131st Legislative Day

June 19, 1990

- Speaker McPike: "The House will come to order. Our chaplain for today is the Reverend James Magnuson of the Presbyterian Church in Assumption, Illinois. Reverend Magnuson is the guest of Representative Noland. The guests in the balcony may wish to rise and join us for the invocation."
- Magnuson: "Let us pray. Eternal God, history and our experience have given us so many evidences of Your guidance to nations and individuals that we should not doubt Your power or willingness to direct us. Give us the faith to believe that when God wants us to do or not to do a particular thing, God finds a way of letting us know it. May we not make it more difficult for You to guide us, but be willing to be led by You. That Your will may be done in us and through us for the good of the state of Illinois and all humankind. Amen."
- Speaker McPike: "We'll be led in the pledge of allegiance 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 McPike: "Roll Call for Attendance. Representative Matijevich."
- Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, there are no excused absences on this side of the aisle."
- Speaker McPike: "Thank you. Representative Piel."
- Piel: "Good afternoon, Mr. Speaker. There are no excused absences on the Republican side."
- Speaker McPike: "Thank you. Take the record, Mr. Clerk. 118

 Members answering the Roll Call. A quorum is present. At

 this time we will read all the Approp. Bills a Second time.

 Representative McCracken...intend to read all the Approp.

131st Legislative Day

June 19, 1990

Bills a Second time they will be held on Second Reading. Tomorrow we'll do Second Reading Amendments on Approp Bills and then call the Approp Bills for a vote on Third Reading tomorrow. Mr. Clerk, would you read all the Approp Bills on Second Reading and hold them on Second Reading?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1489, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Department of Commerce and Community Affairs. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1535, a Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary contingent expenses of the General Assembly. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1536, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the cost of Members to the General Assembly. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1537, a Bill for Act making appropriations to various an legislative support agencies. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1589, a Bill for an Act to make appropriation funds for the Alton Lake Heritage Parkway. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1784, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for education. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1785, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Board of Trustees. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1786, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Southern Illinois University. Second Reading of the Senate Bill 1787, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Board of Regents. Second Reading of Senate Bill 1788, a Bill for an Act making Bill. appropriations to the Board of Governors. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1789, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Illinois Student Assistance Commission. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1791, Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Illinois Community College Board. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1792, a Bill for an Act to amend the Public

131st Legislative Day

June 19, 1990

Community College Act. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1793, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to certain retirement systems. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1794, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the State Universities Civil Service System. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1795, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Abandoned Mine Land Reclamation Council. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1796, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Illinois Asbestos Abatement Authority. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1797, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Commissioner of Banks and Trust Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1798, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Build Illinois Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1799, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Bureau of the Budget. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1800. a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Department of Central Management Services. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1801, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Civil Service Commission. Second Reading of the Senate Bill 1802, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the various agencies. Second Reading of Senate Bill 1803, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Department of Conservation. Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1804, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Court of Claims. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1805, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Department of Employment Security. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1806, a for an Act making appropriations to the Environmental Protection Trust Fund Commission. Second Reading of Bill. Senate Bill 1807, a Bill for an Act making

131st Legislative Day

June 19, 1990

appropriations to the Environmental Protection Agency. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1808, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Illinois Development Authority. Second Reading of the Bill. Bill 1809, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Office of State Fire Marshal. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1810, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Department of Human Rights. Second Reading of the Senate Bill 1811, a Bill Bill. for an Act making appropriations to the Human Rights Commission. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1812, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Industrial Commission. Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1813, a Bill for an Act. making appropriations to the Department of Labor. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1814, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Labor Relations...Local Labor Relations Board. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1815, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Department of Lottery. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1816, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Metropolitan Pier and Exhibition Authority. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1817, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Department of Military Affairs. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1818, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Department of Nuclear Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1819, a Safety. Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Prairie State 200 Authority. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1820, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Office of Public Council. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1821, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the state agencies and certain retirement systems. Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1822, a Bill for an Act

131st Legislative Day

June 19, 1990

making appropriations to the Office of Commissioner of Savings and Loans. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1823, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the State Labor Relations Board. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1824, a Bill for an Act making appropriations the Department of State Police. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1825, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the State Police Merit Board. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1826, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Department of Alcoholism and Substance Abuse. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1827, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Department of Children and Family Services. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1828, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Governor's Purchase Care Second Reading of the Bill. Board. Senate Bill Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Guardianship and Advocacy Commission. Second Reading of the Bill. 1830, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Prisoner Review Board. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1831, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Department of Rehabilitation Services. Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1832, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Department οf Veterans Affairs. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1922, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Attorney Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1926, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Court of Claims. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1929, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Department of Mental Health and Developmental Disabilities. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1933, a Bill for an Act making certain appropriations. Second Reading οf the

131st Legislative Day

June 19, 1990

Bill."

- Speaker McPike: "These Bills will be held on Second Reading.

 Representative McAuliffe."
- McAuliffe: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'd like to take this opportunity to introduce Sheriff Jim O'Grady to you. He's come down here from Chicago to visit with us today. And he invites everybody to his party at Sam's between 5:00 and 7:00 o'clock. All the Members on both sides of the aisle are invited to his party."
- Speaker McPike: "Consent Calendar, Second Reading."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 2067, a Bill for an Act to amend the Municipal Code. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee."
- Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. Alright, there are Amendments filed to this Bill. So, the Chair was in error of the Bill to Third Reading. Senate Bill 2067 will remain on Second Reading. Special Order of Business, Banking, Second Reading, appears Senate Bill 1488. Representative Cullerton. Senate Bill 2083, Representative Environment, Second Reading, Senate Bill 2253. Criminal Law, Second Reading, Senate Bill 1613. Representative Munizzi. Senate Bill 2309, Representative Tony Young. State and Local Government, Second Reading. Senate Bill Representative Steczo. Senate Bill 1750, Representative Brunsvold. Brunsvold. Joel Brunsvold. Senate Bill 2036, Representative Saltsman. Bill 2171, Representative Keane. 2171. Insurance, Readings. Senate Bill 2099, Representative Countryman. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 2099, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Insurance Code. Second Reading of the Bill.

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

131st Legislative Day

June 19, 1990

Speaker McPike: "Any Motions?"

Clerk Leone: "No Motions filed."

Speaker McPike: "Any Floor Amendments?"

- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #4 is being offered by Representatives Shaw - Flowers."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Shaw. Representative Flowers.

 Representative Shaw, is the Gentleman here? We're on
 Amendment #4 for Representative Shaw or Representative
 Flowers. Representative Cullerton, are you a Cosponsor of
 this Amendment? The Gentleman asks leave to present the
 Amendment. The Gentleman has leave. Proceed,
 Representative Cullerton."
- Cullerton: "Yes, this provides that no insurance company may charge a higher auto insurance premium because the applicant does not have uninsured motorists coverage."
- Speaker McPike: "And on the Amendment, Representative Peterson...or Representative Countryman."
- Countryman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am the Sponsor of the Bill. I oppose the Amendment. This brings rate regulation into Illinois insurance. I think it's a bad Amendment and a bad idea at this time. And oppose it and ask you to vote 'no'."
- Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #4 be adopted?' All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'nos' have it. And the Amendment's defeated. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #5 offered by Representative Lang."

 Speaker McPike: "Representative Lang, Amendment #5."
- Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House.

 Amendment #5 is an Amendment we adopted previously on
 another Bill but the Bill failed. This Amendment deals
 with how often insurance companies may increase their
 premiums. As you know now companies are free to set rates

131st Legislative Day

June 19, 1990

at any level they choose and raise rates as often as they like. This Bill does nothing to affect rates in anyway. It merely says, 'that an insurance company must set their rates...their premium rates and change it no more than once every six months. We have...this deals with health insurance only I should add, it does not deal with auto or life or accident, health insurance only. We've debated this before but I would answer any questions you might have."

Speaker McPike: "On the Amendment, Representative Countryman."

Countryman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'm the Sponsor of the Bill this is a hostile Amendment. It was a matter that the Gentleman proposed in Insurance Committee in which I do not serve but I happened to be there the day that he proposed it. It's been defeated in that Committee and should remain there until the Committee sees fit to approve it. And I'd ask you to yote 'no'."

Speaker McPike: "Further discussion? Representative Parke." Parke: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #5, in fact, is going to cost the State of Illinois and the consumers of this state a tremendous amount of money. We're talking tens of thousands of dollars, that the Insurance Department is going to have to do, to provide the additional staff and manpower that going to be required to add together and to bring all this information together and make it on file. So that the people who may want this information can have it accessible We think this...needs to be more debate on this issue. We do not think this is a good idea. And, in fact, it is going to be negative to what we think is good for consumers. This information is available once a year. There's no absolutely no reason that this has to be done at

131st Legislative Day

June 19, 1990

this time."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Regan."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in opposition to this Amendment. Insurance companies very rarely will raise insurance increases other than every six months. happens in one particular area individual health insurance is issued on a class basis. The premiums have to changed on a class basis. They can't raise rates just because you have more clients than the other fellow. it's time for a rate increase it may have been two or three months from the time the person has taken the policy out. And in that case everyone gets their rates raised at same time. It certainly is unfortunate if you might be in the position of purchasing a policy right before this annual rate goes through, but that's the way the business works and this would interfere considerably. I urge its opposition to this Amendment."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Pedersen."

Pedersen: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I also rise to oppose this Amendment. We discussed this thoroughly in committee. I think he tried to do a discharge on it. I got only four votes in committee. We did inquire about why this was needed and he had something happen in his district. But when we kind of queried the committee nobody else had heard anything about this sort of thing. I don't think that they even tried to call the insurance company to get an explanation. So, we just felt that it was a micromanaging again of something that's just better to let the private market take care of it. So, I would vote 'no'. And we would ask for a Roll Call vote."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Lang to close."

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. While it's quite true that the insurance committee did not pass this Bill out. It's also

131st Legislative Day

June 19, 1990

true that the Members of this House on this floor adopted this as an Amendment to another Bill. So, it's not exactly an idea that is foreign. I should remind the Members of the House that this initiative will help your senior citizens and others who are trying to budget their money in an area where we have high taxes that alot of people are complaining about. I think it's appropriate that people know what they're going to have to pay for their insurance. Newspapers, in my area, have come out in favor of this proposal and they've heard from people that live in my area indicating that they think it's a good idea. is not micromanagement, this Bill does not tell insurance companies how much they can charge or limit how much they can charge. It merely says let's tell people, what they're going to pay for their health insurance and let's tell them twice a year and let's give them the opportunity to determine what that will be, so they can plan their lives. It's a very important Amendment. And I would ask for a Roll Call vote."

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

All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all

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

record. On Amendment #5 there are 64 'ayes' and 49 'nos'.

And the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"

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

Speaker McPike: "Representative Lang."

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. Amendment #6 is an Amendment we've seen before. We've adopted it previously on a Bill that failed. And this is what we call the policy simplification Amendment. Simply and basically this Amendment requires every insurance policy written in our state to be written in language that people understand without having to go to a lawyer to interpret it for them,

131st Legislative Day

June 19, 1990

without having to go to their insurance broker to interpret it for them. In the past some of the arguments against this Bill have been, Well, it's an insurance contract it has to be written in legalese so that it says everything suppose to say. That's nonsense, Ladies Gentlemen, any contract can be written so that people understand it and this is no exception. We've been through this before. I don't think we need alot of long debate. But it's important that people understand what they're getting when they buy an insurance policy. It's important that people understand that ... "

- Speaker McPike: "Excuse me, Mr. Lang. Representative Parke, for what reason do you rise?"
- Parke: "An inquiry of the Chair, Mr. Speaker. Is this Amendment out of order? I believe it is. If Amendment 5 was adopted I believe that the title does not reflect the new section added by Amendment #5. And I believe it's out of order."
- Speaker McPike: "Alright, let us check that. Mr. Lang, why don't you proceed while we're checking this."
- Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well, I have very little else to say but let's help out our constituents by having them understand: how to make a claim, what they're buying when they buy an insurance policy. It's critical to your constitutents that they understand what they're buying.

 And I would answer your questions."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Parke, do you want to speak to the Bill (sic Amendment). Go on and speak to the Amendment while we're checking it."
- Parke: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #6 has been debated before on this House floor. But I may simply point out that if, in fact, this Amendment goes on and we now require the insurance companies to make this so basic that a two year old can

131st Legislative Day

June 19, 1990

understand it. Then what we're going to find is that of these claims are going to go to court. And many lawyers are going to be able to have additional revenue because they will be challenging the court of law. Because were not and I repeat not legal enough to explain what they were purchasing. And, in fact, what we're going to have is negative, a reverse effect, on this. What this is going to end up doing is giving lawyers more of an ability to sue insurance companies. Because they're going to say, simply put, that this insurance policy does not explain in a legal manner what the responsibilities of the person purchasing the policy or the responsibilities of the insurance company is. We think this is a bad idea and, in fact, what it's going to do it's going to cost insurance business more money to litigate these kind of programs. And, ultimately we will find a greater expense to the consumer. This is an anti-consumer Amendment. No matter what Sponsor was. I think the Sponsor of this Bill is a lawyer though he tries to tell me he may be a farmer. that he still is a lawyer. And I think that this Amendment should be defeated."

- Speaker McPike: "Representative Parke, the Amendment is germane to the Bill. Representative McCracken."
- McCracken: "Yes, I think the parliamentary point was, and I asked the Chair to rule, the Amendment is out of order. Because it does not account for Amendment #5 which had previously been adopted. Amendment #5 added a new title not referred to in Amendment #6."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative McCracken, you are correct the Amendment is out of order. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #7 offered..."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative...Representative Countryman, for what reason do you rise?"

131st Legislative Day

June 19, 1990

Countryman: "Would you take this out of the record?"

Speaker McPike: "Alright, the Gentleman takes the Bill out of the record. Representative Pedersen, did you wish...State Government Administration, Second Reading. Senate Bill 1504, Representative Capparelli. Senate Bill 2229. Horse Racing, Second Reading. Labor, Second Reading. Senate Bill 1501, Representative Kulas. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1501, a Bill for an Act in relationship to medical and family responsibility leave. Second Reading of the Bill. There are no Committee Amendments."

Speaker McPike: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Mautino."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Mautino, on Amendment #1."

Representative Mautino, on Amendment #1."

Mautino: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #1, I think is a fair Amendment. Since the large corporate entities of this state are at the maximum level as it pertains to unemployment comp. the construction industry is at the maximum level so this Amendment would not effect the majority of employers in this state. What this Amendment does do is to provide income tax credit if, in fact, the unemployment compensation rate rises because of the implementation of Senate Bill 1501, that, I think, is the most important factor for those individuals that have four or five employees in their firm. One was to ...avail themselves of the family leave provisions and another employee were to be hired, then in fact, you would have a situation where the experience factor, if that person were eligible unemployment comp. would raise approximately 20 percent. Therefore, I think this a fair Amendment it does not

131st Legislative Day

June 19, 1990

address the, the situation raised by the Majority Leader as it pertain to the 'You I Agreement' that has been ongoing for seven years. This addresses the question an income tax credit if a company does experience an increase in the unemployment compensation rate because of this legislation. I believe firmly that if we enact legislation in this august body that does cause increases would should provide for offsets of those increases and basically this Amendment would benefit those small employers in the State of Illinois and I move for its adoption. That's exactly what the Amendment does."

Speaker Young: "Anthony Young, in the Chair. The Gentleman from Madison, Representative McPike."

McPike: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Could I have a little order please?"

Speaker Young: "A little order in the Chamber please."

McPike: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. The other day when Gentleman offered this Amendment I asked him to withdraw it. And I did so because the all four caucuses in the General Assembly have an agreement since 1983. Representative Daniels and the Speaker and Senator Rock and Senator Philip, along with the Governor, has...have had an agreement since 1983 and we have enforced this a to the letter in the House and this is the eighth straight year that we have not voted on any U.I. Bill or Amendment on the House Floor unless it was agreed to by labor, and by management, and by the department, and by the Governor. Now, this is a violation of that agreement that we have had for eight years. We started eight years ago \$2.4 billion in debt and we end up today a million dollars in surplus and the reason behind that is because we have worked together both parties with different views labor management with different views have worked together to

131st Legislative Day

June 19, 1990

make sure that we have an Agreed Bill process that works. If we are going to begin to vote U.I. Bills on the House Floor without that then in my opinion the U.I. Agreed Bill process is dead. And I would think that anyone on the House Floor should have the right to offer Amendments supported by labor that are not supported by business. This Amendment is supported by business but it is opposed by organized labor. It is being offered on the House Floor against the Agreed Bill process that has worked for us for eight straight years. I would persist again today, and ask the Gentleman to withdraw the Amendment. Representative Mautino, if you would yield I would ask you to withdraw the Amendment."

Speaker Young: "Representative Mautino."

"Well, I thank you, very much for that offer Majority Leader McPike. But I do believe that this legislation does not address the Agreed Bill process of unemployment compensation which establishes rates and provides for benefit levels. What this Amendment does is address a our economy which does not currently have the highest possible rate. I explained it in my explanation of the Amendment whereby the construction industry currently is at the highest rate, as well as major employers. If in fact, this legislation by it's enactment and the signature by the Governor does increase by 20 percent to a small employer if that employer has five employees, then I think we are responsible, we should be responsible in providing an offset as it pertains to the income tax. I respectfully hope that you understand that I feel strongly about this. I understand your rationale for asking me to withdraw it. But I feel very strongly on this issue for the small business people of this state. I no real...objection to the position taken by the Leadership

131st Legislative Day

June 19, 1990

on unemployment compensation. I have no intention of creating a problem for organized labor, but I am presenting this Amendment for the benefit of those small employers who may affected by what we do. My personal opinion is I support this Amendment, as well I support the Bill as I did last Session and intend to do so here. But I believe this Amendment is critical. It's responsible, and it's the right thing to do and I respectfully hope you, I hope you understand very respectfully that I'm going to move forward...even though you have asked me to withdraw."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative McPike."

McPike: "I would question the germaneness of the Amendment, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Young: "Representative Mautino, the Parliamentarian informs me that the underlying Bill deals with family leave. The Amendment deals with the Illinois Income Tax Act and therefore the Amendment is not germane. Representative Mautino."

Mautino: "Thank you, very much Mr. Speaker. Although, I disagree with the Parliamentarian and yourself on this question, I know full well what my options are. I could move to override the Chair. My personal belief is I probably have enough votes to do that. But, I've served in this General Assembly for 16 years and on one other occasion I was a Member of this august body that overrode the ruling of the Chair. That became a real spaghetti bowl in the process of this Legislative Body and in fact, the Speaker in the Chair at that time, Representative Lechowicz, had to come out later and it was a reconsideration about six Parliamentary procedural rules and the House was in turmoil. The reason I say that is there's a body of legal minds that believe that if you overrule the decision of the Chair then the Majority Party has lost their majority. I will not be a

131st Legislative Day

June 19, 1990

part of that, I think your ruling is absolutely incorrect, politically motivated, special interest design, and I say that is totally unfair, Mr. Speaker, and I think you should read those rules real closely with the Parliamentarian or this House could go up for grabs."

Speaker Young: "Representative McPike in the Chair."

Representative McPike: "Further Amendments?"

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

Speaker McPike: "Representative Didrickson."

Didrickson: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Members of the House. Amendment #2, I think, really deserves some consideration by this Body. It simply provides that family leave may be taken only by full time employees. Ιt increases the existing Bill as it stands right now from the stated 20 hours to 37.5 hours required per week. I think this is reasonable. I think it's legitimate. Last year we dealt with a Bill that Representative Bowman had which would have given part time employees, those who work at McDonald's for example, full benefits. We soundly defeated that initiative. I think we should do the very same thing with family leave with regards to part time employees who may be working at your fast food chains. I think family and medical leave at the fast food chains would be the last benefit or, at least, one of the last benefits that ought to be considered for part time employees. If at all we are going to consider benefits for part time employees. this is an Amendment that would say, Yes, indeed, if you're a full time employee you're going to get family leave. And I'd be glad to answer any questions and urge an vote."

Speaker McPike: "On the Amendment, Representative Kulas."

Kulas: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield to a

131st Legislative Day

June 19, 1990

question?"

Speaker McPike: "Yes."

Kulas: "Representative Didrickson, if your Amendment gets on will you support the underlying legislation?"

Didrickson: "Representative Kulas, I would have to look at the shape of this Bill as we go through the remaining Amendments and then I would be glad to answer your question."

Kulas: "Well, Mr. Speaker, to the Amendment. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is a hostile Amendment that's being put on. It's dilatory. I think, the person presenting the Bill would not support the legislation anyway. It's just trying to water the Bill down, trying to kill the Bill. And I would ask all my colleagues to support me in defeating all these Amendments."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Didrickson to close."

Didrickson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would ask for a Roll Call vote on this. And I would just like to remind this Body again. All we're saying is, that if you're a part time employee working at McDonald's or one of the fast food chains no you're not going to get this entitlement this benefit. But if you are a fulltime worker yes, indeed, you will get family leave. I think it's reasonable. If you look at the State of Massachusetts and what they do, which some would say is probably the most liberal state out of all of 50 states, they require full time workers and, in fact, they only give it to females. But you have to be a full time worker in the State of Massachusets in order to get family leave. This is a good Amendment and I would ask for your 'aye' vote."

Speaker McPike: "Question is, 'Shall Amendment #2 be adopted?'

