75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

Speaker McPike: "The House will come to order. The Chaplain for today is Pastor Merrill Hall, retired from the United Methodist Church in Morris, Illinois. Pastor Hall is the guest of Representative Weller. The guests in the balcony may wish to rise and join us for the invocation."

Pastor Merrill Hall: "I've only been here a short time, but I can't help but sensing the feeling of urgency that exists all around. And when I am confronted with something like this, sometimes the...my sense of values maybe will slip out the window or something. So I think it's good that we pause for a moment of meditation to remind ourselves of who we are and what we are to be doing here upon earth, and for that, I have selected a prayer from St. Francis of Assisi. I would like to share with you at this time. Lord, make me an instrument of Thy peace. Where there is hatred, let me so love, and where there is injury, pardon, and where there is doubt, faith, where this despair, hope, and where there is darkness, light, and when there is sadness, help me to spread joy. Oh, devine Master, grant that I...I may not so much seek to be consoled as to console, to be understood as to understand, to be loved, as to love. For it is in giving that we receive, it is in pardoning that we are pardoned, it is in dying that we are born to life eternal. May the Lord bless you and keep you, as you once again engage in the business at hand. Amen."

Speaker McPike: "We'll be led in the Pledge of Allegiance by Representative Ann Stepan."

Stepan — 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 Stepan

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

is always here on time. Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Speaker, on this side of the aisle, Representative Flowers and the baby are doing well. She is excused."

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Kubik."

Kubik: "Let the record reflect, Mr. Speaker, that Representative Klemm is excused due to illness."

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Clerk, take the record. 116 Members answering the Roll Call. A quorum is present. Special call Children, Third Reading."

Speaker Giglio: "Agreed Resolutions."

Clerk O'Brien: "Agreed Resolutions. House Resolution 808, offered by Representative DeJaegher; 809, DeJaegher; 810, DeJaegher; 811, DeJaegher; 812, DeJaegher; 813, DeJaegher; 814, DeJaegher; 815, DeJaegher; 816, DeJaegher; 817, DeJaegher; 818, Hartke; 819, Noland; 820, Noland; 821, Ewing; 823, Rice; 824, Doederlein; 826, Wolf; 827, Granberg; 828, Phelps and 829, Novak. Also Senate Joint Resolution 33, offered by Representative Churchill."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, we've examined the Resolutions. They are agreed to. I move the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions."

- Speaker Giglio: "You heard the Gentleman's Motion. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it. The Resolutions are adopted. General Resolutions."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Joint Resolution 68, offered by Representative Curran. House Resolution 825, offered by Representative Santiago and Senate Joint Resolution 20, offered by Representative Regan."
- Speaker Giglio: "Committee on assignments. Death Resolution."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 822, offered by Representative Shaw. With respect to the memory of Sandra Lorecia Wynn."

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

- Speaker Giglio: "Representative Matijevich moves the adoption of the Death Resolution. All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it. The Death Resolution's adopted...Agreed Resolution."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Joint Resolution 43, offered by Representative Kubik."
- Speaker Giglio: "Representative Matijevich moves for the adoption of the Agreed Resolution. All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it. The Resolution is adopted. Mr. Clerk, the Chair erred, Senate Joint Resolution 43 should be moved to the Committee on Assignments. The...page 17 of the Calendar under Motion, appears House Resolution 767, Representative Currie."
- Currie: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move for adoption of House Resolution 767. This is a Resolution that deals with the issue of alternate birthing...programs..."
 - Speaker Giglio: "Read the Motion, Mr. Clerk."
 - Clerk O'Brien: "A Motion pursuant to Senate Rule 43(a). I move to bypass Committee and place House Resolution 767 on the Speaker's table for immediate consideration."
 - Speaker Giglio: "Any discussion? Hearing none, Attendance Roll
 Call will be used. All those in favor say 'aye'. The
 Motion is adopted. Representative Currie on the
 Resolution."
- Currie: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. This Resolution is one that we've worked on with the Medical Society, the Hospital Association, the Department of Public Health. The point of the Resolution is to ask our State Department of Public Health to have a look at the issues of safety and utility in developing free-standing birthing centers as an alternate place for Illinois women to...to have children. So, I would appreciate your support for the

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

adoption of this Resolution."

Speaker Giglio: "Any discussion on the Lady's Motion? Hearing none, all those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it. The Resolution is adopted. The Chair will now go to page 15 of the Calendar under Nonconcurrence, and those Bills that those Members wish to refuse to recede will be...and request Conference Committees. Now on that order appears Senate Bill 10, Representative Levin. Is Representative Levin in the chamber? Out of the record, Mr. Clerk. Representative...Representative Homer."

Homer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I note this is the first of the Bills on the Order of Nonconcurrence, and we run into this each year where midway through the presentation someone gets up and says, 'wait a minute, what's the reason you want to do that?' I would like to ask the Members at the outset to, rather than just simply make a Motion to refuse to recede and ask for a Conference Committee, that the Member explain, however briefly, what the purpose of the Conference Committee will be and why the Member wishes to...why the Member is either receding or refusing to recede from the Amendment. So, I would just simply ask that there would be some explanation rather than a general request just for a vote."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Lang, Senate Bill 10."

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. At this time I move to refuse to recede from House Amendment #1. This is a vehicle for Chicago School Reform."

Speaker Giglio: "All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it, and the House refuses to recede on House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 10 and requests a Conference Committee. Senate Bill 11, Representative Lang."

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

- Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. At this time, I move that the House refuse to recede from House Amendment #1 and that a Conference Committee be appointed."
- Speaker Giglio: "You heard the Gentleman's Motion. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it, and the House refuses to recede from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 11 and a Conference Committee will be appointed as requested. Senate Bill 86, Representative Currie."
- Currie: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would move that the House refuse to recede from House Amendment #1 and would request the appointment of a Conference Committee. This Bill had to do with slum housing conditions in the City of Chicago. The legislation like it has already left both chambers and the Senate Sponsor, Senator Cullerton and I are working with some people involved with the affordable housing..."
- Speaker Giglio: "You heard the Lady's request. All those in favor of the Lady's Motion signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it, and the House refuses to recede from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 86 and a Conference Committee be requested. Senate Bill 130, Representative Black."
- Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. A question of the Chair. Is House Amendment #1...or #2 an immediate effective date? Mr. Speaker, I've been informed that, by your side of the aisle, that #2 is the immediate effective date and in that case I would move to refuse to recede from House Amendment 1 and would send it to Conference Committee where we'll hopefully take off Amendment #2 and do some additional work on it."
- Speaker Giglio: "You heard the Gentleman's Motion. All those in favor signify by...Representative Black, you have to deal with both Amendments, so do you want to take them one at a

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

time? Divide the question?"

Black: "Yes. If we could do that."

Speaker Giglio: "Alright, proceed."

Black: "I would move to concur with the Senate action as far as

House Amendment #1."

Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman moves to recede from House
Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 130 and then..."

Black: "Yes, House Amendment #1, I think, is agreed to by most parties to this legislation. That Amendment takes out any reference to age, categories, groups, and grids. So, that Amendment basically, I shouldn't say it's an Agreed Amendment, it isn't, but I think most people agree with that Amendment and I don't think we have any problem with that, so I would accept Amendment #1. It's the next one that I will not."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Black."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. At this point, let me move to refuse to recede from House Amendment #1 and 2 and send the Bill to Conference Committee."

Speaker Giglio: "You heard the Gentlemen's Motion. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it, and the House refuses to recede from House Amendments #1 and 2 to Senate Bill 130 and requests а Conference Committee. Representative Novak, Senate Bill 201. Representative Currie, 201? Senate Bill 201? Are you going to Alright, we'll come back when Representative Novak returns. Senate Bill 257, Representative Kubik."

Kubik: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would move to refuse to recede from House Amendment #1 and call for the creation of a Conference Committee. This particular Bill will be used as a Vehicle Bill for a potential legislation regarding redistricting of the Cook County Water Reclamation

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

District."

Speaker Giglio: "You've heard the Gentleman's Motion.

Representative Homer."

Homer: "A question for the Sponsor. Representative Kubik, this was the...Amendment 1 made the Bill a shell Bill?"

Kubik: "Correct."

Homer: "And what's the plan for conference?"

Kubik: "The plan is, Representative Homer, to look at legislation which would sub-district the single member districts..."

Homer: "Single member districts...it would have nothing to do with the issue of the authority of who would appoint the attorney for the district or any of the other employee powers."

Kubik: "Well, let me put it to you this way. If that...my name wouldn't be on that Bill...on this Bill if that were the case. I strongly object to that particular provision and it's certainly not my intention to have that as part of the final version."

Homer: "Okay. That's fine."

Speaker Giglio: "You've heard the Gentleman's Motion. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it. The House refuses to recede from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 257 and a Conference Committee be requested. Senate Bill 264, Representative Hoffman. Representative J. Hoffman? Is Representative Hoffman in the chamber? Senate Bill 264. Do you want this...Representative Hoffman on Senate Bill 264?"

Hoffman: "I'd like to send this to a Conference Committee."

Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman asks..."

Hoffman: "I refuse to recede..."

Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman refuses to recede from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 264, and requests a Conference

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

Committee. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it, and the House refuses to recede and requests a Conference Committee on Senate Bill 264. Senate Bill Representative Satterthwaite. Senate Bill 539? Do you refuse to recede from the Amendment and put this in a Conference Committee? The Lady refuses to recede from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 539. Any discussion? Hearing none, all those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it, and the House refuses to recede on House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 539 and a Conference Committee be requested. Representative Rice. Brother Rice. Representative Hicks. Is Representative Hicks in the chamber? Representative Steczo. Steczo? Just saw him. Representative Steczo. Senate Bill 922."

- Steczo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would move now to refuse to recede from House Amendments #1, 3 and 8, from...on House Bill...Senate Bill 922. These are Amendments that deal with the Election Code, and we're hoping that by taking this Bill to Conference that perhaps some agreements can be reached to have some election material passed this year."
- Speaker Giglio: "You've heard the Gentleman's Motion. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it, and the House refuses to recede from House Amendments #1, 3 and 8 to Senate Bill 922 and requests a Conference Committee. Representative Steczo on Senate Bill 972."
- Steczo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move now that the House refuse to recede from Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 972.

 This Bill had some flaw...the Amendment had some flaws in it. We need to correct it in Conference, and I would move, Mr. Speaker, that we refuse to recede."

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

- Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman moves to refuse to recede from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 972. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it, and the House refuses to recede from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 972 and a Conference Committee be requested. Representative DeLeo. Representative DeJaegher. Robert DeJaegher. Representative DeJaegher, Senate Bill 1009."
- DeJaegher: "Good morning, Mr. Speaker. Thank you. I refuse to concur...I nonconcur on Senate Bill 1009 and respect (sic request) a Conference Committee."
- Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman moves to refuse to recede from

 House Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 1009. All those in favor
 signify by saying...Representative Homer."
- Homer: "Thank you. We would like, on each of these Bills, just to have a brief explanation as to why a Member wishes to nonconcur? Can you give us just a brief explanation, Representative DeJaegher, as to why you wish to refuse to recede?"
- DeJaegher: "How come you're so difficult, Mr. Homer? Basically, our Senator, Senator Brookins, this is his Bill, and there is a problem, and the problem is basically dealing with the funding mechanism. What we're trying to do is add a continuation of the Senior Citizen Program and try to make seniors aware that basically their funds are going to be cut off. Thank you."
- Speaker Giglio: "Representative Hultgren."
- Hultgren: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative, you may recall that this was a Bill that was heard before the Aging Committee, and we had an agreement in that Committee that this Bill would not move off of Second Reading on this floor until we work out the problems. It was amended to work out those problems, but now if I understand correctly,

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

your proposing to move this Bill to Conference which presumably would change the Bill yet again. I would like to have the same commitment from you now that we had when the Bill was moved out of Committee, that we would have an opportunity to sign off on this since that was the understanding that we had in the Aging Committee. Do you remember our discussion on this in the Aging Committee?"

