64th Legislative Day

June 11, 1991

- Speaker McPike: "The House will come to order. The Chaplain for today is Dr. Patrick Pajak, of the Tabernacle Baptist Church in Decatur. Dr. Pajak is the guest of Representative John Dunn. The guests in the balcony may wish to rise and join us for the invocation."
- Dr. Patrick Pajak: "Let us pray. Our heavenly Father, we come to Thee and we invoke Your blessing upon this Session of the House. We pray that all that is done would be done under Your watchful care and eye. We pray that You would guide the decisions that need be made and the discussion that is neard and, Lord, we pray for these men and women, who are pur Representatives. We thank You for them and for their ledication to the vocation that You have given them, and we pray that everything that is done this day would be reflective of Your honor and glory, and we pray it in Jesus' precious name. Amen."
- Speaker McPike: "We'll be led in the Pledge of Allegiance by Representative Hartke."
- Hartke:— 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: "Speaker, let the record reflect the excused absence of Monroe Flinn on this side of the aisle."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Kubik."
- Kubik: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Republicans are all here today, so no absences. Thank you."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Levin. Mr. Ellis Levin. Mr. Levin, please just punch your 'present' button please.

 Thank you. Take the record, Mr. Clerk. 117 Members

64th Legislative Day

June 11, 1991

answering the Roll Call. A quorum is present. Representative Munizzi...with the Calendar. Consent Calendar, Second Reading, Second Day. Read the Bills, Mr. Clerk."

"Consent Calendar, Second Clerk O'Brien: Reading, Second Day. Senate Bill 9, a Bill for an Act to amend the Nursing Senate Bill 19, a Bill for an Act to amend the Credit Card Insurance Act. Senate Bill 31, a Bill for an Act to amend the Animal Control Act. Senate Bill 68, a Bill for an Act to amend the Livestock Dealer Licensing Act. Senate Bill 106, a Bill for an Act to amend the Hospital Licensing Act. Senate Bill 108, a Bill for an Act to amend the Civil Administrative Code together with Committee Amendment #1. Senate Bill 130, a Bill for an Act to amend the Child Care Act together with Committee Amendment #1. Senate Bill 153, a Bill for an Act to the Illinois Municipal Code together with Committee Amendment #1. Senate Bill 154, a Bill for an Act to amend the Jury Act. Senate Bill 188, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. Senate Bill 251, a Bill for an Act to amend the Code of Civil Procedure. Senate Bill 253, a Bill for an Act to amend the Wildlife Code together with Committee Amendment #1. Senate Bill 269, a Bill for an Act to amend the Interest Act. Senate Bill 283, a Bill for an to amend the School Free Lunch Program Act. Senate Bill 298, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Savings and Loan Act. Senate Bill 317, a Bill for an Act to amend the Interest Act. Senate Bill 442, a Bill for an Act to amend the Public Aid Code. Senate Bill 506, a Bill for an Act to amend the Municipal Code. Senate Bill 510, a Bill for an Act to amend the Nursing Home Care Act. Senate Bill 567, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Public Library District Act. Senate Bill 591, a Bill for an Act to amend

64th Legislative Day

June 11, 1991

the Trust and Trustees Act. Senate Bill 600, a Bill for an Act to amend the Emergency Medical Services Act together with Committee Amendment #1. Senate Bill 609, a Bill for an Act to amend the Local Library Act. Senate Bill 638, for an Act to amend the Dental Student Grant Act. Bill Senate Bill 643, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Senate Bill 654, a Bill for an Act to amend the Code. Service Occupation Tax Act. Senate Bill 656, a Bill for an Ac+ to amend the Attorney's Lien Act. Senate Bill 660, Bi.l for an Act to create the Currency Reporting Act. amend the a Bill for an Act to 678, Senate Bill Metropolitan Water Reclamation District Act. Senate Bill a Bill for an Act to amend the Marriage 717. Marriage Act together with Committee οf Dissolution Amendment #1. Senate Bill 825, a Bill for an Act to amend Senate Bill 988, a Bill for an Act to the School Code. amend the Illinois Savings Association Banking Act. Senate a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Bill 1025, Senate Bill 1077, a Bill for an Act to Insurance Code. Senate Bill 1191, a Bill amend the Nursing Home Care Act. for an Act to amend the School Code. Senate Bill 1193, a Senate Bill Bill for an Act to amend the Wildlife Code. Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Insurance 1310. Senate Bill 1338, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Insurance Code. Senate Bill 1380, a Bill for an Code. Act to amend the Public Aid Code together with Committee Amendment #1. Second Reading of these Senate Bills."

Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. Representative Ropp."

I rise for the purpose of an "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. announcement about the fact that the... Pete Miller Ropp: House-Senate softball game will be this evening at 6:30 at Iles Park. For those of you who are interested in playing, be sure to go down to Representative Capparelli's office

64th Legislative Day

June 11, 1991

and pick up your shirt and hat. We would like to have some slight practice at 5:30 before the game at 6:30. You all come. Thank you."

Speaker McPike: "Does any Member have a Bill on the Consent Calendar, Third Reading, that needs to be brought back to Second for an Amendment? Representative Hensel, what is your Bill? Hensel, Mr. Hensel? Mr. electrician, please turn him on."

Hensel: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have a technical Amendment..."

Speaker McPike: "What is the Bill number?"

Hensel: "On Senate Bill 845 that I'd like to put on it and then have it go back to..."

Speaker McPike: "Okay. The Gentleman asks leave to return, on page 15 of the Calendar, Senate Bill 845, to Second Reading for an Amendment. Are there any objections? Hearing none, leave is granted. The Bill's on Second Reading.

Mr. Clerk, are there any Amendments?"

Hensel: "Mr. Speaker?"

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

Hensel: "Speaker?"

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Hensel."

Hensel: "Could that be put back on...Third Reading on Consent Calendar?"

Speaker McPike: "Let's try to adopt the Amendment first."

Hensel: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker McPike: "Go ahead. Go ahead, Sir. Go ahead. It's your Amendment. On the Amendment."

Hensel: "On 845?"

Speaker McPike: "The Bill's on Second Reading, Amendment #1.
 It's your Amendment."

Hensel: "Okay. It's a technical Amendment to explain what

64th Legislative Day

- June 11, 1991
- station is, and I just ask for its approval."
- Speaker McPike: "Let's try to give the Gentleman some quiet, please. Mr. Hensel."
- Hensel: "I have a technical Amendment to put on 845. All it does is explain what a station is, and I just ask for adoption of the Amendment."
- Speaker McPike: "The question is, Shall the Amendment be adopted?' All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. The Gentleman asks leave to use the Attendance Roll Call to put the Bill back on the Consent Calendar, Third Reading. Are there any objections? Hearing none, the Attendance Roll Call will be used. Leave is granted. The Bill's on Consent Calendar, Third Reading. Representative McAfee, on Senate Bill 686. Is that correct? The Gentleman asks leave to return 686 back to Second Reading. Leave is granted; the Bill's on Second Reading. Mr. Clerk, any Amendments? Mr. McAfee, there are no Amendments filed. Representative McAfee?"
- McAfee: "Mr. Speaker, the Amendment was filed in the well, just a few minutes ago, and I believe it's..."
- Speaker McPike: "Oh, we have an Amendment."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representatives

 Lang and McAfee."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Lang."
- Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Amendment #1 is simply a technical Amendment, defining...the term 'family member' that's in the Bill. No one is opposed to this. It is just clarification language, and I ask that it be adopted."
- Speaker McPike: "Mr. Black."
- Black: "Thank you very much,... Mr. Speaker. I'm not sure how

64th Legislative Day

- June 11, 1991
- long I can ...stall here until we can at least read the Amendment. Just a few seconds, alright?"
- Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall the Amendment be adopted?' All in favor say 'aye', opposed, 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. Representative Black. Mr. Black? Alright, the Gentleman asks leave to return the Bill to the Consent Calendar. If there no objections, the Attendance Roll Call will be used, leave is granted and the Bill is on Third Reading, Consent Calendar. Does anyone else have a Bill they wish amended? We're going to pass the Consent Calendar now. Representative Deering, what's your Bill number?"
- Deering: "What? Five sixty-four. I'd like to have leave to..."

 Speaker McPike: "Five sixty-four is not on the Consent Calendar,

 Third Reading. The Bills on Second Reading have been put

 on Third Reading, so we'll have to do that tomorrow.

 Alright. Has anyone...Representative Preston?"
- Preston: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to move to waive the posting requirements for Senate Bill 580, so that the Bill can be heard in the Children and Family Law Committee on Thursday at noon."
- Speaker McPike: "Mr. Preston, has this been cleared with the Minority spokesman?"
- Preston: "It has not. This just came up."
- Speaker McPike: "Alright. We'll need 71 votes. I think it would be advisable to...to clear it with the other side.

 Alright. We want to pass the Consent Calendar. We want to pass the Consent Calendar. Does anyone have a Bill on the Consent Calendar that needs to be amended? If not, Mr. Clerk, read the Bills. Consent Calendar, Third Reading."

64th Legislative Day

June 11, 1991

Clerk O'Brien: "Consent Calendar, Third Reading, Second Day. Senate Bill #8, a Bill for an Act to amend the Barber, Cosmetology and Esthetics Act. Senate Bill 41, a Bill to amend the Alton Lake Heritage Parkway Law. Senate Bill 43, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. Senate Bill 60, a Bill for an Act to amend the Higher Education Study Assistance Law. Senate Bill 110, a Bill for an Act to amend the Personnel Code. Senate Bill 115. a Bill for an Act to amend an Act concerning the Experimental Organ Transplantation Procedures. Senate Bill 118, a Bill an Act to amend the School Code. Senate Bill 139, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Public District Act. Senate Bill 140, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Municipal Code. Senate Bill 169, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Insurance Code. Senate Bill 181, a Bill for an Act to amend the Personnel Code. Senate Bill 189 has been removed from the Consent Calendar. Senate Bill 191. a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. Senate Bill 192, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. Senate Bill 220, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. Senate Bill 238, a Bill for an Act to amend the Code of Criminal Procedure. Senate Bill 240. a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. Senate Bill 262, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Alcoholism and other Drug Dependancy Act."

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Clerk stop on that Bill, 262.

Representative McNamara asks leave to return 262 to Second

Reading foran Amendment. Leave is granted. The Bill's on

Second Reading. Senate Bill 262, Mr. Clerk. Are there
any Amendments?"

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

Speaker McPike: "Representative McNamara."

64th Legislative Day

June 11, 1991

McNamara: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Amendment...adds an immediate effective date."

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

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. The Gentleman asks leave that the Bill remain on the Consent Calendar, Third Reading. Hearing no objectionstheAttendance Roll Call will be used. Leave is granted. The Bill's on the Consent Calendar. Mr. Clerk, read that Bill,..."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 262, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Alcoholism and other Drug Dependancy Act. 388, a Bill for an Act to amend the Environmental Protection Act. Senate Bill 422, a Bill for an Act to amend the Consumer Fraud and Deceptive Business Practice Senate Bill 462, a Bill for an Act to amend the Metropolitan Water Reclamation District Act. Senate Bill 527 has been removed from the Consent Calendar. Senate 649, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. Senate Bill 686, a Bill for an Act to amend the Circuit Court Clerk's Registration Act. Senate Bill 845, a Bill for an Act to amend the Environmental Protection Act. 864, a Bill for an Act to amend the Bill Senate Environmental Protection Act. Senate Bill 883, a Bill an Act to amend the Solid Waste Planning and Recycling Act. Senate Bill 1023, a Bill for an Act to amend the Comprehensive Health Insurance Act. Senate Bill 1098, Bill for an Act to amend the State Employees Group Insurance Act. Senate Bill 1244, a Bill for an Act to amend the Environmental Protection Act. Senate Bill 1286, a Bill for an Act to amend the Wildlife Code. Senate Bill

64th Legislative Day

June 11, 1991

1316, a Bill for an Act in relation to Wildlife Code. Senate Bill 1337, a Bill for an Act to amend the Consumer Fraud and Deceptive Business Practice Act. Senate Bill 1350, a Bill for an Act to amend the Job Referral and Job Listing Services Consumer Protection Act. Third Reading of these Senate Bills."