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

voted? Have all voted who wish? Representative

131st Legislative Day

June 19, 1990

- McCracken."
- McCracken: "For a veri...If it appears to lose I want to verify the negative."
- Speaker McPike: "Alright. Representative Didrickson to explain her vote."
- Didrickson: "No, that's what I was going to do is..."
- Speaker McPike: "Alright. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. Representative Kulas. The Gentleman asks for a poll of those not voting."
- Clerk Leone: "Poll of those not voting. Capparelli. DeLeo.

 Krska. Terzich. No further."
- Speaker McPike: "Capparelli 'no'. DeLeo 'no'. Alright,
 Representative McCracken has now asked a poll of the
 negative, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "Poll of those voting in the negative. Balanoff. Bowman. Breslin. Brunsvold. Bugielski. Capparelli. Cullerton. Curran. Currie. Davis. DeJaegher. DeLeo. Dunn. Farley. Flinn. Flowers. Giglio. Giorgi. Hanniq. Hartke. Hicks. Homer. Lou Jones. Shirley Jones. Keane. Kulas. Lang. Laurino. LeFlore. Levin. Martinez. Matijevich. McGann. McPike. Morrow. Munizzi. Novak. Phelps. Preston. Rice. Richmond. Ronan. Saltsman. Santiago. Satterthwaite. Shaw. Steczo. Stern. Sutker. Trotter. Turner. Van Duyne. White. Williams. Anthony Young. Wyvetter Younge and Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative McCracken."
- McCracken: "Yes, thank you. Representative Van Duyne?"
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Van Duyne. Mr. Van Duyne here?

 Mr. Van Duyne? The Gentleman is not here. Remove him from
 the Roll Call."
- McCracken: "Representative Shaw?"
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Shaw. Representative Shaw. Is

 Mr. Shaw here? The Gentleman is not remove him from the

131st Legislative Day

June 19, 1990

Roll."

McCracken: "Representative Farley?"

McPike: "Representative Farley. Representative Farley. Mr. Farley is not here. Remove him from the Roll Call."

McCracken: "Representative McGann?"

Speaker McPike: "Representative McGann. Mr. McCracken,
Representative Morrow would like to be verified. He's
right here."

McCracken: "Yes."

Speaker McPike: "Mr. McGann here? Mr. McGann is not here.

Remove him from the Roll."

McCracken: "Representative Granberg? Oh wait, no, he's voting 'yes'. Representative Levin?"

Speaker McPike: "He's here."

McCracken: "Representative Leverenz?"

Speaker McPike: "He's voting 'yes'. Is Mr. Leverenz here? He's
 voting 'yes'."

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

Speaker McPike: "Representative Leverenz, they wanted to verify you off of the 'yes' column. Representative Phelps. He's here."

McCracken: "Representative Brunsvold?"

Speaker McPike: "He's here."

McCracken: "Representative Homer?"

Speaker McPike: "Representative Homer. Representative Homer.

Mr. Homer here? He is not. Remove him from the Roll."

McCracken: "Representative Terzich? Oh, he's not voting. I'm sorry. Representative Santiago?"

Speaker McPike: "He's here."

McCracken: "Nothing further."

Speaker McPike: "Alright, Representative Shaw has returned. Put Mr. Shaw on the Roll as a negative vote. Representative Edley, for what reason do you rise? Edley would like to be

131st Legislative Day

June 19, 1990

changed from 'aye' to 'no'. Representative Saltsman."

Saltsman: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. How am I recorded?"

Speaker McPike: "You're recorded as 'no'."

Saltsman: "Yes, the reason is this knocks 37 hours a week knocks out all the white collar workers who have an average of 35 hours. This knocks out huge sums of people and every vote up there should be 'red'."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Saltsman, I think you're out of order. Representative Woolard. Representative Woolard would like to change from 'aye' to 'no'. On Amendment #2 there are 56 'ayes' and 56 'nos'. And the Amendment fails. Further Amendments?"

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

Speaker McPike: "Representative Didrickson."

Didrickson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the chamber. Amendment #3 allows the Director of Labor to exempt certain occupations from the benefits of leave when a critical labor shortage exists. I would just ask you to stop and listen with regards to who we will be offering and granting part time family medical leave to, unless this Amendment is adopted. That means nurses in hospitals which I think most of us here understand there is a critical shortage of We are going to hamstring those facilities, those health care organizations that need nurses. And we're going to give them intermittent leave of family leave. And I would ask you just to think about that. That says the same thing with regards to paramedics, we're going to grant family leave to a fire department that may have only one or two paramedics. And we're going to grant that person family leave or medical leave and put the health and safety of the residents of that community in jeopardy. We're going to say 'yes' to all of our schools across the State

131st Legislative Day

June 19, 1990

of Illinois. And, yes indeed, your schools do come under family medical leave right here. We're going to say to you that not only in addition to all the sick days and the other benefit days that you get. You're going to get family leave. And we're going to give it to those critical shortages with regards to math teachers and teachers. And we're going to affect the learning abilities of the students in the State of Illinois by granting intermittent family leave. Yes, indeed, that's what we're going to do. How 'bout the nuclear power plants across the State of Illinois? Ask yourself, nuclear safety engineers would qualify? We're going to say 'Yes, indeed, you're going to get family leave. Even though there is a critical shortage of such nuclear safety engineers.' All we're asking for is some flexibility with this Amendment. needs to be approval, it says 'yes, indeed, the Department of Labor Director would have to grant this leave. It would have to be validated. It would have to be a critical labor shortage.' I would ask for an 'aye' vote. And I would like a Roll Call vote on this one also."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Kulas."

Kulas: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would presume that nuclear safety engineers don't get sick. I'd presume they don't have any families. They don't have children. They don't have aging parents. This is another hostile Amendment just to kill the Bill. And I would ask all my colleagues to vote against this Amendment."

Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #3 be adopted?' All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'.

Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this Amendment, there are 47 'ayes', 62 'nos'. The Amendment's defeated. Further Amendments?"

131st Legislative Day

June 19, 1990

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

Speaker McPike: "Representative Parcells."

Parcells: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of House. This is an Amendment that you can all embrace. It's good for business and it's good for labor. This says, 'That in the event a permanent employee finds it necessary to take family or medical leave. That the employee on leave will be replaced by a temporary employee that has the same qualifications or licenses that are normally required of the permanent employee.' This is good for business because they will realize that the quality of their work Imagine for instance if a history will not go down. teacher has to take leave you don't want to have somebody off the street coming and teaching history. You want your kids to have a proper teacher in that nurse, a paramedic, they should be replaced by people of the same training or the same qualifications they have. addition, this is excellent for the labor movement because it is stating that those employees who come in there will have the same caliber education, that the job will never be downgraded. So, when that first employee comes back job is at the same status it was when he left. I think it's an excellent Amendment. It's good for business. good for labor. It would add considerably to this Bill. And I'd ask for your 'aye' vote. I'd like a Roll Call please."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Ropp."

Ropp: "Mr. Speaker, I would just like to interrupt and just to introduce, in front of you, the gals from the Future Homemakers of America. They're all here today, about 70 of them in the gallery, these are the State Officers. There're 8600 of these charming young ladies and gentlemen

131st Legislative Day

June 19, 1990

throughout the state. And they are the ones that are responsible for your daisies today. So, I would welcome it if you would give them a kind warm House appreciation. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Kulas."

Kulas: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would probably embrace this Amendment ,too, if the Sponsor of this Amendment would embrace the Bill. Which she obviously won't. It's another hostile Amendment. It's just trying to kill the Bill. There are safeguards built into the Bill. So I would ask for the defeat of this Amendment."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Parcells."

Parcells: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And in closing I'd like to say the Sponsor is making an assumption that I'm sure he can't back up. I would like to see this Bill when it's done. I think there have been some Amendments here that would have made this an almost unanimous vote here if they had been adopted. I repeat this Amendment would be good for both the business community and the labor movement. I think you can't afford to vote 'no' on this Amendment. It's excellent. It makes it a better Bill. And I ask for your 'aye' vote."

Speaker McPike: "Question is, 'Shall Amendment #4 be adopted?'

All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all

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

record. On this Bill, there are 48 'ayes' and 61 'nos'.

And the Amendment's defeated. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #5 offered by Representative Didrickson."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Didrickson."

Didrickson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the chamber.

Amendment #5 does absolutely nothing to Family Leave and

131st Legislative Day

June 19, 1990

Medical Bill. Absolutely nothing. All it says is that, 'First employees must use all sick, personal and vacation time before applying for family leave.' If you thought the first Amendment was a very reasonable Amendment that I offered which was really Amendment #2 requiring full time employees versus part time employees to receive this benefit. Let me ask you this, are you willing now to go on and say, yes, we'll give a part time employee family medical leave but first they must use up all sick days, all personal days and all vacation time before they can apply for family leave. And, Representative Kulas, I'm even willing to support this Bill if you'll help us put this Amendment on."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Kirkland."

Kirkland: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker McPike: "Yes."

Kirkland: "Does the Amendment apply to just part time employees or all full time?"

Didrickson: "The whole Bill applies to just...including part time employees. We're not doing anything with that. We're just simply now saying what you have to do is that you have to first use sick days, personal days and vacation days."

Kirkland: "Rather you're full time or part time. Thank you." Speaker McPike: "Representative Kulas."

Kulas: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The provisions in this Amendment are already included in the Bill. So this Amendment isn't needed. And again, I would ask everybody to vote 'no' against this Amendment."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Didrickson."

Didrickson: "Just in closing, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to have a Roll Call vote on this. And I would also like to know where these provisions are already in this Bill. Our staff

131st Legislative Day

- June 19, 1990
- and myself have gone over this with a fine tooth comb. We can't find where they are included. And I would suggest that the real vote on this one is an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker McPike: "Question is, 'Shall Amendment #5 be adopted?'

 All in favor vote 'aye', oppose vote 'no'. Representative

 McCracken."
- McCracken: "Yes, I'd like to verify the negative, if appropriate."
- Speaker McPike: "Alright. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this Amendment, there are 54 'ayes' and 55 'nos'. Representative McCracken has asked for a Poll of the Negative. Representative Kulas would like a...Representative Kulas has asked for a poll of those not voting. Proceed with those not voting first, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "Poll of those not voting. Ackerman. Black.

 Capparelli. Goforth. Harris. Krska. Martinez. Morrow.

 Terzich. No further."
- Speaker McPike: "Alright, proceed with the Poll of the Affirmative. I'm sorry. Proceed with the Poll of the Negative, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "Poll of those voting in the negative. Balanoff. Bowman. Breslin. Brunsvold. Bugielski. Cullerton. Curran. Currie. Davis. DeJaegher. DeLeo. Farley. Flinn. Flowers. Giglio. Giorgi. Granberg. Hannig. Hartke. Homer. Lou Jones. Shirley Jones. Keane. Kulas. Laurino. LeFlore. Lang. Levin. Matijevich. McGann. McNamara. McPike. Mulcahey. Munizzi. Phelps. Preston. Richmond. Rice. Ronan. Saltsman. Santiago. Satterthwaite. Shaw. Steczo. Sutker. Trotter. Turner. Van Duyne. Williams. Wolf. Woolard. White. Young. Wyvetter Younge and Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Harris votes 'aye'.

131st Legislative Day

June 19, 1990

Representative Ackerman 'aye'. Alright, Representative McCracken."

McCracken: "Are you going to let me verify still?"

Speaker McPike: "...Representative...I'm sorry. Representative

Capparelli 'no'. Capparelli 'no' and Martinez 'no'.

Alright, now you can proceed with the verification, Mr.

McCracken."

McCracken: "Thank you. Representative Farley? Is he there? Oh alright, I see him. Representative Keane?"

Speaker McPike: "Representative Keane. Mr. Keane. Mr. Keane.

Representative Keane here? No, he's not...Representative

Keane? He's not here. Remove him from the Roll."

McCracken: "Representative McGann?"

Speaker McPike: "Representative McGann. Representative McGann.

Is the Gentleman here? He is not. Remove him from the Roll."

McCracken: "Representative McNamara?"

Speaker McPike: "He's here. Representative Keane has returned.

Please vote Representative Keane 'no'."

McCracken: "Representative Homer?"

Speaker McPike: "Representative Homer. Mr. Homer here?

Representative Homer is not here. Remove him from the Bill

(sic - Roll)."

McCracken: "Representative Van Duyne?"

Speaker McPike: "Representative Van Duyne. Representative Van Duyne. Mr. Van Duyne here? He is not. Remove him from the Roll."

McCracken: "Representative Laurino?"

Speaker McPike: "Representative Laurino. Here he is."

McCracken: "Okay, thank you. Representative Steczo?"

Speaker McPike: "He's here."

McCracken: "Representative Lou Jones?"

Speaker McPike: "She's here."

131st Legislative Day

June 19, 1990

McCracken: "Representative Williams?"

Speaker McPike: "Representative Williams. Paul Williams.

Representative Williams here? I see somebody pointing but I don't see...Representative Williams. The Gentleman is not here. Remove him from the Roll."

McCracken: "Representative Morrow?"

Speaker McPike: "Representative Morrow. Charles Morrow. Is he here? Oh, he's not voting."

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

Speaker McPike: "He's here."

McCracken: "Representative DeLeo?"

Speaker McPike: "Representative DeLeo. Representative DeLeo.

Where is he? Representative DeLeo. The Gentleman is not here. Remove him from the Roll."

McCracken: "Representative Phelps?"

Speaker McPike: "Representative Bowman is right here. He'd like leave to be verified. Phelps is here."

McCracken: "Representative Trotter?"

Speaker McPike: "He's here."

McCracken: "Nothing further."

Speaker McPike: "Alright, Representative Stern. Grace Mary Stern would like to be changed from 'aye' to 'no'. Is anyone else seeking to change their vote? Alright, if not Representative Kulas has asked for a verification of the affirmative. Yes."

McCracken: "I've only done this once before in my time down here.

May I be verified?"

Speaker McPike: "Absolutely. Alright proceed, Mr. Clerk, with the verification of the affirmative."

Clerk Leone: "Poll of the Affirmative. Ackerman. Barger.

Barnes. Churchill. Countryman. Cowlishaw. Daniels.

Deuchler. Didrickson. Doederlein. Dunn. Edley. Ewing.

Virginia Frederick. Hallock. Harris. Hasara. Hensel.

131st Legislative Day

June 19, 1990

Hicks. Hoffman. Hultgren. Johnson. Kirkland. Klemm. Kubik. Leitch. Leverenz. Mautino. McAuliffe. McCracken. Noland. Novak. Bob Olson. Myron Olson. Parcells. Parke. Bernard Pedersen."

Speaker McPike: "Just a minute, Mr. Clerk. Representative Hicks would ask to be changed from 'aye' to 'no'. And Representative DeLeo has returned so vote him as 'no'. On this Amendment, there are...Representative Black."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. How am I recorded?"

Speaker McPike: "You're not recorded."

Black: "That must be some oversight on my part. Vote me 'aye',
 please."

Speaker McPike: "Absolutely, Representative Black votes 'aye'.

On this Amendment, there are 55 'ayes' and 55 'nos'. And
the Amendment's defeated. Further Amendments?"

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

Speaker McPike: "Representative Wojcik."

Wojcik: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Amendment #6 to Senate Bill 1501 is what I term the essential services Amendment. This Amendment would remove from the provisions of the Act: police departments, fire departments, ambulance services, hospitals and long term care facilities. addition, it would allow the Directors of Corrections. Mental Health and Developmental Disabilities and Health to exempt their Departments from the provisions of the Act. As many of you are aware, there is not a hospital, nursing home, department or fire police department that does not have difficulties in meeting need for trained qualified professionals. Indeed this Assembly has, on more than one occasion, looked at nursing profession to see how we can rectify this critical labor shortage. At this time the public well-being would

131st Legislative Day

June 19, 1990

not be served by mandating this program on these professions. In the case of ambulance services it is clear that we would not be serving the public interest by allowing the use of this benefit to deny life saving services. An individual who calls 911 should know that someone will be there to take the call, deliver help and treat the emergency. With this in mind, I move for the adoption of Amendment #6 to Senate Bill 1501 and ask for a Roll Call vote."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Currie."

Currie: "Will the Sponsor yield for a question, please?"

Speaker McPike: "Yes, she will."

Currie: "Representative, is it your understanding that the police stations, the fire stations, the long term care facilities and these specific state agencies provide no sick leave time to their employees, provide no vacation time to their employees, provide no personal days for their employees?"

Wojcik: "They do, Representative, but this is an additional time.

This is more this would be a hinderance to the people who are there."

Currie: "Mr. Speaker, to the Amendment...to the Amendment, Mr. Speaker. This strikes me as absolutely silly, all of agencies οf which she speaks do provide adequate opportunities for employee time off. To extend give employees the opportunity to stay home to with the new baby, to care for an elderly or relative is no expansion at all. In terms of the problems that these agencies are designed to meet. The effort is clearly to kill the Bill rather than in any way, shape or form to improve it. If we care about making sure that employees, wherever they're employed, have the opportunity to take a little time off, unpaid time off, for these purposes. We should surely vote 'no' and when you note

131st Legislative Day

June 19, 1990

that all these agencies do provide paid time off now to their employees. The argument that the Representative makes falls on its face. I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Wojcik to close."

Wojcik: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I think the Lady's comment was correct. They do have adequate time off. So, therefore, this would not be a valid issue regarding these areas that I have spoken to. I don't know about you but I have visited many hospitals, many nursing homes and they're short of staff right now. Family leave is not the answer. I'm sure that there could be another avenue to go down but I think this Amendment is a good Amendment. And I ask for its favorable passage."

Speaker McPike: "Question is, 'Shall Amendment #6 be adopted?'

All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this Amendment, there are 48 'ayes' and 60 'nos'. And the Amendment...Representative Jones, Shirley Jones votes 'no'. And there are 48 'ayes', 61 'nos'. And the Amendment is defeated. Further Amendments?"

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

Speaker McPike: "Representative Didrickson."

Didrickson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I know alot of you out here are just dying to be voting 'aye' on alot of these Amendments. And I know that for whatever reason you're not...I'm going to give you another opportunity to look at a real legitimate Amendment with regards to the Family Medical Leave Act. It is not a killer Amendment. It is not designed to kill this Act. It's simply designed in those certain situations that we create some flexibility. For example, for all of you who are going to vote for this Bill and go back to your small

131st Legislative Day

June 19, 1990

businesses. You think you're covering them because it says 50 employees or more. Well, stop to think about the little string of card shops that maybe that small business owner owns. This Amendment says that there can't be any cumulative effects, that it has to be 50 employees per facility. Because what you're saying if you don't adopt this Amendment is, if you have fewer than 50 employees but they're strung out amongst maybe 10 or 12 card shops. You're going to reduce the flexibility of that employer with regards to not only full time employees but part time employees. This is a good Amendment. It eliminates the cumulative effect. And an 'aye' vote is a good vote."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Kulas."

Kulas: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. You know, we've worked on this Bill for so many years already and we've built in all kinds of safeguards and everything else. Now when we're coming to final passage, because everybody sees that we've got to do something in this area, they're trying to water it down a little bit more. This really doesn't help any small businessman because I don't know very many card shops who employee 50 people or more. So, I would ask all of my colleagues to oppose this Amendment."

Speaker McPike: "Question is, 'Shall Amendment #7 be adopted?' All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the On this Amendment, there are record. 52 'ayes' 'nos'. And the Amendment is defeated. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #8 offered by Representative Pullen."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Pullen."

Pullen: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I hope that particularly those of you who have

131st Legislative Day

June 19, 1990

enterprise zones in your district will pay attention to this Amendment and hopefully will support it. Regardless of what you think of the merits of the underlying purpose of the Bill. It is certainly the case that it is going be a burden to one degree or another on the employers of the state. This particular Amendment would remove from its application those businesses that are doing business in The reason for this is that when we enterprise zone. passed the enterprise zone legislation several years ago. The purpose for that is to make certain areas of the state that are economically blighted to make those attractive to businesses to either locate or expand in those areas and bring with them the benefit to the people in those areas of jobs. One of the means of doing that, of making those areas more attractive is to relieve certain regulations that government puts on business from the businesses focus their activity, their job creations in enterprise Because government regulations of business does create a burden and so as an incentive for businesses to locate in enterprise zones. We designed differences in the law affecting businesses as their enterprise activities would apply. So this Amendment carries through that very good intention of a law, that was backed virtually unanimously several years ago in the House, the Enterprise Zones Act. So that businesses that are employing people in an enterprise zone would not be subject to the burdens under this Act for those facilities that are actually operating in the enterprise zone. I urge its adoption."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker McPike: "Yes."