DeJaegher: "Mr. Hultgren, I respect your wishes. I didn't feel that we had that much of a problem with 1009. I thought we basically had that Bill in structure form. I thought our trouble was with 705, but Senator Brookins seems to be a little bit disturbed that additional language should be put into this particular Bill. So, I'll just have to see how this thing works out, and I assure you when this develops that I will communicate with you."

Hultgren: "Well, will we have an opportunity, Representative, to agree to the changes that are made as a result of the Conference?"

DeJaegher: "Yes."

Hultgren: "And you'll present it to us and have us sign off on it
 before you call that report...Conference Committee Report?"
DeJaegher: "Yes."

Hultgren: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Giglio: "Alright, the Gentleman moves to refuse to recede on House Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 1009. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it, and the House refuses to recede from House Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 1009 and a Conference Committee requested. Representative Obrzut. Representative Hannig on Senate Bill 1071."

Hannig: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I
would move that we..."

Speaker Giglio: "House refuses to recede from House Amendment #1

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

- to Senate Bill 1071. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it, and the House refuses to recede from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1071 and requests a Conference Committee. The Senate Bill 1016, Representative Obrzut."
- Obrzut: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to refuse to recede on Senate Bill 1016. We added an Amendment in the House that dealt with noise monitoring for O'Hare Airport and what I'd like to do is...that Bill's already on the Governor's desk. There's a problem with the Senate Sponsor. He would like...that Bill originally was intended for the RTA. It's a Vehicle Bill for them and for that reason I would like that that Bill go to Conference Committee."
- Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman moves to refuse to recede from House Amendment #1016 (sic #1), and on that question the Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black."
- Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor
 yield?"
- Speaker Giglio: "He indicates he will."
- Black: "Representative, since this is a...since this is an 'Airport Bill' basically, let me make sure I have you on the record. It's your intent now that this be used as a vehicle for the RTA, correct?"
- Obrzut: "It's not my intent, it's Senator Brookins intent."
- Black: "But, that's all it will used for, no third airport or fourth airport...?"
- Obrzut: "If that was the case I would be opposed to it, and that's my understanding that it wouldn't be. So I want to work that that doesn't happen."
- Black: "Alright, that's all I wanted to make sure of. Thank you."
- Speaker Giglio: "The question is, 'Shall the House refuse to

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

recede from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1016?' All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it. The House refuses to recede on House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1016 and requests a Conference Committee. Representative Williams. Representative Williams in the chamber? Out of the record. Representative...Parke. Out of the record. Representative Hartke, 1364. Senate Bill 1364."

- Hartke: "Mr. Speaker, I refuse to recede from House Amendment #1
 on Senate Bill 1364 and would ask for a Conference
 Committee."
- Speaker Giglio: "You heard the Gentleman's request. Do you want to explain...?"
- Hartke: "We will be using this for, hopefully, an ethanol
 proposal."
- Speaker Giglio: "The question is, 'Shall the House refuse tο recede from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1364?' those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it, and the House refuses to recede from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1364 and requests a Conference Committee. The intention of the Chair is to go through the Calendar for those that wish to nonconcur on these House Bills, so we can start the Conference Committees, and then we'll come back to the under Civil and Criminal Law appears concurrence. So, Senate...House Bill 65, Santiago, Homer, McCracken, Steczo. Those that want to nonconcur. We're going to do those first so we can get them out. Hicks, is there any Bills you want to nonconcur on this order? Turner? Satterthwaite? Peterson? Excuse me. Hoffman? J. Hoffman? Representative Walsh? DeJaegher? McCracken, 1340? Homer, 1415? Representative Keane? Representative Representative Richmond? Representative Curran?

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

Representative Steczo? Representative Steczo? George?"

- Steczo: "Mr. Speaker, are we on the Regular Calendar?"
- Speaker Giglio: "We're on the Supplemental...we're on the Special Order Calendar. Special Order Calendar under concurrence, Civil and Criminal Law. Are there any of your Bills that you want to nonconcur? That's what we're doing first. Do you have any Bills that you want to nonconcur? Representative Richmond? Proceed."
- Richmond: "Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move to nonconcur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1498."
- Speaker Giglio: "You heard the Gentleman's Motion. The Gentleman moves to nonconcur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1498. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it. Representative Curran? Representative Currie? Representative Flowers? Representative Homer, 1950? Representative Keane?"
- Keane: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On the Order of State and Local Government. I have House Bill 214.."
- Speaker Giglio: "No, we're not on that, Representative Keane, we're on Civil and Criminal Law. We're going to go down the Calendar. We're taking those that want to do a nonconcurrence so we can get these over to the Senate. Representative Homer."
- Homer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I don't...this is not...I intend to move to concur on this Bill, but I had a previous Bill 1415 on this call that I do wish to nonconcur. May I back up to that Bill?"
- Speaker Giglio: "Sure. So, the Gentleman moves to nonconcur on Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1415. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it, and the House

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

moves to nonconcur. Representative Regan on 2125? Do you move to nonconcur? Representative Regan moves to nonconcur with Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 2125. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it and the Motion carries. Representative Lang on 2208? Representative Lang?"

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Move to concur with Senate
Amendment #1 to House..."

Speaker Giglio: "No, we're on nonconcurrence."

Lang: "Oh, sorry."

Speaker Giglio: "We're trying to speed up the process by taking those that want to nonconcur on the order that we're on.

Representative Keane."

Keane: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On House Bill 1440, on this order, I move to nonconcur with Senate Amendment #1."

Speaker Giglio: "You heard the Gentleman's Motion. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it, and the House moves to nonconcur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1440. Representative Curran. Representative Curran on House Bill..."

Curran: "I move to nonconcur on Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1440."

Speaker Giglio: "Does the Gentleman have leave? Hearing none, leave is granted. All those in favor signify by 'aye', opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it, and the House moves to nonconcur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1499. Alright, we're just going to go right down the line. There seems to be too confusion. much I guess you can't handle it. Representative Lang? Representative Curran on Representative Currie on 2243? Representative J. Hoffman

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

on 2306 and 2307? Representative Curran? Representative Curran? Proceed."

Curran: "2222?"

Speaker Giglio: "That's correct."

- Curran: "I move to nonconcur in Senate Amendment #1. House Bill 2222 is technically incorrect."
- Speaker Giglio: "You heard the Gentleman's Motion. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it, and the House moves to nonconcur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2222. Representative John Dunn? Representative Pedersen, 2392?"
- Pedersen: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move to nonconcur with Senate Amendment #1 on House Bill 2392."
- Speaker Giglio: "You heard the Gentleman's Motion. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it, and the House moves to nonconcur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2392. Representative DeJaegher on 2557. You move to nonconcur? The Gentleman moves to nonconcur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2557. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it and the Motion carries. Alright, on Transportation, those who wish to nonconcur. Representative Currie on 121. Sieben on 1431. LeFlore on 1685 and Ronan on 1960. Anybody wishes to nonconcur? Representative Currie?"
- Currie: "I move that the House nonconcur in the Senate Amendment to House Bill 121."
- Speaker Giglio: "The Lady moves to nonconcur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 121. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair the

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

'ayes' have it and the Motion carries. Representative Sieben on 1431. Do you wish to nonconcur? Out of the record. Representative LeFlore? Representative Ronan? On the Order of Education. Wyvetter Younge, do you wish to nonconcur on...Representative Obrzut? Representative Steczo on 1815? Do you wish to nonconcur? Representative Steczo."

Steczo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to nonconcur with Senate
Amendment #1 to House Bill 1851."

Speaker Giglio: "You heard the Gentleman's Motion. All those in favor..."

Steczo: "Sorry, Mr. Speaker, House Bill 1815."

Speaker Giglio: "You heard the Gentleman's Motion. All those favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it, and the House moves to nonconcur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1815. Representative Ronan in the chamber? Representative Steczo on 2042? Steczo, 2042? Nonconcur? Out of the record. Representative McNamara, 2642? Out of the record. On the Order of Revenue and Banking appears House Bill 67, Representative Currie? Out of the record. Representative Churchill on 1256? Representative Bugielski on 1982? Do you wish to nonconcur? Out of the record? On the Order of Agriculture and Environment? Representative McAfee? Representative Matijevich 580? on Representative Matijevich on House Bill 580?"

Matijevich: "Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would move to nonconcur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 580."

Speaker Giglio: "You heard the Gentlemen's Motion. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it, and the House moves to nonconcur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

580. Representative Granberg on 742? Representative Brunsvold on 1433? Brunsvold? Representative Peterson? Peterson on 1449? Do you move to nonconcur or do you want to concur? Just nonconcurrence. Out of the record. Representative Mautino on 1514? Do you want to nonconcur? The Gentleman moves to nonconcur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1415. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it, and the House moves to nonconcur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1514. Representative Mautino? Is Representative Mautino..."

Mautino: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I believe I screwed up on 1514."

Speaker Giglio: "Do you want to concur?"

Mautino: "I wanted to concur on the Senate Amendments to 1514."

Speaker Giglio: "Alright. Mr. Clerk..."

Mautino: "So, I'd like to withdraw my..."

Speaker Giglio: "Let the record indicate that Representative Mautino withdraws his request to nonconcur and leave it on the Order of Concurrence. That's Senate Bill 1514. On nonconcurrence appears Senate Bill 978, Representative Munizzi."

Munizzi: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentleman. I move to nonconcur with Senate Bill 978 and we can get this to a Conference Committee."

Speaker Giglio: "The Lady moves to refuse to recede on House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 978. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it, and the House refuses to recede from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 978 and requests a Conference Committee. Representative Hensel on 2022? Okay. Representative Kulas on 2250? Do you want to nonconcur? Representative Stepan on 2295?

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

Representative Stepan? Do you wish to nonconcur with 2295 or are you going to concur? Fine. Representative Kulas on 2491? Representative Kulas?"

Kulas: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to nonconcur to Senate Amendment #1 to 2491."

Speaker Giglio: "You heard the Gentleman's Motion. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it, and the House moves to nonconcur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2491. On the Order of Human Services, we're going to move to nonconcur on any of these Bills. Those that wish please advise the Chair. Representative Currie, 318? Representative McAfee? Representative Currie on Representative Regan on 555? Representative Woolard on Black. 677? Do you have any of these you want to nonconcur? Okay. Representative Jesse White on 691? Representative White? Representative Phelps on 735. Do you wish to nonconcur? Representative Phelps? Representative Phelps do you wish to nonconcur on Senate Bill 7...or House Bill 735 or are you going to concur? Oh, Representative Burke on 751. Do you wish nonconcur or are you going to concur, 751? These are nonconcurrence. Oh, okay. Well, we're trying...let the Chair. I don't know...Representative Curran."

Curran: "Mr. Speaker, on House Bill 1499, when we did that nonconcurrence the board was only showing Senate Amendment #1. The board finally caught up with itself and showed Senate Amendments #1, 2 and 3. Verbally all I referenced was Amendment #1. To be appropriate, what we should do on House Bill 1499 is to nonconcur in Senate Amendments #1, 2 and 3, just to be technically correct."