Speaker McPike: "Three Bills have been removed from the Consent Calendar. Senate Bill 189 and Senate Bill 527 have been removed from the Consent Calendar. The rest of the Bills have been read a third time. The question is, 'Shall these Bills pass?' All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take record. Representative Satterthwaite? Representative Satterthwaite, did you wish to vote on the Calendar? Mr. Clerk vote Representative Satterthwaite 'aye'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On these Bills. there are 115 'ayes' and 0 'nays' and these Bills, having received the Constitutional Majority, are hereby declared passed. Speaker Madigan in the Chair."

Speaker Madigan: "Ladies and Gentlemen, if the staff could retire to the rear of the chamber or to the side of the chamber and would the Members please take their chairs. Mr. Preston, please sit down and give us your attention. We're very pleased today to have with us the Counsel General from Poland, assigned to the City of Chicago and for the purpose of introduction I'm going to ask Representative Bugielski...to present the Counsel General and his wife. Representative Bugielski."

Bugielski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. It is an honor for me to be here today to introduce the Counsel General for the Country of Poland. It was in July of 1990, that Dr. Hubert Romanowski was asked by the Minister of

64th Legislative Day

June 11, 1991

Foreign Affairs to serve as Counsel General in the Chicago for the Republic of Poland. His tenure began in November of 1990. Dr.Romanowksi was the first non-Communist to hold such a position in 50 years. Mr. Romanowksi was also involved in...many organizations. He...in 1985. Romanowski was granted political asylum in the United States, on the basis of his former arrest and imprisonment in Poland for his involvement in the Solidarity activities. Mr. Romanowski's most ambitious achievement was the revival of the Chicago Chapter of the Polish University abroad, an institution his grandfather helped establish in England after World War II. Dr. Romanowski holds a doctorate in physical chemistry from the University of Wroclaw. his academic career, he received numerous awards for the research in the field of theoretical chemistry and has published extensively in American and European scientific iournals. Ιn 1982. Mr. Romanowski accepted postdoctorial fellowship, at the Illinois Institute of Technology. In 1985, he became a research associate, Northwestern University, and, in 1987, he took a position at the University of Chicago. It's my honor, and I you'd give them a welcome here to Springfield, to introduce Dr. Hubert Romanowksi."

Romanowski: "Good afternoon, Ladies and Gentlemen. Thank you, Bob, for a very nice introduction. I would like to thank all of you for giving me this chance to address you. This is a great honor for me. I came to Chicago in 1982 as a political refugee. At that time, I learned how strongly the people of Illinois supported the then-underground Solidarity movement in Poland. Illinois did a great deal to convince American government to help Solidarity and support its role in Poland, and Poland has always appreciated the help extended by the citizens of Illinois.

64th Legislative Day

June 11, 1991

Two years ago, in 1989, elections were held in Poland. We brought Solidarity to power and began the collapse of Communist system in Eastern Europe. Polish people then began the painful process toward democracy and free market At this time, once again, the State of Illinois committed itself to support Poland's rebirth of free 1990, Illinois passed legislation to open a market. In commercial office in Warsaw. You are the first state which has such an office in Poland, and it's used by many Americans, American businessmen, to help them conduct business in Poland. This office not only offers critical assistance to businessmen in the emerging business environment in Poland, but, it's a signal to Illinois businessmen of...of the commitment which your state has to economicel development in Poland. During 1990 and 1991, many representatives of the Polish legislature judiciary, local politicians, bankers and business people have come to Chicago, Springfield and other cities in Illinois to learn from you about democracy and free market. Many of you have met them personally and you have always been willing to help them and assure that their experience in Illinois has been fruitful. On behalf of the Polish government, I thank you for your hon...this office in Warsaw and for giving Polish visitors the chance to see democracy in action and bring knowledge of their experience back to Poland. year Poland celebrates 200 years anniversary of Constitution of 1791, which was the first constitution in Europe and model of the American Constitution of 1789. After 45 years of Communism, Poland enjoys this anniversary as a free country, rebuilding democracy at the end of 20th Century. Poland has made great progress during past 18 months of our boot-strap initiative. Our currency is a convertible; our credit is

64th Legislative Day

June 11, 1991

vastly improved, the international banking communities lending to good ventures. Our borders are open. I echo our President, Lech Walesa, 'People, of Illinois, come to do good business in Poland.' I can assure you that it is even now a good business for people of Illinois and Poland. Despite the gains of past 18 months, Poland will need you. We need your continued guidance, advice and encouragement. You have done a tremendous job already. I'm asking for you to continue to show an interest. Currently Poland faces many tasks during the transition from communism to democracy, since there's no model for the changes which Poland has already taken. The triumph of democracy over communist is the greatest triumph of our century. As elected officials, each of you are (sic is) reminded of the Meaning of democracy every day. for Poland is now, and the time to help Poland is now. Poland is a new democracy, Not a mature democracy like the United Sta tes. Your help and guidance is critical. I can promise you that whatever you do for Poland, Poles in Poland and Polish Americans in the State of Illinois, will welcome your interest and your interest will contribute a important... period of the history of the world. you for your attention."

Bugielski: "I just want to introduce Dr. Romanowski's wife,

Beverly, and just to let Representative Currie know that

the doctor and his wife are residents of Hyde Park."

Beverly Romanowski: "I would just also like to say hello and also say that I am very unusual as the wife of a Counsel General because I am an American citizen, and I can say that I have a very interesting view having grown up as an American and now seeing the other side of the developing democracy. So, thank you again for having us here and for listening to my husband's words today. Thank you."

64th Legislative Day

June 11, 1991

Speaker McPike: "Representative McPike in the chair. Page two of the Calendar. House Bill, Second Reading, appears House Bill 106. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 106, a Bill for an Act to apportion the State of Illinois into legislative and representative districts, Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 lost in committee. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Churchill and Parcells."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Churchill."

Churchill: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Floor Amendment #2 is a very simple Amendment that just says that as we create district we shall not dilute voting strength of any person, group of persons or members of any political party."

Speaker McPike: "Speaker Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker,...Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in opposition to the Gentleman's Amendment because the subject matter of this Amendment will be covered by a later Amendment to be offered by Representative Jones and Representative Young."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Churchill, to close."

Churchill: "I have not had an opportunity to read that subsequent Amendment at this point. I would state that...this Amendment can rise or fall on its own merits. If it is to be duplicated at a later time, that's fine, but I think we ought to have a Roll Call vote on this issue, and the question, basically, is do you dilute the voting strength of any person, group of persons or members of any political party. I don't think we want to do that, and I think at this point the Roll Call vote should be maintained, and I would ask for that. Thank you."

Speaker McPike: "This is House Bill 106. The question is, 'Shall the Amendment be adopted?' All in favor vote 'aye',

64th Legislative Day

June 11, 1991

opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this Amendment there are 46 'ayes' and 69 'nos'. The Amendment is defeated. Further Amendments?"

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

Speaker McPike: "Representative Churchill."

Churchill: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Floor Amendment #3 basically says that in...in the process of redistricting that we do whatever we can to preserve existing communities of interest, and we do that in compliance with the constitutional standards of the Voting Rights Act of 1965. It defines community of interests to those communities that include, but are not limited to racial, ethnic, geographic, social, cultural, local government or historical interest and commonality of communications or transportation. I would move for the passage of Amendment #3 and ask for a Roll Call vote thereon."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rop...rise in opposition to the Gentleman's Amendment, because the subject matter of this Amendment will be covered in a later Amendment, offered by Representatives Jones and Young. I am opposed to the Amendment."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Churchill, to close."

Churchill: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Again, I would state that this is a very important issue. I have not had an opportunity to read this similar language in a subsequent Amendment. I think that the issue ought to rise and fall on its own merits. It is something...preserving the communities of interest...it is something that we have heard about in every one of the redistricting hearings that

64th Legislative Day

June 11, 1991

we have gone to where people have testified that we should preserve communities of interest. I think that this is an Amendment that rises and falls on its own merits and deserves a vote, and, therefore, I would ask for a Roll Call vote."

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

Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this Amendment, there are 46 'ayes' and 70 'nos', and the Amendment is defeated. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #4, offered by Representatives
Churchill and Parcells."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Churchill."

Churchill: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #4 to this Bill says that as we redistrict, we should create districts that are compact in form, that we should not bypass populace adjacent territories to reach some district...and that we should try and draw districts in compliance with the Voting Rights Act of 1965 and in line with the constitutional mandates concerning that Act. I would ask for a Roll Call vote on Amendment #4."

Speaker McPike: "Speaker Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I
rise in opposition to the Gentleman's Amendment because the
subject matter of the Amendment will be covered by a later
Amendment, offered by Representativ'es Jones and Young."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Churchill."

Churchill: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Again, I have not had an opportunity to see this exact language in the subsequent Amendment and, therefore, would request that we vote on this with a Roll Call vote...This is an important piece of

64th Legislative Day

June 11, 1991

redistricting...Everybody, I believe, understands that compactness is one of the requirements of redistricting and all of the hearings that we have gone to, we have heard testimony saying that people wanted districts that were compact and, therefore, I ask for a Roll Call vote on this Amendment at this time."

- Speaker McPike: "The 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. Representative Ryder."
- Ryder: "After you take the record on this Roll Call, the House Republicans request a conference for 30 minutes."
- Speaker McPike: "On this Amendment, there are 46 'ayes' and 70 'nos', and the Amendment is defeated. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #5, offered by Representative Lou Jones and Anthony Young."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Young."
- Young: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #5 will require that districts be established in a manner that complies with the legal mandates of the United States Constitution, the Illinois Constitution and the Voting Rights Act of 1965 as amended. I move for its adoption."
- Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall the Amendment be adopted?' Representative Daniels."
- Daniels: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I believe that Representative Ryder has made a request for a Republican Conference immediately in Room 118 for the purpose of discussing House Bill 106, 107, 108 and other related materials, so in an effort that we may respond to the quickness in which you have filed an Amendment which you say covers Amendment 2, 3 and 4 and certainly Amendment #5 as stated does not, so we'd like a Republican Caucus

64th Legislative Day

June 11, 1991

immediately before you vote on this."

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Daniels, how much time did you need? Thirty minutes? Alright, the Republicans will have a Caucus immediately in Room 118 and Democrats will have a Caucus immediately in Room 114, and we will stand in recess until 1:45. The House will come to order. We're on House Bill 106, Amendment #5. The Chair recognizes Representative Young."

Young: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #5 provides that districts shall be established in the manner that complies with the legal mandates of the United States Constitution and the Illinois Constitution and the Voting Rights Act of 1965 as amended. I move for its adoption."

Speaker McPike: "And on that, Representative Churchill."

Churchill: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Gentleman yield for a question?"

Speaker McPike: "Yes."

Churchill: "Representative Young, does the Majority Party's

Amendment provide for an adequate time period to allow for
public inspection of the maps?"

Young: "I think the rules, as adopted by this House, provide for that time period."

Churchill: "Okay, but this Amendment does not do that."

Young: "And neither did yours."

Churchill: "Okay. Does the Majority Party's Amendment...provide for an adequate time period to allow for public comments?"

Young: "I think the Rules Representative, provide for that."

Churchill: "Okay, but this Amendment does not?"

Young: "And again, neither did yours."

Churchill: "Okay. Does the Majority Party's Amendment preserve existing communities of interest?"