Cullerton: "Representative Pullen, are you familiar with the federal statute that's similar to this statute that's

131st Legislative Day

- June 19, 1990
- working its way through Congress with regard to this provision? Do you know whether or not the Federal Law exempts enterprise zones or not?"
- Pullen: "Well, there is no Federal Law because it is not enacted,
 Sir. But the Bill pending in Congress does not exempt
 enterprise zones yet..."
- Cullerton: "That's what I...that's what I meant."
- Pullen: "However Congress has never passed federal enterprise zone legislation so, that's not really relevant."
- Cullerton: "Well, I mean the federal law could refer to enterprise zones and say that it should not apply to them if they wanted to."
- Pullen: "I think that would be rather unusual since the Congress doesn't recognize enterprise zones. But this legislation...Illinois laws do."
- Cullerton: "Well, they don't create there own here. Well, let me give you this opportunity to comment on the...The reason why I really asked the question is I heard Congressman Hyde on a talk show over the weekend. And among other topics he talked about his support for the Family Leave Bill and he thought it was consistent with his position on...anti-abortion position that he's taken. So I was just curious if you'd like to explain why you and Congressman Hyde would disagree on this particular issue."
- Pullen: "Well, Sir, since I haven't discussed that with Congressman Hyde. I do not know why he disagrees with my position on this Bill. But my position on this Bill doesn't relate to this Amendment anyway."
- Cullerton: "Well, I'll tell you what I'll do. I'll save that question for the next Amendment and I'll ask that author of that Amendment what his position is with regard to Congressman Hyde. Thank you."
- Speaker McPike: "Alright, the question is, 'Shall this Amendment

131st Legislative Day

June 19, 1990

be adopted?' All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. Representative Kulas votes 'no'. On this Amendment there are 45 'ayes' and 63 'nos'. And the Amendment's defeated. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #9 offered by Representative Hallock."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Hallock."

Hallock: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members οf the House. Amendment #9, I believe, tries to state the Republican policy that we do in fact believe in the family leave Are difference with the other side of the aisle is how do we go about it to achieve that. So, Amendment #9 tries to insert into the Bill some language which in makes it a voluntary program. We take in essence the bulk of their concepts and say these in fact will be voluntary. We also allow employers to opt out in those cases where they choose to do that. But the real big point in this measure is that we do in fact offer tax credits and incentives to participation for employers. I think all of us on this side of the aisle strongly believe that it's an imperative that we in this General Assembly try to some sort of Family Leave Bill. But the way to do that is through tax credits and tax incentives not by another state mandate. We have heard over the years that Illinois has not been competitive in terms of business and jobs. If we want to stay competitive but yet offer things like this should do it through tax incentives and tax credits not state mandates. So what this Bill does simply is state that we do believe in the policy. We do believe in the concepts herein and we think we should be in fact become law of Illinois but should be done through employer incentives, not mandates. That's what the Amendment does.

131st Legislative Day

June 19, 1990

And I would ask for your support."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Yes, first of all I'd like to question the germaneness of the Amendment."

Speaker McPike: "Alright, let the Chair check on the germaneness.

And...Yes?"

Cullerton: "Can I ask the Sponsor a question while that's being researched?"

Speaker McPike: "Representative Hallock would you yield?"

Hallock: "Sure."

Cullerton: "Now, I have two questions about the Bill. The first part of your Bill makes the whole concept of family leave voluntary. Is that right?"

Hallock: "Right. Yes."

Cullerton: "Well, it's voluntary now. Isn't it? So, why do we have to pass a Bill saying that it's voluntary when it's already voluntary. Or maybe that's what they do in Congress."

Hallock: "Well, I'm trying to follow what they do in Congress, trying to learn the ropes. But, I think, what we're trying to do here is assure any employer now through the negotiating process can set down with his employees and, of course, take this leave."

Cullerton: "I see. So we have...They can refer to this state law and say, 'Well, you know, there's this state law that says we can sit down and voluntarily negotiate family leave. So that will be real helpful. What about the..."

Hallock: "No, what's really important is that by setting in works, in the state statutes, some guidelines an employer could utilize to make voluntary leave. I think does make that provision very important."

Cullerton: "What about the tax credit? Explain the tax credit to me. That's not voluntary I take it. I guess they could

131st Legislative Day

- June 19, 1990
- volunteer not to take the tax credit, right? Is the tax
 credit voluntary or what?"
- Hallock: "No, if an employer chooses to participate then he can partake...he or she...can partake of the tax credit provision. It seems incredibly logical to me that if we, in fact, do really want to bring this policy about. That we ought to offer employers incentives and tax credits this would do that. And I think that employers would, in fact, participate. If you really want to bring this policy about tax incentives would ensure that. If you're talking about just more burdens on business, more burdens on our job base in Illinois. The Bill without this Amendment in fact does that."
- Cullerton: "I asked you specifically how the tax credit works and how much would it cost? Is it a state tax credit? It has to be, right, a state tax credit? Unless you're trying to do a federal tax credit before you get to Congress."
- Hallock: "Yes. No. This is a state tax credit."
- Cullerton: "How much will it cost? I don't want to file a fiscal note if it gets on."
- Hallock: "Well, I think it really depends on how much participation there could be. You know, my point will be it is entirely dependent on how many employers would come into the program. And I would think that with a program such as this. You'd probably find that most Illinois employers would want to participate on behalf of themselves and their employees."
- Cullerton: "And are you familiar with Congressman Hyde's position on the Federal Family Leave Law?"
- Hallock: "Well, I didn't see him on tv over the weekend like you did. But I have read his articles."
- Cullerton: "Yeah, he's in favor of it. You're opposed to it, apparently."

131st Legislative Day

June 19, 1990

Hallock: "Well, like all good Republicans we're a wide open party. We have alot of different points of view. And I respect his position but we differ somewhat."

Cullerton: "Okay, thank you."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Cullerton, to your original question, the Amendment is not germane."

Hallock: "Mr. Speaker."

Speaker McPike: "Yes, Representative Hallock."

Hallock: "Well, we've debated family leave for the last 45 minutes. This Amendment, it seems to me to be very appropriate for the rest..."

Speaker McPike: "The Amendment was identical in every respect to Amendment #1 except for the voluntary portion. The Chair found Amendment #1 is nongermane and we find Amendment #9 nongermane."

Hallock: "Well, it just looks to me you don't want to debate this
 issue this is the way to pass this Bill. But I respect the
 Chair's position."

Speaker McPike: "Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "There are no further Amendments."

Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1638. Out of the record. Civil Law, Second Reading. Senate Bill 2267, Representative Cullerton. John Cullerton. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 2267, a Bill for an Act in relationship to Criminal Law. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1..."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Cullerton."

Cullerton: "I understand that there's an Amendment that's not printed."

Speaker McPike: "Is that correct, Mr. Clerk?"

Cullerton: "Amendment #2 is sponsored by Representative Johnson.

It is a combination of Representative Johnson. And I'll

131st Legislative Day

June 19, 1990

take it out of the Bill since it's not printed and he's not here."

Speaker McPike: "Is Amendment #2 printed?"

Unknown: "It's not printed and he's not here."

"Alright, out of the record. Speaker McPike: Revenue, Second Reading. Representative Currie, Senate Bill 2210. Alright the Chair has gone through all Second Readings on Special Order of Business. We will now proceed to Third Readings...Bill 934. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1125. Representative Piel. Out of the record. Education, Third Reading. Bil1 Senate 1512. Senate Bill 1523. Representative Turner. Mr. Turner? Senate Bill 1591. Representative Levin. Mr. Levin. Is there anyone that would like to call a Bill on Second or Third Reading? Environment, Third Reading. Alright, Representative Balanoff is willing to call a Bill. Senate Bill 1508. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1508, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Vehicle Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Balanoff: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 1508, known as the 'shake, rattle and roar' Bill, would prohibit operation of a motor vehicle with a sound system that is capable of being heard from 75 feet or A driver convicted of violating the prohibition would be guilty of a petty offense with a maximum fine The only exception to the law would be the use of \$50. such systems to seek assistance, warn of a hazard by emergency vehicle or vehicle engaged in advertising. The Bill is crafted to ban ear drum shattering, building vibrating noise from what has become known as 'boom box cars' some costing over \$25000 to equip, some can currently be heard as far away as several blocks. The sound is more than that of a jet taking off. The sirens of an emergency

131st Legislative Day

June 19, 1990

vehicle come in at 120 decibels. A mere whisper when compared to the sound of a 'boom car'. This Bill is to promote safety. As a 'boom car' can easily drown out the sound of an approaching emergency vehicle and there have been accidents involving ambulances and 'boom Further, it is quite disturbing to be at home at night trying to get some sleep only to be awakened by some clown in a 'boom car' driving past. Doctors have warned us that even brief exposures to noises of 115 decibels can cause hearing loss. Some of these cars are capable of outputs of 140 to 150 decibels. And, interestingly, just a couple of days ago a young woman from Mary Flowers' district was telling me that often they put certain songs on these and cruise up and down neighborhoods. And that's how you know when the drug dealer is coming through. So, this Bill would...I think is very important. And I ask for a favorable vote and be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Breslin in the Chair. The Gentleman has moved the passage of Senate Bill 1508. On that question, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Breslin: "Yes, he will."

Leverenz: "Would this also cover 'boom box' aircraft around O'Hara Airport?"

Balanoff: "Coming from the home of the...Airport. We'd certainly
hope so but, unfortunately, it would not."

Leverenz: "Well, if you're thinking of another airport down there. You might want to take this Bill back to Second and just take in all vehicles that have wheels."

Balanoff: "We're confident that the airport won't come to the southeast side. So, the people that live around O'Hara should introduce this Bill for airplanes."

131st Legislative Day

June 19, 1990

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Coles, Representative Weaver."

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

Speaker Breslin: "He will."

Weaver: "Representative, while I don't disagree with the intent of the Bill. I guess I have a question about how this offense is going to be measured. Will this be in the judgement of the police officer that it can be perceived from 75 feet or that it's too loud at 75 feet? Or, exactly how is this to be enforced?"

Balanoff: "Well, I imagine what they would do if it could be heard. If a stereo could be heard a block away then they would be in violation and that would be certainly at the discretion of the police officer."

Weaver: "If it can be heard at all?"

Balanoff: "Yes."

Weaver: "I guess that would bring up another point that I'm not really sure about. Would this then require us to give periodic hearing tests to police officers? I'm serious.

This will be a defense in court, you can guarantee it."

Balanoff: "Well, I don't know. I mean, I certainly don't think so. I don't know."

Weaver: "Obviously, a police officer who is hearing impaired to a certain degree is not going to be able to enforce the law.

The same way another police officer who is not hearing impaired. This will...is this not a mandate on local police departments to require that they give their officers periodic hearing tests?"

Balanoff: "No, it's not a mandate in that respect."

Weaver: "Will it not be a mitigating defense in court then that the officer can not hear?"

Balanoff: "I'm not an attorney. I can't tell you if that would

131st Legislative Day

June 19, 1990

be...I think that would be up to the courts to make that decision."

Weaver: "Okay. Well, thank you very much."

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

Barger: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Is this thing working, Peg?"
Speaker Breslin: "Yes, it is."

Barger: "Okay, thank you. This Bill is one of four pages of bills that the Sponsor has put into the General Assembly during this Session. And this one is one that has perhaps no value or virtue at all. Automobile...Police Officers throughout the State of Illinois, right now test for auto emission sounds, various sounds that come from automobiles. They use a decibelometer...or something like that, to check the volume of the noises. There are laws now to protect against people making excessive noises, whether from the radio in their car or in their house, because if the noise coming out of the house is too much, it is being checked, and there is no reason for this Bill. It is duplicative. And it just makes mischief. And it will do absolutely nothing that isn't presently being done. And I think the Bill should be voted down because all it does is complicate the statutes."

Breslin: "There being no further discussion, Representative

Balanoff is recognized to close."

Balanoff: "Yes. Just...I'd ask for a favorable vote on Senate
Bill 1508. This is not to prohibit just ordinary car
stereos. What we are talking about here are stereos that
cost over \$20,000 often, and are capable of heard of
being...being heard blocks and blocks away."

Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1508 pass?'

All those in favor vote 'aye'. All those opposed vote
'no'. Voting is open. Representative Davis is recognized

131st Legislative Day

June 19, 1990

one minute to explain your vote."

Davis: "Well, I rise in support of the Gentleman's Motion. Some people who maybe don't live in city areas are not aware that on a very wonderful night where your windows are open and senior citizens are just falling asleep, they're awakened with booming boom box music. And I think it is an excellent piece of legislation."

Speaker Breslin: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 97 voting 'aye', 12 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill Representative Brunsvold. Clerk, read the Bill. Out of the record. Senate Bill 2110, Representative Hicks. of the record. The next Order of Business on Third Reading is Criminal Law. Criminal Law, Third Reading. Sponsors are Hensel and Trotter. Gentlemen, please be prepared to present your Bills. The first Bill is Senate Bill 15..excuse me, Representative Cullerton, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

Cullerton: "Well, I was going to give Representative McCracken's speech before he had an opportunity to give it since these are Republican sponsored. You know the speech he gives about Postponed Consideration, and we've got all our deadlines, and we got to do something and why aren't we doing this..."

Speaker Breslin: "Go right ahead. Your doing very well."

Cullerton: "Mr. Speaker, Madam Speaker, why are we doing this...this is on Postponed Consideration we've already killed it.."

Speaker Breslin: "It is on the Calendar."

Cullerton: "It is on the Calendar, is that the answer?"

Speaker Breslin: "It's the answer."

131st Legislative Day

June 19, 1990

Cullerton: "If it is fair for the Democrats, it's fair for the Republicans?"

Speaker Breslin: "Absolutely."

Cullerton: "Alright."

- Speaker Breslin: "The Goose and the Gander. Representative Hensel on Senate Bill 1515. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1515, a Bill for an Act relating to crime statistics reports. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Hensel."
- Hensel: "Madam Speaker, because of Representative Cullerton's comments, I'm waiting for an Amendment, so, I'm going to ask it to be taken out of the record until an Amendment is made, so it will be favorable, so Mr. Cullerton can vote for it. Thank you."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved the passage of Senate
 Bill...I see...out of the record. Senate Bill 2066,
 Representative Trotter. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 2066, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Vehicle Code. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Trotter."
- Trotter: "Yes, Madam Speaker, I would like leave to take the Bill back to Second Reading for purposes of Amendment."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman ask leave to return this Bill to the Order of Second for the purposes of an Amendment.

 Does he have leave? Hearing no objection, leave is granted. Are there any Amendments filed, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Trotter."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Trotter."
- Trotter: "Yes. Amendment 1...#1...is the Amendment that we discussed in committee and it basically does nothing more than just some clarifying language."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved the adoption of

131st Legislative Day

June 19, 1990

Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 2066. On that question the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Yes. Could you tell me what the Bill does with regard to the DUI offenses, and then tell me what the Amendment does? The way I read the Bill...requires a person who is convicted of the offense of DUI, who is under 21 to participate in a youthful intoxicated driver's visitation program, involving a visit to three facilities with a counselor, and the offender has to bear all costs associated with the program. Now, what the Amendment does is to expand the provisions of the Bill to apply to cases where a person is given supervision?"

Trotter: "That is correct and also..."

Cullerton: "Is that what it does?"

Trotter: "Yes. And also those persons on probation. They in fact..."

Cullerton: "I'm sorry?"

Trotter: "Those that were given supervision and probation versus those that were convicted. If they were convicted, then it is my understanding that they would have to serve time and then come out. But if they were given probation..."

Cullerton: "Let me ask you this. Supervision is what is given to first offenders...who have a hard suspension of thirty days, up possibly as much as three months or six months of hard suspension...are you going to...are you going to...is it your intent then to have this expanded to just every case? Even first offenders under the age of 21?"

Trotter: "I'm sorry. I didn't hear you. I can't hear you."

Cullerton: "I can't hear your answer."

Trotter: "And I couldn't hear your question."

Cullerton: "Okay. The question is...the way the Bill is drafted, it applies to people who are convicted of the offense of DUI. To be convicted of DUI for the most part normally it

131st Legislative Day

June 19, 1990

involves a second offense. First offense normally results in supervision, in Cook County anyway. Downstate maybe there is a conviction the first time, but because of the law we have, there is an opportunity for supervision. But you also have what's called a hard suspension; you lose your license for three months or six months depending upon whether or not you took the test. Now, I'm just trying to understand the purpose of your Amendment is to expand this, it appears...this program to virtually every first offense for people under 21. By adding supervision you are talking about making it apply to every person...every...even first offense. And I just want to know if that is indeed what you want to do?"

Trotter: "I had no problems with that. When we discussed it in committee, it was Chairman Homer who recommended this language. Possibly I can get Chairman Homer to address it."

Cullerton: "Okay. Well, just let me look and see how it would apply in Cook County. The offender shall bear the costs associated with the program, unless the court waives the cost, because a person is indigent. Now in Cook County we've got a lot of indigents who happen to be out driving and get arrested for the first time for drunk driving. Would this cost then be borne by the county government?"

Trotter: "No. It would not."

Cullerton: "They're indigent?"

Trotter: "No."

Cullerton: "Well, it says the court can waive the cost, if they are indigent."

Trotter: "If they are indigent."

Cullerton: "So, and if it is mandatory, I assume that if they are indigent, they have to be...they have to be paid for by the county."

131st Legislative Day

June 19, 1990

Trotter: "Or the state."

Cullerton: "Now, or the state. What does the Bill say? Does the Bill say the state or the county?"

Trotter: "I believe it says the county. It does cost the county."

Cullerton: "Do have any idea how much? Now apparently, what it involves is a visit to one of three facilities with a counselor. Do you have any idea how much the cost would be? In other words do you have spend an hour, or does it specify how much time you have to spend at these facilities? I assume you have to have the counselor be paid for this. So, do you have any idea how much it would cost?"

Trotter: "No. I do not."

Cullerton: "Okay. See, I'm only asking these questions because the people up in Cook County are sometimes very cautious about passing legislation that involves increasing their cost. If the state pays for it, they don't care as much. And this by expanding the Bill as is applies to, you know, a limited...a more limited number of people, at least in Cook County, because as I said most people get supervision the first time and it is the second time when they get arrested for DUI that they get convicted. So, the Amendment greatly expands the applicability and possibly the costs to the county. That's the only reason why I asked the questions. Thank you."

Speaker Breslin: "Is there any further discussion? Any further discussion? There being none, Representative Trotter to close."

Trotter: "Thank you very much. There seems to be problems with the Amendment. If Representative Cullerton, if there are others here that duly believe that there is a problem, then I am willing to withdraw the Amendment."

131st Legislative Day

June 19, 1990

Speaker Breslin: "Okay. Representative Trotter withdraws the Amendment. Are there any further Amendments, Mr. Clerk?" Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. Now, the Bill has not been amended...here, Representative Trotter, so you may move the Bill on Third right now, if you wish. Okay. Read the Bill on Third again, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 2066, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Vehicle Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Trotter."

Trotter: "Thank you very much, Madam Chairman. Senate Bill addresses the problem, the number one problem of our youth here in America, and that is alcoholism. It is said that over five million of our adolescents are identified as problem drinkers. Alcohol is a factor in nearly all fatal accidents including 20%...42% of all deaths from motor vehicles. What this Bill does or asks is that we set up a program of those persons who have been convicted of a DUI who are under 21 years of age to be part of a Youthful Intoxicated Drivers Program. And that program consists of three particulars. One, a visit to a rehabilitation facility that cares for victims of motor vehicle accidents. Two, consists of a supervised visitation to a facility that cares for alcoholics in terminal stages of that disease. And three, that they have supervised...visitation to a coroner's office or to a morgue to observe the...to observe victims of accidents involving persons under the influence. I ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved the passage of Senate
Bill 2066. This Bill has not been amended. On that
question the Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative
Black."

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

131st Legislative Day

June 19, 1990

Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Breslin: "He will."

Black: "Representative, in the absence of the Amendment, let me see if I understand this correctly, now. Is this permissive legislation? Or is it mandatory legislation?"

Trotter: "It is permissive."

Trotter: "That's correct."

Black: "But if...if the defendant wants to have probation for the offense, then I read your Bill as saying, if you want probation, you will participate in this program. Is that correct?"

Trotter: "That is not how I interpret it."

Black: "That is not how you interpret that? In the absence of the Amendment, you...you say that the probation authorities will administer the Act, is that correct?"

Trotter: "That is correct."

Black: "Alright. Thank you very much, Representative. appreciate your time. Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think we may have a great idea here, but it just one more example of what we do, and I know it flew out of the Senate. And I know it will probably fly out of We're not funding probation services now to the level now that we say we will, that we are supposed to, or that we need to. Here we go again with another idea. Yeah, I can't quarrel with the concept, but we can't continue to dump things on the court services and probation authorities unless we are going to put the money there. And we're not going to put any extra money there this year, so the system just becomes overburdened, overworked and then the Gentleman's idea doesn't work. I would urge that you really take a look at this, and if you can't vote 'no',

131st Legislative Day

June 19, 1990

maybe you want to vote 'present'. Until we can meet the budgetary responsibilities that go along with laws like this, no matter how good they might be on paper."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Macon, Representative Dunn."

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

Speaker Breslin: "He will."

Dunn: "In addition to the programs outlined in your Bill, can other penalties be imposed on someone convicted of drunken driving? I guess another way to state this...are these possibilities in your Bill, are they in addition to whatever else may be done to someone convicted of drunken driving?"

Trotter: "The court can make those different stipulations. Yes." "I can't hear you. Yes? The answer is yes? Okay. Thank Dunn: you. Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the Bill with all due respect to the sponsor's intentions we have currently in this state a very expensive situation if someone is convicted of drunken driving. I certainly don't condone drunken driving, but if you are convicted, you pay a very heavy penalty in dollars, let alone the other penalties. And God forbid, no one is hurt, if you get a This would impose additional conditions, or impose the possibility of additional conditions additional expense, and I don't understand why...why probation authorities can't do this now. I had a client a while back. A youngster, who received just a traffic ticket, and the judge made that client go down to the coroner's office and look at slides of fatalities. I don't know if there is anything in the statute that said do that, the judge just said do it. And we did it. So, I think it would be nice if some of this is done. We should be cost conscious, and I think we should go slow in this type of legislation at this time. Thank you very much."