Speaker Giglio: "You heard the Gentleman's Motion to nonconcur in Senate Amendments #1, 2 and 3 to House Bill 1499. All

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'nay'. the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it, and the House nonconcurs with Senate Amendments #1, 2 and 3 to House Bill 1499. Alright, we're still going...we're going to continue going through those Bills that want a...that the Sponsors nonconcur, so we can get these over back to the Senate to see whether or not they will recede from Amendments and if not, proceed for Conference Committees. We're just trying to speed up the process so we can get out of here at а earlier time this evening. 954? Representative Trotter on 1128? Representative Jesse White 1139? Do you wish to nonconcur? Representative DeJaegher, 1162? Do you wish to nonconcur? No. Representative White, we're doing nonconcurrences. Do you have a Bill that you want to nonconcur so we can speed up Representative Trotter did you have one? the process? Representative Trotter on 1128. Do you wish to nonconcur? The Gentleman moves to nonconcur on Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1128. All those in favor signify by 'aye', opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it, and the House nonconcurs with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1128. Okay. On this order, Representative Phelps, 1216. Do you have any Bills that to nonconcur? DeJaeqher? Okay, Representative White, do you have another? 1262, Representative Leitch on 1352? Representative Leitch in the chamber? Representative Hasara on 1629? Do you wish to nonconcur or do you want to concur? Okay. Representative Parcells, 2021. Do you want to nonconcur? Okay. Representative Munizzi on 2038. Do you wish to nonconcur? Okay. Hasara on 2177. Do you wish to nonconcur? Representative Walsh, 2464. Do you want to nonconcur? Representative J. Hoffman? Okay. Alright,

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

we'll go up to State and Local Government for those that want to nonconcur. Representative Lang on 762. want to nonconcur? Out of the record. Representative 942. Representative Steczo Representative Myron Olson on 1692. Representative Keane. of the record. Representative Steczo on Representative McGuire on 2349. Do you wish to nonconcur? No we're not on concurrence. Representative Hartke, Alright, on House Bill 2148, Representative Keane moves to nonconcur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2148. A11 those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it, and the House nonconcurs with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2148. Representative Mautino. Mautino?"

- Mautino: "I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker. You went by 1692 and I'm the hyphenated Co-Sponsor with Representative Olson, and we wanted to nonconcur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1692."
- Speaker Giglio: "You heard the Gentleman's Motion. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it, and the House nonconcurs with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1692. Representative McGuire? Representative Hartke? Okay. On Bills that wish to nonconcur on the Order of Government Operations. Representative Stern, House Bill 12. Do you wish to nonconcur on 12? No? Fine. Representative Steczo on 118? Representative Curran on 452? Do you wish to nonconcur on 452 or do you wish to concur? Nonconcur?"

Curran: "I wish to concur on..."

Speaker Giglio: "No, we're not on that yet? We're trying to move those that want to nonconcur. Representative Hultgren on 1470? Representative Santiago on 1699? Representative Granberg on 1854? Representative Ryder, 1864?

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

Representative Steczo? Representative Ronan? Representative...Representative Steczo? Representative Trotter, do you wish to nonconcur on 2017? No? No, we're not going to concur, we're trying to move the process along. Representative Granberg? Representative Keane? Representative Keane? Representative McNamara on 2524. Alright, now before we leave the Order of Nonconcurrence, did I miss anyone? Is there anybody that wants to nonconcur on the Special Order Calendar, so we could get these Bills back to the Senate, so they can take the appropriate action? Okay. Representative Satterthwaite? Would you come to the podium please? Representative Leitch? Tony? On House Bill 1352."

- Leitch: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd move that we do not concur in the Senate Amendment #1 to not...House Bill 1352."
- Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman moves that the House nonconcur with Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 1352. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it, and the House nonconcurs with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1352."
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Satterthwaite in the Chair. Representative Steczo."
- Steczo: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I have nonconcurrence Motions on three Bills on the Special Order."
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "Would you name the Special Order,
 please?"
- Steczo: "Pardon, Madam Speaker?"
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "Which Special Order?"
- Steczo: "The Special Order of Government Operations. House Bills 1970, 1971 and 1972."
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "Okay. Proceed with House Bill 1970 please. The Gentleman moves to nonconcur."
- Steczo: "Madam Speaker, I move to nonconcur on Senate Amendment

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

#1 to House Bill 1970."

- Speaker Satterthwaite: "Okay. The Gentleman moves to nonconcur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1970. All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it, and the House does not concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 1970. The next Bill, Representative Steczo."
- Steczo: "House Bill 1971, Madam Speaker. Madam Speaker, I move to nonconcur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1971."
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "The Gentleman moves to nonconcur in House Amendment #1 to House Bill 1970 (sic 1971). All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it..."
- Steczo: "Madam Speaker, correction, you said 1970, it should be 1971."
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "1971 and the House does not concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1971. 1972?"
- Steczo: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I move that the House nonconcur on Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1972."
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "The Gentleman moves...the question is, 'Shall the House nonconcur in Senate Amendment #1 to House All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'nay'. The Bill 1972?' 'aves' have it, and the House does not concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1972. Representative Currie. On the Special Order of Civil and Criminal Law, you have House Bill 1609. You wish to nonconcur in Senate Amendment on House Bill 1609? All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it, and the House does not in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1609. We'll now go to the Special Order of Transportation and do concurrences. The Sponsors on that list are Sieben, LeFlore and Ronan. Representative Sieben on House Bill 1431. Out of the record. Representative LeFlore on House Bill 1685. Representative LeFlore you wish to concur in Senate Amendment #1 on House Bill 1685?"

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

LeFlore: "Ms. Speaker. I wish to concur with Senate Bill 1."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Senate Amendment #1?"

LeFlore: "To House Bill 1685."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1685?' Is there any discussion? Seeing none, voting is open. All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. this question there 114 voting 'yes', none voting 'no', none voting 'present' and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1685. Representative Ronan? Is the Gentleman in the chamber? He is not. Proceeding then to Special Order of Civil and Criminal Law. The Sponsors on that list are Representative Santiago, Homer, McCracken, Steczo. House Bill 65, Representative Santiago. Representative Santiago on House Bill 65? Out of the record. Representative Homer on House Bill Out of the record. Representative Homer on House Bill 331. Representative Homer on House Bill 331?"

Homer: "Madam Speaker, I...we're...I was on the...I was distracted. We're now doing concurrences?"

Speaker Satterthwaite: "We're doing concurrences. There are Senate Amendments #1 and #2 on this Bill."

Homer: "Alright, could we back up then to the previous Bill?"

Speaker Satterthwaite: "You want to go back to 316?"

Homer: "Right."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Back to 316 for concurrence?"

Homer: "Yes."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Homer."

Homer: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I would move to concur on Senate Amendments 1 and 2. Both Amendments were offered to refine and define the rights of State's Attorneys with respect to Statewide Grand Jury. Amendment #1 has a

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

provision that would re...make it necessary before a Statewide Grand Jury be convened in a county that it had the approval of the State's Attorney, and Amendment #2 was offered in the Senate to clarify that the Statewide Grand Jury would not be able to grant transactional immunity without the permission of the State's Attorney and would not be able to utilize use immunity without the...without consulting with the State's Attorney. I would move the adoption...I would move that we concur with both Amendments."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Dunn. Representative John Dunn? Will the people clustered in front of Representative Dunn's desk, move."

Dunn: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'd like to call the attention the Members to what this Bill is. This is the legislation which would create a Statewide Grand Jury. There have been Amendments added in the Senate which ameliorate the Bill somewhat, but what those Amendments do as I understand them, is provide the State's Attorneys with some control over whether a Grand Jury may come into your county or not. But please don't forget that this is the legislation, which in my view at least, correlates directly and analogously with star chamber proceedings. It has ripe potential for abuse. It means that a defendant can essentially be prosecuted anywhere in the State of Illinois. and it further means that when the Grand Jury sits, your local county will have to pay the cost of proceeding and the State of Illinois is supposed reimburse the county after the county ponies up the money for the proceedings. So if you think your county is strapped for dollars now, wait until the county is forced to cough up millions of dollars for an extensive Statewide Grand Jury proceeding. And will this procedure work? This

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

Bill has not been changed since it left the House, in this regard, that two counties must be involved for the Grand Jury Act to be triggered. And as I pointed out in debate, all a narcotic criminal has to do is fly into O'Hare Airport, do the dirty work involved, distribute, sell narcotics, get back on the plane and fly away and this Bill doesn't even cover the situation because only one county in this state has been involved. So legislation, I'm here to tell you, will essentially exclude criminal activity in the largest county of this State. This is a political Bill, this is a political move, this is politicians legislation, this is bad legislation. I urge a 'no' vote. This legislation is sponsored by the current Attorney General who is a friend of mine, but I think he's dead wrong about this legislation. This legislation has proposed under Attorney Generals, both Democrat and Republican for years and has never succeeded, and it has never succeeded for a good reason. The good reason is, it throws out our rights and freedoms out the window with no consideration, no cause, no reflection about the damage that is done, and furthermore, do you think it will catch narcotic kingpins from South America and South Florida when they're going to come into Illinois and have to be involved with two counties before this Act ever kicks in? This Bill is ripe for abuse..."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Excuse me."

Dunn: "It is a bad Bill. I urge a 'no' vote and I urge you, please do not concur with these Senate Amendments. Let's get rid of this Bill right here and now. Thank you."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Homer. Did you wish to be recognized, Representative Homer? No. Okay."

Representative Wennlund."

Wennlund: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. The prior Speaker is

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

correct. but he just didn't go far enough. There's one other factor that remains to be said, and that is when said it was ripe for abuse. It is also ripe for political abuse, depending on which party is in office. Representative Dunn is correct, it could be either party in office, but it subjects all of you and I and the Members of the Senate to the same type of political abuse that could In fact, what this Bill will do is, it will occur. easier on the criminal because here's what happens. crime is now committed in two or three counties, they could be prosecuted in all three counties and have triple the amount of trouble and sentence that they would have in one county. Have you talked to your own local State's Attorney about this Bill? I think...I have, and I think you'll find that it's actually a slap in the face to all 102 State's Attorneys in Illinois. It's telling them that they are not doing the job in their own county, when in fact you and I know that they are doing the job. This will add nothing to criminal justice in the State of Illinois. We also know that all 102 State's Attorneys in Illinois are doing a fantastic job, because they are filling up the prisons with about 12,000 more than we have the capacity to do and these are all drug offenders. Almost 85% of those going into prison today are drug offenders. We know...and they say that that's the purpose of this Bill. Well let me tell you something, they're doing a good job. They're doing good a job, because we can't afford to house all 29,000 prisoners in the adult correctional facilities in Illinois. There is no necessity for this Bill, and when you remember and think about the fact that it is so political that it could be used by either Republican or a Democrat for political purposes against you, a 'no' vote is the proper vote on this Bill. Let's get rid of it once and for all."

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Petka."

Petka: "Thank you much...very much, Madam Speaker, Members of the House. It was a high honor and a distinct privilege that I enjoyed as a State's Attorney of the fourth largest county of this state for a period of ten years. idea...for a Statewide Grand Jury surfaced back in the 1970's under a Republican Attorney General, I was holding This idea, unlike vintage wine, does not that office. taste good with age. The idea of a Statewide Grand Jury, in my opinion, is an idea who's time will never ever come. Members of the House, if we really believed that this type legislation could make even the slightest dent in what the intent of the Sponsor of this Bill believes it will, I think we would be joining hands together, but as I have indicated many many times before on this House Floor, cases are made by street agents and the police. They are simply put in their final form by prosecutors. All this Bill will do, in my estimation, is expand the state bureaucracy, expand the waste of taxpayers funds, all name of getting tough on crime. If we're really serious on that, we would take direction and cue from the Supreme Court and drop drug offenders in prison for the rest of their lives, as the Supreme Court of the States held can't be without violating the done Constitution. I believe that the correct vote on this will remain a 'no' vote, and I certainly ask for your consideration of that."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "The Gentleman asks to take the Bill out of the record. Representative Ronan is recognized for nonconcurrence on House Bill 1960. Representative Ronan moves to nonconcur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 1960. All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it, and the House does nonconcur in Senate Amendment

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

#1 to House Bill 1960. Representative Homer on House Bill 331. Excuse me. Representative Rice, did you have...for what reason did you arise?"