Young: "Representative, I have yet been able to understand what a

64th Legislative Day

June 11, 1991

- community of interest is and after sitting through quite a few hearings with you and asking that question, I didn't get the same response from any two people as to what a community of interest is, and therefore, I would oppose putting something that is so hard to define, that we couldn't get the exact same response from any two people after 15 hearings, into our...into the law as we pass a Bill. Excuse me."
- Churchill: "Your Amendment does not preserve existing communities of interest?"
- Young: "Our Amendment says that we shall and will comply with the Illinois Constitution and the United States Constitution and, most importantly, the Voting Rights Act of 1965 as amended."
- Churchill: "And if you comply with these laws, will you then be preserving existing communities of interest?"
- Young: "Representative, again I cannot adequately tell you what a community of interest is and that's after the input of some 21 hearings."
- Churchill: "Let me ask you this then: Does your Amendment require that the boundries of a local government...governmental unit, be respected?"
- Young: "The Amendment says we will follow the existing law and the Constitution and the Voting Rights Act."
- Churchill: :Under those laws, do we require that the boundaries of the local governmental units be respected?"
- Young: "Representative, I'm going to follow the Constitution.

 I'm not going to offer my opinion right now as to what that requires. I think both sides of the aisles have a bevy of Constitutional lawyers who are assisting us in this process."
- Churchill: "Does the Majority Party's Amendment protect the voting strength of any person, group of persons or members

64th Legislative Day

June 11, 1991

of any political party from dilution?"

Young: "The Amendment protects those persons who are protected by the Voting Rights Act..."

Churchill: "And what persons are those?"

Young: "...and the Constitution."

Churchill: "And what persons are those?"

Young: "Representative, I'm sure you know who's protected by the Illinois Constitution and by the Voting Rights Act as amendment...amended and that's what our Amendment does. We want to protect those people who are protected by the courts and by the laws of this country."

Churchill: "Perhaps there are some Members of this Body who have not been able to read the laws in this area, and if you could perhaps just explain to those Members, who are protected under this Amendment, we would appreciate that."

Young: "Representative, you could tell them right now as you speak to the Amendment, if you like, but I don't want to misquote or forget where I leave out, so I think we've done enough by saying what we will comply with and that is the entire sum of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 as amended."

Churchill: "Can you tell me if there are certain acts that are prohibited under your Amendment?"

Young: "By this Amendment?"

Churchill: "Yes."

Young: "Anything that would be prohibited by the Voting Rights

Act or the Federal or State Constitution, would be
prohibited by this Amendment."

Churchill: "Is political Gerry Mandering prohibited under these laws?"

Young: "If it is protected under the Illinois Constitution, the United States Constitution or the Voting Rights Act of 1965, it is."

Churchill: "Does the Majority Party's Amendment provide that

64th Legislative Day

June 11, 1991

legislative districts should be compact in form?"

Young: "The Amendment provides that we will comply with all of the provisions of the United States Constitution and the Illinois Constitution and the Voting Rights Act of 1965 as

amended."

Churchill: "Do you state what standards should be used to comply with those Acts?"

Young: "The Amendment does not state any standards."

Churchill: "Representative, we've gone through a whole set of hearings, as you previously mentioned. There have been a lot of people who have provided testimony and tried to provide input into the redistricting process. Seems to me that I recall people talking about communities of interest. I recall people talking about compactness. I recall people bringing up the question of political gerry mandering'. I want to make sure that this Amendment covers those items that were brought up in our public discussions. Are you telling me that this Amendment takes care of all those concerns that were expressed by the people who came before these redistricting meetings?"

Young: "Representative, we both know that there was so much diverse and conflicting testimony that we heard in those hearings that there is no Amendment anyplace that anyone could ever draft that could protect all the concerns we've heard simply because we heard so many conflicting concerns. What this Amendment does is it requires this Body to follow the law and to protect those interests of classes of people protected by the law as it exists today."

Churchill: "Mr. Speaker, to the Amendment. I do not believe that Amendment #5 explains what specificity the types protections that the people of Illinois deserve, as well as the Amendments that were previously offered by me. I think that we heard a lot of testimony in the redistricting

64th Legislative Day

June 11, 1991

hearings. I think that testimony said that people were concerned about a community of interests and I think that's something that we can define and should define. Those people talked about compactness and contiquousness; those issues that are of concern to the people who testified before our hearings. And I think that they deserve Amendments to these Bills that will provide them with those protections that they have sought. I think that the Amendments that I offered previously set standards which are better than the standards that are offered in this Amendment. Therefore, I would ask the Members of my side of the aisle to join me in voting 'present' on Floor Amendment #5 and to work until we can get some standards that are going to comply with the requests of those people during our legislative hearings."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Parcells."

Parcells: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. ... As the Minority spokesman on that... Committee for Reapportionment, I sat through many, many hearings. We heard the people over and over again, asking for compact, asking for contiquous and asking for the things that Representative's and my Amendments did here. Those meetings are now just for folly. The people...we could have passed this Amendment without ever having a single hearing. This Amendment is perfectly fine, but it doesn't go very far. It's not saying what the people want. The people are telling us, follow the law and within that give us compact, give us contiguous, equal distance and so that we will have the things we think are important to us. They took their time; we took our time; we spent a great deal of money on these hearings, hundreds of thousands of dollars to traipse all over the state to have these hearings, and now we're saying to these people, we're going to pass an Amendment that says nothing,

64th Legislative Day

June 11, 1991

says something we could have that said without ever listening to you. Our Amendments said something very specific. It dealt with the things that we felt and we produced a report. The report can be expanded, but it a good report, to say what we heard the people say. love to see your report sometime to see what you think the people said. This is probably a little early to be taking this vote, because we haven't even studied what the said. We have and we hope you have, but we haven't seen a report that says you have, so why would we be voting on this today, saying something that we don't even need at this point. We could have done this without a hearing here. I would ask our side to for 'present'; and I would ask for a Roll Call vote."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Wennlund."

Wennlund: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the No one can quarrel with the one sentence of the Amendment, as it exists, but what people can guarrel with and what the people of Illinois can quarrel with is that it is what it does not say and what the House Rules do not provide for and that's for genuine public input and there could never be any genuine public input unless someone sees lines on a map. There are no safeguards for the people of Illinois, for minorities, for ethnic groups, to, in see and work on and have the opportunity to address their concerns by looking at a map with lines, and you and I know what is going to happen. This Bill is going to go out here; it's going to go to the Senate. It's going to come back with a map with lines drawn on it, and you're going to vote 'yes' or 'no'. You'll not have the opportunity, yes, you'll have the opportunity to talk about it, but you'll have no opportunity to amend it; you'll have no opportunity for input from the public, from the people

64th Legislative Day

June 11, 1991

that we represent here in the State of Illinois. has seen any lines and will see any lines until it comes back here with lines on it and that's what is missing in It's the apparent intention of this Amendment. Majority to bring a map, one, only one map, and you will vote 'yes' or 'no' on it, without a choice, without opportunity for input by the people of Illinois and the interest groups in Illinois and those being represented. No input by those who currently represent the people of Illinois and that's the Members of the General Assembly. It's this type of procedure that is... is missing in the Amendment and missing in 106, and it's this whole procedure that makes it crystal clear that all 21 of those hearings throughout the state were in fact a dog and pony show because none of those people had ever had the opportunity address lines on a map to see in fact who would be represented and how they would be represented in Illinois. There apparently is no intention to give that public input to the people of Illinois and certainly we know the House Rules don't provide it. It'll come back here, on a Bill, and you will vote 'yes' or 'no' to concur on that Amendment where the map will appear and how could there ever be any meaningful input from the people of from minorities, ethnic groups and those being represented. The difference between downstaters and suburban and Chicago legislators, all of their concerns that we heard about in the abstract. How will you ever know what, in fact, the public in Illinois intends? That's what missing to provide an opportunity for a public hearing display, by looking at some physical map of lines drawn on it, and that's why this Amendment does not go far enough to protect the people of Illinois. There are no legal mandates in the U.S. Constitution and the Illinois Constitution or in the

64th Legislative Day

June 11, 1991

Voting Rights Act of 1965, that will give and guarantee all groups in Illinois who are to be represented for the next ten years, public input in looking, in fact, at a map. Hearing rhetoric about what ought to be in the map or what ought not to be in a map is one thing, but looking at a map is another, and there is no protection for the people of Illinois in this type of a process, and that's why a 'present' vote is a correct vote."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Preston."

Preston: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of House. I rise in support of the Gentleman's Amendment #5. ...I've been in this House about 13 years, and I have never seen any piece of legislation that has more, has had more of an opportunity, and in fact has had more public input than has this very issue that we're addressing here today. There have been hearings all over the State of Illinois and in every part of the state. People in every segment of our society have come forward to testify with their ideas of how the maps should be laid out, what concerns they have regarding reapportionment, and...how they would like our redistricting process to...end up; as far as that redistricting concerns and affects them, whether it be the business community, the manufacturing community, the retail community, residents, people from small municipalities and large urban areas have all had an opportunity, and taken advantage of that opportunity, to address their concerns. If we had this kind of input on every single issue,...we'd be probably the single most democratic...state in the history of the United States. ... This has been the process its best, and we are having a opportunity here on this floor and in the Senate to debate the map. We will have opportunity to debate the actual lines on that map, after all the concerns of the people who testified have

64th Legislative Day

June 11, 1991

been taken into consideration, so I encourage the people to vote in favor of this Amendment."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Klemm."

Klemm: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is funny how we look at The previous speaker had just indicated that he thought we did a fantastic job on having our hearings throughout the State of Illinois, and I thought we did pretty well, too, except I thought, well, what we should be doing is waiting for some conclusions to find out what the world we did here, because all of us didn't go to all 20 to 22 meetings, but we went to many of them. And I thought and I had hoped when we first started this process that we would be very intent and very sincere in that when we heard the testimony let's try to incorporate all the suggestions we possibly could for fairness and It seems as if this Amendment, in fact the passage of this Bill at this point, is almost premature. because the report and summary has not come from the committee, as I'm aware of, that has had all these hearings. And if that is the case, then why in the world as one of the Speakers said, why in the world are we doing this point, why do we go through the public sham of saying we wanted your input when, in fact, we already had made up our minds. I'm disappointed we didn't wait, maybe another week, to find out what the people said, summarizing it, letting here,...letting our people know what some οf the provisions were or what this Amendment is. The Sponsor of the Amendment doesn't know all those provisions and therefore can't explain it to either their side of the aisle or ours so obviously it's difficult for us to move on something that we thought, in all fairness, we would have been open, we would have listened to it, we would have had the opportunity. This is premature, and I think that we

64th Legislative Day

June 11, 1991

should vote 'present'."

Speaker McPike: "Representative McCracken."

McCracken: "Yes, I'd just like to make the point that the Amendment does not add anything to the protection guaranteed to various persons in this state. ... This Body is already bound by the laws which were referred stet this Amendment whether this Amendment gets on the Bill or not, so this is nothing more than a palliative so that someone can point to the public record and say 'Look, we agreed to follow the law,' but that is all it does. we agreed to follow laws superior to this Body. constitutional law, the federal Voting Rights Law. already have to do that, so don't be fooled by this as it were some great guarantee that in our...infinite wisdom, we deigned to give to the populace. That's just not the case. We're already...required to do this. This is window dressing."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Black."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentleman of the House. If a previous speaker was being accurate and to the point about this being one of the most democratic processes that he'd seen in his years in the House, then I wonder why we want to move this Amendment and, indeed, Bill today perhaps, this when, in fact,...the Reapportionment Committee is not even finished with its work. T believe meeting а οf Reapportionment...Committee is scheduled for next Tuesday, as other speakers have related to, there is no final report yet about the public input into this process and if that be the case, then what's the hurry? If, indeed, it's a democratic process, as the previous speaker said, then why aren't we incorporating what we have heard from those people around the state and why are we rushing to move this

64th Legislative Day

June 11, 1991

Amendment and this Bill today when in fact, the business of the Reapportionment Committee has not yet even concluded. I would ask that many of you stop and think about It's a very, very delicate subject, but no more important subject will be debated all year than how the people of this state will be treated in the reapportionment process, and to move a Bill and Amendment subsequent to completion of business of the Reapportionment Committee seems somewhat odd. Wouldn't you agree? I really think a 'present' vote is the right vote. Let the Reapportionment Committee finish its work, let a report come back to us all let us do the people's business in, indeed, a and then democratic fashion, listening to what they have told us over the last few months."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Santiago."