131st Legislative Day

June 19, 1990

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Dekalb, Representative Countryman."

Countryman: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, you know when you think about it, the things that this Bill allows the court to do are somewhat disrespectful to the victims of drunk driving. you...first of all, if you send the violators to look at the victims at a rehabilitation institute...think of it, if you were the victim of a drunk driver, would you want all kinds of people coming and looking at you as you were trying to learn how to walk once again? I don't think you And I don't think those victims would. And how about those people who are recovering alcoholics? Do they want youthful offenders coming in and seeing them in their stages of rehabilitation? I think you will find the rules of those institutions provide that they have little or no contact with the outside world while they are going through their treatment. And finally, some friend or relative was the...died as a result of a drunk driver. Would you want that friend or relative's body to be on display in the county morgue in some horrible condition to be shown to the drunk drivers? I think there are a lot of ways of attacking the problem, but I don't think this one really attacks the problem, or solves anything. With all due respect to the Sponsor, I think this Bill deserves a 'no' vote."

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

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

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman moves the previous question. The question is, 'Shall the main question be put?' All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the main question is put.

131st Legislative Day

June 19, 1990

Representative Trotter is recognized to close."

Trotter: "Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. Alcoholism...alcoholism is a major problem in our country. is a larger problem in our...with our youth. This Bill shows these individuals the ramifications of their actions when they drink and drive. It is not a pretty sight to see a mangled body. It is not an easy place to go to visit the loved ones in a family of those who have been maimed and killed by the accidents caused by these drunk drivers. think it is time that we nip the bud in the head before it Let's show them that their actions are gets started. That their actions are wrong, and I ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 2066 pass?'

All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Sixty votes are required for passage. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question...on this question there are 59 voting 'aye', 51 voting 'no' and 6 voting 'present'. Representative Davis, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

Davis: "I know it is past time to ask questions, but...I understand that...but I want to explain my vote. And I hope..."

Speaker Breslin: "I's sorry but it is past time..."

Davis: "Oh, it is past time to explain my vote?"

Speaker Breslin: "Yes. We have taken the record, but Representative Turner wishes to vote 'aye'. So, therefore, 60 voting 'aye', 51 voting 'no' and 6 voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. The next Order of Business is the Order of State and Local Government, Third Reading. Representative Countryman, for what reason do you seek

131st Legislative Day

June 19, 1990

recognition?"

- Countryman: "Well, I was seeking a verification, but I must have missed the time."
- Speaker Breslin: "I'm sorry. Yes. State and Local Government.

 Sponsors: Bugielski, DeJaegher, Bowman, Cullerton, DeLeo,
 Peterson, Ewing and Kirkland. Gentlemen please be ready to
 present your Bills when your number is called. First Bill
 is Senate Bill 1484, Representative Bugielski. Out of the
 record. Senate...Senate Bill 1571, Representative
 DeJaegher. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1571, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act in relationship to the transfer of property. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative DeJaegher."

DeJaegher: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Members of the General Assembly, Senate Bill 1571 has the support of the Illinois Chamber of Commerce, Caterpillar, Deere and many others. The Department of Revenue has established a position on 1571. This Bill passed in the Senate 58-0and basically to the Bill. What the Bill...what Bill...what Senate Bill 7...1571 will do is restore equity to the Sales Tax Act that was established in 1990. believe that they concur that there was a huge oversight in the enactment of this particular legislation. For it was never the intent of the General Assembly to tax service agreements. With the passage of this Bill it will restore equity. I stand available to answer questions and if ... "

Speaker Breslin: "Representative DeJaegher moves the passage of Senate Bill 1571. On that question is there any discussion? Any discussion? There being none the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1571 pass? All those in favor vote 'aye'. All those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Sixty votes are required for passage. Representative

131st Legislative Day

June 19, 1990

Black, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

Black: "Madam Speaker, I'm sorry I didn't turn my light on in time. It doesn't make any difference, but I...I...we have some confusion over here whether Amendment #2 was adopted to the Bill. I don't think it was, correct?"

Speaker Breslin: "Mr. Clerk is indicating that Amendment #2 was
not adopted to the Bill."

Black: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Breslin: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. There are 113 voting 'aye', 2 voting 'no' voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Bill 1847, Representative Bowman. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1965. Out of the record. Senate Bill Representative DeLeo. Out of the record. Senate Bill 2012, Representative Peterson. Mr. Peterson? Out of the record. Bill Senate 2084, Representative Ewing. Representative Ewing? Out of the record. Senate Bill 2131, Representative Kirkland. Out of the record. On the Order of Banking, Third Reading. There appears Senate Bill 1125, Representative Piel's Bill. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

"Senate Bill 1125, a Bill for an Act to amend the Clerk Leone: Illinois Savings and Loan Act. Third Reading of the Bill." Speaker Breslin: "Representative Piel has asked leave to this Bill to the Order of Second Reading for purposes of an Amendment. Does he have leave? Hearing no objection. leave is granted. The Bill will remain on the Order of Second Reading for consideration of an Amendment at a later Back on the Order of State and Local Government, date. Third Reading. There was a Bill that we passed over, Representative Cullerton's. That Bill is Senate Bill 1965. Do you wish to call that at this time? Oh, it is a Bill on

131st Legislative Day

June 19, 1990

Postponed Consideration. Out of the record. On the Order of Housing, Third Reading. There is one Bill sponsored by Representative Capparelli. Is Mr. Capparelli in the chamber? Out of the record. On the Order of Human Services, Third Reading. There are three Bills. Sponsored by Representative Lang, Representative McGann's committee, and Representative Phelps. And I see none of the Sponsors are ready to go forward with their Bills. The next Order will be close to that. The next Order is Insurance, Reading. Sponsors are: Representative Wolf and Representative Mautino. The first Bill is Senate Bill 1568, Representative Wolf. Is Mr. Wolf in the chamber? Out of the record. Senate Bill 1962, Representative Mautino. Mr. Mautino? Do you wish to proceed with this Bill? The CHIPS Bill. Out of the record. The next Order of Business is the Order of Transportation. Third Reading. The Sponsors are Representative Hicks, Representative Novak and Representative Mautino. The first Bill is Senate Bill 1491, Representative Hicks. Is Mr. Hicks in the chamber? Out of the record. Senate Bill 2167, Representative Novak. 2167. Kankakee River Valley Airport. Out of the record. Senate Bill 2239, Representative Mautino. Mr. Mautino? Do you wish to proceed with this Bill? Tow trucks. Representative Mautino. Clerk, read the Bill. 2239."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 2239, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Vehicle Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Mautino."

Mautino: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'd like to move this Bill back to Second Reading for the purposes of an Amendment."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman asks leave to return this Bill to the Order of Second the for purposes of an Amendment. Does he have leave? Hearing no objections, leave is granted.

Are there any Amendments filed, Mr. Clerk?"

131st Legislative Day

June 19, 1990

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

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Santiago."

Santiago: "Madam Speaker, I would like to withdraw Amendment #2."

Speaker Breslin: "Withdraw #2. Any further Amendments?"

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

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Santiago."

Santiago: "Yes. Madam Speaker, Members of the General Assembly, Amendment #3 is basically...it's House Bill 3043, which passed this House with a margin of 114 - 0. The Bill was not called in the Senate. What the content of the Bill is, it requires school bus drivers to be fingerprinted. And I move for favorable consideration on this Amendment, if there is not questions."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment 3 to Senate Bill 2239. On the question the Gentleman from Macon, Representative Dunn."

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

Speaker Breslin: "He will."

Dunn: "As I read Amendment #3, it appears to supply...apply only to the City of Chicago."

Santiago: "Yes, Sir."

Dunn: "It applies no where else, is that correct?"

Santiago: "No where else."

Dunn: "Thank you very much."

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

McCracken: "Thank you. I don't disagree with the merits of the Bill. And I'm glad to see it limited to Chicago. The State Police are opposed, however. Because they don't have the funds or feel they don't have the funds necessary to implement this. The Bill requires that the Department of

131st Legislative Day

June 19, 1990

State Police pick up the cost for these checks. In a year where there is great controversy over diverting transportation funds, and whether they will be used for the State Police budget, this comes at a...maybe an inappropriate time. I wonder, Representative, do you have an estimate for the cost of this program? How it will be paid?"

Santiago: "Tom, I don't have the exact amount now, but I fully limited...if it is limited to the City of Chicago...it is estimated that each...each check will cost maybe about \$22 to \$24 per bus...school bus driver. So, the amount of money that we are investing in trying to...save our children, it is not very much. I think the life of a child is worth more than maybe \$50 or \$60 thousand. And the State Police was not opposed to this Bill a couple of weeks ago. And I accommodated them and their Amendment and have been working with them. I am very surprised that they will now oppose the Bill."

McCracken: "When the Bill was being considered in committee, did you at that time require the State Police to pick up this cost?"

Santiago: "Yes. Yes."

McCracken: "Okay. How did you choose the State Police as the party responsible for it? It's maybe the Chicago school district should pay for it."

Santiago: "Well, it is the responsibility of the State Police to conduct all of the fingerprinting for all of the other agencies. So, I don't think the Chicago Board of Education is in the business of conducting fingerprint checks. They are in the business of educating children. And I think that will be the proper authority to do it."

McCracken: "Well, what about the idea of their paying for their own checks?"

131st Legislative Day

June 19, 1990

- Santiago: "Well, the only problem with that is that these school bus drivers, they are only working part time. And it is usually costs them about \$100...\$125 to get a part time job. That is the only reason...that I am asking the state to pick up the tab and let the state be responsible."
- McCracken: "Alright. Well, I...I again am in favor of the idea and I supported this as a Bill in committee. They come to us claiming they can't find the money for it, and in a year of budget cuts, I think probably, that objection is well founded."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative McNamara."
- McNamara: "Yes. Thank you. The Sponsor will yield for a question?"

Santiago: "Yes."

McNamara: "The fingerprinting provisions of this Bill, are they limited to the City of Chicago?"

Santiago: "Yes, Sir."

- McNamara: "And could you tell me what portion of that Amendment that they are limited to? When I was reading through the Amendment I did not see the limitation. Do you have the wording there, which gives me the limitation?"
- Santiago: "The wording is in the Amendment. It is on there. It is on the last page Line 9 on the 5th page of the Amendment."
- McNamara: "Okay. Thank you. I'm going to run down there take a look at that. I don't have a copy of that. This is Amendment #3 then?"
- Santiago: "Right. Amendment #3. Amendment #2 was withdrawn."
- McNamara: "Okay. I'll run down and take a look at it."
- Speaker Breslin: "Any further discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Rice."
- Rice: "Would the ...would the Representative ... ask a question,

131st Legislative Day

June 19, 1990

please?"

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

- Rice: "Representative Santiago, if a bus company is housed outside of the City of Chicago and does business in the city and the employees of that bus company are not residents of the city, who handles that...that printing then? Who is required?"
- Santiago: "If they are going to work for the City of Chicago, they must submit in their application where they are going to be employed."
- Rice: "Is it...have you checked with the Department of Registration here? They usually for their security systems deal with the finger printing both at the federal level and the state level."
- Santiago: "Right. They will run a national check."
- Rice: "And that does not cost a hundred some dollars. It only costs \$28 to \$32."
- Santiago: "Yes. That's what I said. The cost was between \$22 and \$25, the average."
- Rice: "Why can't the person who is seeking the job, as they do in the taxi cab industry, pay for that themselves?"
- Santiago: "Well, as I said before. These are basically part time jobs. These people are working four and five hours a day. They are only making about \$4 or \$5 an hour. And already they are already paying a large amount of fees to begin with. So, we are asking them to pay over a hundred dollars in the average to be hired as a part time worker, which doesn't make sense. It might just cost the State of Illinois, maybe I will guess between \$40 and \$50 thousand and if they cannot find \$40-\$50 thousand in the budget for a good program like this, I think there is something wrong with the department then."

Rice: "To the Bill."

131st Legislative Day

June 19. 1990

Speaker Breslin: "Proceed, Sir."

Rice: "The Bill is wonderful. It's fine, but the Bill where it would affect some of the minority communities, the State of Illinois Police Department...the State Patrol does not do a thorough check on those things. We found that out with the security system. And it is a block. I certainly would understand better if he would add into that to send those finger prints to the federal government as well. We had the incident down in Florida, and we found out there that a man was registered with guns was a felon. I think you need to take a hard look at it."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Perry, Representative Goforth."

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

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Santiago will yield to a question."

Goforth: "Representative, I'm all in favor of your Bill. I got no problem with your Bill at all. The only problem I've got in it is where the fees come from. Now, am I correct that this is just for the City of Chicago?"

Santiago: "Just for the City of Chicago."

Goforth: "Why don't we have the City Police in Chicago doing these finger prints instead of the state police, because it is my understanding the only the state police does in the City of Chicago is patrol the interstates."

Santiago: "Well, it is the responsibility of the...of the state police already to conduct background checks. If you look at statute under Chapter 95, it gives you all...it gives all the responsibility to the state police."

Goforth: "And even though you Bill is just to the City of Chicago that the Bill applies. Alright. Thank you."

Santiago: "Yes, Sir. Yes, Sir."

Speaker Breslin: "There being no further discussion,

131st Legislative Day

June 19, 1990

Representative Santiago is recognized to close."

Santiago: "Madam Speaker, Members of the General Assembly, this is a good Bill. This is a good Amendment. trying to do here is trying to save the lives of the children of the people of the kids in the City of Chicago. Last Friday, I don't know if you recall, I passed out a flyer here on this House floor, which...of an incident that happened in the City of Chicago where a bus driver sexually abused a handicapped eleven year old girl. And this is what I am trying to prevent. And for the state police to come here today and say that they do not have enough money to pay to conduct finger printing of school bus drivers, I think it is ludicrous. It is an insult to all the parents in the State of Illinois. This is an Agreed Bill, that I worked with the state police. I worked with the IEA, and worked with everyone involved, and guess what happens. They try to pull the rug from under us. And they are saying that \$50,000 is not enough to cover and try to help the children in the City of Chicago. It is ridiculous. And I wish and I hope that you let your good conscience dictate your vote. Thank you very much."

Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 2239 pass?'

All those in favor vote 'aye'. All those opposed vote
'no'. Voting is open. That's right...excuse me. The
question is, 'Shall Amendment 3 be adopted?' All those in
favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who
wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question
there are 106 voting 'aye', 1 voting 'no' and the Amendment
is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "There are no further Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Mautino. Where is Representative Mautino? Mr. Mautino? There is now a request for a fiscal note on this Bill as amended. So the

131st Legislative Day

June 19, 1990

Bill will have to remain on the Order of Second Reading until that is provided. Thank you. The next Order is the Order of Children, Third Reading. Representative Trotter is the Sponsor of the only Bill on this Order. We will not go to that Order. The next Order is State Government Administration. The Sponsors are: Capparelli, Stern, and Olson...Myron Olson. The first Bill, Senate Bill 1496, Representative Capparelli. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1497, Representative Capparelli? Out of the record. Senate Bill 1904, Representative Stern. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1904, a Bill for an Act to amend the Fair Campaign Practices Act. Third Reading of the Bill." Speaker Breslin: "Representative Stern."

"Mr. Speaker...Madam Speaker, excuse me, and Members of the House, this is the Bill that came out of the bipartisan elections Task Force this year. From the Senate it contains really relatively little. It includes a provision that anyone who subscribed to the Code of Fair Campaign Practices and failed to comply will not be considered guilty of a criminal offense. It includes a...a provision that an unconditional resignation effective on a future date may not be withdrawn after it is received by the officer authorized to fill the vacancy. It. also includes...no...it doesn't include that either. T t includes a provision that says the...there shall be voter registrars in the Secretary of State's Drivers License Examining Facilities. And that is all that it includes." Speaker Breslin: "The Lady has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 1904. On the question is there any discussion? There being no discussion, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1904 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye'. All those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. This is final passage.

131st Legislative Day

June 19, 1990

Sixty votes are required for passage. 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'. Bill This having received Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Representative 2150, Myron Olson...excuse me, Representative Dunn, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

Dunn: "Well, if we're talking about fair campaign practices. And if you subscribe to the Fair Campaign Practice Act, which I did, and you have voted for that Bill, you probably had a conflict of interest. So, I want to announce that if I had a conflict, I still voted for the Bill. I think it is a good Bill and the Act is good. Some of our conflicts are silly and that would be one of them."

Speaker Breslin: "Senate Bill 2150, Myron Olson. Clerk...Clerk, read the Bill. Oh, out of the record. Excuse me. Out of the record. The next Order is the Order of Public Utilities. Third Reading. The only Order...only Bill this Order is Representative Hoffman's Bill. 2091. Ιs Representative Hoffman in the chamber? Out of the record. next Order is the Order of Labor, Third Reading. only Bill on this Order is Representative Saltsman's Bill. Senate Bill 1704. Is Mr. Saltsman in the chamber? Out of the record. Next Order is the Order of Civil Law, Representative Cullerton has the only Bill on Reading. this Order. Is Mr. Cullerton in the chamber? Out of record. Ladies and Gentlemen, we are going to do Second Readings now. Bills on Special Order on Second. The first Order is Banking, Second Reading. The Sponsors Cullerton and Hicks. Cullerton and Hicks. The first Bill is Senate Bill 1488, Representative Cullerton. Out of the record. Senate Bill 208...excuse me...we will go back, Mr.

131st Legislative Day

- June 19, 1990
- Clerk to 1488. Senate Bill 1488 for Representative Cullerton. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1488, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Banking Act. Second Reading of the Bill. There are no Committee Amendments."
- Speaker Breslin: "Any Floor Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #1 is being offered by Representative Levin."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Levin on Amendment #1.

 Representative Levin, you are recognized to present

 Amendment 1. Representative Cullerton."
- Cullerton: "I'll take the Bill out of the record. Madam Speaker, there is ongoing negotiations with regard to the Amendment, so I think soon we will have an answer. What was the other one?"
- Speaker Breslin: "Out of the record. Senate Bill Representative Hicks. Out of the record. On the Order Environment, Second Reading, appears Senate Bill 2253, Representative Currie. Out of the record. On the Order of Criminal Law, Second Reading, appears Senate Bill 1613. Representative Munizzi. Out of the record. Senate Bill 2309, Representative Anthony Young. Out of the record. On the Order of State and Local Government, Second Reading. The Sponsors are: Steczo, Brunsvold, Saltsman and Keane. I don't see any of these Sponsors in the room. So, we will pass over this Order of Business. And go on to the Order of Insurance, Second Reading. Representative Countryman, is your Bill 2099 still on the Order of Second? Ιt Out of the record. On the Order of State Government Administration, Second Reading, appears Senate Bill Representative Munizzi. Representative Munizzi? Out of the record. On the Order of Horse Racing, Second Reading. Representative Hicks has those Bills. We will pass over

131st Legislative Day

June 19, 1990

that Order of Business. On the Order of Labor, Second Reading, appears Senate Bill 1638, Representative McPike. Mr. McPike. Out of the record. On the Order of Civil Law, Second Reading, appears Senate Bill 2267, Representative Cullerton. Out of the record. On the Order of Revenue, Second Reading, appears Senate Bill 2210. Representative Currie. Out of the record. On the Order of Waste Reduction, Second Reading. We'll take those Bills out of the record. Ladies and Gentlemen, we are going to proceed to the Special Orders of Call on Third Reading, again. is hoped that if you wish to call these Bills this day, you should call them this time. The Special Order of Banking, Third Reading, Senate Bill 934, Mr. Hicks. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1125, Representative Piel. of the record. On the Order of Education, Third Reading, appears Senate Bill 1512, Representative Steczo. Sponsors of the Bills on Education, Special Order are: Steczo, Turner and Levin. Steczo, Turner and Levin. Since none of these Sponsors are present, we will skip over this Order of Call. The next Order is Environment, Third Reading. The Sponsors are: Balanoff, Brunsvold and Hicks. The first Bill will be Senate Bill 1838, Representative Brunsvold. Out of the record. Senate Bill Representative Hicks. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 2110, a Bill for an Act in relationship to oil and gas. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Hicks. This Bill deals with the Environment. It has been on the Calendar for several weeks. Out of the record. The next Order is Criminal Law, Third Reading. The Sponsors are: Hensel and Trotter. Senate Bill 1515, Representative Hensel. Out of the record. Senate Bill 2066, Representative Trotter. Did we already move that Bill? We already moved that Bill. On

131st Legislative Day

June 19, 1990

the Order of State and Local Government, Third Reading. The Sponsors are: Bugielski, Bowman, Cullerton, DeLeo, Peterson, Ewing and Kirkland. The first Bill is Bill 1484. Representative Bugielski. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1847, Representative Bowman. Representative Bowman, do you have this? The note that you were waiting for on this Bill yet? Clerk, read the Bill. Well, I asked you, if you had it. Yes. You said yes. Okay. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1965, Representative Cullerton. of the record. Senate Bill 1994, Representative DeLeo. Out of the record. Senate Bill 2012, Representative Peterson. William Peterson. Representative Peterson is recognized on Senate Bill 2012."