Rice: "Madam Chairman, I wasn't here when the Senate Bill 703 was called and I'd like to recede, so we can get a Conference Committee going."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "What was the Bill number again, Representative?"

Rice: "Senate Bill 703."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Senate Bill 703. Is it on one of the Special Orders, Representative?"

Rice: "I'm sorry, Madam, I see nonconcurrence and it was called earlier."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative, you're refusing to recede from House Amendment #1 on Senate Bill 703 and requesting a Conference Committee?"

Rice: "Yes, Ma'am."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'nay'.

The 'ayes' have it, and the Gentleman's Motion carries.

The House refuses...refuses to..."

Rice: "Thank you."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "The House refuses...refuses to recede from House Amendment #1 on Senate Bill 703 and requests a Conference Committee be appointed. Okay. Back to Representative Homer on House Bill 331."

Homer: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. This Bill is a Bill that deals with the expungement procedures under the Illinois Criminal Code, and has been negotiated and fully worked out between the Illinois State Bar Association, the Illinois State Police and other parties of interest. The Senate Amendments make further refinements in the Bill that left the House and Amendment #1 requires the records to be impounded until the court orders otherwise, and also deals

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

with the supervision records, may not be discharged until two years after dismissal of supervision. Amendment #2 includes Section 410, probation in the application of the Act and also of cases where there has been a vacation of judgement which were inadvertently omitted in the original House Bill. The...I believe all the parties are in agreement. I would move that the House now concur in both Senate's Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 331."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 on House Bill 331?' All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 111 voting 'yes', 1 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present' and the House does concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 331. Representative McCracken on House Bill 431. Representative McCracken."

McCracken: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I move that the House concur on Senate Amendments #1 and 2. The underlying Bill is a revision of Articles 3 with conforming Amendments to Articles 4 and 1 of the Uniform Commercial Code. Senate Amendments #1 and 2 were adopted to make this portion of the Bill identical to that agreement reached between the banks and the retail merchants regarding charge-backs of dishonored checks. I move that the House concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur?' There is discussion. Representative Dunn."

Dunn: "Yes. Will the Sponsor yield for a quick question?"

McCracken: "Yes."

Dunn: "As presently configured, what proponent groups are for this legislation and who is against this legislation?"

McCracken: "I don't believe anyone is against it. The Bar

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

Associations are for the Bill. The Retail Merchants and Bankers are for the Bill with these Senate Amendments on the Bill. There's no opposition to my knowledge."

Dunn: "There's no opposition?"

Speaker Satterthwaite: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 on House Bill 431?' All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Homer?"

Homer: "Madam Speaker, I would like to point out that while the principal organizations may have signed off on this Bill, I am continuing to receive calls and letters from individual merchants in my district who are very upset about provisions of this Bill, who don't want to be assessed for checks in which they're an innocent party. And even the organization to which they belong may have entered into an agreement for the purpose of this there are many of your merchants that are very unhappy about the provisions that are in this Bill. Furthermore, the consumer, the customer, was not at the table and the Bill provides that the charge of a bad check charge can now be raised from \$10.00 to \$25.00, 250% increase. \$25.00 was put in the Bill when the banks were going to be able to charge the merchants \$7.50. Amendment #2 drops the \$7.50 to \$4.50, but it does nothing for the consumer. doesn't lower the \$25.00 at all, and as a consequence, what may be an agreement between some parties is not going to be met well with favor with consumers or with individual merchants who are not going to be in favor of And as a final shot, I have no empathy for people who write bad checks, but I recognize that there may be an occasion where a couple has a joint checking account or an error is made or a check is deposited, but not credited at a time, when it may make it possible for anybody to have an

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

check. And to impose a \$25.00 hit on them, when that check may be for a \$1.98 or any amount at all, I think is exorbitant. It's a 250% increase, we ought to look at it carefully."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Parke. Representative Parke. Representative Hartke."

Hartke: "Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. I started to realize this is 1167, I do believe which I spoke against yesterday or the day before. Like my previous speaker, Representative Homer, I'm continuing to receive calls from my local retail merchants who were not at the table either and they are not members of the association who have agreed. And I think this is a bad policy and we ought to be taking a real hard look at this thing. The merchant is not only out his merchandise but then he is again charged for trying to deposit that check. I don't know what the answer is, but I think this is bad policy and I urge more red votes on this concurrence."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 71 voting 'yes', 35 voting 'no', 9 voting 'present', and the House does concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 431 and this Bill having received the required Constitutional Majority, is declared passed. Representative Homer on House Bill 434. Out of the record. Representative Steczo on House Bill 515?"

Steczo: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I would move to concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 515. The Senate Amendment adds to the list of duties administered by the Police Training Board to review and approve applications in order to prevent convicted felons or those convicted of crimes of moral turpitude from being admitted to a certified academy. It also further requires the applicants

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

to be of good character. Madam Speaker, I'd move for concurrence of the Amendment."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 515?' All those in favor, vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Representative Black."

Black: "Well, thank you very much, Madam Speaker. I would have liked to have asked the Gentleman a question about whether or not moral turpitude is defined anywhere in statute or is it merely case law?"

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Steczo."

Steczo: "From my underst...to the best of my knowledge,
Representative Black, the Police Training Board has no
problem in terms of defining the phrase whether it be
statute or case law. They indicate that there is no
problem judging what that term means."

Black: "For example, I had a call this morning from a person who would like to be a police officer. When he was 18 years old he was convicted of illegal possession of alcoholic beverage. Could he be denied access to the police training academy on the grounds of moral turpitude?"

Steczo: "I believe not."

Black: "Alright. Thank you."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 115 voting 'yes', none voting 'no', none voting 'present', and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 515 and this Bill having received the required Constitutional Majority, is declared passed. Representative Frederick on House Bill 554. Representative Frederick?"

Frederick: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I move the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 on House Bill 554. The underlying

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

Bill dealt with automatic withholding of child support and required that this happen on the same day the employee was paid. When the Bill got to the Senate, the business community came to me and said that there was some cases where the checks could not be processed the same day and asked that I lengthen the time to three business days, which I have done. It also includes an intent on the part of the employer not to pay before the penalty is imposed. I move concurrence on Senate Amendment #1 of House Bill 554."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Dunn."

Dunn: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise in opposition to the concurrence Motion. This legislation, those of you who are sensitive to employers, should look at this legislation very closely because the legislation provides for a penalty of \$100.00 for each day the child support is not paid. Sponsor has indicated that there is a provision inserted in here about intention or knowingly not paying. I haven't seen that in the language. I presume that that is so, but you must take into account especially for smaller employers who may have three or four or five employees and have the bad luck to have each of them be divorced and be a payor, and one pays weekly, one pays twice a month, one pays every two weeks, one pays once a month and the employer is supposed to be right on top of each of those situations and failure to send a child support payment in subjects the employer to a penalty not of \$100.00, but of a \$100.00 each day that that payment is late. There is some confusion about whether mailing the check in complies, so not only is there confusion, but this penalty is way, way too stiff for this legislation. So I would urge the Members not to support this legislation in its present configuration."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Any further discussion? Representative

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

Frederick to close."

- Frederick: "Yes. Thank you, Madam Speaker. The penalty is in the Bill right now and in order...for it to be applied, there has to be an employer that knowingly withheld the payment to the ex-wives. So, I don't see this as a real negative in the Bill, and I really ask for your support and concurrence on Senate Amendment #1 on House Bill 554."
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 on House Bill 554?' All in favor vote 'yes', opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 109 voting 'yes', 1 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present', and the House does concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 554, and this Bill having received the required Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Representative Hicks. Gentleman in the chamber? He is not. Representative Turner. Is the Gentleman in the chamber? He Representative Hoffman. J. Hoffman on House Bill 840?"
- Hoffman: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentleman of the House. This Bill would amend the Criminal Code and make it an offense to wear or possess body armor for use by individuals when they have a dangerous weapon on them. It would make it a criminal offense. Though this passed out of the House, the only change that the Senate Amendment makes is it changes the word 'while' to 'when' from 'while wearing in the commission of a crime,' to 'when wearing in the commission of a crime.' It's just a technical change and I ask that we concur."
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "The Gentleman moves that the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 840. All in favor vote 'yes', opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? On this question

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

there are...Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 112 voting 'yes', none voting 'no', none voting 'present', and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 on House Bill 840 and this Bill having received the required Constitutional Majority, is declared passed. Representative Matijevich in the Chair."

- Speaker Matijevich: "The next Bill is House Bill 786, Representative Satterthwaite. Helen Satterthwaite."
- Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker. I move to concur in Senate
 Amendment #1 on House Bill 786. It is a technical
 Amendment and in no way changes the original intent of the
 Bill. It simply repeats some clarifying language so that
 we make sure which records are available, and I move for
 concurrence in the Amendment."
- Speaker Matijevich: "Representative Satterthwaite has moved to concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 786. There being no discussion, those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 114 'ayes', no 'nays', and this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority, the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 786 and the Bill is declared passed. Representative Satterthwaite in the Chair."
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Walsh on House Bill 852.

 Did you wish to concur in Senate Amendments on House Bill 852?"
- Walsh: "I concur. Yes, Madam Chairman, I will...Speaker, excuse
 me, I will concur with the Senate Amendments."
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "Is there any discussion? The question is, 'Shall...Representative McNamara."
- McNamara: "Yes, I would like to hear an explanation as to what those Senate Amendments that he's concurring in...with."

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "The Senate Amendment, in this regard, restricts the release of the information that will be acquired by the coroners to the mental health institutions of the state. It does not allow the information to be passed from any private institutions or any private files, any medical files."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Seeing no further person seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 852?' All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the On this question there are 113 voting 'yes', none voting 'no', none voting 'present', and the House in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 852, and this Bill having received the required Constitutional Majority, is declared passed. Representative DeJaegher on House Bill Out of the record. Representative McCracken on House Bill 1340. Is the Gentleman in the chamber? Yes, Representative McCracken."

McCracken: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I move that we concur in Senate Amendment #1. This adds a provision that would allow individuals serving on municipal advisory panels or commissions of a municipality to provide material services or labor if the contract does not exceed \$2000 and would not cause the aggregate amount in any one year to exceed \$4000. That same provision is currently in law for the protection or benefit of trustees who serve on the municipal boards or councils. This extends it to citizen participants who serve in a similar capacity on a volunteer basis. I move its adoption."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 on House Bill 1340?' All in favor

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 115 voting 'yes', none voting 'no', none voting 'present', and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1340, and this Bill having received the required Constitutional Majority, is declared passed. Representative Regan on House Bill 1453. Representative Regan."

Regan: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Members of the House. I concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1453. It exempts the sale and delivery of firearms, if otherwise legal under the Deadly Weapons Article or the 'FOID' card. I concur in the Amendment."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1453?' All in vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 105 voting 'yes', 6 voting...none voting 'no' and 6 voting 'present', and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1453, and this Bill having received the required Constitutional Majority, is declared passed. Representative Black wishes to be added to the Roll Call voting 'aye'.

Black: "Thank you."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Currie on House Bill 1608."