Santiago: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and...Ladies and Gentleman. rise in support of this Amendment. I attended, like οf attended you. several of these...reapportionment meetings. As I sat there, I heard three main concepts that the public...was interested in and that was that they wanted a map that was fair, equitable and a map that follow (sic follows) the guidelines of the Illinois Constitution. the guidelines of the U.S. Constitutions (sic Constitution) and the guidelines of the Voting Rights Act as amended of That was the whole objective of the Reapportionment Committee, to give people an opportunity to present data, to present whatever they had to say, but also if you sat there and you listened carefully and analyzed what the public was telling us, you will conclude, like we have concluded, that we will draw a map that's fair, equitable map that complies with all the ...constitutional rights that the public deserves. Thank you."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Ropp."

64th Legislative Day

June 11, 1991

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

Speaker McPike: "Yes."

Ropp: "Representative, in attending a number of the hearings, one of the questions that we attempted to raise all the time was in what priority in complying with the federal Voting Rights Act is it important, either based on a percentage of minorities or ethnic background or compactness and contiguous in that particular map, how is it under this Amendment that you are proposing, do you interpret that to be played out?"

Young: "Representative, what we envision is that we will follow all the guidelines in the laws, of this country as it exists right now. A great...much of the conversation from your side of the aisle and the previous speakers have been regarding the words 'compact' and 'contiquous' does this Amendment address it. Well, the Amendment says that we will follow the Illinois Constitution,...shall be 'compact, contiguous and substantially equal in population' so, obviously, we will make them 'compact, contiguous and substantially equal in population'. Now in terms of what priority will we address things in, it's my understanding that the cases involved in the Voting Rights Act require you to draw minority districts where they can be drawn. So, it would be my thought that you have to protect the interest of African-Americans and Hispanic Americans in districts where those districts can be drawn."

Ropp: "In other words, where they can be compact and whether they can be contiguous in that order."

Young: "Representative, now we're getting into one of the reasons why we intend to...why I offer the Amendment that says we will comply with the laws and the Voting Rights Act rather than try to decide whether compact and contiguous would

64th Legislative Day

June 11, 1991

take priority over the interest of African-Americans and Hispanic Americans. It's my own opinion that the interest of minorities would have precedent, but that's my opinion."

Ropp: "Okay, in other words, just for the record, for your intent of this Amendment, minorities would be placed first, compactness and contiguousness would then be second and third, and then we would just go ahead and complete the map. I guess my concern is that it would seem like what you are attempting to do here is something that we're charged with by... acceptance when we've taken this oath that we comply with the federal laws of the Constitution of the U.S., and obviously this is an Amendment that is just somewhat like whitewash."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I was a Member of the ...touring committee on the reapportionment hearings all over the state, and, as I recall,...and some of the Members will avail themselves of the transcripts of the voluminous testimony we heard, the peculiar requests we heard, and the ...fears and anguish of the minority members that we heard from, wanting to be sure...wanting to be sure they were part of the process. I think the language in ... Anthony Young's Amendment is right to the point. Districts shall be established in the manner that complies with the legal mandates of the United States and the Illinois Constitution and the Voting Rights Act of '65. Those...slogans were replete throughout the entire testimony we heard from His Amendment is the answer to all of the, everyone. ...over 150 people that probably appeared before our committee. I mean Tony has capsized it or capsuled it perfectly."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Young, to close."

Young: "I ask for a favorable vote."

64th Legislative Day

June 11, 1991

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

Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this Amendment, there are 71 'ayes', 0 'nays' and 45 voting 'present', and the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, had this Bill been read previously a second time?"

Clerk O'Brien: "This Bill was read a second time previously."

Speaker McPike: "Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk. Third Reading."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 106, a Bill for an Act to apportion the State of Illinois into legislative and representative districts, Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Speaker Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, I move for the passage of the Bill. The
Bill is a vehicle Bill that relates to reapportionment of
the Illinois General Assembly and, in addition, contains
language which reads that 'districts shall be established
in a manner that complies with the legal mandates of the
United States and Illinois Constitutions and the Voting
Rights Act of 1965 as amended'. Thank you."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Daniels?"

Daniels: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Several months ago, we talked at some length about the issue of redistricting and reapportionment and the fact that throughout this process this, just, perhaps, affected the Members and this Body more severely and more directly than any other piece of legislation that they'll ever act upon. At that time we were assured by the Majority Party that there'd be ample enough time, not only for the legislative process within hearings, but also during the course of the discussion, in order to debate in some

64th Legislative Day

June 11, 1991

detail, the issues concerning the Voting Rights Act, concerning compact and contiguous, concerning community Now, today, I'm somewhat puzzled, because interests. apparently, by the action of the Speaker on House Bill 106, he intends to set aside all of the hearings that have taken place to this point in time, 20 in number, and you might remember we still have one left to go, next Tuesday, which the purpose of,...is in order to discuss the report that would be issued in the analysis of the hearings that were held to date. Now let's not lose sight of the fact that because House Bill 106, by the action of the Majority Party, has now bipassed the Amendment stage, short of the completion of the legislative hearings. Because it is now on Third Reading and because it is being called the passage stage, no Member in this Body, if this passes, will be afforded the opportunity to amend this legislation with any form of House or Senate redistricting map."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Daniels."

Daniels: "That means that any one of you that argues that the Voting Rights Act must be complied with, as amended, cannot possibly follow through on that commitment because you, individually, will not have an opportunity to amend this Bill with a legislative House or Senate map because it will go to the Senate, hypothetically be amended by the and sent back to us on concurrence without the opportunity for further participation. Which, of course, makes a the actions that were sponsored by Representative Young and his Amendment #5 and his inability to answer the related to what do those items mean. questions as it Which, of course, makes a sham of the 20 hearings that were held throughout the State of Illinois and the completion of those hearings, which would take place next week, and which, of course, then sets forth the true intent of the

64th Legislative Day

June 11, 1991

Majority Party in setting aside the interest of the people Illinois in the reapportionment process. Now we, like you, have the transcripts of the 20 hearings and we. you, also have an analysis of each one of those as to the items that were stated, and of course, we understand that in fact, by your Majority vote, pass out House Bill 106 to the Senate absent of any language that with the redistricting of the State of Illinois. But, let it be known, that what you are doing is flying directly the face of Davis versus Brandemier which states if you shut out, in the process, the opportunity of a party to participate in the political discussion and the political restructuring of the legislative districts, you are, fact, violating the premise of the Constitution of the United States and, yes, in this case, the State of Illinois and, yes, truly, in the Voting Rights Act. That's what's being accomplished at this moment. So, make no mistake about it, the comments of today will lay the ground work and the foundation for the action in the Federal Court which...without any question whatsoever, will take place and analyze the action of the Majority Party today in shutting out minorities, in shutting out representation on political basis, whether it be Republican or Democrat, and a fair redistricting of the State of Illinois. This is a conclusion that you will be acting upon today, disallow the opportunity for Amendment stage because the redistricting hearings have not been completed, because the work of that committee has not yet been done, which would afford us the opportunity to present that Amendment. I think it's a mistake. I think you've...you've severely hurt yourself and the Majority Party, and I think it will come back to haunt you. I would suggest that you ought to hold this legislation, pending the outcome of our hearings

64th Legislative Day

June 11, 1991

and pending the opportunity for the people of Illinois to be able to file a redistricting House and Senate map in this instance."

- Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this Bill there are 7l 'ayes' and 46 'nos'. House Bill 106, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 107. Has this Bill been read a second time previously?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 107. This Bill has been read a second time previously. Amendment #1 lost in committee.

 Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Churchill."

 Speaker McPike: "Representative Churchill."
- Churchill: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Amendment is similar to the Amendment that I offered on the preceding Bill and basically says that...in establishing districts that we would not dilute the voting strength of any person, group of persons, or members of any political party."

Speaker McPike: "Speaker Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I
rise in opposition to the Gentleman's Amendment, because
the subject matter of this Amendment shall be covered in a
later Amendment."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Churchill."

Churchill: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I...I now have had an opportunity to see the content of an Amendment that...is being proposed. I do not believe that that Amendment goes as far as this Amendment does. I believe that there are additional protections offered by this Amendment and, therefore, I would ask the people to support this Amendment, and I would ask for a Roll Call vote."

64th Legislative Day

June 11, 1991

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

Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On Amendment #2, there are 45 'ayes' and 71 'nos', and the Amendment is defeated. Further Amendments?"

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

Speaker McPike: "Representative Churchill."

Churchill: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Floor Amendment #3 is similar to the Amendment that I offered on a preceding Bill. This is the Amendment would preserve existing communities of interest and I would point out to those who debated the issues in the last Bill that we define communities of interest as,' a recognizable area with similarities of interest, including but not limited to racial, ethnic, geographic, social, cultural, local government or historic interests and commonality of communications or transportation'. So, the...question that posed in the preceding Bill, regarding a was definition, is answered with this Amendment, and I think this Amendment goes far...beyond the...Amendment that you will propose later on and that we should vote for it, I'd ask for a Roll Call vote."

Speaker McPike: "Speaker Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, I rise in opposition to the Gentleman's Amendment, because the subject matter of the Amendment is covered in a later Amendment."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Young."

Young: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker McPike: "Yes."

Young: "Representative, I looked at your definition of communities of interest and it strikes me that this would

64th Legislative Day

June 11, 1991

apply, cover every area in this state, and I can't think of any area, regardless of how small or large, that this would not apply to when you talk of racial, ethnic, social, cultural, and geographic and historic, so, this covers everything, right? So, how would we draw lines, based on this Amendment, if we put it into our Bill?"

Churchill: "We've had...testimony throughout the hearings...part of that testimony...was related to the thoughts of various people about what communities of interest were and so there were times when we would have someone testify that a local governmental unit would be a community of interest; there were times when we had people that testified that certain ethnic areas would be a community of interest, there are times when we had people that testified that certain cultural areas would be a community of interest; and what this would do is to say that we should recognize those communities of interest that were established throughout our hearings and that we should do the best we can to include those communities of interest in one district, so that we don't separate them."

Young: "To the Amendment, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I think it's clear that this Amendment and the previous Amendment, what the other side of the aisle is attempting to do is raise to legal status, the status that does not exist now, when you talk about the effect of a voting strip of any person, when you talk about interests such as social, cultural and geographic, the Voting Rights Act of 1965 provides protection for specific categories of minority people. If we pass these Amendments, we'll be extending those protections to every possible category of citizenry in this state and, in effect, will dilute the protection that the Voting Rights Act attempts for minority citizens, and that's why I oppose it."

64th Legislative Day

June 11, 1991

Speaker McPike: "Representative Churchill, to close."

Churchill: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think we finally have reached the point where you can understand what this is all The Voting Rights Act the any other Acts that are found in a later Amendment are general laws. This is an Amendment that would create a specific law and so that we would be protecting people that are not protected later Amendment, which is the question that previously. Yes, this does create a new standard. Ιt creates the standard in the Act that is complied in terms of the Amendment and what it does say though is that should determine what are communities of interest. We should look to the communities of interest. We should ask people if there are communities of interest. We should be sensitive to those communities of interest and we and incorporate those communities of interest within one district so that we don't separate and divide communities of interest. Yes, this is something more than just complying with the Voting Rights Act. But, something that is important, and we heard so much testimony saying that we should be looking at communities of interest that it doesn't make a lot of sense at this point to come back and say, 'Well we don't want to consider communities of interest. What you're saying when you vote 'no', if you vote 'no' on this Amendment, what you're saying is to all those people who testified, saying that they believe is a community of interest, you're saying, we don't believe To all those people who testified saying; Please keep our communities of interest together: you're saying: 'No'. we're not going to do that.' To all those people who feel there is such a thing as a community of interest, whether we define that in this Amendment or in some other way, you're saying, 'No, that doesn't exist and we're not going

64th Legislative Day

June 11, 1991

to comply with it.' I think that this Amendment does offer something more than a subsequent Amendment does. I don't think the subsequent Amendment incorporates this. I think the only proper vote is an 'aye' vote on this, and I would ask for a Roll Call vote."