Peterson: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I move to extend the deadline on Senate Bill 2012 to November 30th."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved to extend the deadline on this Bill until November 30th of 1990. On that question is there any discussion? On that question the Gentleman from Lake, Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Would my good friend yield for a question or two?" Speaker Breslin: "He will."

Matijevich: "Representative Peterson, could you tell the Body why you are extending the deadline?"

Peterson: "Yes. The deadline is being extended. The request is being asked for LRB. They are working on some additional legislation and they would like to keep this Bill alive until the fall. It is strictly a vehicle for the Legislative Reference Bureau."

Matijevich: "And if the Bill were amended to include anything but the advisory language from the Reference Bureau, you would table the Bill, right?"

Peterson: "That is correct."

Matijevich: "Alright. On his good word, which we can all live

131st Legislative Day

June 19, 1990

with we will go along with that."

Speaker Breslin: "Is there any further discussion? There being no further discussion, is there any objection to the extension of the deadline on this Bill? There being none, the Gentleman's Motion is granted by use of the Attendance Roll Call. The deadline on Senate Bill 2012 will be November 30th, 1990. Senate Bill 2084. Representative Ewing. Mr. Ewing? Out of the record. Senate Bill 2131. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 2131, a Bill for an Act concerning land in Kane County. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Kirkland."

Kirkland: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. This now...this Bill now involves four land transfers in effect. It came over the Senate with one land transfer and will have to go back there for a concurrence assuming it passes here. original Bill transfers property from the Department of State Police to the Sanitary District οf Elgin. approximately fifteen acres at a price agreed on by the parties with a reverter clause in case the property is not used for solely sanitary district purposes. Amendments were put on actually on behalf of One transfers property from the Department of Corrections to the City of St. Charles in connection with eventual development of a waste water treatment plant. Two other transfers then...the other two transfers involve actually trades of property, both for purposes of properties contiguous for a certain purpose that they will be used for. Properties that are being traded are of the approximate same size and value. Move for passage of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 2131. On the question is there any discussion?

131st Legislative Day

June 19, 1990

There being none, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 2131 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye'. All those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. This is final passage. Sixty votes are required. Have all voted who wish? voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 115 voting 'aye', none voting 'no' none voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. The next Order is the Order of Housing. Senate Bill 722, Representative Capparelli. Out of the record. On the Order of Human Services, Third Reading, appears Senate Bill 2050, Representative Lang. Out of the record. 2076. Representative McGann. Is Mr. McGann in the Senate Bill 2277, out of chamber? Out of the record. record. On the Order of Insurance appears Senate Bill 1768, Representative Wolf. Is Mr. Wolf in the chamber? Out of the record. Senate Bill 1962. Representative Mautino. Out of the record. On the Order Transportation, Third Reading, appears Senate Bill 1491, Representative Hicks, out of the record. Senate Bill 2167, Representative Novak. Out of the record. Senate Bill 2239, Representative Mautino. Out of the record. On the Order of Children, Third Reading. Representative Trotter, Senate Bill 1593. Representative Trotter? record. On the Order of State Government Administration, Third Reading, appears Senate Bill 1496, Representative Out of the record. Capparelli. Senate Bill 1497, Representative Capparelli, out of the record. Senate Bill 2150, Representative Myron Olson, out of the record. Third Reading under Public Utilities appears Senate Bill 2091, Representative Hoffman. Mr. Hoffman? Out of the record. On the Order of Labor, Third Reading. Representative Saltsman has a Bill. Is Representative

131st Legislative Day

June 19, 1990

Saltsman in the chamber? Out of the record. On the Order of Civil Law, Third Reading. Representative Cullerton has Is Representative Cullerton in the chamber? Cullerton? Out of the record. Ladies and Gentlemen. allow some time for Members to get their Amendments filed to their Bills, we will do some of the Motions on Speaker's Table. We will use Supplemental #1, that was printed on Wednesday, June 13th on the Order of Motions. And we will go down that Order. House Resolution 1514, Representative Curran. Representative Curran, this is a Motion to discharge the Judiciary I Committee from further consideration of the Resolution, advance it to the Order of Speaker's Table and then you will be recognized if it is the will of the Body to grant your Motion. You will be recognized to present your Resolution immediately. Representative Curran are you ready with your Motion? Proceed. Sir."

- Curran: "I move, Madam Speaker, I move to discharge the Judiciary
 I Committee and advance it to the Order of Second Reading,
 House Resolution 1514."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Curran, I'm sorry I didn't hear what you said."
- Curran: "I move to discharge Jude. I and move to the Order of Second Reading, House Resolution 1514 which requests the Supreme Court and the State Board of Education to examine educational services for minors held in detention."
- Speaker Breslin: "You have heard the Gentleman's Motion. It is to discharge this Bill from the Judiciary Committee and advance it to the Speaker's Table. Is there any discussion? There being no discussion, the question is, 'Shall the House discharge House Resolution 1514 from the Judiciary I Committee and place it on the Speaker's Table?' All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'no'.

131st Legislative Day

June 19, 1990

In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, by use of the Attendance Roll Call. This Bill is on the Order of the Speaker's Table. Now, Representative Curran, you are recognized to present the Resolution."

- Curran: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I don't think that there is any opposition, it simply requests that the Supreme Court and the State Board of Education examine the educational services for minors held in detention. The reason we had to discharge this Bill is because the committee had not had an opportunity to meet and discuss it. I don't think there is any opposition, and I'd be glad to answer any questions and ask for a favorable Roll Call."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved the adoption of House Resolution 1514. On that question is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall House Resolution 1514 be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no', in the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it and the Resolution is adopted. House Resolution Representative Trotter. You are recognized to present your It is a Motion to discharge the Committee on Motion. Your Motion is found on page 15 Children. on the Calendar."
- Trotter: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Members of the House, I move to discharge Children from further consideration and advance to the Order of Speaker's Table."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved to discharge the Resolution from the Committee on Children. Is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall the Motion be granted?' All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is discharged by use of the Attendance Roll Call. Now, Representative Trotter this Bill appears on the Order of the Speaker's Table. You are recognized

131st Legislative Day

June 19, 1990

to present the Resolution. He takes it out of the record at this time. House Resolution 1526, Representative Ryder. Representative Ryder, on a Motion on House Resolution 1526."

Ryder: "I would ask to discharge the Committee on House Resolution 1526 since we do not have the committee scheduled, I would think it appropriate at this time."

Speaker Breslin: "You have heard the Gentleman's Motion. Ιs there any discussion? There being no discussion, the question is, 'Shall the House discharge House Resolution 1526 from the Judiciary I Committee and advance it to the Order of the Speaker's Table?' All those in favor 'aye', opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Motion carries. The Bill on the Order of the Speaker's Table. Representative Ryder. Ryder? Representative Ryder, you are recognized to present the Resolution at this time. This...Representative Ryder, this Bill was discharged from the committee by of the Attendance Roll Call. So, it is properly before the Body at this time. Proceed, Sir."

Ryder: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I appreciate the diligent concern and prompt attention that this Resolution has received. It is a piece of significant interest to those of us in the General Assembly. It does urge the Auditor General of the State of Illinois to audit the proceeds from the sale of property that has been forfeited pursuant to the Illinois Controlled Substances Act. As many persons know, because of recent legislation, we've been able to obtain enormous amounts of property from the illicit sale of drugs, drug dealers, et cetera. This is simply an attempt by the Auditor General to place some dollar values, and more importantly, to see what has happened to that property once it has been obtained and then that the proper

131st Legislative Day

June 19, 1990

sorts of disposition has taken place."

- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved the adoption of House Resolution 1526. On that question is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall House Resolution 1526 be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The Resolution is adopted. House Resolution 1544, Representative Balanoff. On the Order of Motions."
- Balanoff: "Yes. Madam Speaker, both this Resolution 1544 and 1545 have already been passed previously under a different number. So, we will take both of them out of the record."
- Speaker Breslin: "Out of the record. Did you say 'take both of them out of the record?' Okay. Both of them are out of the record. House Resolution 1545. Okay, would you withdraw your Motions to discharge? The Gentleman indicates he wishes to withdraw his Motions to discharge on House Resolution 1544 and House Resolution 1545. House Resolution 1562, Representative Hultgren. 1562."
- Hultgren: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Did you intentionally skip 1548?"

Speaker Breslin: "Yes."

- Hultgren: "Very well. I move to discharge the Energy,
 Environment, Natural Resources Committee from further
 consideration and advance to the Order of Speaker's Table
 House Resolution 1562."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved that the House discharge the Environment, Energy and Natural Resources Committee from...for House Resolution 1562. On that question is there any discussion? There being none the question is, 'Shall the House Committee be discharged on House Resolution 1562?' All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. By use of the Attendance Roll Call, since there

131st Legislative Day

June 19, 1990

is no objection, the committee is discharged, and this Bill is on the Speaker's Table. Representative Hultgren, you are recognized to present the Resolution."

Hultgren: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the as most of you know the Department of Central Management Services currently operates an I-cycle program, whereby they recycle some kinds of paper in state offices throughout the State of Illinois. This Resolution urges the Department of Central Management Services to study the expansion of the I-cycle program to include other types of paper. Currently, we are just doing white or bond paper. This would hopefully encourage them to expand newspapers and other kinds of waste products in the state buildings. Would ask for a favorable Roll Call, and would certainly happy to answer any questions if anyone has them."

Speaker Breslin: "You have heard the Gentleman's Resolution. On the Resolution is there any discussion? There being none the question is, 'Shall House Resolution 1562 be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it and the Resolution is adopted. House Resolution 1578, Representative Santiago. Out of the record. With leave of the Body, I'll go back to Representative Trotter's Resolution...House Resolution 1518. This Bill is on the Order of the Speaker's Table. Representative Trotter you are recognized to present your Resolution."

Trotter: "Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. House Resolution 1518 urges the Auditor General to conduct a management audit of availability of prenatal care in Illinois. Through all of our deliberations in working with the committee...Select Committee on Children. We thought that this was an appropriate audit."

131st Legislative Day

June 19, 1990

- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Trotter has moved the adoption of House Resolution 1518. On that question is there any There being none, the question is, 'Shall House Resolution 1518 be adopted?' All those in favor opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The Resolution is adopted. Resolution 1627, Representative Shirley Jones. Shirley Jones. Out of the record. House Resolution 1633. Representative Matijevich."
- Matijevich: "Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would move to discharge the Roads and Bridges Committee from further consideration of House Resolution 1633 and order...advance it to the Order of Speaker's Table."
- Speaker Breslin: "You have heard the Gentleman's Motion. On the question the Gentleman from Madison, Representative Stephens."
- Stephens: "Well, Mr...Madam Speaker, we would object...I would object to the Gentleman's Resolution rescinds a Resolution that this House passed unanimously...passed unanimously just last spring. The...if the Gentleman is serious about this it should be presented before a committee. It should be given a full hearing. It talks about rescinding a suggestion to the Department of Transportation that State of Illinois take the very bold step, being sarcastic, that we institute and adopt a highway program. Gentleman thinks that this issue deserves further study. the Resolution that we passed before, said was that we urge the Department of Transportation to develop appropriate adopt-a-highway program. One that has been adopted in many states throughout the country. One that in the spirit οf the President's administration one of pride in our highways, one that again volunteerism, passed out of this House unanimously. Previously, I think

131st Legislative Day

June 19, 1990

this is not the proper way to go about this. If it needs to be considered as the Gentleman thinks, then let's hear it in committee. So, I would stand in strong opposition to this discharge Motion."

Speaker Breslin: "Is there any further discussion? There being none, Representative Matijevich is recognized to close."

Matijevich: "Yes. Madam Speaker, in answer to Representative Stephens, this Resolution that we did adopt, was adopted where all of us thought it was kind of innocuous Resolution, so we did it on the Agreed Resolutions. nobody really knew that we adopted it, except myself the Clerk's office up there. After we adopted it, we received letters from ... mostly from the Teamster's Union. who have problems, because the adopt-a-highway is one where not-for-profit organizations adopt a highway, clean it and do different things. And the Teamster's Union said, and I think rightfully so, that before we implement such a program, we ought to look into the one, economic effects where it may mean some legitimate people on the payrolls may lose monies. now Representative Two, Stephens, you spoke to the issue and I ought to also."

Speaker Breslin: "Excuse me, Representative Stephens, for what reason do you interrupt?"

Stephens: "Point of order, Madam Speaker. I did not answer...ask a question, and I know that there..."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative, the Gentleman is closing and he..."

Stephens: "There are no others seeking recognition?"

Speaker Breslin: "There is no one else seeking recognition."

Stephens: "Thank you, Madam."

Speaker Breslin: "Prior to his...proceed."

Matijevich: "I didn't say you asked a question, but...what I said is that the...I believe the Teamster's Union and rightfully

131st Legislative Day

June 19, 1990

so feels that before we do that we ought to look at: one, the fiscal...economic impact. Two, we ought to look at whether we may be imposing on the state some liability because these not-for-profit organizations aren't covered and we may find the state liable for somebody injured on the highway. Because of those considerations, I think it is proper that we rescind the prior Resolution, which no one knew we adopted anyway. So, Madam Speaker, I would now move to discharge the Roads and Bridges Committee."

Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall the Committee on Roads and Bridges be discharged from further consideration of House Resolution 1633, and should this Resolution be to the Order of the Speaker's Table?' All those in favor vote 'aye'. All those opposed vote 'no'. A simple majority is required...excuse me, 71 votes are required to discharge. Excuse me, Ladies and Gentlemen, 60 votes are all that is required to discharge the committee, because the Resolution is on a Calendar. So, 60 votes are all that is required. Have all voted who The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 66 voting 'aye', 48 voting 'no' and one voting 'present'. And the Motion carries. The Bill...Representative Matijevich, you are recognized to proceed on your Resolution."

Matijevich: "Yes. Madam Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, as I said House Resolution 1633 would rescind House Resolution 998, a prior Resolution which is...was adopted on a Agreed Bill list, which none of us really looked at. We thought it was sort of innocuous, but on letters received and with discussions with the Teamster's Union, I think they are right, that before the DOT implements the adopt—a—highway program, that they first ought to study the economic effects of such a program, and also whether we

131st Legislative Day

June 19, 1990

would be imposing liabilities on the State of Illinois if some were injured or if...on that program. So, therefore, I think it is reasonable and proper that we rescind the prior Resolution. And I appreciate your support for the adoption of House Resolution 1633."

Speaker Breslin: "You have heard the Gentleman's Resolution. On the question the Gentleman from Madison, Representative Stephens."

Stephens: "Well, Madam Speaker, just to say that we in no want to overlook the safety factors and the Resolution that was passed before did not call for the...for passing over any safety requirements, any safety considerations, concerns that the Teamsters have we feel, since there was no deadline in the institution of the program, that had ample opportunity and still have ample opportunity, since we're still studying the issue. We want them to come forward and we don't standing opposition to their making their concerns known to the Department of Transportation. But we do believe that a well throughout adopt-a-highway program sends a strong message to the people of the United States that Illinois cares about a couple of things. First of all, we care about clean highways. We care about spirit of volunteerism. We care about giving the Lions Club and the Jaycees and the local flower growers club or whatever, an opportunity to partake in government right out there by keeping the highways clean. We want to make sure that all safety factors are taken into consideration. want to address the Teamsters' concerns. I think their concerns might not just be about highway safety, but about other issues. And we want to address those concerns, too. But I would stand in opposition."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Madison, Representative McPike."

131st Legislative Day

June 19. 1990

McPike: "Well, thank you, Madam Speaker. And Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I stand in support of this Resolution for two reasons. The first is rather not we actually want clean highways. Ι was recently Mississippi for five days with my wife. We went down fishing in February. I have never seen such filthy highways in my entire life. Every two miles they had adopt-a-highway program. Some fraternity from a college thirty miles away, ten years ago had adopted this two lane stretch of highway. And the next two lane stretch of highway was adopted by some men's club forty miles the other direction twelve years ago. Every two mile strip had been adopted by somebody. I have never seen so much trash and tires and garbage and papers every place, every place along the highway. I had never heard of adopt-a-highway program. And I was shocked when I found out that by an Agreed Resolution we were going to adopt the same filthy highways that I found in Mississippi. The second reason I stand in support of this is for the legitimate reason of One of the most dangerous jobs we hire...we have right now on the state highways is picking up trash with trucks going by at seventy-five miles an hour. Two lane roads, four lane roads. You drive sixty-five miles an hour right now and you know what is going on on the interstate. People pass you when you are going sixty-five miles an hour. The trucks pass you when you are going sixty-five miles an hour. The trailers pass you when you are going sixty-five miles an hour. And what do we want on the highways? We want a bunch of volunteers running back and forth across the highway picking up paper and trash. Well, we are going to have thousands of people killed. This is the craziest idea we've ever had to have these people running back and forth. And the second thing, they

131st Legislative Day

June 19, 1990

won't show up. So, either they show up and get hurt or they don't show up. Either way it doesn't work. Representative Matijevich, congratulations on putting a stop to this idiotic idea."

- Preston: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I have a question for the Chair. A point of order, if I could. It's really a point of inquiry. I'm a bit confused on why we, in the House of Representatives, are considering so ridiculous a program, so low on anyone's priority list, when we in Illinois have drug problems, gang problems, child abuse problems, child neglect problems, problems of joblessness, of homelessness, poverty, the disgraceful state of the foster care system. Why instead of worrying about an adopt a highway, are we wasting our time here instead of considering about adopting children? Adopting programs that could assist the citizens of Illinois."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Preston, the reason we are considering it is because this Legislature has already adopted the program, and there are citizens who have brought it to our attention. And as Representative McPike has stated it might not be the best thing this Legislature has ever done. We are debating the issue..."
- Preston: "Madam...Madam Speaker, we have...we have serious problems in Illinois. This is certainly not one of them.

 And I think we should get on to addressing those serious problems."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Will, Representative Wennlund."
- Wennlund: "Thank you, Madam Speaker..."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Coles, Representative Weaver."

131st Legislative Day

June 19, 1990

Weaver: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Just an inquiry of the Chair.

If I were to file a Resolution to do away with a Resolution
to do away with a Resolution, what would that number be?"

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Matijevich..."

Weaver: "Haven't we got enough to do? That we need to file
Resolutions to do away with Resolutions? Ad infinitum. I
think it's getting rather ridiculous if we got work to do,
let's do it. If we don't got work to do, let's go home."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Weaver, you should know that many of your colleagues filed these Resolutions. Now, if you would like to contact Representative Black, who will be up next with his Resolution and tell him you don't want to consider it, you talk to him. And Representative Hasara has a Resolution. And Representative Frederick has a Resolution. And many have Resolutions."

Weaver: "Are these all...Madam Speaker, are these all Resolutions

to do away with a Resolution that is doing away with a

Resolution?"

Speaker Breslin: "I don't know. We'll have to hear them first." Weaver: "Well, I..."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Bowman, on the Resolution."

Bowman: Well, I certainly rise in support the Resolution. After fourteen years down here I thought I'd seen everything, but now we have orphaned highways. didn't realize we had orphaned highways until the first Resolution came up. I think before we consider adoption. We ought also to look at foster care for our highways. Now, we haven't considered this issue thoroughly enough. I the issue ought to be reconsidered think in this Resolution sent back to committee. And we ought to look at foster care for highways. Representative Stephens, have you considered foster care for highways? I think we ought to adopt this Resolution and look at the big picture.

131st Legislative Day

June 19, 1990

Thank you."

- Speaker Breslin: "Now, Representative Stephens is recognized on a point of personal privilege, since his name was used in debate. Representative Bowman, in violation of the rules.

 After fourteen years here you'd think he'd know better, wouldn't you? Representative Stephens."
- Stephens: "Shame on you, Representative Bowman, but I suggest if you want to hug a highway, that you do it in your district and not mine."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Winnebago, Representative Hallock."
- Hallock: "I move the previous question."
- Speaker Breslin: "That's not necessary, Representative Hallock.

 No one else is seeking recognition. Representative

 Matijevich is recognized to close."
- Matijevich: "Madam Speaker, if I didn't introduce this Resolution to rescind another Resolution, no one would have known that we adopted the first Resolution. And the fact is, I think it is right that the General Assembly in the House particularly, says that we made a mistake. I think it is honorable to say, we made a mistake. Madam Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we did make a mistake, we did it on the Agreed List and I humbly say that it was my fault, because I go over the Agreed List. I thought it innocuous until I received my letters from the Teamsters Union. And their questions were legitimate, that there is a matter of safety and yes, they do have a selfinterest they...an economic interest, because think that maybe somebody will do something voluntarily and be...may be injured or maybe even killed in the process, and they have trained and skilled workers on the payroll to do the job, and do a better job , too. So, I think we did make a mistake and therefore, I would move to adopt House

131st Legislative Day

June 19, 1990

- Resolution 1633 and ask for your support."
- Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall the Resolution be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye'. All those opposed say 'no'. All those in favor vote 'aye'. All those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. The Lady from Cook, Representative Davis. One minute to explain your vote."
- Davis: "Yes. Madam Speaker, thank you for this opportunity. We would just urge the Legislators to put green votes up there, because we do want to adopt children, and not adopt highways."
- Speaker Breslin: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk...excuse me, Representative Hasara, one minute to explain your vote."
- Hasara: "Thank you. Madam Speaker. My objection to this Resolution has nothing to do with the adopt-a-highway but I'm speaking on behalf of the millions of volunteers in Illinois, on behalf of the hospitals, many of them which would have to close if it were not for volunteers, and I resent the fact that it's been stated that volunteers are undependable and would not show I've worked with paid employees and volunteers, and I find volunteers to be every bit as dependable as those who So, I think it is very sad that we are running down the many hours of volunteer work that is done Illinois and in this country."
- Speaker Breslin: "Have all voted who wish? The Lady from...the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Leverenz. One minute to explain your vote."
- Leverenz: "I might take the whole minute. I think the volunteers supplied by the Department of Corrections are doing a fine job. You can all vote green."
- Speaker Breslin: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 67 voting 'aye', 49

131st Legislative Day

June 19, 1990

voting 'no' and one voting 'present'. And the Resolution is adopted. House Resolution 1627, Representative Shirley Representative Shirley Jones. Out of the record. House Resolution 1650, Representative Hicks. Now me you're not going to present this Resolution! This is Motion to discharge the Hauler...Intra-state Hauler Licensure Act and move this Resolution out of the Constitutional Officers Committee. Look at this. Look at this. Representative Hicks."