Currie: "Thank you, Madam Speaker and Members of the House. The Bill as it left here was intended to establish that orders of protection under domestic violence statutes have a priority. The Bar Association felt that the language did not do the trick and recommended language that basically would put the onerousness on the court, to try to determine

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

if other orders are outstanding in any particular case involving domestic violence. So, we have accepted their language and their language becomes the Bill, and we think it accomplishes our purpose. So, I would appreciate your support for the Motion to concur in Senate Amendment 1."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1608?' All in favor 'aye'...Representative Johnson, did you have comment? I didn't see your light. All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Representative Olson. Robert No, he does not wish to be Olson. recognized. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 109 voting 'yes', none voting 'no', none voting 'present', and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 1608, and this Bill having received the House Bill required Constitutional Majority, is declared Representative Lang on House Bill 1632."

Lang: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Can I have leave to handle for Representative Flowers?"

- Speaker Satterthwaite: "Is there leave for Representative Lang to handle the Bill for Representative Flowers? Seeing no objection, leave is granted."
- Lang: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Move to concur in Senate
 Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 1632. This would create a
 pilot study for computer literacy programs for committed
 persons in our correctional facilities."
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House...Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 1632?' All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 114 voting 'yes', none voting 'no', none voting 'present', and

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

the House does concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 1632. This Bill having received the required Constitutional Majority is declared passed. Representative Homer on House Bill 1950. Representative Homer."

"Thank you, Madam Speaker. This... I would move to concur Homer: with Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 1950. The Amendment is an Agreed Amendment that makes a technical change in the Bill that left the House. The Bill that left the House and the Bill that we're dealing with here, provides representation of indigent persons on appeal by the Appellate Defender's Office. And there are some other Amendments that were noncontroversial that were added the House not the Senate. The Senate Amendment's technical. I would move that we concur."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur Senate Amendment #1 on House Bill 1950?' All those in favor vote 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 113 voting 'yes', none voting 'no', none voting 'present', the House does concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill This Bill having received the required Constitutional Majority is declared passed. Representative Weller on Bill House 1955. Out of the Representative Currie on House Bill 2075."

Currie: "Thank you, Madam Speaker and Members of the House. This Bill, as it left this chamber, provided for a criminal penalty for the knowing disclosure of the whereabouts of a domestic violence shelter without authorization from that domestic violence shelter. At the suggestion of Senator Hawkinson in the Senate, we've changed the Bill so as to specifically protect the victims of domestic violence which, of course, was our real intent. So, the language as

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

it comes back is pretty close to what we sent the Bill over with, except that instead of the disclosure of the location of the shelter, we're now attaching a criminal penalty for the knowing disclosure without authorization of the whereabouts of a victim of domestic violence. So, I would appreciate your support for this concurrence Motion."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Dunn."

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

Speaker Satterthwaite: "She indicates she will."

Dunn: "Pursuant to the Senate Amendment, it says that anyone who discloses the location of a domestic violence victim, knowing that such disclosure will result in substantial likelihood of bodily harm, commits a misdemeanor. Now what if, as in many downstate communities, a lot of people know where the domestic violence shelter is, and what if someone says yes, this person went to the domestic violence shelter?"

Currie: "I'm sorry, I didn't hear the question. Can you repeat it?"

Dunn: "Well, why do we need this Amendment?"

Currie: "Well, if you remember, this Bill came out of...I thought it was your Judiciary Committee, with a good deal..."

Dunn: "I can't hear you."

Currie: "This Bill was modelled on a California statute. The concern is that there are people who have been victims of domestic violence who go to a domestic violence shelter, the batterer discovers where that individual is even though the location is meant to be a secret, even when there is an order of protection involved. So, the proposal here is to try to give additional protection to victims of domestic violence. As I say, this Bill had a lot of help from the lawyers on the Judiciary Committee in changing the language adopted in California to language appropriate here.

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

Senator Hawkinson, in the Senate, was of the view, and I think it was not an unreasonable one, that since the point is to protect the victim, wherever that victim may be, it makes more sense to change the language instead of about a domestic violence shelter to make it applicable to the victim him or herself of domestic violence."

Dunn: "Well...well...alright...To the Amendment, Madam Speaker. Let's visualize this scenario. A spouse, a woman, goes to the domestic violence shelter. And let's say that woman goes to the domestic violence shelter in my community. which is a well known location, hopefully, adequately And the estranged husband, who is under an Order secured. of Protection, asks his mother-in-law, 'Where is my wife?' mother-in-law, the wife of the victim says, 'She went to the domestic violence shelter.' And the who protective order, does something bad. under The mother-in-law has now disclosed to that man where the victim is, and knows that her son-in-law may not be the most wholesome person. The lady has a daughter in the shelter, a son-in-law who is not such a hot person, and all she has done is confirm to the son-in-law that her daughter went to a domestic violence shelter. Under this Amendment she has knowingly told that man where the victim knows he has a history of bad action, and in my community she might as well tell him, because he knows where domestic violence shelter is. You can't protect everybody from everything. And, this is very likely to result innocent people being dragged to court. We have protective orders which are designed to cover these situations. We have domestic violence shelters which are designed to protect victims from abuse and give them a place to go. And, maybe in large metropolitan areas those shelters can be kept secret as to their location. But throughout the

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

downstate area, and I come from a community of 84,000 people, but I don't think there are many people, probably very few in my community, who don't know where the domestic violence shelter is. It's supported by approximately 30 or 40 churches. Their members donate, they tour it, there have been open houses, they volunteer there, they know where it is. It's common knowledge. This Amendment is not needed and I would urge the Members to reject this Amendment to House Bill 2075. It should be defeated."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Madam Speaker and Members of the House. The knowing intent here is knowing that such disclosure will result in or has the substantial likelihood of resulting in the threat of bodily harm. So, that I think that we're well protected against an innocent individual providing information without authorization. As well, let me point out that the Senate change in this Bill makes disclosure of the presence of the victim, rather than the shelter, the problem under the Act. This proposal came from the House of the Good Shepherd, a shelter program for victims of domestic violence in the City of Chicago, it has the strong support of the Coalition Against Domestic Violence, the other women's advocacy groups. And, it had substantial support among all of you when we saw this Bill the first time around in the House. So, I hope you will give it your overwhelming approval on concurrence Motion, just as you gave it your strong support in the month of May."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 2075?' All in favor vote 'yes', opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 104 voting 'yes',

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

l voting 'no', 8 voting 'present', and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2075. This Bill having received the required Constitutional Majority, is declared passed. Representative Lang on House Bill 2208. Representative Lang on House Bill 2208.

Lang: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I would move to nonconcur in Senate Amendment #1."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "The Gentleman moves to nonconcur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2208. All in favor say 'aye', opposed, 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the House nonconcurs in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 208 (sic - House Bill 2208). Representative Currie on House Bill 2243. Representative Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Madam Speaker and Members of the House. I move the House do concur with Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 2243. This is the issue of alienage. And the effort, as the Bill left this House, was to see if we could find some agreement among the members of commerce and industry associations and the hispanic community, in particular, on the protections that might be awarded...some protection under the Illinois Human Rights Act, in respect to issues of alienage or immigration. And the agreement among those groups is Senate Amendment 1 and I would appreciate your support for the Motion."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative McNamara."

McNamara: "Yes, it is a little difficult to hear over here. Do I understand that an agreement has been made between the hispanic groups and the department in regards to protection of aliens? Is that correct?"

Currie: "To charges of discrimination, yes. And it was not so much the department that was at issue, Representative, but the business community."

McNamara: "Okay, so they are now all in agreement?"

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

Currie: "Yes."

McNamara: "Thank you."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2243?' All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 106 voting 'yes', 8 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present', and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2243. This Bill having received the required Constitutional Majority is declared passed. Representative J. Hoffman on House Bill 2306."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill...I move to concur with the Amendments of House Bill 2306. House Bill 2306 allows a judge to enter an order of withholding to collect the amount of restitution. It's a garnishment provision to help victims of crimes receive the restitution money. Amendment believe, indicates that if an individual is on a conditional discharge or supervision and is being monitored by a probation department, that individual, who was placed on conditional discharge and found guilty of a crime or placed on supervision, could be charged a fee which is much like the probation fee, which is presently paid individuals on probation, only if they're being supervised by a probation department. Right now, you can only do if you're placed on probation. There's essentially no great difference if you're supervising a conditional discharge, the probation department is, or supervision. I ask that we...and Senate Amendment #2 indicates that this becomes law...It changes the effective date that it becomes law immediately upon signage."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Homer."

75th Legislative Day June 28, 1991

Homer: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Satterthwaite: "He indicates he will."

Homer: "Representative Hoffman, the \$25.00 per month charge on

probationers was approved last year, correct?"

Hoffman: "A couple of years ago."

Homer: "And the idea of that charge was that people on probation should help pay the cost of those probation services,

correct?"

Hoffman: "Yes."

Homer: "What...What would be the rationale of putting a \$25.00 per month charge on an offender sentenced to conditional discharge for which there is no probation service?"

Hoffman: "Well, it would only apply if probation is monitoring that case. In St. Clair County when we were...we had conditional discharge cases that we would have to monitor, the Probation Department did actually monitor the case. In other words, make sure the restitution's being paid, make sure to run criminal history checks, things of that sort. It's based on ability to pay. To me there's no difference because the Probation Department is still monitoring the case."

Homer: "So, again, what services does the Probation Department provide to those who are on conditional discharge or court supervision? What does the Probation Office do in connection with those defendants?"

Hoffman: "Well, you still monitor the individuals on conditional discharge or on supervision. For instance, there may be certain conditions that you have to ensure that they are complying with: alcohol, drug treatment, things like that, make sure they pay restitution. You still do essentially the same thing, however, it's a different form of supervision. You don't necessarily go out to their house and check on them, but you're still monitoring."

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

Homer: "Well, I...I don't...I don't...You know, I understood that the \$25.00 fee last year...To the Bill, Madam Speaker. \$25.00 fee last year that we approved was to pay for the probation services provided to the person on probation, made sense, it was a users fee. To extend that idea now to people on conditional discharge and court supervision who historically don't receive any direct probation service, they don't report, they don't have a probation officer, seems to me stretching a little bit. It is mostly a way of generating revenue but really isn't a users fee as such, since the person paying the \$25.00 is for something they are not receiving any service for. And while there may be, Sponsor said, some oversight by the Probation Department or some monitoring, I think it would be better if the fee not be \$25.00. If there has to be a fee, seems to me that it should be a fee less than \$25.00. As far as I know, this Bill was not introduced as a Bill was added as an Amendment in the Senate. And I highly respect this Gentleman, the Sponsor of the Bill and Senate Sponsor, but I think the idea needs to be re-thought and that it doesn't make sense. So, I'm going to have to, reluctantly, at this time, oppose the Gentleman's Motion."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative McNamara."

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

Speaker Satterthwaite: "He indicates he will."

McNamara: "In regards to the supervision/probation, what types of acts occur in which this supervision fee would be paid?"

Hoffman: "The Bill specifically says, 'Only when the Probation Department is actively supervising a case.' For instance, if your...you could get conditional discharge. Conditional discharge, in Illinois, is essentially...can be essentially the same as probation. It's just called something different. The monitoring is not to the same scale. But

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

if they are being actively supervised by a probation department, we now allow on a sliding scale probation fees if they're on probation, not for a conditional discharge or supervision. But a probation department would still be supervising these individuals."