- 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 46 'ayes' and 70 'nos'. Amendment #3 is defeated. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #4, offered by Representative Churchill."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Churchill."
- Churchill: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Floor Amendment #4 is similar to an Amendment which was offered on a preceding Bill. This basically says that districts shall be compact and contiguous. I would ask for approval of this Amendment."
- Speaker McPike: "Speaker Madigan."
- Madigan: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen, I rise in opposition to the Gentleman's Amendment because the subject matter of this Amendment is covered by a later Amendment."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Churchill."
- Churchill: "I would ask for an 'aye' vote, and I'd ask for a Roll Call vote."
- Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall the Amendment be adopted?' All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'.

 Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this Amendment, there are 46 'ayes' and 69 'nos'. Amendment #4 is defeated."
- Speaker McPike: "Further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #5, offered by Representative Lou

64th Legislative Day

June 11, 1991

Jones."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Jones and Representative Young."

The Chair recognizes Representative Young."

Young: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #5 is the Amendment that says districts shall be established in a manner that complies with the legal mandates of the United States and the Illinois Constitution and the Voting Rights Act of 1965 as amended. I would move for its adoption."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Churchill."

Churchill: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Gentleman yield?" Speaker McPike: "Yes."

- Churchill: "Representative Young, I'm not going to go through the whole list of questions that I asked you...during the debate on the last Bill. But, let me just ask you this, if I were to go through that complete list of questions, would your answers, to this Amendment, be substantially the same as they were to the previous Bill?"
- Young: "They would, only I would add to it that if you look at your Amendments, Representative, as I've had more time to, if you combine 2, 3 and 4, it's my opinion that there's absolutely no map than could be drawn that wouldn't violate some of the provisions in the combined effect of those three Amendments, which is why I suggest we limit what we put into our Bill the requirements of the Constitution and the Voting Rights Act."
- Churchill: "To the Amendment, Mr. Speaker: I'll be happy to debate that issue with you in another few minutes, when we get to the next Bill, but as to this Amendment, I would request that the Members of my side of the aisle, vote 'present'. Again, I think the Amendments that were offered previously provide substantial protections in addition to what is offered here. This basically just

64th Legislative Day

June 11, 1991

restates the law and is unnecessary."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Wennlund."

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

Speaker McPike: "Yes."

- Wennlund: "Representative Young, is it the position...is it your position that without this Amendment the provisions of the United States Constitution would not apply to the redistricting process that we're about to undertake?"
- Young: "It's my position that we want to make it perfectly clear to everyone that it's our intent to comply with those provisions."
- Wennlund: "Well, the...the...the answer to the question is obviously the United States Constitution applies to this entire process, as well as does the Illinois Constitution, as well as does the federal Voting Rights Act of 1965, so why do we need the Amendment? Because all three of those clearly apply, regardless of whatever we could do here in the General Assembly. Isn't that a fact?"
- Young: "I think it's good public policy to spell out our intentions and not only spell them out, but put them into the Bill that might actually have the map attached to it at one point in time."
- Wennlund: "Do you suspect that there is a move afoot to...to violate the Constitution of Illinois or the United States or the Voting Rights Act of 65?"
- Young: "Some of the Amendments that have been filed to this Bill make me think there's a move afoot to dilute the intent of the Voting Rights Act in regards to protection for minorities by extending that protection to every category conceivable."
- Wennlund: "What rules apply or what legal mandates apply that would give the public and all people in Illinois input into what, in fact, a map looks like?"

64th Legislative Day

June 11, 1991

- Young: "I think the Rules of the House, as adopted by this Body regarding redistricting, provides for the public input."
- Wennlund: "Can you tell me what rules...adopted by this Body...requires public input on a map that, first of all, before you can have input, you must agree that you...you have to be able to see a map...before you can have input on it."
- Young: "Was that a question? Repeat which one you want to answer."
- Wennlund: "To the Amendment, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House.

 This Amendment does not guarantee public input by any group in Illinois, by the citizens of Illinois, by any minority group, any ethnic group or anyone else. How can there possibly be any input on a map when you've never seen the map? And you won't see it, only one time when it comes over here from the Senate and you vote 'yes' or 'no', and the people of Illinois will never have seen it. This Amendment does not guarantee, nor do the Rules of this House, guarantee public input on a map that you can physically see and look at with lines and districts on it, and that's why a 'present' vote is the proper vote on this Amendment."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Klemm."

- Klemm: "...Will the Sponsor yield for a question, Mr. Speaker?
 ...Representative, when Representative Churchill had some
 Amendments, I believe the Speaker of the House stood up and
 said that the provisions of his Amendments would be covered
 and included in your Amendments? Is that correct?"
- Young: "I don't recall what the Speaker of the House said."
- Klemm: "...Well, then you didn't hear what the Speaker said or..."
- Young: "I don't recall exactly what he said. I'd hate to agree, if you happen to be misquoting him."

64th Legislative Day

June 11, 1991

Klemm: "Well, then let me ask the question. Do the provisions then, of Representative Churchill's Amendments, were they covered by your Amendment #5?"

Young: "Our Amendment covers those things that are protected by law. They do not cover historic interest and some of the other expansions of protections under the Voting Rights Act that these Amendments attempted to include."

Klemm: "So, then you are not sure what it covers, Representative..."

Young: "Again, Representative, if I could, let me repeat my remarks. I think the combined effects of Amendments #2, 3 and 4 will leave us in the position that any map that was drawn by anybody at any time would violate one of thosethree provisions."

Klemm: "Thank you."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Young, to close."

Young: "I ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #5 be adopted?' All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'.

Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this Amendment there are 7l 'ayes', 0 'nays' and 44 voting 'present', and Amendment #5 is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. House Bill 107 has been read a second time previously. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill on Third Reading."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 107, a Bill for an Act to apportion the State of Illinois into congressional districts.

Sec...Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Speaker Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, I rise in support

64th Legislative Day

June 11, 1991

of the passage of House Bill 107, which is now a vehicle Bill that relates to the question of congressional reapportionment for the State of Illinois. In addition, the Bill provides that the districts shall be established in a manner that complies with the legal mandates of the United States and the Illinois Constitutions and the Voting Rights Act of 1965, as amendment...as amended. Thank you."

Daniels: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentleman of the House. the comments made on House Bill 106, that I mentioned in reference to that passage of that legislation, would apply on House Bill 107, as well. That is to say that violation of the Davis versus Bandemeir Case, by shutting out the opportunities for minorities, the opportunities for Republicans, the opportunities for Democrats in certain cases, to amend this legislation and to deal with it on its face in an open fashion, prior to the conclusion of the Redistricting Committee hearings which are scheduled to have a hearing next Tuesday, is a violation, we believe directly, of the mandates in the Supreme Court...a case that was laid down, in reference to gerrymandering. It shuts out the opportunity of a party or a particular interest group to impact the system and to be able to address the subject of redistricting. Now, of course, we listen to the Gentleman's comments in moving for the passage of this Bill, as he calls it a vehicle Bill. What is a vehicle Bill? I've been here for 17 years, and everytime it comes up, I wonder now, what do we really mean by a vehicle Bill. Is a vehicle Bill one that is set on a track and moved quickly to the other chamber, bypassing any kind of committee, bypassing any kind of Amendment stage? Perhaps it is. Is it a fast vehicle Bill? That's what appears to be the case here, violating perhaps the Supreme

64th Legislative Day

June 11, 1991

Court decision in the Davis case and that's what the Speaker has said that we have here, a vehicle Bill, a vehicle Bill which denies the opportunity for parties of interest, for the people of Illinois to amend to discuss, to question, to be able to debate on the House Floor at the Amendment stage, the very process that is so important to representive democracy. I think it's a mistake. I think it violates every premise of constitutional protection, and I would suggest to the Majority Party that it not continue to shut out the minorities and to discontinue its efforts to shut out the political process as it is doing by the passage of this Bill. I will vote 'no', because I think it violates all those premises."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Preston."

Preston: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in support of House Bill 107, for the same rose in support of the previous Bills that we discussed concerning the input that was had on this Bill, but, additionally, the previous speaker, who I respect a great deal has complained now the second or third time, about the inability to offer Amendments. I thought that was exactly what we had just done. We had Amendments to this Bill. I have not seen a Bill or an Amendment offered by anyone on the other side of the aisle concerning the lines and districts that I've heard so often complained of. This is the opportunity that we just completed on Second Reading, on this Bill, to offer those Amendments and they were not offered. We can't hold a gun at the head of any of the people on either side of the aisle and say, 'Now offer your Amendment.' You had the opportunity. You did not take that opportunity. We're sending this Bill to Senate for them to have the same opportunity, and I'm quite certain when the Bill comes back to us, that the Bill will

64th Legislative Day

June 11, 1991

be amended with those specific lines and districts that you were concerned about and, at the same time, failed to offer to this Body. So, I think that this is a good Bill. The Bill, as a vehicle, states that we will comply with the Constitutions of Illinois and the United States and with the Voting Rights Act of 1965, as amended. We are going to make every attempt and, in fact, this is part of that process, attempting to achieve just that, so I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker McPike: "Speaker Madigan, to close."

Madigan: "I would request a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All those 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 70 'ayes' and 45 'nos', and House Bill 107, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 108. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 108. This Bill's been read a second time previously. Amendment #1 lost in committee. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Churchill."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Churchill."

Churchill: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Amendment is similar to Amendments that have been offered to the previous two Bills. This Amendment basically says that we should, in creating Districts for redistricting,...not dilute the voting strength of any person, group of persons, or members of any political party."

Speaker McPike: "Speaker Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, I rise in opposition
to the Gentleman's Amendment because the subject matter of
this Amendment is covered in a later Amendment."

64th Legislative Day

June 11, 1991

Speaker McPike: "Representative Churchill."

Churchill: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Again, now having seen the subject matter of the later Amendments, I do not believe that...this subject matter is contained therein. I believe that this goes beyond...the later Amendment and...is important thing to make sure that...people in political partiess, or various groups of any...particular background would not have their voting strength diluted. I would ask for a Roll Call vote and an 'aye' vote."

Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #2 be adopted?' A11 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 46 'ayes' and 71 'nos'. and Amendment #2 is defeated. Amendments?"

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

Speaker McPike: "Representative Churchill."

Churchill: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Amendment is also similar to Amendments that were offered to the previous two Bills. This is the Amendment that states that we must preserve existing communities of interest and in the previous Bill, I said I would be happy to debate this particular issue with the Representative from the other side. I think this does create something more than you have created in the Voting Rights Act and in the constitutions. What this says is that we in the Legislature should examine, determine and try to preserve existing communities of interest. That is not to say that we have to take a look at one ethnic group or one historical group across the whole state, but that we can take a look within various locales to determine whether or not there is a community of interest than can be

64th Legislative Day

June 11, 1991

preserved. If we are...are determining that there is a community of interest which can be preserved, then we have to do something to try and preserve that community of interest. This goes beyond anything that is offered in a subsequent Amendment or has been offered to the previous two Bills, and I think it deserves an 'aye' vote."

Speaker McPike: "Speaker Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, I rise in opposition to the Gentleman's Amendment because the subject matter of the Amendment is covered by a later Amendment."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Since it is obvious that the other...other side of aisle is attempting to speak to the court probably more than speak to the Members of the Legislature, I would like to address the court, because the court ought to know that by the adoption of this Amendment, the only way we could draft...map is to give every single person in the State of Illinois a map of their own. That's the only way we could address a fair map. To give every person their own district. That's the absurdity of this Amendment because we talk about communities of interest and then we set out specific communities of interest, but then add, but limit it to, which means unlimited communities of interest. let me give you an example: We have left-handers southpaws, who have a community of interest such that have their own magazine, they have a left handers magazine. Are we going to develop a map and look to make sure all left-handers are protected by this Amendment? We talk about a commonality of transportation. Are we going to protect those who use motorcycles as a commanality of interest in transportation, the bicyclers? You know this Amendment is absurd. We have reached, I think, the lowest

64th Legislative Day

June 11, 1991

of asininity with this Amendment and the court ought to be aware of that, and since that side of the aisle seems to be addressing the court, I think the court ought to know that it is difficult enough to follow the law and the Voting Rights Act...Act to present a fair map, but that's what we intend to do. We are not going to reach to the depths of absurdity that the other side of the aisle is trying to do."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Munizzi. Miss Munizzi? Representative Churchill."