Hicks: "Yes. Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. This Resolution was initially submitted dealing Intra-state Licensure Act by the federal government. we found was with the new federal licensing Act that times that we had, for example, let me give you an example in your own districts. If you have a farmer, for example, that has a...a truck that he hauls his grain to market on, he falls under the classification for the Intra-state Licensure Act, whereby he has to pass the test for the federal license. The subject came up quite often in office doing work every day and coming the first of the year we are going to have to comply with this program. Αt the time that this Resolution was put in I was asking Congress to take a second look at that and simply make apply to over the road haulers, those that travel from state to state to state, and ask them to take another at the Licensure Act. I'd ask the discharge of the committee so that this Resolution could be heard by the full House."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved to discharge House Resolution 1650 from committee and advance it to Order of the Speaker's Table. On that question is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall the Motion be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye', opposed

131st Legislative Day

June 19, 1990

'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it.

By use of the Attendance Roll Call the committee is discharged and the Resolution is advanced to the Speaker's Table. Representative Hicks you are recognized to present the Resolution."

Hicks: "Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. I'd like to explain.

That's what this Bill does. It urges Congress to take a second look at the federal Licensure Act. And I'd be happy to try to answer any questions dealing with the Resolution."

Speaker Breslin: "You have heard the Gentleman's Resolution. Is there any discussion? The Lady from Champaign, Representative Satterthwaite."

Satterthwaite: "Will the Sponsor yield for a question?"
Speaker Breslin: "He will."

Satterthwaite: "Representative, if Congress were to reconsider, is it possible that the garbage haulers would be exempt from this if Congress made an appropriate change to do that?"

Hicks: "That verv well could happen, Representative Satterthwaite. What we really were asking them in the Resolution to do was look at those haulers who were crossing state lines and hauling from state to state to state. The ones that the Interstate Commerce Commission was actually overseeing. We felt like those haulers that operated only within the boundaries of the State of Illinois should be licensed by those of us here in the State of Illinois, not by the federal government. allows both our farmers to those local haulers within your own community to be licensed by us here in Illinois, which...who I think ought to oversee their operation. We're simply asking Congress to take a second look at this."

131st Legislative Day

June 19, 1990

Satterthwaite: "Madam Speaker and Members of the chamber. I concur in the Gentleman's Motion. I believe that federal legislation has probably extended itself farther than need be, and we will find that many of the people who haul only locally are going to have to abide by very strict regulations that may not be appropriate for them. may find that we are not able to get appropriately qualified people for some of our local services. I have had complaints from some of our local garbage haulers, instance. Many of these are people who have only a high school education and they fear that in having to meet federal regulations by the new testing procedures that they will be prohibited from continuing their small business operations. I think it is very appropriate for us to urge Congress to take another look at this requirement and to try to give some flexibility at the state level. urge support for the Gentleman's Motion."

Speaker Breslin: "Any further discussion? The Gentleman from Effingham, Representative Hartke."

Hartke: "Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. I concur with the Sponsor of this Resolution. It seems that there are many summer jobs that are available at local elevators and chemical and fertilizer dealers, which allow young people, and if this were regulated by the federal government, many of those individuals according to the federal regulation would have to be over the age of 21, even to begin to apply for one of these jobs. So, I would urge the adoption of this Resolution."

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

Black: "Well, thank you very much, Madam Speaker. Perhaps being redundant, but I, too, rise in support for the Gentleman's Motion. There is one thing you have overlooked here. Your

131st Legislative Day

June 19, 1990

nonprofit organizations back home have to get a CDL. If they are hauling around senior citizens in your district. They have to get a drivers license that costs upwards of \$40, and these people are paid minimum wage. I think he's got a good Resolution. Let's shoot it out of here."

Speaker Breslin: "There being no further discussion. The question is, 'Shall House Resolution 1650 be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye'. All those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the Resolution is adopted. Representative Leverenz, were you seeking recognition? Representative Leverenz? He indicates he was not seeking recognition. House Resolution 1660, Representative Black. You are recognized on the Motion."

Black: "Well, thank you very much, Madam Speaker. I'm joined in this Resolution as a hyphenated Cosponsor by Representative Weaver. And I'm very proud to announce that fact. However, it looks as if staff must be thinking of adjournment because it looks like we have the St. Louis spelling of President Bush (p. 16-Busch) in the Calendar, but be that as it may I...I move to discharge Executive Committee from further consideration and advance to the Order of Speaker's Table House Resolution 1660."

Speaker Breslin: "You have heard the Gentleman's Motion. Is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall the committee be discharged on House Resolution 1660 and should this Bill be moved to the Order of the Speaker's Table immediately...for immediate consideration?' All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. By use of the Attendance Roll Call the committee is discharged on House Resolution 1660. And Representative Black you are recognized to present the Resolution."

131st Legislative Day

June 19, 1990

- Black: "Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, HR 1660 urges President Bush, no matter how you spell it, to authorize the release of any information that any department or agency may have concerning military personnel listed as POWs or MIAs from World War II, Korea, or Vietnam Conflict."
- Speaker Breslin: "You have heard the Gentleman's Motion. Is there any further discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall House Resolution 1660 be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The Resolution is adopted. Ladies and Gentlemen, I have an announcement. We have a Sponsor who is willing to call a real Bill. It is on the Order of Environment, Third Reading. Would everyone please give a nice round of applause to Representative Brunsvold? Mr. Clerk, would you read Senate Bill 1838?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1838, a Bill for an Act to amend the Wildlife Code. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Breslin: "This Bill is on the Order of Third Reading.

 Representative Brunsvold asks leave to return this Bill to
 the Order of Second for the purposes of an Amendment. Does
 he have leave? Hearing no objection, leave is granted.

 Are there any Amendments filed?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative Leverenz."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Leverenz on Amendment #3"
- Leverenz: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Amendment #3 would provide that there would be no bow hunting in Rock Cut State Park.

 I move for the adoption of Amendment #3."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved the adoption of Amendment 3 to Senate Bill 1838. On that question is there any discussion? The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative McCracken."

131st Legislative Day

June 19, 1990

- McCracken: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. The Department of
 Conservation is opposed to the Amendment. They would like
 to have the discretion to control the activities in the
 parks under their jurisdiction and are opposed to the
 Amendment."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative McNamara."
- McNamara: "Question of the Sponsor of the Amendment. Is this not sufficient enough in order to accomplish that purpose?"
- Leverenz: "Representative McNamara, I'm glad you brought up calling of the herd. The Department as well as the Members of the subcommittee...by bow and arrow. It is a documented fact within the Department of Conservation."
- McNamara: "Thank you. And to the Amendment. Ιt is my understanding that it is not impossible if the Department of Conservation puts in to the rule that two does for every buck must be taken. I am concerned about the availability of hunting lands in the State of Illinois. I understand that the bow and arrow is a much safer method of culling that herd, if those regulations are in force. Much better than sharpshooters or rifles, going in there in order to do So, I urge the defeat of this Amendment."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Parke."

 Parke: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I, too, rise in opposition to this. I think this is a bad precedent to set, that in one particular park we're not going to allow bow hunting. Quite frankly, the Bow Hunters Association of Illinois is opposed to this also, because they think that they can present a worthwhile program of keeping deer populations down. There has been a number of compromises offered to the people in that area, to allow hunters with rifles to come in for another period of time to go in and clean up the job that the bow hunters

131st Legislative Day

June 19, 1990

may not be able to do in its entirety. But between the bow hunters and the rifles, the paid hunters, we ought to be able to get the deer population down. But many of us understand, especially downstaters, that bow hunting is a sport and today if we start here in this particular park to exclude bow hunters for the hunting of deer, then we'll find that this initiative may start in other counties and other park districts. So, I rise in opposition and I think that we should defeat this Amendment."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Leverenz is recognized to close."

Leverenz: "The previous speaker, the last speaker to speak, on the other side of the aisle is completely off base with his remarks, and I'll tell you why. Number one, you cannot thirty state parks currently. Of the sixty you cannot hunt in thirty state parks. So, this Amendment would allow the following: no hunting at all in thirty parks, and no bow and arrow hunting in one park, and hunting is allowed in the other thirty parks. It is illegal to hunt by rifle in any state park, and that where the previous speaker on the other side is completely off base, and I would hope that the Department would provide some better information so that the people that rise in their support are telling the facts rather than things that are just conjugated up. The people that live in the surrounding homes to the park, simply do deer that are shot with bow and arrow walking through their front or back yards, or running through their front or back bleeding with arrows hanging out of them. And that is exactly the point of the Amendment. I know of opposition from the Legislators from those areas, and I would ask for the adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #3 be

131st Legislative Day

June 19, 1990

adopted?' All those...excuse me, Representative Hartke, Representative Leverenz had already been recognized to We'll recognize you later for an explanation of vote, if you like. The question is, 'Shall Amendment #3 be adopted?' All those in favor vote 'aye'. All those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Representative Hartke, would you like to...one minute to explain your vote? Representative Hartke? No. The Gentleman indicates he does not wish to explain his vote. Have all voted who simple majority is required to adopt the all voted who wish? The Clerk will take Amendment. Have the record. On this question there are 40 voting 'aye', 60 voting 'no'. Representative Leverenz is recognized. For what reason do you seek recognition?"

Leverenz: "We've got 13 absentees. If we could call them." Speaker Breslin: "Poll the Absentees, Mr Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Poll of those not voting: Balanoff. DeJaegher.

Deuchler. Flinn. Klemm. Krska. Martinez. Matijevich.

McPike. Richmond. Satterthwaite. Anthony Young. And
Wyvetter Younge."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Hallock. Vote Representative Hallock 'aye'. On this question there are 41 voting 'aye', 60 voting 'no'. Representative Balanoff votes Representative Van Duyne. Vote Representative Van 'ave'. Representative Wyvetter Younge votes Representative Shirley Jones votes 'aye'. Representative Davis votes 'aye'...Monique Davis votes 'aye'. Representative Anthony Young votes 'aye'. Representative Matijevich votes 'aye'. Representative Nelson Rice votes 'aye'. Representative Edley votes 'aye'. Have all voted who wish? Representative Deuchler votes Representative Dunn votes 'aye'. That was Deuchler Dunn. Representative Hartke changes his vote from 'no' to

131st Legislative Day

June 19, 1990

- 'aye'. Is everyone recorded the way he or she prefers? If so, Representative Leverenz is recognized to verify the negative votes. Would you Poll the negative, Mr. Clerk?"

 (k O'Brien: "Poll of those voting in the negative: Ackerman
- Clerk O'Brien: "Poll of those voting in the negative: Ackerman.

 Barger. Barnes. Black. Breslin..."
- Speaker Breslin: "Excuse me, Represent...Mr. Clerk,
 Representative Hicks changes his vote from 'no' to 'aye'.
 Proceed, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Bugielski. Capparelli. Churchill. Countryman. Cowlishaw. Daniels. Doederlein. Ewing. Goforth. Granberg. Hannig. Hasara. Hensel. Hoffman. Hultgren. Johnson. Leitch. McAuliffe. McCracken. McNamara. Bob Olson, Myron Olson, Parcells, Parke, В. Pedersen. W. Peterson. Petka. Phelps. Piel. Pullen. Regan. Ropp. Ryder. Shaw. Sieben. Stange. Steczo. Stephens. Tenhouse. Terzich. Wait. Weaver. Wennlund. White. Williamson. Wojcik. And Zickus."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative DeJaegher...Representative

 DeJaegher was seeking recognition. Mr. Clerk, would you
 record me as not voting. The Gentleman from Cook,
 Representative Harris."

Harris: "Please record me as 'aye'."

Speaker Breslin: "Record Representative Harris as 'aye'. Repre sentative Turner as 'aye'. Representative Cowlishaw votes 'aye'. Representative Leverenz, you no longer have a right to verify the negative. Representative DeJaegher votes 'aye'. So, Representative Leverenz no longer has a right to verify the negative. Representative... and since one is no seeking to verify the affirmative... Representative McCracken...seeks to verify the affirmative. So, Poll the Affirmative. Poll the Affirmative, Mr. Clerk."

McCracken: "We have nothing else to do."

131st Legislative Day

June 19, 1990

Clerk O'Brien: "Balanoff. Bowman. Brunsvold, Cowlishaw. Cullerton. Curran. Currie. Davis. DeJaegher. Delieo. Deuchler. Didrickson. Dunn. Edley. Farley. Flowers. Virginia Frederick. Giglio. Giorgi. Hallock. Hartke. Hicks. Homer. Lou Jones. Shirley Jones. Keane. Kirkland. Kubik. Kulas. Lang. Laurino. LeFlore. Leverenz. Levin. Matijevich. Mautino. McGann. Morrow. Mulcahev. Munizzi. Novak. Preston. Rice. Ronan. Saltsman. Santiago. Stern. Sutker. Trotter. Turner. Van Duyne. Williams. Wolf. Woolard. Anthony Young. Wyvetter Younge. And Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative McCracken, do you have any questions of the Affirmative Roll? Excuse me, Representative Bowman asks leave to be verified. Mr. McCracken, Representative Bowman asks leave to be verified. Leave is granted. Any questions of the Affirmative, Mr. McCracken?"

McCracken: "Yes...Yes. Representative Lou Jones?"

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Lou Jones. Representative Lou Jones...is in the chamber. The Lady is in the chamber."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Flowers is...I see a hand, but I can't see you Representative Flowers. It doesn't look like Representative Flower's hand either, so, I don't think she is in the chamber. Remove her."

McCracken: "I don't think she is here either. You can just..."

Speaker Breslin: "Remove her, Mr. Clerk."

McCracken: "Representative Morrow?"

McCracken: "Representative Flowers?"

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

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

Speaker Breslin: "Remove him."

McCracken: "Representative DeJaegher?"

131st Legislative Day

June 19, 1990

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

McCracken: "Representative Giorgi? Oh, he is right there."

Speaker Breslin: "He is in the chamber."

McCracken: "Representative White?"

Speaker Breslin: "Representative White. How is the Gentleman recorded? He is recorded as voting 'no'."

McCracken: "Ready?...Okay. I'm sorry. Representative DeLeo?"

Speaker Breslin: "Yes...Representative DeLeo. How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Breslin: "Remove him."

McCracken: "Representative Preston?"

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

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

Speaker Breslin: "Remove him."

McCracken: "Representative Dunn?"

Speaker Breslin: "Representative John Dunn is in the chamber."

McCracken: "Representative Martinez?"

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Martinez. Mr. Martinez? How is the Gentleman recorded? He is not recorded as voting."

McCracken: "Just as well. Representative...Representative Saltsman?"

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

McCracken: "Representative Kulas?"

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

McCracken: "Representative Keane?"

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Keane. Mr. Keane? How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

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

McCracken: "Representative Ronan?"

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

131st Legislative Day June 19, 1990

McCracken: "Representative Giglio?"

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

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

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

McCracken: "Representative Hartke?"

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

McCracken: "Representative Lang?"

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Lang. Representative Lou Lang?

How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Breslin: "Remove him from...oh, he is in the chamber."

McCracken: "Oh, I'm sorry. Representative Woolard."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Woolard. Larry Woolard is in the chamber."

McCracken: "Representative Edley?"

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Edley. Bill Edley? How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Breslin: "Remove him from the Roll Call. Representative Mike Curran has asked leave to be verified...Leave is granted."

McCracken: "Yes...Nothing further."

"Representative Shaw changes his vote to 'aye'. Speaker Breslin: Representative Granberg changes his vote to Representative Flowers and Martinez have returned to the Add them to the Roll Call chamber. voting Representative Granberg has voted 'aye', Mr. Clerk. And Flowers and Martinez wish to be voted 'aye'. Now Representative Preston and Morrow have returned to the chamber. Add them to the Roll Call voting 'aye'. On this question there are 57 voting 'aye', 50 voting 'no', none voting 'present'. The Amendment is adopted. Are there any

131st Legislative Day

June 19, 1990

- further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #4, offered by Representative Brunsvold and Novak."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Brunsvold."
- Brunsvold: "Well, Madam Speaker...number...Amendment #4 is out of order after adopting Amendment #3, and I would like to take the Bill out of the record."
- Speaker Breslin: "Surely. Out of the record. Representative Brunsvold, do you wish to withdraw 4 while you have it before us here?"
- Brunsvold: "Yes. I'd withdraw 4 and I'm going to have #5 drafted."
- Speaker Breslin: "Very good. Withdraw #4, Mr. Clerk. On the Order of State and Local Government, Second Reading, appears Senate Bill 1617, Representative Steczo. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1617, a Bill for and Act to amend the Illinois Nursing Act. Second Reading of the Bill.

 Amendment #1 was adopted in committee."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Steczo. Oh, This bill is on the Order of Second Reading, excuse me. Are there any Motions or Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Steczo and Parke."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Steczo."
- Steczo: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Members of the House,
 Amendment #2 provides language to this Bill, which reflects
 language already passed by this House, but held in the
 Senate Rules Committee, that makes...nurse...the new nurse
 agencies comply with the same provisions of the law as
 hospitals and nursing homes in terms of reporting nurses
 that are habitually intoxicated or addicted. And I would
 move for its adoption."

131st Legislative Day

June 19, 1990

- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 1617. And on that question is there any discussion? Any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall Amendment 2 be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye', oppose 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative Richmond."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Richmond. Mr. Richmond. The Gentleman is not in the chamber. Representative Steczo is recognized for a Motion."
- Steczo: "Madam Speaker, I move to table Amendment #3."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman moves to table Amendment 3. On that question is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall Amendment 3 be tabled?' All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. Amendment 3 is tabled. Any further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #4, offered by Representative Steczo."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Steczo."
- Steczo: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Amendment #4 is clean up language for the Nurse Agency Act that was determined after consultation with the Joint Committee on Administrative Rules. Amendment #4 does two things. It, first, it provides that a home health agency is not exempt from obtaining licensure under this Act. That is in accordance with the discussions and negotiations that were held last year. And secondly, Madam Speaker, to allow the Nurse Agency Division in the Department of Labor to...provide for additional licensure for each location. This allows them to do that while providing for a small administrative fee.

131st Legislative Day

June 19, 1990

I would move for the adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment 4 to Senate Bill 1617. On that question is there any discussion? Any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill...Shall Amendment #4 be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #5, offered by Representative Steczo."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Steczo."

you, Madam Speaker. Members of the House, Steczo: "Thank Amendment #5 does three things. First, the Department of Professional Regulation has clean up language dealing with the Collection Agency Act. That is provided for Amendment. Secondly, there are...there is clean up language, I should say, that deals with the Pharmacy Practice Act, that was asked for by the Department of Professional Regulation. And thirdly, there is provisions dealing with various Acts that call for verification of continuing education by the Department of Qualified I move for the adoption of the Amendment." Organizations.

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment 5 to Senate Bill 1617. On that question, the Lady from Cook, Representative Didrickson."

Didrickson: "Yes. Would the Sponsor yield for a question, please?"

Speaker Breslin: "He will."

Didrickson: "Representative Steczo, it is my understanding, my office has received a number of phone calls with regards to some federal regulation with regards to continuing education of nurses aides. Does this, in any way, affect what is going on at the federal level and put Illinois into

131st Legislative Day

- June 19, 1990
- conformity with regards to requiring fifty additional hours of continuing education, for example nurses aides?"
- Steczo: "Representative Didrickson, first of all this does not apply to nurses aides at all. And secondly, this only deals with verification of continuing education, not continuing education itself for the other professions."
- Didrickson: "Does it expand upon the requirements for continuing education as..."
- Steczo: "No. It does not. Strictly verification."
- Didrickson: "Thank you."
- Speaker Breslin: "Any further discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall Amendment 5 be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #6, offered by Representative Richmond."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Richmond. Representative Richmond. Representative Steczo is recognized for a Motion."
- Steczo: "Madam Speaker, I move to table Amendment #6."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman moves to table Amendment 6. On that question is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall Amendment 6 be tabled?' All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. Amendment 6 is tabled. Any further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. On this same Order of Call appears Senate Bill 2036, Representative Saltsman. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 2036, a Bill for an Act to create
 Tri-County River Valley Development Authority. Second

131st Legislative Day

June 19. 1990

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

Speaker Breslin: "Any Motions or Amendments?"

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

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Saltsman."