- McNamara: "Alright, if a person were to go to traffic court and be assigned supervision, does this mean that under that supervision they would be assigned at \$25.00 per month?"
- Hoffman: "Only if a probation department is actively, actively engaged in the monitoring of that individual. If he just gets supervision, no. If he gets supervision and he has to go to drug or alcohol treatment and the judge says, 'The probation department shall monitor that individual, shall make sure they're going to drug or alcohol treatment, shall run his criminal record, shall do various other things such as collect restitution.' Then, then they could be eligible to have to pay the sliding scale fee based on ability to pay."
- McNamara: "Okay. And these fees...that's precisely my question, why don't you just say it for...for the record."
- Hoffman: "The Circuit Clerk collects the fees...at this time."
- McNamara: "Okay. Now these fees go towards the salaries of the probationer and court services, is that correct?"
- Hoffman: "No, they can't be used for... I don't..."
- McNamara: "Alright, the analysis says that it goes for it, that's the reason I'm asking the question."
- Hoffman: "I don't know that they...I'm not sure...I don't know that they can go for salaries."
- McNamara: "It says...let me just quote our analysis on it. It says, 'Said fees shall go towards salaries of probation and court services personnel.'"
- Hoffman: "I was told by the Administrative Office of Illinois

 Courts...they can't be used for salaries. But what it can

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

do...The analysis is wrong."

McNamara: "Thank you."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Davis. Monique Davis."

Davis: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I would like to ask the Gentleman a question or two?"

Speaker Satterthwaite: "He indicates he will yield."

Davis: "Representative, I'm not an attorney and sometimes lay people have difficulty with the probation and parole.

Could you give me the difference between those two?"

Hoffman: "Probation is run by the counties, local counties, parole is run...or the local circuits, I should say.

Parole is run by the state. And the difference is, probation is an alternative sentence which is imposed by a judge. Parole is something that you get after you come out of prison."

Davis: "So, if a judge offers probation or an alternative sentence, you're saying the person given the probation should pay a monthly fee of \$25.00?"

Hoffman: "It's...No, it's based on ability to pay. Right now, we have a probation fee in Illinois. Right now, based on ability to pay on a sliding...sliding fee scale. If you're on General Assistance you may not have to pay anything. It's up to the local jurisdiction to do the sliding fee. Right now, we have that in Illinois for probation. This would extend that to conditional discharge and supervision, if the probation department is actively monitoring the case."

Davis: "Now, when a person leaves probation they're free of the court's jurisdiction, is that correct?"

Hoffman: "Yes."

Davis: "So, do you think there might be some chance of someone saying, 'Well, if we let this guy from under our supervision, that's going to stop us from getting that

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

money he's been paying, so, therefore, we better make this probation a little longer? Think that might happen?"

Hoffman: "I don't think so. I mean that's up to a judge."

Davis: "What would prevent it? What would prevent it from happening?"

Hoffman: "We're not talking about probation. We're talking about conditional discharges and supervision under this Bill."

Davis: "What is the purpose? Are you trying to raise money for the state, is that your purpose?"

Hoffman: "The purpose is...is that we now have...We...The General Assembly two years ago passed probation fees for people who were put on probation. Probation departments do essentially the same monitoring in conditional discharges/supervision, if the court tells them to do. They cannot collect that same type of a fee for conditional discharge and supervision. If they are actively involved in the case, based on a sliding fee scale based on ability to pay, then they would be able to collect the same fee if they were put on probation. We're cutting...Right now, before the General Assembly is cutting...cutting...I think it's down to \$3.1 million from probation services in the State of Illinois. We're talking about public safety issue We're talking about giving proper funding probation departments in local localities to run the services."

Davis: "Okay. To the Bill, Madam Speaker. I do support the idea of probation and also parole. But I really hesitate to endorse or support legislation that might induce crime or cause an admitted obvious criminal, who has been...has done something criminal to be involved with the court system, to not have that money to pay and attempt to do things that they wouldn't do normally to pay that fee. And, I also would be a little concerned that once we become used to the

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

use of those dollars, we would start to have the period of probation extended, because we knew as long as it was extended, we'd have use of those dollars. And I really think it's a very bad concept. I don't even think the intent has merit. Thank you."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Hoffman to close."

Hoffman: "Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This makes common sense. Probation departments already, already in the State of Illinois can collect on a sliding scale basis up to \$25.00 a month for monitoring an individual. They are doing the same thing for conditional discharge and supervision, if the judge orders them to monitor that individual. We're talking about...We're talking about funding local probation departments. We're talking about cutting them here in the General Assembly. This is a way to ensure public safety. This is a way to ensure that they can do their job properly. I ask that we concur on Senate Amendments #1 and 2 and on the Bill."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 on House Bill 2306?' All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 89 voting 'yes', 18 voting 'no', 6 voting 'present', and the House does concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 on House 2306. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is declared passed. Representative Hoffman on House Bill 2307. Oh, excuse me, we had one other intervening thing we need to do first. On the Order of Nonconcurrence in your Regular Calendar, Representative Lang is recognized on Senate Bill 133."

Lang: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. In fact I have two Bills, may I have leave to handle these for Representative McPike?"

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Proceed."

- Lang: "Thank you. On Senate Bill 133, move to...refuse to recede from House Amendments and ask that a Conference Committee be appointed."
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "The Gentleman asks that the House refuse to recede from Amendment #1 on Senate Bill 133. All in favor say 'aye', opposed, 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the House refuses to recede from House Amendment #1 on Senate Bill 133, and a Conference Committee is requested. Representative Lang."
- Lang: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. On House Bill 1878, we move to nonconcur."
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "Do you know which order that is on, Representative?"
- Lang: "It's possibly a budget item. It's the CDB budget."
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "On page 12 of your Calendar under Concurrence. The Gentleman moves to nonconcur in Senate Amendment #1 on House Bill 1878. All in favor say 'aye', all opposed say 'no', and the House does nonconcur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1878...back to Representative J. Hoffman on House Bill 2307."
- Hoffman: "Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House.

 House Bill 2307 is another restitution Bill which will help victims out in this state. Provides for a payment schedule that will be set up for monthly payments for restitution.

 These Amendments were put on by the Senate Sponsor. Senate Amendments 1 and 2 are the same Amendments that were put on House Rill 2307 that we just voted on. It's the...they're the exact same Amendments. I ask that we concur."
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "Is there any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 on House Bill 2307?' All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Representative

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

Levin. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 107 voting 'yes', none voting 'no', 7 voting 'present', and the House does concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 on House Bill 2307. This Bill having received the required Constitutional Majority is declared passed. Representative Davis wishes to change her vote to 'no'.

Davis: "Thank you."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Dunn on House Bill 2334.

Representative John Dunn. Representative Dunn on House
Bill 2334. Out of the record. Representative Hicks on
House Bill 624. Representative Hicks."

Hicks: "Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. I would move to concur with Senate Amendment #1. It's a wage deduction Bill. This Bill simply puts it in the same situation as did the Senate Bill that was also passed out of here. It makes both Bills identical to each other and I would move to concur."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment 1 on House Bill 624?' All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 115 voting 'yes', none voting 'no', none voting 'present', and the House does concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 624. This Bill having received a Constitutional Majority is declared passed. Are there any other Sponsors with Bills on the Order of Civil and Criminal Law, who wish to have their Bills called? Representative Homer."

Homer: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. This would be House Bill 434."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "On House Bill 434."

Homer: "I would move to nonconcur in Senate Amendment #1. An

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

identical Bill has already passed out of the House and there's no need to have two Bills on the same subject. And I would move to nonconcur in the Amendment."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "The Gentleman moves to nonconcur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 434. All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it, and the House does not concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 434. Are there any other Sponsors with Bills on the Order of Civil and Criminal Law wishing to have their Bills called at this time? Then we will go to the Special Order of Education, the Sponsors are Wyvetter Younge, Obrzut, Ronan, Steczo and McNamara. Representative Young on House Bill 883."

Younge: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I move to concur with the Senate Amendment #1 and 2 of House Bill 883. House Bill 883 establishes the enterprise high school in school district 188 and 189. Senate Bill...Senate Amendment #1 indicates that no enterprise high school will have more students and that the coordination of than 50 enterprise high school shall be by the Illinois Community College Board and that this Act is repealed after three years. Senate Amendment #2 calls for the taking out of any funds being made available by the Illinois Community College Board. And I move for the concurrence of these two Amendments."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Cowlishaw."

Cowlishaw: "Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. I rise in support of this Motion and congratulate Representative Younge, for having worked long and hard to achieve this particular proposal in its current form. And I think we all ought to join her in voting 'yes'. Thank you."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Ropp."

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

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

Speaker Satterthwaite: "She indicates she will."

Ropp: "Representative, I see in Senate Amendment 1, it provides that the enterprise high school would enroll no more than 50. Why is that 50? Why is that number there?"

Younge: "That number is there because the Joint Partnership

Training Act Agency has funds for only 50 students. And it
is our intent to have a pilot program and 50 is a good
number."

Ropp: "Okay. I would think that because the need is, I understand, rather great in that area that we ought to almost allow as many people to enter that program, to provide the greatest amount of service to as many people as possible. But I understand your..."

Younge: "In addition, Representative Ropp, that's about a good number to get started with...to...for the first formulation of a good program."

Ropp: "Okay, thank you."

Younge: "I appreciate Representative Cowlishaw's kind remarks."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 on House Bill 883?' All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 72 voting 'yes', 37 voting 'no', 2 voting 'present', and the House does concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 on House Bill 883.

This Bill having received the required Constitutional Majority is declared passed. Representative Obrzut on House Bill 1024. Is the Gentleman in the chamber? He is not. Representative Ronan on House Bill 1855."

Ronan: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I move to concur in Senate
Amendment #2 to House Bill 1855. This is the bone marrow
transplant Bill...or the bone marrow Bill that we passed
out of this chamber unanimously."

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

Speaker Satterthwaite: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 1855?' All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 115 voting 'yes', none voting 'no', none voting 'present', and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 1855. This Bill having received the required Constitutional Majority is declared passed. Representative Steczo on House Bill 2042."

"Thank you, Madam Speaker, Members of the House. Steczo: I would move that the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2042. Senate Amendment #1 deletes everything after the enacting clause, becomes the Bill, and seeks to clarify and has been clarified with the aid of the State Board of Education; the requirement that every school district needs to form plans to provide programs for gifted students. Under this Amendment, the plans must follow all the rules and regulations developed by the State Board of Education and have to be implemented in the 1991-92 school year. The for the plan must be based on the amount provided under Section 1485 of the School Code, which provides for gifted education reimbursement. This Amendment does seek to clarify. It puts everything in perspective. There's no known opposition to the Bill. It was worked out with the assistance of the State Board of Education. I move, Madam Speaker, for concurrence with Senate Amendment #1."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2042?' All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 113 voting 'yes', none voting 'no', none voting 'present', and the House does

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2042. Bill having received the required Constitutional Majority declared passed. House Bill 2642, Representative McNamara. Out of the record. On the Order of Revenue and Banking appears House Bill 67, Representative Currie. House Bill 1256, Representative Churchill. On Special Order Agriculture and Environment, House Bill 477. Representative McAfee. House Bill 742, Representative Granberg. House Bill 1433, Representative Brunsvold. Representative Brunsvold, do you wish to have House Bill 1433 handled?"

Brunsvold: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I would move to concur in Senate Amendment #1. This Senate Amendment would simply move the discretionary days for hunting, surplus hunting days would be at the discretion of the Department of Conservation, from 14 to 10. So, it's very...very simple Amendment and would ask for a concurrence."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Ropp."

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

Speaker Satterthwaite: "He indicates he will."

Ropp: "Representative, when we hear that there are so many deer all over the state, why are we attempting to reduce the number of days that would help to effect the control?"