Churchill: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think that the previous Representative has taken the intent of this Amendment far beyond the limits that the Amendment states. To say you're going to be looking out for people who are left-handed, is ridiculous. I mean this doesn't even but that also denies that we shouldn't be looking at communities of interest for ethnic reasons, for racial reasons, or for local governmental reasons. We heard testimony at almost every hearing that I saying that certain communites should be kept together. The public thinks that there are communities of interest: the people who testified think there are communities of interest. There are communities of interest and there are communities of interest that we can look at, and we can try to keep together inside of legislative districts, and what this Amendment says is that we must try to preserve those when we can, that we don't go out there and pick a community, such as a town or village, and split it into five legislative districts. That's ridiculous. That community ought to be kept in one legislative district, if at all possible, and that's what this Amendment says, and I would think that we should be voting 'aye' on this because it does a lot more than the subsequent Amendment that will

64th Legislative Day

June 11, 1991

come up. It is an important factor. It was important to the people that testified in the hearings, and it is important to this Body to try and preserve community of interests. I would ask for a Roll Call vote and for a favorable vote."

- 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? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. Rotello votes 'no'. On this Amendment #3, there are 46 'ayes' and 71 'nos', and the Amendment is defeated. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #5, offered by Representative Churchill."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Churchill."
- Churchill: "Mr. Speaker, did we pass over an Amendment?"
- Speaker McPike: "The Clerk misspoke. It's Amendment #4. Mr.
 Clerk, is that correct?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #4, offered by Representative Churchill."
- Speaker McPike: "Mr. Churchill."
- Churchill: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Floor Amendment #4 is the similar Amendment to those that were presented previously, and this just says the district will be compact and contiguous."
- Speaker McPike: "Speaker Madigan."
- Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the Gentleman's

 Amendment because the subject matter of the Amendment is

 covered by a later Amendment."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Churchill."
- Churchill: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would ask for an 'aye'
 vote, and I would ask for a Roll Call vote."
- Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #4 be adopted?' All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'.

64th Legislative Day

June 11, 1991

Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this Amendment there are 45 'ayes' and 71 'nos'. Amendment #4 is defeated. Further Amendments?"

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

Speaker McPike: "Representative Churchill."

Churchill: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Well, we finally got to that point. Here is a map. finally have an Amendment that is a map. This is a map of judicial subcircuits in Cook County, and what this map does, according to previous law that we passed, we're required to come up with a map that breaks Cook County down into judicial subcircuits and this map does that. Ιt creates 15 subcircuits in Cook County. It creates two of those subcircuits which are basically Hispanic. four οf those subcircuits which are basically African-American, and it creates nine of those subcircuits which are basically white ethnic districts. The importance of this map is that this is one of the few maps in this process that has no time period beyond July 1st, of this year. In the event that we do not reach some accord pass a Bill on congressional maps, those maps go to a federal court. Ιn the event, we do not reach some agreement, or pass out Bills regarding House and Senate legislative districts, those issues go before a commission. But, with this map, if we don't do anything by July 1st. the present system stays in existence. A few years back legislation was passed to create these subcircuits. The reason that legislation was passed was a direct result of Operation Greylord and the subsequent convictions that came out of that, because it was believed that one of the ways that we could open up a judiciary and shed the light of day on the members of that judiciary is to create subcircuits,

64th Legislative Day

June 11, 1991

where judges would have to reside, where they would have to live, where they'd have to be a member of the community, where they could be seen, where they could be known by their neighbors and where they could serve on the bench knowing well what the interests of their community were. That is what this Amendment does. It creates a map."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Young. Mr. Young?"

Young: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of House. I rise in opposition to this map, and the reason I do it is twofold. The first reason is of course, during the course of these hearings, we've heard a great deal from the other side about an openness of the process, about input and about community involvement. I haven't been involved in the process of this map. The minority interests that I represent have not been involved in the process οf this map. The African-American Associations have not been involved in drawing this map. I talked to people on the other side of the aisle last week about a map but I wasn't sure and I think the conversation that we had was not taken into consideration. I am somewhat confused, because I have two different before me. One, I guess, was delivered to this side of the aisle about five minutes ago, and...my question to the Sponsor is the map that's on file the one that was sent out publicly, last Saturday, or is it the map that's on the one that was delivered to this side of the aisle five minutes ago?"

Speaker McPike: "Representative Santiago?"

Santiago: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker McPike: "Oh, excuse me, I'm sorry."

Churchill: "I yield."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Young."

Young: "No, I'm trying to find out which of the maps I have in my

64th Legislative Day

June 11, 1991

hands the one that's on file."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Churchill."

Churchill: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. First of all, let me that we are most happy to have any input into this map which you would like to offer, on any other interested parties would like to offer. We have...made this map public, for more than 72 hours. We have had a hearing, in Chicago, on Saturday morning. At that hearing, there were people who testified, I believe on behalf of Hispanic communities, I believe on behalf of Afro-American communities. There were changes made in the map from Saturday until today's date. Those changes incorporated on the basis of information that was provided to us on Saturday. We had another hearing earlier and we showed the new map where we made those changes and. basically, at the hearing this morning no one had offered make any further changes. We would be...totally in accord with any Motion that you might wish to make or handling of this Bill which would allow for further opportunity for the public to take a look at this. would like to delay this Bill for 72 hours, if you would like to delay it...so that you may have input to it or that other parties may have input into it, we're most happy to The map which is before you in written form, basically, shows you the same map that is entitled in the which you received, Cook County Judicial Subcircuits, and it shows a District 4 divided by District 10. If you have a map that shows Districts 4 and 5 being contiguous, then you have a map that was showing you the map on Saturday morning. If...you wish to have input into this process,... I would invite you to ask the Speaker, who is sitting right next to you there, to take the Bill out of the record, and we'd be happy to

64th Legislative Day

June 11, 1991

hold this for another 72 hours to take a look at the Bill." Young: "To the Bill, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Again, I think the Gentleman's comments will show why I oppose this map. As he knows I have a great interest in passing the judicial map after all the Members of this side of the aisle, the Gentleman mentioned a hearing on Saturday on this specific map. I wasn't invited to that hearing, didn't see the map, didn't know about it. I don't think that any of the Members of this side of the aisle who are interested in the map knew about or were invited to that hearing. I understand, I did get a letter at 10:30 this morning inviting me to a hearing at 11:00 dealing with the map that I guess it is before us right now. It does not adequately address my concerns, and if the Gentleman was serious about taking my input into consideration, he certainly would not have distributed a map and had a hearing on Saturday that no one from this side of the aisle was even invited to or knew about. those reasons, I oppose the map."

Speaker McPike: "Speaker Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker. I rise in opposition to the Gentleman's Amendment because has been referred to in earlier comments, the submission of this Amendment is somewhat premature at this time. Thank you."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Kubik."

Kubik: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would like to make a couple of points on this particular proposal. All of the rules as set forth...in the House Rules governing Reapportionment have been followed in this particular map...situation. So far as the previous, Representative Young's remarks regarding not being able to see the map, we would have liked to have been able to distribute this map widely, but, unfortunately,

64th Legislative Day

June 11, 1991

this particular Bill was called this afternoon. ... We have stressed all along with this process, particularly in the judicial redistricting process, that we are more than willing to take Amendments. We are more than willing to...to look at changes in this map, but one should understand that this map does and follow the guidelines as set forth by the United States Constitution and Constitution of the State of Illinois. It produces two Hispanic districts, which...take into consideration the proposal that the Mautino Coalition has put forth about a week and a half ago. It also creates four black districts or African-American districts of super-majority, which are also very, very much a...part of this map. So, this proposal does dо substantially what the Sponsors, Representative Young and Representative Williams, have worked hand and hand with over the years on this particular issue, it does, primarily, what they have asked it to do. ... I would suggest to the Representative that we can continue to amend this map...and make changes that may...that they may see as necessary. But the bottom line is we have a map before you. We finally have a chance to look at a map that makes some sense and that has the constitutional guidelines as set forth. I would urge the Members on both sides of the aisle to look at this map carefully not look at the partisanship or the political consideration, but rather, look at the fact that this is a map that meets the needs of the minority community and...is a substantial step forward, and I'd urge support of House Amendment #5."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Santiago."

Santiago: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The question that I have is,
'Where is the map?' There's no map. All we have is 48
pages of a census tract. Who, is...in this Body, is ready

64th Legislative Day

June 11, 1991

to vote on census tracts? This is like a blank check, and anyone that votes for this is a fool. I'm sorry to say, anyone who votes for this is a fool. We have to see the subject matter. We have to see a physical map, a map that will outline the boundaries of all the judicial districts, all of them, not just one, not two, but all 15 of I'm ...I'm...I'm also upset that there's a Community of interest. I've heard all this all afternoon that we must be fair to the communities of interest. Well, Hispanic community, in the City of Chicago, we have a population of over 700,000 people. Let me ask you this question. Is that a Community of interest? Certainly that interest, that community, was neglected by this map, I was taught or so-called map. This is not a map. geography that we must have a map with keys and codes and All we have here is census tracts. et cetera. So, once again, we are being ignored, and if we're going to be ignored, we're going to see you in Federal Court, and I will go to Federal Court, and I will sue, and I will make sure that the Hispanic community is represented because we want a fair and equitable map. Before I finish, I would like to , if the Gentleman will yield for a couple of auestions in regards to the census tracts.....Representative Churchill, with all due respect to you, let me ask you the following questions. How many Hispanic...districts was (sic were) drawn by your side?"

Speaker McPike: "Representative Churchill."

Churchill: "There are...two Hispanic districts."

Santiago: "What percentage of His...what is the population of this district? The percentage of each district?"

Churchill: "One of the districts is 58.1% Hispanic. One of the districts is 58.0% Hispanic."

Santiago: "How many black, Afro-American districts, do you have

64th Legislative Day

June 11, 1991

in this...?"

Churchill: "There are four black districts."

Santiago: "What is the...percentage of population in each map...in the proposal?"

Churchill: "One of the districts is 75.1% black. One of the districts is 71.7% black. One of the districts is 76.5% black, and one of the districts is 79.6% black."

Santiago: "Was the...black,...the Afro-American community given an opportunity to be involved in the process?"

Churchill: "There were several members of the Afro-American community that have been...present. Today we testimony from a Gentleman who, I believe, is a member of the Cook County Barr Association, and we've heard... testimony from some other people who have...who have also appeared at previous hearings. We also...heard testimony from Maldef, Maurice Sown was with us, on Saturday and looked at the original map which we had presented and said that he...thought there should be changes made. Those changes have been made. In this morning's hearing, question was asked of Maurice Sown, if the current map, that has been distributed, is approximately the same as the map which he presented, and he said that he thought it was approximately the same as the map which he had presented on Saturday."

Santiago: "One final question: Who votes on this map?"

Churchill: "We all do here."

Santiago: "Have any of the African-American Legislators been involved in the process? Have any of the Hispanic Legislators been involved in the process?"

Churchill: "The subcircuits were proposed after consultations with Afro-American organizations and public hearings, during which recognized Afro-American leaders provided testimony."

64th Legislative Day

June 11, 1991

Santiago: "Bob, with all due respect to you, you didn't answer my question because I think as Legislators and as Members of this Body, we should show some courtesy to each other in getting ourselves involved in a map is...it's that particularly interest (sic) to my community. I was never notified of this. I have never received a copy of the This is the first time I see a proposal which gives us only census tract, and I cannot vote for something that I have not involved myself and neither is anyone here. I mean, I said it before, whoever votes for this is voting for a blank check. I have all the respect for you and the admiration, but I think you're wrong. I think you should involve all of us, so that we could draw maps that is fair and equitable and a map that meets all the requirements of the Illinois Constitution, the United States Constitution and the Voting Rights Act, and what you did here was...what you did here is you totally ignored, ignored 700,000 Hispanics in the City of Chicago and because you mentioned that you only talked to Maldef. Maldef organization? I vote on the map, and I represent 96,000 people, and I think I should be consulted and every other Legislator here. Thank you very much, and I will ask all our Members here to 'no' vote or 'present' this...Amendment. Thank you very much."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Petka."