Saltsman: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. All that Amendment #2 does it, allows IDA to disapprove a project, and when they do that the Tri-county Authority must get their own financing."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved the adoption of Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 2036. On that question is there any discussion? There being no discussion, the question is, 'Shall Amendment 2 be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye'. All those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. Any further Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"

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

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Saltsman."

Saltsman: "Like to withdraw Amendment #3."

Speaker Breslin: "Withdraw #3. Any further Amendments? There are no further Amendments, but there is a request for a fiscal note, Representative Saltsman. A request for a fiscal note, according to the Clerk's office, has not been complied with yet. So, the Bill will remain on the Order of Second Reading. On the Order of Civil Law, Second Reading, appears Senate Bill 2267, Representative Cullerton. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 2267, a Bill for an Act in relation to Criminal Law. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Hold the Bill on Second, Mr. Clerk. Senate

131st Legislative Day

June 19, 1990

Bill 2267 will be held on Second. Having been read a second time. Ladies and Gentlemen, on the Order of the Consent Calendar, Second Reading, Second Day, there appears Senate Bill 2067. Representative Saltsman's Bill. We held this Bill for an Amendment and the Amendment has been filed, printed and distributed. Do...are you ready to proceed? I see. They are waiting for another Amendment, Mr. Clerk. So, take this Bill out of the record. Back on the Order of Motions...on Resolutions on the Supplemental published Wednesday, June 13th appears Senate Bill 1627, Representative Shirley Jones. You are recognized to present your Motion, first and then the Resolution. Excuse me, it is a House Resolution. 1627. Before...excuse me. Representative Jones, Representative McCracken, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

- McCracken: "Is your sixty vote ruling based on the fact that these appeared on a Supplemental last week?"
- Speaker Breslin: "That's what I was told, although I didn't look it up."
- McCracken: "Okay. I think that's what it was."
- Speaker Breslin: "On the Calendar...They are also on today's Calendar."
- McCracken: "Oh, they are? Alright."
- Speaker Breslin: "They are all on today's Calendar.

 Representative Jones. Representative Jones, proceed."
- Jones, S.: "House Resolution 1627 on public pay telephones. I move to discharge Public Utilities from further consideration and advance to the Order of the Speaker's Table."
- Speaker Breslin: "You have heard the Lady's Motion. On that
 Motion is there any discussion? There being no discussion,
 the question is, 'Shall the House discharge House
 Resolution 1627 from the Public Utilities Committee and

131st Legislative Day

June 19, 1990

advance it to the Order of the Speaker's Table?' All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the Motion carries. Representative Jones you are recognized to present...by use of the Attendance Roll Call your Motion carries. Representative Jones, proceed with your Resolution."

- Speaker Breslin: "The Lady has moved for the adoption of House Resolution 1627. On that question is there any discussion? Any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall House Resolution 1627 be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it and the Resolution is adopted. House Resolution 1671, Representative Hasara. You are recognized on your Motion. Representative Hasara."
- Hasara: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I move to discharge Labor and Commerce from further consideration and advance to the Order of Speaker's Table House Resolution 1671."
- Speaker Breslin: "You have heard the Lady's Motion. Is there any objection? Hearing no objection and by use of the Attendance Roll Call House Resolution 1671 is discharged from the Labor and Commerce Committee and placed on the Speaker's Table. On that Order, Representative Hasara, you are recognized to present your Motion."
- Hasara: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. This Resolution addresses a very timely topic. Both the Environment and the Department of Corrections. This idea has come from some people in central Illinois, who are urging the Department of Corrections and Department of Energy and Natural Resources to consider implementing environmentally sound programs, while making use of the vast amount of prison labor. We

131st Legislative Day

June 19, 1990

are asking them to consider the possibility of instituting a recycling plant in one of the new prison facilities. I move for its adoption."

Speaker Breslin: "The Lady has moved for the adoption of House Resolution 1671. On the question the Gentlemen from Lake, Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Madam Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I don't have the Resolution in front of me. However, reading from the synopsis of the Resolution, Resolution may be frought with some danger, because we again are getting into the issue, 'shall we use prison labor, before we use people who are good citizens, who are employable, who have jobs?' I can't conceive the State of Illinois not being able to provide that good environmental plants and systems be not...be incorporated into the private sector. And I would urge the Members to be very careful about adopting what, again, some of us may think is innocuous or good to provide our prison...people in prison to be...to use their services. I'm all for keeping our prisoners busy and active, but when it encroaches on the employment of people who are good citizens, who depend on jobs for their family, then I have a problem with that. So, I am reluctantly going to oppose this Resolution because of what I think its effect may be."

Speaker Breslin: "There being no further discussion.

Representative Hasara is recognized to close."

Hasara: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I certainly do not disagree with the former speaker, that we do not want to be in competition with private enterprise. However, I would have you note that we already have many correctional industries in the State of Illinois. Our prisoners make absolutely beautiful furniture, that you could argue possibly should not be in conflict or in competition with furniture stores.

131st Legislative Day

June 19, 1990

They make many, many products. The reason that this Resolution came to my attention was because the two new correctional facilities are located in small communities. who are having a lot of difficulty developing recycling centers of their own. It is very difficult to get private business to come into a community of ten thousand and open up a recycling center. And that is why some of the residents of the area have asked that both the Energy and Natural Resources Department and Corrections simply look at a way to solve an environmental problem that some of these small areas are having. So, I do think it is a good to have them simply look at the issue and see if they can match the resources of our prisoners with the possibility of a need for a place to take recycled products."

Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall House Resolution 1671 be adopted?' All those in favor vote 'aye'. A11 opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mulcahey votes 'aye', Mr. The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 101 voting 'aye', 8 voting...excuse me, Representative Mautino, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

Mautino: "Just to explain my vote, if I may, Madam Speaker."

Speaker Breslin: "I'm sorry, I didn't see you light, but proceed."

Mautino: "I think the Members of this General Assembly should reexamine what they are doing here. The majority of people in the recycling business today...the mentally...the mental health and developmentally disabled facilities throughout this state. When, in fact, we put prison industries in that business, we take away from those entities, such as Horizon House, Gateway Center, Self-Help, all those mental health MHDD facilities that are now doing that recycling

131st Legislative Day

June 19, 1990

business. I think we should reevaluate and not put prisons in direct competition with MHDD facilities, that are doing an excellent job now. We should rethink this and put some yellows on there or some reds."

- Speaker Breslin: "Mr. Clerk, I already took the record, didn't I? The record has already been taken. Have all voted who wish? And are they recorded as they wish? question there are 101 voting 'aye'. Change Representative Saltsman to 'no', Mr. Clerk. There are 100 voting 'aye'. Representative Hartke votes 'no'. Representative Granberg votes 'no'. Representative Black votes 'no'. Representative Cullerton votes 'aye'. Representative Curran votes 'present'. Curran votes 'present'. Van Duyne votes 'no'. Representative Brunsvold votes Representative Weaver votes 'no'. On this question there are 94 voting 'aye', 15 voting 'no' and 2 voting 'present'. And the Resolution is adopted. House Resolution 1796. Representative Balanoff."
- Balanoff: "Yes, Madam Speaker, I move to discharge Energy,
 Environment and Natural Resources Committee from further
 consideration of House Resolution 1796, and move it
 to...advance it to the Order of the Speakers Table."
- Speaker Breslin: "You've heard the Gentleman's Motion. any objection? Hearing no objection by use of Attendance Roll Call, House Resolution 1796 has been discharged from the Energy, Environment and Natural is placed on the order of the Resources Committee and Speakers Table. On the Order of the Speakers Table, Representative Balanoff, you may present your resolution."
- Balanoff: "Yes, yes, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Resolution 1796, would urge Congress to repeal Section 10 of 1985 low level radioactive waste policy amendments, which require the Nuclear Regulatory

131st Legislative Day

June 19, 1990

standards for Commission to set the deregulation radioactive materials that have been characterized as below regulatory concern, the Resolution further asks that the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency and the U.S. Regulatory Commission refrain from any activity that will further deregulate the radioactive waste or materials. Very quickly if the U.S. government and the Nuclear Regulatory commission are allowed to deregulate what called below regulatory concern nuclear waste, it could end up in every landfill, every incinerator throughout the nation. It will wind up in many recycling streams and it's conceiveable that even your morning newspaper, your morning cup of coffee or a glass of orange juice could set off a Geiger counter because of radioactivity. The Department of Nuclear Safety is firm in their resolve that DRC should not be deregulated."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of House Resolution 1796, and on that question the Gentleman from Coles, Representative Weaver."

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

Speaker Breslin: "He will."

Weaver: "Representative, is this Resolution intended to deal specifically with the west Chicago low level material?"

Balanoff: "No, what is what's happening is that there is a possibility that Congress and the Nuclear Regulatory Commission will deregulate what is called the low regulatory concern on radioactive waste, and what that would mean is that it would not be manifested. There would be no tracking, it could end up in any landfill or incinerator..."

Weaver: "Okay, I understand, my concern is centered around as you may be aware I have a similar Resolution but I think I very

131st Legislative Day

June 19. 1990

much agree with you and will support your Amendment."
Balanoff: "Thank you."

- Speaker Breslin: "Any further discussion? There being none the question is, 'Shall House Resolution...' Excuse me. The Gentleman from DuPage, give the Gentleman some order please. Representative DeLeo, would you give Representative McCracken some order please. Proceed, Sir."
- McCracken: "Thank you, very much, that was very kind. I've trying to calm that man down all day. I believe that this Resolution is premature, apparently there is some talk in Washington about deregulating a certain level of nuclear waste. I think that it would be more prudent for us to wait to see what happens in Washington, if anything. There is no reason that we have to act now, before Washington does, in anticipation of what is rumored to be in fact, the findings justify deregulation at action. Ιf the federal level, I don't think there is a reason to suspicious of those conclusions. There is plenty of time and opportunity to address an actual piece of legislation in Congress, passed by Congress prior to the time we consider taking up the regulatory burden. And don't forget this...this will be a burden. No matter what the government finds, we can overregulate that to our hearts content and I assure you we will undoubtedly do so. Let us wait until we see and have the benefit of all of the from Washington to determine what, if regulation, we should impose as a result of their actions. This is absolutely premature. I rise in opposition to it."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Balanoff, is recognized to close."

Balanoff: "Yes, to talk about it being premature. Four states have passed laws already that say that no matter what the federal government does and no matter what the Nuclear

131st Legislative Day

June 19, 1990

Regulatory Commission does that they as states want to continue to be able to regulate DRC waste because it is that serious of a concern. This Resolution simply urges Congress and the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to refrain from deregulating DRC waste. Thank you."

- Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall House Resolution 1796, be adopted?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 100, there are 99 voting 'aye', 15 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. And the House does adopt House Resolution 1796. House Resolution 1812, Representative Trotter. Out of the record. House Resolution 1864, Representative Frederick."
- Frederick: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I move to discharge Appropriations II Committee from further consideration and advance 1864 to the Order of the Speaker's Table."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Lady...You have heard the Lady's Motion. Is there any discussion? There being none, is there any objections? Hearing none, by use of the Attendance Roll Call. House Resolution 1864 is discharged from the Appropriations II Committee and advanced to the Order of the Speaker's Table. On the Speaker's Table, Representative Frederick is recognized to present Resolution. Yes."
- Frederick: "House Resolution 1864 asks the Department of Public
 Health and Public Aid to be sure that the rights of
 handicapped individuals are protected as the two
 departments carry out the OBRA initiatives as set in place
 by the federal government in 1987. I move adoption of
 House Resolution 1864."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Lady has moved for the adoption of House Resolution 1864. On that question is there any discussion?

131st Legislative Day

June 19, 1990

There being none, the question is, 'Shall House Resolution 1864 be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And House Resolution 1864 is adopted. House Joint Resolution 111, Representative Weaver."

- Weaver: "Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. I move to discharge committee from further consideration of House Joint Resolution 111. The Bill was never heard in committee, never posted in committee and did not receive a fair hearing."
- Speaker Breslin: "You have heard the Gentleman's Motion. Is there any objection? Hearing no objection and by use of the Attendance Roll Call, House Joint Resolution 111 is discharged from the Energy, Environment and Natural Resources Committee and advanced to the Order of the Speaker's Table. On the Order of the Speaker's Table, Representative Weaver, you are recognized to present the Resolution."
- Weaver: "Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. House Joint Resolution lll asks the U.S. Congress to reconsider the COMPACT Commission Program that it established simply because a study conducted after their ruling indicated that we may not actually have enough waste for the twelve separate facilities that they are requiring be built. Barring that we ask them that they reconsider in terms of the time line, if you are aware of what is happening in Illinois at this current time...we are proceeding this summer on what are the actual site selection should be, and with the permit requirements it is apparent that we may have a great deal of difficulty meeting the 1993 deadline. I'll be happy to answer any questions that you may have."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of House Joint Resolution 111. On that question the Gentleman

131st Legislative Day

June 19, 1990

from Effingham, Representative Hartke."

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

Speaker Breslin: "He will."

Hartke: "Representative Weaver, are you saying that the eleven sites do not generate enough waste? Eleven sites in Illinois or eleven sites...or what eleven sites are you talking about?"

Weaver: "No. That is nationally."

Weaver: "No. I am suggesting that perhaps we don't need twelve sites in the nation to store low level material, because the study has indicated that we are going to have about 55% of the material that was originally projected. Currently, there are only three sites in the united States. And it seems to be a little bit far reaching to me that all of a sudden we are going to need a dozen sites, where in the past we functioned very well with three."

Hartke: "So, you are suggesting with this Resolution then that

Congress consider not twelve sites, but maybe two sites or

three sites in the United States. And then that we join

another state or three states or five states to form a

compact and start the system all over again?"

Weaver: "Well, perhaps we don't even need a compact system.

Perhaps we can do with low level material, what we are

currently studying to do with high level material and that

is to store it in the desert in an area that is totally

away from human habitation, and totally away from ground

water and totally away from any environmental impact."

Hartke: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Breslin: "Any further discussion? There being none the question is, 'Shall House Joint Resolution 111 be adopted?'

131st Legislative Day

June 19, 1990

- All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. House Joint Resolution lll is adopted. Representative Cullerton in the Chair."
- Speaker Cullerton: "Representative Hartke, for what purpose do you arise?"
- Hartke: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Representative Satterthwaite wants to be next."
- Speaker Cullerton: "Mr. Clerk, please read House Joint Resolution 123, Representative Satterthwaite."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Joint Resolution 123, a Motion to discharge
 Higher Education from further consideration and advance to
 the Order of the Speaker's Table."
- Speaker Cullerton: "Representative Satterthwaite."
- Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the..."
- Satterthwaite: "I rose. Fine. Thank you. Now that I have arisen..."
- Speaker Cullerton: "No. Now that you are up."
- Satterthwaite: "I move to discharge Higher Education from further consideration and advance to the Order of Speaker's Table House Joint Resolution 123. The Resolution was inadvertantly omitted from posting in committee. It is by agreement that we ask that this Resolution come out so that a study can be done in time for us to know before the end of the Session, whether or not to move forward with the Midwest Higher Education Compact Bill. And for that reason I ask your support to discharge the Resolution from Higher Education."
- Speaker Cullerton: "The Lady moves to discharge Higher Education from further consideration with regard to House Joint Resolution 123. On that Motion is there any discussion?

 The Gentleman from McLean, Representative Ropp."

131st Legislative Day

June 19, 1990

Ropp: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, I stand in support...pardon?"

Speaker Cullerton: "Objection."

Ropp: "Mr....Mr. Speaker..."

Speaker Cullerton: "Thank you."

Ropp: "I could hardly see. There is hair almost over the ears.

It was hard to distinguish, but I'm sorry. Mr. Speaker, I stand in support of the Lady's Motion. We have legislation that is already passed the House waiting in the Senate, but it is important that this Resolution be passed so that the study can allow the Bill that we have to move forward. It is a good step and I urge the Body to support the Motion."

Speaker Cullerton: "Any further discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall the House discharge Education from further consideration with regard to House Joint Resolution 123?' A11 in favor say 'ave'. opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The Motion carries. Do we have leave for Attendance Roll Call to consider House Joint Resolution 123. Leave is granted by the Attendance Roll Call. Representative Satterthwaite on House Joint Resolution 123."

Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, as Representative Ropp and I have both said in discussion of the Motion, it is agreed that we would move forward with this study of the advantages of...a higher education compact to be formed in the midwestern states and to look at that study in order to determine whether to move forward with actual legislation. I know of no objection. This is being done in conjunction with the Intergovernmental Cooperation Commission. I would urge your support of the House Joint Resolution 123."

Speaker Cullerton: "Lady moves for the passage of House Joint Resolution 123. On that is there any discussion? There

131st Legislative Day

June 19, 1990

being none, the question is, 'Shall House Joint Resolution All in favor say 'aye', opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. House Joint Resolution 123 passes. Representative Johnson, House Joint Resolution 130. Representative Johnson? Out of the record. House Joint Resolution 123 is adopted. Representative Ronan, House Joint Resolution 133. Representative Ronan? Out of the record. Representative Trotter. Representative Trotter, you had a Motion with regard to House Resolution 1812. Did you want to proceed with that Motion to discharge?"

Trotter: "No, Sir. I have an Amendment coming and I'm waiting until it is distributed. Has it already been distributed?"

Speaker Cullerton: "Representative Trotter, we'll take this Resolution out of the record until that Amendment is printed. Okay. The Chair is prepared to go through the Calendar again. We'll start at the top of the Calendar with regard to Banking, Second Reading, Representative Hicks, House Bill 2083. With regard to House Bill 2083, did you have a Motion? I'm sorry, Senate Bill 2083?"

Hicks: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I would move to extend the deadline on Senate Bill 2083 to November 30th, 1990. It has been talked about on both sides. It is agreed to by both sides of the aisle to extend this deadline. The purpose being that we want this Bill to be used in the fall for any clean up in the Saving Bank Act. And I'd be happy to answer any questions anyone might have."

Speaker Cullerton: "Excuse me, Representative Hicks, just take it out of the record for one second. There is one technical...take it out...thank you. Representative Currie, on the Order of Environment on Second Reading, 2253. Do you wish to have that Bill called? Yes. Mr. Clerk, please read the bill, 2253."

131st Legislative Day

June 19. 1990

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 2253, a Bill for an Act to amend the
Toxic Pollution Prevention Act. Second Reading of the
Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Cullerton: "Any Floor Amendments?"

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

Speaker Cullerton: "Representative Currie on Amendment #1."

Currie: "I think...I think this one we want to withdraw."

Clerk O'Brien: "That was Representative Barnes - Currie."

Currie: "We want to withdraw this Amendment, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Cullerton: "Representative Currie?"

Currie: "Withdraw the Amendment, please, Mr. Speaker. There's a later Amendment that does the same that does, and it does it better."

Speaker Cullerton: "Amendment #1 is withdrawn. Any further Amendments?"

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

Speaker Cullerton: "Representative Currie."

Currie: "Mr. Speaker, this Amendment and several that follow are identical to Amendments offered by Representative Keane on another Bill last week. The Amendment failed rather...by rather a large margin and Representative Keane authorized me to offer to table these Amendments."

Speaker Cullerton: "So you wish to withdraw Amendment #2?"

Currie: "Yes. 2, 3, 4...2, 3 and 4, please."

Speaker Cullerton: "The Lady moves to withdraw Floor Amendments #2, 3 and 4. Those Amendments are withdrawn. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #5, offered by Representative Barnes and Currie."

Speaker Cullerton: "Representative Currie, Amendment #5."

Currie: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Members of the House, this is

131st Legislative Day

June 19, 1990

an Amendment proposed by the Department of Energy and Natural Resources, that was the subject of a Senate Bill that got stuck in House Rules. It would...it would expand the CMS program on waste reduction and recycling in state buildings and would apply to all state supported institutions of higher learning and a waste reduction and recycling program as well. I would appreciate your support for the Amendment."

Speaker Cullerton: "The Lady has moved for the adoption of House...Floor Amendment #5. On that is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Would the Sponsor yield for a quick question?"

Speaker Cullerton: "She indicates, she will."

Black: "Thank you. Representative Currie, it is stated in our analysis that the higher education community has no problem with this Amendment, but we often overlook the community college system when we say that. For the record, can you tell me what to the best of your knowledge has the Community College Board also signed off on this Amendment?"

Currie: "I don't have specific information, Representative, but I would assume that the answer is yes. This proposal came out of the Senate with an overwhelming vote. It has been around for a number of months."

Black: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Cullerton: "Further discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall Amendment #5 be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye', opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. Amendment #5 is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #6, offered by Representative Black and Novak."

131st Legislative Day

- June 19, 1990
- Speaker Cullerton: "Representative Black wishes to withdraw Amendment #6. Any further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #7, offered by Representative
 Currie."
- Speaker Cullerton: "Representative Currie on Amendment #7."
- Currie: "I believe #7 and 8 are actually offered by Representative Keane. And I would, again, like leave of the Body to withdraw those Amendments, with Representative Keane's approval."
- Speaker Cullerton: "What Amendment numbers were they that you wish to withdraw?"
- Currie: "It looks to me as if 7 and 8."
- Speaker Cullerton: "You wish to withdraw 7...You're the Sponsor of #7."
- Currie: "Oh, wait a minute. Sorry. Sorry. Sorry. Sorry."
- Currie: "Seven, I am the Sponsor of and I would move adoption of the Amendment. This is the Environmental Protection Agency Proposal that again succeeded in the Senate Bill, but was stuck in House Rules. And the Bill deals with the reports to the EPA from the owners and operators of land fills, incinerators and transfer stations."
- Speaker Cullerton: "So, Amendment #7 is not withdrawn. Instead we are going to move to adopt Amendment #7. On that is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall Amendment #7 be adopted?' All in favor say opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. Amendment #7 is adopted. Any further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #8, offered by Representative Keane."