Brunsvold: "Actually, the Amendment...part of the Amendment moves the shotgun and muzzleloading from 10 to 14. It increases the hunting days, but they have discretionary days...that would have been 10 days. I moved it to 14 last year and they simply moved it back to 10. They say it's plenty, they don't need any more."

Ropp: "Okay. So, in effect, what we really have under legislation that we passed this year is the extension of at least four more days..."

Brunsvold: "Under...under the..."

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

Ropp: "...not maybe in this Bill but in the overall scheme of things."

Brunsvold: "The Bill really increases the allowable days for actual shotgunning of deer to 14 days instead of 10. They also have discretionary days and they don't need any more than 10."

Ropp: "Okay, thank you."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Hartke."

Hartke: "Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. I really don't have any problem with this other than the concept that...that we as elected Representatives, sometimes turn entirely to much of these decisions over to the agencies. And I think, at some point in time, we ought to take a better handle on what we're doing here."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Weller."

Weller: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Satterthwaite: "He indicates he will."

Weller: "Representative, you had indicated that you felt the Department of Conservation didn't...did not need the extra discretionary days. It's my understanding that right now the deer season is at the ceiling of 10 days, the maximum number that's allowed for their discretionary days. Is that correct?"

Brunsvold: "Are you talking about discretionary or actual hunting days used for shotgunning and muzzle loading?"

Weller: "Well, the discretionary days for the length of the season."

Brunsvold: "Well, they indicate to me that... I had moved it to 14 last year, when we were talking about the handgun hunting season. And that would have been plenty of days if we were discussing the handgun hunting season. But now they don't need those days, they say that 10 is plenty. They don't even use all those days, from what Conservation tells me."

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

Weller: "Representative, what would happen...Of course, one of the reasons many individuals and deer hunters have urged a longer deer season and have urged giving the Department of Conservation the opportunity to have a longer deer season, is because of the overpopulation of deer in my area and other parts of the state. Should that overpopulation continue, would by removing these additional discretionary days, would they then have to come back to us to have that authority?"

Brunsvold: "Well, they don't, you know, there's two different areas here, they're only going to use 10 days right now in the regular shotgun and muzzle loading season. They're not even using the 14 days that they can use. They're only going to use 10, they added one this year. And now that's the...the extra 10 to 14 days that are discretionary, could be used for experimental hunts, like a handgun season."

Weller: "Thank you."

Brunsvold: "There's...there's two different...There're two different areas here: the regular allotted hunting days and then there're discretionary days for...for pilot hunts that they would use. And they indicate to me that...that they have no problem with 10 days."

Weller: "Thank you, Representative. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I feel that they need these additional days. think many of you, if you read the paper on a regular you probably notice the accidents that particularly in rural and suburban areas with the increase in population of deer. They become a nuisance to many homeowners. They become a nuisance to landowners and farmers. And that's why it's important that the Department of Conservation have these extra days, so that if there is a need because of the growing population of the deer, which does need to be dealt with, they can then extend the season

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

accordingly. So, I would urge a 'no' vote. In fact, this provision allowing for that maximum length of the season to go up to 14 days should be kept in the Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Brunsvold to close. Oh, Representative Black."

Black: "Yeah, thank you very much, Madam Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Satterthwaite: "He indicates he will."

Black: "Representative, as you know, my Senator, Senator Woodyard and the Department of Conservation and others have been working for about two years to increase the harvest of the deer herd because of depredation to crops. I think we had 10,000 deer/automobile accidents last year, et cetera. So, I guess I'm a little confused as to this Amendment because about two weeks ago the Department and some of the Senators went around the state, and, I thought, were talking about extending the deer season, making additional landowner permits. And, so this Senate Amendment #1 would seem to contradict what they were doing. Have I got the wrong slant on this or what?"

Brunsvold: "The...This Amendment was requested by the Department of Conservation. I mean, they have increased deer season, they've added an extra day, they've given out more permits on the deer hunting this fall. They requested this change simply because I don't think they need the extra discretionary days."

Black: "Okay, I know one of those press conferences was down in Representative Woolard's area. Maybe, he can enlighten me."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Woolard. Representative Woolard."

Woolard: "Yes, Representative Black, what really took place was the Director of Conservation along with Senator Rea,

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

Senator Woodyard, and myself addressed this issue. But it was not to extend the number of days available but it was to extend the number of deer that an owner could take on his property. The number now is 10, it was increased or it's going to be increased to 20 in the upcoming year. That's the way it was addressed by the Department. I think it's the correct way and it doesn't need additional days."

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

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Brunsvold to close."

Brunsvold: "Again, this is simply an Amendment that was requested by Conservation. I would ask for a concurrence."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 on House Bill 1433?' All those in favor vote 'yes', opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Representative McAfee votes 'aye'. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 106 voting 'yes', 2 voting 'no', 8 voting 'present', and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1433. This Bill having received the required Constitutional Majority is declared passed. Representative Peterson on House Bill 1449. Representative Peterson."

Peterson: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. House Bill 1449, as amended in the Senate, the Bill originally was a vehicle Bill. It was amended in the Senate. The Amendment becomes the Bill. It would extend the fees paid by Commonwealth Edison and Illinois Power to the Department of Nuclear Safety for the continued support of the Department's Reactor Monitoring Program, as well as an update on DNS Nuclear Safety Preparedness Program. It would provide that the fee paid to the Department be \$925,000 per reactor, per year in FY92; \$975,000 in '93; \$1,010,000 in '94; \$1,060,000 in FY95 and \$1,110,000 in FY96, at which time the fee level

75th Legislative Day

June 28. 1991

will be renegotiated with Com. Edison and Illinois Power. This Bill has been agreed to by the Department and Com. Edison, as well as Illinois Power. I ask for a favorable Roll Call on this concurrence Motion."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 on House Bill 1449?' All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 109 voting 'yes', 2 voting 'no', 3 voting 'present', and the House does concur in Senate Amendment 1 on House Bill 1449. This Bill having received the required Constitutional Majority is declared passed. Representative Hensel on House Bill 2022. Representative Hensel."

- Hensel: "I move to concur with Senate Amendment #1 on House Bill 2022."
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "Would the Gentleman tell us what the Amendment does?"
- Hensel: "Okay. The effect of Senate Amendment #1 allows the
 Department of Nuclear Safety, through its licensing fee
 procedures, to recover all charges it incurs from
 monitoring the removal and decontamination of radioactive
 materials from the party responsible for the disposal of
 the material. I ask for a favorable vote...to concur with
 Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2022."
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment 1 on House Bill 2022?' All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 111 voting 'yes', 2 voting 'no', none voting 'present', and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2022. This Bill having received the required Constitutional Majority

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

is declared passed. Representative Mautino on House Bill 1514."

Mautino: "Thank you very much, Madam Speaker and Members of the House. I move to concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1514. Senate Amendment #1 becomes the Bill. It provides that the Environmental Protection Act may allow the EPA to grant exemptions from the fee requirements that was an original part of the Bill. In the second portion, is the Environmental Council's recommendation for making the provisions for waste generated by processing recyclable materials by shredding. I move for its concurrence on Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1514."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1514?' All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 114 voting 'yes', none voting 'no', none voting 'present', and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1514. This Bill having received the required Constitutional Majority is declared passed. Representative Kulas on House Bill 2250."

Kulas: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would move that the House concur to Senate Amendments #2 and 3 on House Bill 2250. Senate Amendment #2 changes the requirements for locating a landscape waste composting facility from the nearest residence, from one quarter of a mile to one eighth of a mile. And Senate Bill...Senate Amendment #3 is the...is identical to House...Senate Bill 923, which we passed out of here dealing with ground water protection. And I would move for a concurrence."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

in Senate Amendments 2 and 3 on House Bill 2250?' All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there 113 voting 'yes', none voting 'no', 1 voting 'present', and the House does concur in Senate Amendments 2 and 3 on House Bill 2250. This Bill having received the required Constitutional Majority is declared passed. Representative Stepan on House Bill 2295."

Stepan: "Madam Speaker, I ask for favorable support for Senate Amendment #1 and 2 on House Bill 2295. Amendment #1 was to accommodate the Christian Scientists, so that no child would have to undergo a lead blood level screening if it conflicts with his or her religious beliefs. I move to concur."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "What about Amendment #2?"

Stepan: "Okay. Amendment #2, this was done to accommodate the home builders and includes dust as...on surfaces or on furniture or other non-permanent elements of the dwelling. It also has in there a definition of lead-bearing substances that conforms to a HUD definition. It also includes the inspection of buildings occupied. We put the term 'occupied' by a person screening positive. And it also includes an education and training program prescribed by the Department of Public Health, which shall include scientific sampling, chemistry and construction techniques. I move to concur."

Speaker Satter+hwaite: "Representative Black."

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

Stepan: "The Sponsor will yield."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "She indicates she will."

Black: "Representative, let me revisit this Bill with you just a

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

little bit. On House Amendment #3, did that remove the inspection and disclosure language? Remember, the realtors and bankers had a major concern with that?"

Stepan: "Yes...yes, we resolved that issue, Representative."

Black: "Okay. Then we had another question when we visited this Bill in the House, that there is a word 'child care facility' in that Amendment. And I had asked if you would get that clarified in the Senate, as to define a child care facility and perhaps exempt day care homes. I'm not sure that that was done...is..."

Stepan: "No, it...it wasn't done. I'm not clear, no, it wasn't done by the Senate Amendment. I wasn't aware of...that this...that you wanted this done."

Black: "Okay. Well, we had...We had visited this before. So, there's no real definition as far as you know on this Bill, with...as to what...how a child care facility is defined in this Bill, right?"

Stepan: "What are you saying?"

Black: "I see it in the language."

Stepan: "An Amendment?"

Black: "It's pretty much out of DCFS' definitions. Okay. Under the current shape...The Bill...The current shape that the Bill is in, originally a lot of opposition, as you well know, and you worked very hard on this to get it in the shape, is the Department of Public Health now in agreement with the Bill?"

Stepan: "Yes, they do, Representative."

Black: "How about the bankers?"

Stepan: "We never had any opposition from the bankers. They have never been involved in any of our negotiations."

Black: "I thought they were because of a potential problem on sale, you know, on a foreclosure and sale if it had some kind of..."

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

Stepan: "No, the realtors were involved."

Black: "The realtors, okay. Okay, well, you've done a lot of work on the Bill. It's a very complicated Bill. I congratulate you for all your work. And I guess everybody will just have to take a look at this and vote their conscience."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Stepan to close."

Stepan: "I move for...for favorable concurrence."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 on House Bill 2295?' All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 90 voting 'yes', 22 voting 'no', 3 voting 'present', and the House does concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 on House Bill 2295. This Bill having received the required Constitutional Majority is declared passed. On the Order of Human Services for concurrence, appears House Bill 274, Representative White. Representative Lang. Representative Lang asks leave to handle House Bill 137 for Representative Flowers."

Lang: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Move to concur with Senate
Amendment #1. This is an Amendment that takes the number
of days for documentation on a placement from three to
eight."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 137?' All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 112 voting 'yes', 1 voting 'no', none voting 'present', and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 137. This Bill having received the required Constitutional Majority is

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

declared passed. Representative Currie on House Bill 318. Representative Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Members of the House. I move
the House do concur with Senate Amendment 1. It's a
technical Amendment recommended by the Legislative
Reference Bureau. And I would appreciate your support for
the concurrence Motion."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 318?' All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 112 voting 'yes', none voting 'no', 1 voting 'present', and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 318.

Representative McAfee on House Bill 329."