Petka: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Here we are, the third Bill that we are going to be considering in connection with the reapportionment process. We finally had an opportunity to take a look at a map, and, yet, there are complaints coming from the Majority that they did not have sufficient time to review this map. The solution to the problem is something that we have proposed for the last three months. Simply this: Keep this Bill on

64th Legislative Day

June 11, 1991

Second Reading, and if adjustments or fine tuning are necessary to a map that, I believe, is compact and contiquous, which map which maximizes minority participation, which is in complete compliance with the Voting Rights Act as amended in 1965 and which is not a mandered map. If there is some fine tuning that's let's required, work on it for the next few and...push this out, but it's very apparent what is happening this afternoon, Members of the House. The Majority Party has decided to put the bulldozer into forward gear, and we're not going to get an opportunity to take a look at a map, and anything that even resembles a map is not going to be coming back to us...until...it received in the Senate or after these vehicle Bills are voted out. We will have an up or down. Our rights will trampled; the rights of the citizens of the State will be trampled; as a result, the entire process will suffer. is a good idea. This map, and this Amendment should be adopted, and I would urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Lou Jones."

Jones: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the As...Chairman of the Reapportionment Committee State of Illinois for the General Assembly, I was not privy to a meeting Saturday in the State of Illinois Building. Nor was I privy to a meeting today at 11:00. I just found out about the meeting at 11:00 today. I think I ran a very fair committee. I don't think I excluded anyone. had notices of all meetings, and everybody was invited come. Right now I feel like I was slighted by my collegues on the other side of the aisle. I've been listening for the last month, how fair you want to be and how unfair party, the Democratic Party, has been to us and I'm talking about the Afro-American community and for the last month

64th Legislative Day

June 11, 1991

you have been telling, putting it on record, through the news media, and, however how you intend to be fair and just and to include everybody. Well, I'd like to go on record today and let you know that I was not included in the drawing of this map. I've yet to even see the map, and if you can remember, when we voted on this piece of legislation, how it came about. It came about with the Afro-Americans on this side of aisle...this aisle joining in with you to pass this legislation. So, I think right now you're not only insulted and slighted me, you also did the same thing to my colleogues. Right now I wonder how just and fair you can be."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Thank you. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker McPike: "Yes."

Ryder: "Representative, I've listened to...one of our Representatives across the aisle...complain that the Amendment that you filed contains only ...census tracts. ...Why is it that you don't have, in the Amendment that you filed, a map that indicates the...existence of the borders or boundaries?"

Churchill: "Representative Ryder, let me tell you what has filed. Ιn accordance with rules, we have filed a qeographic map. We have filed a statistical summary. W۵ list οf а counties, townships and municipalities, included in the proposed district. We have filed a computer disk in standard ASCII format containing the required information. And have we filed a redistricting impact statement written both in English and Spanish. It is also my understanding that maps should have been delivered to Members of the other side of aisle previously today. If that is not the case, then I apologize for that. We don't want to move this Bill right

64th Legislative Day

June 11, 1991

now. don't want to have to file this and rush through We don't want to file it and have it denied. We to have time to hear this Bill. We want to have time to be able to look at this, and work with the Members of the other side of the aisle, but this thing is headed out of here. It's on the greased track. It's going over to Senate. We may never see it come back. We may never have another chance to look at this Bill. I mean, i f really believe that we have to have time to take a look at this, ask the Speaker to take the Bill out of the record. have time. We can take a couple of days to take a look I'm more than happy to work with the Members the other side of the aisle. I'm more than happy. I'll be happy to work with you on this. I'll be happy accommodate any requests that you might have, and I'll happy to work with you on any requests that you might have. We can't do it if we are pushed into today, and that's where we are. We're here, we're today, and you're pushing the Bill, and we have to have something on there so we can take a look at this map and that's why this Amendment has been presented."

Ryder: "Thank you, Mr. Churchill, for a comprehensive answer to the question that I asked. To the Bill, Mr. Speaker. To the Amendment, more importantly. I've heard a couple of comments from my friends on the Democratic side of the aisle. I've heard one person say, 'Why wasn't I allowed to participate in this Amendment?' The answer is we don't control the Bill. If you wish to participate on this subject matter, we in the Minority on this side, the Republican side of the aisle, have to do when the Bill is called. Ιt is the intention, in fact it was our guidelines to suggest that Amendments of this kind should lay for 72 hours so that our friends can see a map that

64th Legislative Day

June 11, 1991

corresponds with the census information, so that you can offer your own Amendments to improve the map that we have offered. You ask for participation and yet you're givin' a vehicle Bill. For those who say that they 'Are interested in the subdistricts, for a judicial map of Cook County, then, I suppose, I'll see your 'no' votes when a vehicle Bill is voted out to go over to the Senate. I suppose that I'll hear your votes of protest for a vehicle Bill that's sent over to the Senate. Because you're then putting your trust in the man that said, 'This map is premature.' Where's your map? Where is his premature map? Where's his map going to be on the judicial remap of Cook County on today, June 11th or June 28th? I suspect for those of you that are calling the most about participation that discover your ability to participate, even in your own map for this subject matter will be denied. We're offering opportunity. Your side is offering denial. I sincerely hope that I see your red votes of protest to the lack of participation you're being offered when this vehicle Bill goes out of this House. Take the Bill out of the record, work with us, give us your ideas. We are open. format, not the meetings on Saturday or others. This is format for the Legislature to do its work. Work with Don't put your trust in a Sponsor of a vehicle Bill. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Cowlishaw."

Cowlishaw: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentleman of the House. It is certainly true that given the same set of facts, two different people could easily arrive at two different sets of conclusions, and, so, certainly far be it for me to try to arrive at any conclusions from the following facts. I'm sure all of my colleagues can arrive at those conclusions on their own as long as they

64th Legislative Day

June 11, 1991

understand what the facts are, and the fact is that at this moment, under the current maps, for the judicial system in Cook County, there is one, I repeat, one, Hispanic the fact that there are 11 judges elected from each of the Districts and there are two Hispanic districts created by this map, this map assures that there would be 22 Hispanic judges in Chicago. Twenty two as compared to Under the current map, there are 19 African-American judges in Chicago. Because this map creates African-American districts and each district elects 11 judges, this map would assure that there would be 44 African—American judges in Cook County, fourty-four as compared with 19. I think each of us can reach our conclusions."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Wennlund."

Wennlund: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I want to make sure that Representative Jones is aware of the fact that there was never any intention to slight her as Chairman of the Election Committee, but too often we Members of the House fail to notice and note and congratulate and thank a person, a Representative, for a job well done. Representative Jones did a fantastic job as Chairman of the Reapportion Committee. She was open and fair and allowed full input into that committee. She did a great job, in my opinion, and everybody, every Member of the Committee, whoever attended a hearing, said the same thing, and I thank her for that and congratulate her."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Churchill, to close."

Churchill: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and thanks all of us who entered into the debate on this most important Bill. The word that I heard when the Speaker of the House stood up to deny this Amendment was the word 'premature'. I guess that means to me that this is a matter before its time, and,

64th Legislative Day

June 11, 1991

yet, I hear people saying, that they want time. They want to be able to look at something. They want to be able to look at a map. They want to determine how it affects them and their constituencies. So when aren't we premature? If this Bill goes out as a vehicle, and it comes back on June 30th, it won't be premature, it'll be late. If this goes a vehicle and it comes back on June 20th, ten days before the end of Session, it won't be premature, it'll This Bill isn't premature. This Amendment is not It is timely. It is timely because it does premature. offer the public an opportunity to see something. It offers the public an opportunity for comments, offers the Members of this Legislature a chance to work together, to come up with a final product which satisfies everybody. Your complaints on the other side of the aisle about lack of involvement in this process can be solved ever easily. Just take the Bill out of the record. complain, don't complain to me, complain to the Speaker. Tell him we need some more time to see this Bill and ask for the Bill to be taken out of the record. This may your only chance and our only chance to talk about this issue. I invite you to join us. I ask you to let us be a part of the total process. Take the Bill out of record, and if you are not willing to do that, then proceed to what you have to do, but let me suggest to you this may be the best chance that you have. I only hope it's not only chance you have. Please vote 'aye'. I would ask for a Roll Call vote."

Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #5 be adopted?' All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'.

Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted?

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

On this Bill, there are...I'm sorry...on this Amendment #5,

64th Legislative Day

- June 11, 1991
- there are 46 'ayes' and 71 'nos', and Amendment #5 fails. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #6, offered by Representative Lou Jones and Anthony Young."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Young."
- Young: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House.

 This is the same Amendment that we have discussed on the other two Bills, and I move for its adoption."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Churchill."
- Churchill: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Gentleman yield?" Speaker McPike: "Yes."
- Churchill: "Again, Representative Young, I don't wish to belabor the points, so let me just ask it in this fashion. Were I to ask you the same question about this Amendment that I did to the previous Amendment of two Bills ago, would your answers be substantially the same?"
- Young: "Yes, they would."
- Churchill: "Thank you. I think a 'present' vote is the proper vote on this Amendment, and I'd ask for a Roll Call."
- Speaker McPike: "The 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 Amendment #6, there are 68 'ayes', 0 'nays' and 46 voting 'present'. Amendment #6 is adopted.

 Further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. This Bill has been read a second time previously. Mr. Clerk read the Bill on Third Reading."
- Clerk · O'Brien: "House Bill 108, a Bill for an Act to apportion the circuit of Cook County into subcircuits. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker McPike: "Speaker Madigan."

64th Legislative Day

June 11, 1991

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentleman. I move for passage of House Bill 108, which is a vehicle Bill that relates to the question of judicial districts for County in addition provides that the districts shall be established in a manner that complies with the mandates of the United States and the Illinois Constitutions and the Voting Rights Act of 1965."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Churchill."

Churchill: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in opposition to the passage of this Bill on Third Reading. Earlier the...Sponsor of the Bill stated that an Amendment was premature. I don't think that anything can be premature on this Bill. As I explained before if we get past July 1st, the current system stays intact, nothing gets changed. There is no commission. Courts are not going to hear this Bill. This is something that we in the legislative process have to pass before July 1st and must be signed by the Governor. Legislature and the Governor can't get together on this. the status quo stays intact. This is a major piece of This is an issue that we have been fighting legislation. and talking about for the past two years. To not do something on it by July 1st destroys an opportunity that may never, ever come again. I think this Bill ought to stay in the House. I think this Bill ought to stay right here where it can be taken back to Second Reading, where we can put an Amendment on it, that we have a chance to discuss, that we have a chance to look at, that we have a chance to work over. We don't need to pass this Bill out of here today, and therefore, I would stand in objection and ask the Members of my side of the aisle to vote 'no' on this Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Parcells."

64th Legislative Day

June 11, 1991

Parcells: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to say I think this is an embarrassement and a travesty. We had all of these hearings, we;re saying to the people, we want your input. Tell us what you want, and you want to know what they said? We want compact, we want contiquous, we want equal representation, all οf these things Representative Churchill tried to put in an Amendment, and you weren't buying it. They said it there. You heard them say it there and you won't allow them to have their input. we want your input, but we won't take their input, in any way, shape or form. Then they said, 'Please, give us a map early. Let us look at the map and let us tell you how we think those lines should be changed.' So, Representative Churchill provides a map here. No, you don't like the map either. So you're going to have one map that the people of this state have no input into, it's voted up or voted down because that's the way it's going to come back. There will be no input from the public. There will be no input from us as individuals. A few people will sit in the map and then you get to vote 'yes' or 'no' on it. Hopefully. you've had a few words with that person, but that's your vote, will be 'yes' or 'no'. No input as Representative Churchill has offered on his map. He would like all 118 of us to speak to him about that map, but you aren't listening. I think it's a travesty. I think we have wasted the people's money. We have wasted our time. It's cost hundreds of thousands of dollars to have these hearings, and now we are allowing no input from them and no input from us. I think it's a mistake, and we definitely vote 'no' on this Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Black."

