back with following recommendations. Interim Study Calendar, House Bill 728 and 2049. Representative Hannig, Chairman from the Committee on State Government Administration, to which the following Bills were referred, action taken April 27, 1989, reported the same the following recommendations. 'Do pass' House Bill 1390, 2629, 2806, 2520 and 2598. 'Do pass as amended' House Bill 1945 and 2192. 'Do pass, Short Debate Calendar' House Bills 2123, 2227, 2193, 2393, 2694, 2326, 2718, 2035, 2040, 2053, 2348, 2451, 598 and 2801. 'Do pass as amended Short Debate Calendar' House Bill 2665, and 507. 'Do pass Consent Calendar' House Bills 1940, 2664, and 1732. Representative Dunn, Chairman of the Committee on Judiciary I, to which

33rd Legislative Day

May 2, 1989

the following Bills were referred, action taken April 28, 1989, reported the same back with the following recommendations. 'Do pass' House Bill 1511, 'Do pass as amended' House Bills 1848 and 2289. 'Do pass Short Debate Calendar' House Bills 123, 195, 353, 672, 1416, 1737, 1738, 1744, 1877, 1881, 2073, 2265, 2276, 2363, 2369, 2547, 2581, 2630, 914, 1398, 1404, 1549, 1777, 2408, 2415, 2416, 2328, 2582. 'Do pass as amended Short Debate' House Bills 910, 1159, and 1754. 'Do pass Consent Calendar' House Bills 75, 813 and 2757. 'Do pass as amended Consent Calendar' House Bills 1660. Interim Study Calendar, House Bill 781, 782, 1055, 1550 and 2089. Representative Homer, Chairman of the Committee on Judiciary II, to which the following Bills were referred, action taken April 28, 1989, the same back with the following recommendations. 'Do pass' House Bills 1882 and 1453. 'Do pass Short Debate Calendar' House Bills 2615, 189, 1251, 2497, 2506, 2446, 2625 and 2626. 'Do pass as amended Short Debate' House Bills 2294, 1884, 2290, and 995. 'Interim Study Calendar', House Bills 331, 607, 826, 2136, 1210, 708, 746, 922, 956, 1114, 1452, 2343, 2699, 772, 2244, 2492, 2493, 2494, 2499, 2503, 2504, and 2505. Representative Kulas, Chairman of the Committee on Energy, Environment and Natural Resources to which the following Bills were referred, action taken April 28, 1989, reported the same back with the following recommendations. 'Do pass' House Bills 1804, 1663, 2020, 2576, 2308, 2544, 2461, 2039, 2435, 1983, 1811, 1557, 1396, 1223, 1157, 1370, 2372, and 2306. 'Do pass as amended' House Bills 2025, 1803, 1599, 2779 and 2709. 'Do pass Short Debate' House Bills 2700, 2746, and 1999. 'Do pass as amended Short Debate' House Bills 2346 and 2463. 'Do pass Consent Calendar' House Bill 2201. Interim Study Calendar, House Bills 2774, 2163, 1138, 311, 2023, 2458, 142, 991, 2457,

## 33rd Legislative Day

May 2, 1989

814, 2026 and 2027. Representative Terzich, Chairman of the Committee on Executive to which the following Bills were referred action taken April 28, 1989, reported the same back with the following recommendations. 'Do pass' House Bills 1098, 1834, 1771, 2511, 2628, 'Do pass as amended' House Bills 890. 'Do pass Short Debate' House Bill 211, 'Do pass as amended Short Debate' House Bill 790, 1256 and 2710, 'Do pass Consent Calendar' House Bills 273, 274, 2124, 2191, 2427, 2428, 2514, 2663 and 2669. 'Interim Study Calendar', House Bills 768, 819, 1583, 1584, 1585 and Representative Satterthwaite, Chairwoman of the 2611. Committee on Higher Education to which the following Bills were referred, action taken April 28, 1989, reported the same back with the following recommendations. 'Do pass Short Debate' House Bill 1403 and 2042, 'Do pass as amended Short Debate' House Bill 921, 1995 and 2803, 'Do pass Consent Calendar' House Bills 879, and 1151, 'Do pass as amended Consent Calendar' House Bill 1189. 'Interim Study Calendar', House Bill 192, 450, 2620 and 2813. Representative Mautino, Chairman of the Committee Insurance to which the following Bills were referred, action taken April 28, 1989, reported the same back with the following recommendations. 'Do pass Short Debate' House Bills 2097, 2217 and 1423. 'Interim Study Calendar', House Bills 617, 982 and 2158. There being no further business, the House now stand adjourned."

REPORT: TIFLDAY 10:54

ADJOURNMENT

PERFUNCTORY SESSION
PERFUNCTORY ADJOURNMENT

# STATE OF ILLINOIS 86TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES DAILY TRANSCRIPTION OF DEBATE INDEX

PAGE 1 04/04/90

MAY 02, 198	,	,
-------------	---	---

HB-0073 MOTION	PAGE	21	
HB-0271 MOTION	PAGE	20	
HB-1407 MOTION	PAGE	21	
HB-2274 MOTION	PAGE	18	
HB-2441 MOTION	PAGE	19	
HB-2517 MOTION	PAGE	20	
HB-2761 MOTION	PAGE	2	
HB-2817 MOTION	PAGE	21	
HR-0324 MOTION	PAGE	19	
SUBJECT MATTER			
HOUSE TO ORDER - REPRESENTATIVE MCPIKE	PAGE	1	
PRAYER - POGEMILLER	PAGE	1	
PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE	PAGE	1	
ROLL CALL FOR ATTENDANCE	PAGE	1	
AD LOUDDING N.T.	DAGE	21	

PAGE PAGE PAGE

21

22 25