131st Legislative Day

- June 19, 1990
- Speaker Cullerton: "Representative Currie."
- Currie: "Same Motion to withdraw the Amendment with the support of the Sponsor."
- Speaker Cullerton: "Amendment #8 is withdrawn. Any further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #9, offered by Representative Currie."
- Speaker Cullerton: "Representative Currie."
- Currie: "Withdraw Amendment 9, please."
- Speaker Cullerton: "The Lady withdraws Amendment #9. Any further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #10, offered by Representative
 Currie."
- Currie: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Members of the House, this
 Amendment is clean up language on the underlying Bill in
 Senate Bill 2253, which was an Amendment to the Toxic
 Pollution Prevention Act. I'd be happy to answer your
 questions and would appreciate your support."
- Speaker Cullerton: "The Lady has moved for the adoption of Amendment #10. On that is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall Amendment #10 be adopted?' All in favor say 'aye'. All opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. Amendment #10 is adopted. Any further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #11, offered by Representative Black and Novak."
- Speaker Cullerton: "Representative Black on Amendment #11."
- Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Amendment #11 simply adds the provisions of Senate Bill 2104, which passed out of the Senate earlier this Session by a vote of 58 0. It was held in House Rules. It simply authorizes the Department of Conservation to offer cash incentives to the developer of any property

131st Legislative Day

June 19, 1990

under the Department's jurisdiction. Currently, that's..the Department is limited to offering cash incentives to developers of only four sites: Shelbyville. Rock Cut, New Salem State Park and Wayne Fitzgerroll State This now is a Department of Conservation Administration Bill. Ι urge your support of Amendment #11."

Speaker Cullerton: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #11. On that is there any discussion. Being none, the question is, 'Shall Amendment #11 be adopted?' All in favor say 'aye'. All opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Cullerton: "Third Reading. Representative Countryman. Yes, Representative Countryman, on the Order of Insurance, Second Reading. Representative Munizzi, with regard to State Government Administration, Second Reading. Okay, will...the Chair will now go to the Order of Third Reading and see if there is any Bills that Members wish to call. We can start with...on the Order of Education, Third Reading. Representative Steczo, 1512, out of the record. Representative Stern... Turner, 1523, out of the record. And Representative Levin, 1591, The Gentleman the chamber? Representative Levin on 1591 on the Order of Education. Out of the record. With regard to Environment. Representative Brunsvold. Representative Hicks, we're looking for Bills on Third Reading that the Sponsors wish to call. You have a Bill you wish to call? You have a Bill 2110...you want that out? The Bill is on Third Reading now. Out of the record? Is Representative Hensel in the chamber? Representative Hensel. Representative Johnson. Representative Johnson, we were on

131st Legislative Day

June 19, 1990

the Order of Motions...House Joint Resolution 130, did you wish to call that, Sir? It is on page 16 of the Calendar."

- Johnson: "As long as there is no opposition to it."
- Speaker Cullerton: "I don't think so. Be a Motion to discharge Higher Ed."
- Johnson: "I would move to discharge the Committee on Higher Education and move for immediate consideration of HJR 130."
- Speaker Cullerton: "Okay. The Gentleman has moved for the...to discharge Higher Education from further consideration from House Joint Resolution 130. Is there any discussion on the Motion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall the Motion pass?' All in favor say 'aye'. All opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Motion prevails. Now, with leave of the Attendance Roll Call, the Gentleman wishes to proceed with House Joint Resolution 130. Leave being granted...leave is granted by the Attendance Roll Call. Representative Johnson on House Joint Resolution 130."
- Johnson: "This is a counterpart to the Senate Resolution that urges the National Collegiate Athletic Association to reform its policies to comport with fairness and due process. And it is kind of a modest approach to the issue.

 And I would urge its adoption."
- Speaker Cullerton: "The Gentleman from Macon, Representative Dunn."
- Dunn: "I couldn't hear, Mr. Speaker. What does this Resolution do?"
- Johnson: "It urges the NCAA to examine its policies with respect to fairness, and so forth. It is not legislation. It is simply an admonition."

Dunn: "And does it do anything else?"

Johnson: "No...I...No, it doesn't."

131st Legislative Day

June 19, 1990

Dunn: "So, it urges the NCAA to review their own policies, and that's all?"

Johnson: "Correct."

Dunn: "Thank you."

Speaker Cullerton: "Any further discussion? There being none.

Representative Matijevich from Lake."

Matijevich: "Yes. Would the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Cullerton: "He indicates he will."

Matijevich: "Representative Johnson, I think everybody knows why
you really introduced the Resolution. I think you really
introduced the Resolution to get the University of Illinois
off the hook. That, I'm sure, is the real reason. Did I
read...did I read correctly where there are reports that
the U of I now is going to plead guilty to some of these
charges by the NCAA?"

Johnson: "I can't hear you. What?"

Matijevich: "Did I read...yesterday or today, that the U of I...there are some reports that the U of I is going to plead guilty to some of these allegations by the NCAA?"

Johnson: "Is there reports that they are going to deny the allegations? Is that what you say?"

Matijevich: "No. Admit the allegations."

Johnson: "No. I don't believe so. This Resolution doesn't address that in any event. It simply addresses the procedures. Really parallels the Bill that Representative Cullerton and myself and other House Republicans and Democrats proposed. And probably wouldn't have the same opposition because it is not binding. a statement of fairness."

Matijevich: "Alright. I'll go along with that. I believe everybody ought to go through due process, but I just wonder in this whole process if we aren't going, in the end, cover up some of the real problems that not only the U

131st Legislative Day

June 19, 1990

of I, but all colleges and universities all over the country have. I think...I think we've really got to get to the bottom of what is happening in sports and athletics, now that it has become big, big business. And I agree that if anybody does say that some of the students are probably being taken advantage of, especially the poorer students, but I really don't think we ought to take the U of I off the hook either."

Johnson: "I agree, and I don't think this takes it off the hook. As a matter of fact, I think your point is an excellent one and a procedure that would allow a full disclosure and allow people to examine witnesses before they are convicted absentia, and a procedure that would make sure that all the facts are brought before the appropriate bodies rather than the current procedures, which operate in secrecy and unfairly to student athletes and people who are less able to defend themselves is a system that we all ought to embrace. I agree with you completely. That's basically what the Resolution urges them to do. The more facts that are brought out...if we are guilty, or any university is guilty of infractions they should be sanctioned. If they are not, they shouldn't, but in reaching that decision there ought to be an assumption of fairness in getting So, I think your point is a good one. think this Resolution directs itself to that."

Matijevich: "Alright. Alright. Well, that's why I thought that
 when you sponsored it, I think I'm a Cosponsor. With that
 I'll support your Resolution."

Johnson: "Thank you."

Speaker Cullerton: "Any further discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt House Joint Resolution 130?' All in favor say 'aye'. All opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it.

131st Legislative Day

June 19, 1990

And the House does adopt House Joint Resolution 130. Representative Ronan, House Joint Resolution 133. There's a Motion to discharge."

Ronan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Members of the House, I move to discharge the Select Committee of Constitutional Officers from further consideration, advance to the Order of Speaker's Table. This Resolution is bipartisan and it appears that the committee just overlooked it. So, I'd be glad to answer any questions about it. It deals with the Department of Public Health and their review mechanism for handling the Medical Advisory Board that reports to the Secretary of State's Office."

Speaker Cullerton: "The Gentleman moves for the House to discharge the Committee on Select Constitutional Officers from further consideration for House Joint Resolution Is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall the House discharge the Committee?' favor say 'aye'. All opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The House does charge...does discharge the Committee on House Joint Resolution 133. Now, by leave...by the Attendance Roll Call the Gentleman moves to consider...for consideration of House Joint Resolution 133. Is there Leave is granted by use of the Attendance Roll Call. Representative Ronan, on the Motion."

Ronan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As I stated. This deals with the legislation that we have already sent to the Senate involving the Department of Public Health's review of the physical condition of individuals who operate motor vehicles in the State of Illinois. I'll be glad to answer any questions. This is a bipartisan House Joint Resolution."

Speaker Cullerton: "The Gentleman moves to adopt House Joint

131st Legislative Day

June 19, 1990

Resolution 133. On that is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt House Joint Resolution 133?' All in favor say 'aye'. All opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the House does adopt House Joint Resolution 133. Consent Calendar, Third Reading."

Clerk O'Brien: "Consent Calendar, Third Reading, Second Day. Senate Bill 1498, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Third Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill Vehicle Code. 1532, a Bill for an Act in relation to Regulated Professions. Third Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1572, Bill for an Act to amend an Act to prohibit minors from buying or selling tobacco. Third Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1573, a Bill for an Act to amend the Volunteer Payroll Deduction Act. Third Reading of the Bill. Bill 1588, a Bill for an Act to establish the...and administrate the Alton Lake Heritage Parkway. Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1635, a Bill for an Act to amend the township law. Third Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1641, a Bill for an Act to amend the Counties Code. Third Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1657, a Bill for an Act to amend the Public Building Commission Act. Third Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1676, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. Third Reading of the Senate Bill 1689, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Credit Union Act. Third Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1723, a Bill for an Act to amend the Business Corporation Act. Third Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1744, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Physical Therapy Act. Third Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1761, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Low-level Radioactive Waste Management Act. Third Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1840, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act in relation to

131st Legislative Day

June 19, 1990

youth with disabilities. Third Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1850, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Public Aid Code. Third Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1856, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Lottery Law. Third Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1860, a Bill for an Act to amend the Crime Victim's Compensation Act. Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1867, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act in relation to fire protection. Third Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1882, a Bill for an Act to amend the Consumer Installment Loan Act. Third Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1897, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Vehicle Code. Third Reading of Senate Bill 1905, a Bill for an Act to amend the Local Government Debt Reform Act. Third Reading of the Senate Bill 1958,a Bill for an Act authorizing conveyance of land in Cook County. Third Reading of the Bill. Bill 1985, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1991, a Bill for an Act in relation to Vermilion County Conservation District. Third Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 2026, a Bill for an Act to amend the Code of Criminal Procedure. Third Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 2039, a Bill for an Act to amend the Humane Care for Animals Act. Third Reading of the Senate Bill 2078, a Bill for an Act to Illinois Criminal Justice Information Act. Third Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 2088, a Bill for an Act to Third Reading of the Bill. the Illinois Vehicle Code. Senate Bill 2090, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Vehicle Code. Third Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 2109. a Bill for an Act in relation to Management. Third Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 2124, a Bill for an Act concerning land in Kane County. Third Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 2184, a Bill for an Act

131st Legislative Day

June 19, 1990

in relation to Taxes. Third Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 2193, a Bill for an Act to create the Juvenile Detention Center Revolving Loan Fund. Third Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 2209, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act to revise the law. Third Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 2256, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act in relation to International Trade. Third Reading of the Bill."

- Speaker Cullerton: "Representative Harris, for what purpose do
 you rise?"
- Harris: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As the Sponsor of Senate Bill 1905, I ask that the...I move that the Bill be removed from the Consent Calendar, which was just read. And be moved back to the Order on the Calendar of Consent Calendar. Third Reading. First Legislative Day."
- Speaker Cullerton: "Okay, then the request is to remove the Bill from the Consent Calendar, Third Reading, Second Day and to the Consent Calendar, Second bring it back Reading...Third Reading, First Legislative Day. The Gentleman has leave. The question is, 'Shall these Bills pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'. All opposed vote Voting is open. This is final passage. This is the Consent Calendar, Third Reading. Representative Peterson, for what purpose do you rise? Your light is on, Sir. Representative Olson."
- Olson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, at the end of this Order of Business, I'd like to address it."
- Speaker Cullerton: "Fine, thank you. Have all voted who wish?

 Have all voted who wish? Representative Peterson, I think
 you hit your speak button instead of your vote button,
 so,...you do wish to vote. Okay. Fine. Thank you. The
 vote button is the green one. I know you don't hit that
 that often, but it is right next to the speak button. Mr.
 Clerk, please take the record. On this question there are

131st Legislative Day

June 19, 1990

117 voting 'yes', none voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'.

And the Consent Calendar, Third Reading is hereby...having received the required Consititutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Representative Curran. Is the Gentleman in the chamber? Representative Steczo. Representative Steczo? Representative Flinn. We have some very important House Resolutions on the Speaker's Table. You have one. It is House Resolution 617 urging the appreciation for the Savings and Loan Industry."

- Flinn: "Well, I've been waiting two years to have it...I've been waiting two years to have it called."
- Speaker Cullerton: "So, Mr. Clerk will you please read House Resolution 617?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 617 urges appreciation of the Savings and Loan Industry. Financial Institutions Committee recommends it be adopted."

Speaker Cullerton: "Representative Flinn."

- Flinn: "Well, really about all the House Resolution does is, congratulate the Savings and Loan Industry and show our appreciation for them doing such a great job. When Texas and California was really spending the taxpayer's money like wild, and I guess if everybody gets their just dues, there will be a lot of people in the Savings and Loan business in Texas and California in jail and not very many from Illinois. I would move for the adoption of the House Resolution."
- Speaker Cullerton: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of House Resolution 617. On that is there any discussion? The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative McCracken."
- McCracken: "You know it is about time they...they disregarded goodwill in producing balance sheets. You know the goodwill inflation was the fiction which kept a lot of these savings and loans in operation long after they should

131st Legislative Day

June 19. 1990

have been shut down and their loans sold off. I think is a wonderful thing that they are not going to be able to cook the books by inflating the goodwill value. as an accounting term goodwill is nothing more than the difference between the hard assets and the liabilities. You write it off to goodwill. That's what balances the books and that is what the industry did. I don't think it is such a bad thing. Now, I agree that they had the right to use good...goodwill, that the rules in effect at that time sanctioned the use of goodwill. However, I don't see any reason to continue it. And I don't see that it is such a penalty if in fact the goodwill represents nothing more than the difference between assets and liabilities for accounting purposes. Why should they be able to use it for that purpose any further? I see nothing wrong with using the...or I should say not with using...anything wrong with Congress's action to disregard the use of goodwill, repeal the use of goodwill. I don't think that is such a bad thing. You know when half a trillion dollars goes down the drain, maybe a few changes are necessary. And I think this may be one of those changes."

Speaker Cullerton: "Any further discussion? The Gentleman from DuPage...oh, I'm sorry. Any further discussion? The Lady from DuPage, Representative Cowlishaw."

Cowlishaw: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, it is my understanding from the explanation given by the Sponsor of this Resolution that essentially what it expresses is our gratitude for the fact that in the State of Illinois we have fewer crooks in the savings and loan industry than they do in either Texas or California. I think we ought to indeed be grateful for every little thing including having fewer crooks than the number in Texas and California. And therefore, I stand in support of this

131st Legislative Day

June 19, 1990

very important Resolution."

- Speaker Cullerton: "Any further discussion? The question is, 'Shall the House adopt House Resolution 617?' All in favor All opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The House does Resolution 617. Representative Woolard? Representative Woolard. Out of the record. Representative Santiago. of the record. Representative Van Duyne. Representative Brunsvold. Representative Brunsvold, House Joint Resolution 33. Out of the record. Representative Lou Jones, House Joint Resolution 99. This is a House Joint Resolution that urges the State Comptroller to lower from 1500 to 500 the minimum payroll deductions required. Out of the record. Representative Novak. Representative Brunsvold. Representative Brunsvold. Representative Brunsvold for purposes of an announcement."
- Brunsvold: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen, the Quad city reception that was planned last week is going on at the present time and everyone is invited to come over and have a little food and...whatever. Over at Baur's.

 Baur's at the Archives. It is going on right now until 7:30...This is a big thank you for all of you wonderful people that helped us with riverboat gambling."
- Speaker Cullerton: "In light of that announcement, I'd like to call upon Representative Matijevich for the Agreed Resolutions."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Joint Resolution 131, offered by Representative Ryder. House Resolution 1951, Doederlein. 1952, Ronan. 1953, Matijevich. 1955, DeJaegher. 1956, DeJaegher. 1957, DeJaegher. 1958, DeJaegher. 1959, DeJaegher. 1961, Cullerton. 1962, Turner. 1963, Weaver. 1966, Speaker Madigan."
- Speaker Cullerton: "Representative Matijevich on the Agreed

131st Legislative Day

June 19, 1990

Resolutions."

- Matijevich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, we have examined the Agreed

 Resolutions. They are all agreed to and I move the

 adoption of the Agreed Resolutions."
- Speaker Cullerton: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. All in favor say 'aye'. All opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it.

 The Resolutions are adopted. General Resolutions."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 1948, McNamara. 1950, Weller.

 1964, Cullerton."
- Speaker Cullerton: "Committee on Assignment, Beath Resolutions."

 Clerk O'Brien: "House Joint Resolution 138, offered by Representative Hultgren, with respect to the memory of Michael David Fitzgivens. House Resolution 1954, offered by Representative Hultgren, with respect to the memory of Lee A. Rogers. House Resolution 1960, offered by Representative Hasara, with respect to the memory of Ryan White. House Resolution 1965, offered by Representative LeFlore, with respect to the memory of Anthony W. Cobbs."
- Speaker Cullerton: "Representative Matijevich moves the adoption of the Death Resolutions. All in favor say 'aye'. All opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. Resolutions are adopted. Representative Olson, for what purpose do you rise?"
- Olson, M.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we've had a busy day, but the most important issue today is who won the 'fat man's' contest? Well, I am happy to report that by a very narrow margin the Republicans nosed out the Democrats. The Democrats had an average weight loss of three pounds per person. We averaged five and a half pounds. Some major, major winners were Dick Mautino, who had a significant loss. Dave Leitch, Bob Piel and as a consequence tomorrow night we will be the guests

131st Legislative Day

June 19, 1990

of the Democrats at Alexander's at a half hour after the close of the Session. And we are very pleased to have joined in this significant health issue of this...this Session of the House. Congratulations to all my fellow Republicans. And congratulations to the Democrats who participated."

- Speaker Cullerton: "Representative Rice, for what purpose do you
 rise?"
- Rice: "In response to that fine Republican, him and a fellow named Kubik, they sent all kind of cakes to good Democrats.

 They did blackmail things. A very ugly thing you did, but we just ate that cake tonight, Kubik."
- Speaker Cullerton: "Representative Matijevich moves the House stand adjourned until tomorrow at the hour of 10:00 a.m....10:00 a.m. tomorrow morning."

REPORT: TIFLDAY PAGE: 001

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES DAILY TRANSCRIPTION OF DEBATE INDEX

JUNE 19. 1990

STATE OF ILLINOIS

86TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY

SB-1125	RECALLED
SB-1125	THIRD READING
SB-1488	SECOND READING
\$8-1488	OUT OF RECORD
S3-1501	SECOND READING
SB-150 8	THIRD READING
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	THIRD READING
	OUT OF RECORD
	THIRD READING
	SECOND READING
	RECALLED
	THIRD READING
	THIRD READING
SB~1905	MOTION
SB-2036	SECOND READING
\$3-2066	RECALLED
\$B-2066	THIRD READING
\$8-2066	THIRD READING
SB-2067	SECOND READING
\$8~2083	MOTION
SB-2099	SECOND READING
\$5-2110	THIRD READING
Sa-2131	THIRD READING
SB-2239	RECALLED
SB-2239	THIRD READING
\$5~2253	SECOND READING
SB~2267	SECOND READING
HR-0111	MOTION
HR-0123	MOTION
HR-0130	MOTION
HR~0617	RESOLUTION OFFERED
HR~1514	MOTION
HR~1514	OUT OF RECORD
	MOTION
HR-1526	MOTION
HR-1562	MOTION
HR-1627	MOTION
HR-1627	MOTION

HR-1633 MOTION

HR-1650 MOTION

HR-1660 MUTION

HR-1671 MOTION

HR-1796 MOTION

HR-1864 MOTION

PRAYER - REVEREMD MAGNUSON

CONSENT CALENDAR - SECOND READING

CONSENT CALENDAR - THIRD READING

REPRESENTATIVE BRESLIN IN THE CHAIR

ROLL CALL FOR ATTENDANCE

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

AGREED RESOLUTIONS

DEATH RESOLUTIONS

APPROPRIATION

ADJOURNMENT

HR-1948 RESOLUTION OFFERED

HR-1950 RESOLUTION OFFERED

SUBJECT MATTER

HOUSE TO DEDER - SPEAKER MCPIKE

PAGE PAGE PAGE

104 107 128

ł

1

١

2

6

40

122

127

128

129

128

101

86

90/08/02

15:12:46

54

54

64

64

13

39

44

72

53

95

87

87

62

124

98

44

44

48

6

112

6

65

67

55 55

113

108

110

118

125

69

72

73

71

72

100

101

74

83

3.8

PAGE

PAGE PAGE

PAGE

PAGE

PAGE

PAGE

PAGE

PAGE

PAGE

PAGE

PAGE

PAGE

PAGE

PAGE

PAGE

PAGE

PAGE

PAGE

PAGE

PAGE

PAGE

PAGE

PAGE

PAGE

PAGE

PAGE

PAGE

PAGE

PAGE

PAGE