Black: "Yes, thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I wish we could have some order in here because I think this is going to

64th Legislative Day

June 11, 1991

truly be one of the most important votes we're going to make from now until adjournment, whenever that might be. I ask my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to just bear with us on this and take a look at what you're doing. One of your colleagues got up and said if you voted for Representative Churchill's Amendment, you were signing a blank check, in effect. I submit to you that if you vote this Bill out of the House, you are passing a blank check that you may never see again, and then the status quo on judicial districts will reign supreme in Cook County. Is that what you want? Do you want the status quo? taxpayers, of this state are spending over a million dollars on the reapportionment process. You're going to pass a vehicle Bill out that they've had no input on. They Our Amendment gave you precinct haven't seen the map. tracts, and if you'd taken the Bill out of record, could have seen the judicial map in Cook County that adds significantly to minority representation on the bench, that was rejected and somebody said it was a blank check. Ladies and Gentleman of the House, if you pass this Bill, which is a vehicle Bill, out of this chamber, you will lose whatever input your constituents want you to have on the judicial redistricting in Cook County. Putting all partisan differences aside, I urge you not to send this Bill out of the House and to work with Members the aisle for adequate and fair οf judicial redistricting in Cook County to maximize minority representation on the bench. This could be your last opportunity to do so. A 'no' vote would be in the best interest of the constituents that many of us...that have elected many of us to come down here and do their business. Don't send this Bill out as a vehicle. You'll never see it again. You will abrogate any chance you have to affect the

64th Legislative Day

June 11, 1991

judicial redistricting of Cook County, and I submit to you, you will abrogate the responsibility that your constituents give you. A 'no' vote is advisable on this issue."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Kubik."

Kubik: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of I would oppose this Bill, and I'd ask my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, for one basic reason. We're going to cede all of our ability to make this map to Senate, and I don't think that's the right way to do it. Now, we heard in the last couple minutes of about...those who have...gotten up and opposed this particular concept...or opposed...oppose the map. understand that, but make suggestions, make Amendments, but let's do it in the House. Let's not do it in the Let's not cede our responsibility over to the Senate and then be forced to either concur or to go to a Conference Committee . We are cedeing our ability to make changes in this map. To accommodate the Communities of interest, the various ethnic communities and the racial makeup of this map. We are cedeing our responsibility to the Senate, and don't think that's what we want to do, because as Representative Young and Williams know, the way that we got to this process was by working in the House and...and forcing the issue over in the Senate. So, we shouldn't cede this whole map to the Senate. Let's hold this Bill, let's amend it, let's change it, let's open up discussion. I think that...this side of the aisle is open to that suggestion. We'd be happy to take Amendments to this particular proposal, but let's not make the mistake of letting the Senate do all of the map-making and...so I would oppose this Bill and would hope my colleagues on the of the aisle would not abrogate their side other responsibility as House Members and as map-makers to

64th Legislative Day

June 11, 1991

state Senate."

- Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. Representative Monique Davis votes 'aye'. On this Bill, there are 7l 'ayes' and 46 'nos', and House Bill 108, having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Representative Persico."
- Persico: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Evidently my button was not working when we voted on the Consent Calendar, and I would like the record to indicate that I would have voted 'aye'."
- Speaker McPike: "Thank you. Representative Preston."
- Preston: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I ask to move to waive the posting requirements of Senate Bill 580 may be heard in the Committee on Children and Family Law on Thursday at noon.

 I have checked the Minority spokesman, and he graciously has consented to this Motion."
- Speaker McPike: "Is there any objections to that Motion? Hearing none, the Attendance Roll Call will be used. The Motion carries. Representative Homer."
- Homer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would...ask leave to waive the posting requirements...for Senate Bill 1227 and also Senate Bill 1302 two Bills assigned to the House Judiciary II Committee that were inadvertantly...not posted."
- Speaker McPike: "And the Minority side has agreed?"
- Homer: "Candidly, I haven't had a chance to talk to Representative Petka."
- Speaker McPike: "Mr. Petka, do you have any objections? Hearing no objections, the Attendance Roll Call will be used, and the Motion carries. Representative Giglio. Frank Giglio."
- Giglio: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to move the appropriate...rule to suspend and post the House...Senate Bill 257. It was supposed to be posted in executive and for some reason my

64th Legislative Day

- June 11, 1991
- other two Bills were and this one wasn't. I would ask leave to have it posted. The other side of the aisle agrees."
- Speaker McPike: "The Gentleman's Motion, is there any objections?

 Hearing none, the Attendance Roll Call will be used, and
 the Motion carries. Representative Saltsman. Don
 Saltsman."
- Saltsman: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd ask permission to waive the posting notice so Senate Bill 1167 can be heard in...Executive Committee. It has been transferred from Financial Institutions. Senate Bill 1167."
- Speaker McPike: "To be heard in executive?"
- Saltsman: "Executive Committee, yes."
- Speaker McPike: "You've heard the Gentleman's Motion, are there any objections to that Motion? Hearing none, the Attendance Roll Call will be used, and the Motion carries. Representative McNamara."
- McNamara: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Having voted on the prevailing side of Senate Bill 1337, I wish to reconsider the vote by which that Bill was passed. I've checked with the Minority spokesperson, and they are in agreement with this Motion."
- Speaker McPike: "This Bill was on the Consent Calendar?"
- McNamara: "That's correct."
- Speaker McPike: "Alright, the Gentleman's Motion is having voted on the prevailing side, he moves to reconsider the vote by which House Bill 1337 passed. Are there any objections to that? There being none, the Attendance Roll Call will be used on the Motion, and the Motion carries. Mr. McNamara."
- McNamara: "Just one correction on that. I believe, you said House Bill, it's Senate Bill 1337."
- Speaker McPike: "Senate Bill 1337. The Gentleman's Motion for us was to reconsider the vote, the Attendance Roll Call was

- 64th Legislative Day June 11, 1991 used and the Motion carried. Representative Walsh."
- Walsh: "Mr. Speaker and Members, I'd like to have leave to waive the posting requirements...to have Senate Bill 971 heard in committee, and I have discussed this with the Chairman and the Minority spokesman. State Government."
- Speaker McPike: "You've heard the Gentleman's Motion. Is there any objections to this Motion? Hearing none, the Attendance Roll will be used, and the Motion carries. other announcements? Alright. The Chair would now...if we could just have your attention please. The 2:00 p.m. committees will meet from 4:00 to 5:00 p.m. and if you need to five or ten or 15 minutes to finish up, try to The 4:00 p.m. committees will meet at 5:00 p.m. with the...consideration that we'd like all the committees to finish their business. 2:00 p.m. will meet at 4:00, 4:00 p.m. will meet at 5:00. Agreed Resolutions."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Joint Resolutions 65, Klemm; 66, Noland.

 House Joint Resolution 59, Stange. House Resolution 683,

 Ryder; 684, Deuchler; 686, Matijevich; 687, Woolard; 688,

 Granberg; 690, Churchill."
- Speaker McPike: "Excuse me, Mr. Clerk. Representative Trotter.

 Mr. Trotter."
- Trotter: "Yes. Mr. Speaker. Thank you very much. I rise in a point of personal privilege."
- Speaker McPike: "Yes."
- Trotter: "Yes. If I may proceed, in the last couple of weeks...many Members of this chamber. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. In the last couple of weeks, many Members of this chamber...staff and friends alike, have come to me expressing their encouragement, their kind wishes and just advice on my probabilities, relative probability, of, me replacing Senator Newhouse, as we all know who retired a couple of weeks ago. Professionally, that would have been

64th Legislative Day

June 11, 1991

a good move because as you know, Senator Newhouse has been one of the big people here down in the State of Illinois. He acted for people, no matter if they're from the city or they're from the suburbs or if they're from the rural Senator Newhouse was a great guy. It would have been an honor and a challenge to replace him in the Senate, however, that didn't happen. And if it would have happened, I would have gone over there begrudgingly because the Members of this chamber have been more than good to me. If I can just paraphrase what Dorothy told toto and that is, 'There's no place like the House. There's no place like the House.' So, I thank all of you for those kind words, for that encouragement, and I just want to let you know that there's no Death Resolutions to be read today for me. I'm alive and well, and I'm here to do the business of the House with you."

Speaker McPike: "Proceed, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Continuing Agreed Resolutions. House Resolution 691, offered by Representative McPike; 692, Mautino; 693, Novak; 694, Novak; 695, Novak; 696, Phelan; 698, Madigan; 699, Schoenberg; 700, Black; and 701, Noland."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Matijevich."

- Matijevich: "Speaker, we've examined the Resolution. They are congratulatory. I move the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions."
- Speaker McPike: "The Gentleman moves the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. All in favor say 'aye', opposed, 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and te Agreed Resolutions are adopted.

 Death Resolutions."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 682, offered by Representative Johnson, with respect to memory of Elizabeth Curzin. House Resolution 685, offered by Representative Hultgren, with respect to the memory of Albert T. McClousky. House

64th Legislative Day

June 11, 1991

Resolution 689, offered by Representative Anthony Young, with respect to the memory of Olivia Farrington. Resolution 697, offered by Representatives White and Stepan, with respect to the memory of John J. Cullerton." Speaker McPike: "Representative Matijevich moves for the adoption of the Death Resolutions. All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Death Resolutions are adopted. Representative Matijevich now moves that the House stand Adjourned until tomorrow at the hour of 1 p.m.. All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the House stands Adjourned. The First Special Session will come to order. The Attendance Roll Call for the Regular Session will be used as the Attendance Roll Call for the First Special Session. Representative Matijevich now moves that the First Special Session stands adjourned until tomorrow at the hour of 1:05 p.m. All in favor say 'aye', opposed, 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the First Special Session stands Adjourned."

DOCUMENT NAME	~	-	PRINT COMMAND	DATE	COPY	D WIDTH	DEPTH	ERROR
T061191-1mg	137	0	рj	08/02/91	1	66	78	

REPORT: TIFLDAY PAGE: 001

STATE OF ILLINOIS 87TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES DAILY TRANSCRIPTION OF DEBATE INDEX

92/09/14 14:38:23

JUNE 11, 1991

HB-0106	SECOND READING	PAGE	13
HB-0106	THIRD READING	PAGE	30
HB-0107	SECOND READING	PAGE	33
HB-0107	THIRD READING	PAGE	41
HB-0108	SECOND READING	PAGE	44
HB-0108	THIRD READING	PAGE	63
\$8-0256	MOTION	PAGE	68
SB-0262	RECALLED	PAGE	7
SB-0580	MOTION	PAGE	6
SB-0580	MOTION	PAGE	68
SB-0686	RECALLED	PAGE	5
SB-0845	RECALLED	PAGE	4
SB-0971		PAGE	70
SB-1167	MOTION	PAGE	69
SB-1227	MOTION	PAGE	68
SB-1302	MOTION	PAGE	68
SB-1337	MOTION	PAGE	69

SUBJECT MATTER

HOUSE TO ORDER - SPEAKER MCPIKE	PAGE	1
PRAYER - DR. PATRICK PAJAK	PAGE	1
PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE	PAGE	1
ROLL CALL FOR ATTENDANCE	PAGE	1
CONSENT CALENDAR - SECOND READING	PAGE	2
CONSENT CALENDAR - THIRD READING	PAGE	7
CONSENT CALENDAR - THIRD READING	PAGE	8
COUNSEL GENERAL BUGIELSKI	PAGE	9
AGREED RESOLUTIONS	PAGE	70
AGREED RESOLUTIONS	PAGE	71
DEATH RESOLUTIONS	PAGE	71
ADJOURNMENT	PAGE	72
FIRST SPECIAL SESSION	PAGE	72
FIRST SPECIAL SESSION - ADJOURNMENT	PAGE	72