McAfee: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I move to...for concurrence of Senate Amendment #1. Senate Amendment #1 will amend the Senior Citizens Child Care Act, by providing for an information distribution system of referral service and training, using the existing apparatus and services in both DCFS and the Department of Aging. There will also be a demonstration training module and this does reduce the fiscal impact. I may also point out that both DCFS and the Department of Aging have removed their objections."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Ropp."

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

McAfee: "Yes."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "He indicates he will."

Ropp: "Do I understand by this Amendment that the senior citizens will be accessible to the training for child care?"

McAfee: "If I understand your question, Representative, basically this is to provide them with information about the rules and regulations at child care facilities and primarily it

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

is to be utilized to assist them in placement."

Ropp: "You mean the placement of children or the placement of senior citizens?"

McAfee: "No, it's to link seniors with the need, the crisis that

we presently have in child care facilities. Hopefully, to

get them full employment at child care facilities."

Ropp: "Alright, I guess the thing that I thought was a little bit interesting, if there's anybody that probably has had experience with the rearing of children it's probably senior citizens."

McAfee: "There's no quarrel with that, Representative. The only issue here really is to get a little information about the rules and their responsibilities at the child care facility. There's no question that parenting comes, as you've already indicated, with being one parent already."

Ropp: "Yeah, okay, thank you."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 329?' All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 114 voting 'yes', none voting 'no', 1 voting 'present', and the House does concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 329. This Bill having received the required Constitutional Majority is declared passed. Representative Currie on House Bill 426."

Currie: "Thank you, Madam Speaker and Members of the House. I move the House do concur with Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 426. This Amendment is one recommended by the Department of Public Aid. The major substantive change is to take out of the Bill any reference to a restructuring of the General Assistance Employment, Training and Education Program. In other respects, the Amendments are technical in nature. And I would urge your support for the

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

concurrence Motion."

- Speaker Satterthwaite: "The question is, 'Shall Senate...Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 426?'

 All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Would Representative White come to the podium please? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?

 Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 114 voting 'yes', 1 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present', and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 426. This Bill having received the required Constitutional Majority is declared passed. On the Special Order of Education, Representative Obrzut on House Bill 1024. Representative Obrzut."
- Obrzut: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I would like to nonconcur with Senate...House Bill 1024, Senate Amendment #1. We have some technical problems with the Bill. I'd like to send it to the Conference Committee."
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "The Gentleman moves to nonconcur in House Bill...in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 1024. All in favor say 'aye', opposed, 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the House nonconcurs in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1024. Back on concurrence in Human Services, Representative Currie on House Bill 489."
- Currie: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Members of the House. House Bill 489, as it left here, was a Committee Bill including several Amendments to the Nursing Home Care Act. As we...as the Bill left us, there were some technical changes needed by the Department of Public Health and the Senate Amendment incorporates those technical changes. So, I would move concurrence with the Senate Amendment."
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 489?' All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open.

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

Representative Matijevich. Have all voted who wish? all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk. take the record. Representative Matijevich, did you wish to speak? light inadvertently got put on, I guess. Representative Matijevich, did you wish to vote on the Representative Matijevich wishes to vote 'aye'. On question there are 115 voting 'yes', none voting 'no', none voting 'present', and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 on House Bill 489. This Bill having received the required Constitutional Majority is declared passed. Representative Trotter on House Bill 274."

Trotter: "Thank you very much, Madam Speaker and Members of the House. House Bill 274 amends the Public Aid Code and it sets out to phase in a schedule in which women will be eligible for up to 160% of the federal poverty level income eligibility. In the Senate, it was amended to only to apply to pregnant women and their infants up to one year of age. And I concur with that Amendment and would like for its passage here in the House."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 274?' All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 67 voting 'yes', 45 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present', and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 on House Bill 274. This Bill having received the required Constitutional Majority is declared passed. Representative Regan on House Bill 555."

Regan: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Members of the House. I concur in Senate Amendment #1 on House Bill 555. It adds two new exemptions: group treatment programs and licensed shelter care facilities. I urge its adoption."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

in Senate Amendment #1 on House Bill 555?" All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 115 voting 'aye', none voting 'no', none voting 'present', and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 555, and this Bill having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Woolard on House Bill 606."

Woolard: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'd like to concur on Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 606. If think we've addressed every issue from every concerned person. I've heard from everyone including my mother, and I believe she's even happy with the Bill now. So, I move to accept and concur."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 606?' All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 112 voting 'yes', none voting 'no', none voting 'present', and the House does concur in Senate Amendment 2 to House Bill 606. This Bill having received the required Constitutional Majority is declared passed. Representative Black on House Bill 677. Excuse me, Representative Lang."

Lang: "Just waiting to speak on the Bill."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Currie. Fine.

Representative Black."

Black: "Thank you very much, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 677 has been debated on this floor twice. It's passed out of the chamber twice, both times with more than 80 votes. I am moving to concur in Senate Amendment #1. Senate Amendment #1, and listen

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

carefully, stripped the Bill of any reference to age or grid of how many children could be accommodated in a group...in a licensed day care home. Senate Amendment #2 adds an immediate effective date. The Bill, as it passed from this chamber, increases the number of children permitted in a licensed day care home from eight to twelve. There is no longer any age breakdown or specificity in the Bill. And with that, I would ask your favorable consideration and concurrence in the Senate Amendments on House Bill 677."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Black, are you concurring with both Senate Amendment 1 and Senate Amendment 2?"

Black: "Yes. Yes."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Thank you. Representative Lang."

Lang: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. I rise in opposition to this Motion. The Sponsor has worked very hard on this Bill. He's worked very hard on it for But as the debate went on, when we passed the Bill time. out of the House, I voted for it even though I had not voted for it previously because it was... I was assured that when the regulations came out from the Department, it would be very clear that there would be fewer children under six, fewer younger children and more older children, latchkey children. And, if we're going to allow additional spots in these day care homes, that we would be assured that younger children would be safe and protected and it would be the older children that would be added. In in the last several days the Department has issued their regulations. And, in fact, we have additional children and we have...the regulations show that eight children under the age of six would be allowed in these homes. I think it's very clear from testimony and from commentary by those interested in child care and interested in day care

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

interested in the safety of children, that the more...the greater number of young children you have in these homes the less safe these homes are for all of the children. think, although the Sponsor has worked very hard on it, and based on his assurance, I voted for this previously. Now that I've seen the Department regulations, the plan of the Department, I think that the comments Representative Preston made the debate on in this previously, which is 'Why should we pass a Bill before we've seen the regulations and before we're assured that these children will be safe?' I think his comments were very well taken. So, apparently, I made an error when I voted 'yes' on this Bill originally, because the Department has no intention of properly protecting those children. in the strongest terms, urge you to vote 'no'."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Madam Speaker and Members of the House. too rise in strong opposition to the Gentleman's concurrence Motion. It's one thing to find a evacuation plan when you have four preschool youngsters under the care of a single adult. I'm not quite sure what that evacuation plan looks like when you're talking about eight preschool youngsters under the care of a single adult. On June 20th, those of you who saw Prime Time Tonight saw the disastrous effects on children, of to many children in a day care home with to few adults. That fire, that tragedy happened in Louisiana. Under this Bill, it can happen, my guess is, it will happen here in the State of Illinois. The Gentleman assured us repeatedly that his concern was for latchkey children, children who are not, in fact, preschoolers. But the regulations do not indicate latchkey children are what this Bill is all about. I ask you to join the Illinois Association for the Education

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

of Young Children, the City of Chicago, Kids PEP, the Day Care Action Council, Lutheran Social Services, the Illinois Catholic Conference, the Child Care Association of Illinois and the National Association of Social Workers, in voting 'no' on this concurrence Motion."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Olson."

Olson: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Satterthwaite: "He indicates he will."

Black: "Go ahead."

Olson: "Representative Black, I'd like to address the issue that you're preparing your...A previous opponent of your measure suggested that the Department has already promulgated rules for your proposed legislation. Is that the way you heard that conversation?"

Black: "Yes, I remember that conversation quite well."

Olson: "You were familiar with the fact that I'm a past member of JCAR for six years and a former...chairman for three?"

Black: "Absolutely. Absolutely."

Olson: "It is not in the nature of a Department to promulgate rules until legislation has become law. And then they have a period of time, if they're not under duress, up to a year to put these rules in place. So, is it fair to say that what you are suggesting has not had rule making attached to it?"

Black: "Absolutely correct."

Olson: "Thank you. To the Bill, Ladies and Gentlemen of this House. You'll notice the list of names that were just read off as opponents to this Bill, they all have vested interests in what is going on here. Those of us who live downstate, it's a different ball game than in the urban areas. And for anyone to suggest that Representative Black would not have the best interest of his constituents or

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

mine or any other downstate Legislator, indeed urban, is suggesting this legislation is not attuned to what is happening. I urge support of this Amendment."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative McNamara."

McNamara: "Thank you. Madam Speaker. I'm sure Representative Black has done a phenomenal job on this, he does on all of the things that he does on the House floor, but I have to reluctantly rise in opposition to this Bill. I believe that the proper thing to do, with all of controversy the surrounding it, is to reject this concurrence Motion, to send it back into a Conference Committee and to work on it some more. I reluctantly oppose it because the figures are not...are not the correct ones which can be agreed by most parties taking care of I know he's trying to do the best for children. I'd like to see more discussion in order to have that done. Thank you."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Stern."

Stern: "Madam Speaker and Members of the House. I think my qualifications as perhaps the largest number of children raiser in the House are unchallenged. I can only say to you, that the idea of having up to 12 toddlers racing around hell bent to put their fingers in electric sockets and hang themselves on the jungle gym by their parkas, is mind boggling. This is a scary piece of legislation. And with all due respect to the need for day care, and I acknowledge it and recognize the Gentleman's concern for meeting that unmet need, this is not the vehicle to do it. I urge your 'no' vote on this."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Black to close."

Black: "Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. I hope all of you will give me the courtesy of a couple of minutes of your time, on an issue that I and my wife and others have

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

devoted almost four years of our time and energy to. Let me at first say this and say it very clearly, Chapman from the Department of Children and Family Services in the back of the chamber, and she can assure you that the Department has not promulgated any rules on pending legislation. None whatsoever have been filed. There are no rules in the Illinois Register of any way, shape or form. Let me also remind you, and please, current law allows a day care home to have eight children under the age of six. That's current law. We would hope that the rules will address that problem. The Department of Children and Family Services supports this legislation without any age category in the Bill, and assure all of you that they will work to make this legislation workable for safe and quality day care for our children. And let me also, if I might, Madam Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Many of you received a handout saying why you should oppose this Bill. One of the names at the bottom of it was the National Council of Jewish Women. Let me, for the record, read a letter that was faxed to me today, 'Dear Representative Black: This letter is being sent to inform you that the National Council of Jewish Women was unaware of a position statement that opposed any legislation Furthermore, we would not take any child care issues. position against legislation that would serve to create care openings in child Illinois.' and Gentlemen of the House, what started out as a Bill add slots for day care has turned into a battle of turf. Ιt has turned into a battle of what lobbyist speaks children, what pressure group speaks for parents, what pressure group speaks for providers. Many of the facts that you were given yesterday are false! Blatantly false! If you want to know how many children died in a fire in

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

Chicago in January of 1972, come read the investigation report that I have. It was not 13! It was not 13! the people who told you that were wrong, and they know they're wrong! The Prime Time television show on June Ladies and Gentlemen of this House, dealt with day care centers not day care homes! We shouldn't have children under six, I agree with you. Let me read to you from the current rules of the State of Illinois. following exception to Section 40723A is permitted. is for a child care center! 'A child care worker or group worker aided by a child care assistant, may supervise a group of up to 30 children five years of age or older.' And you want to talk about eight under six, when in a day care center they can take care of up to 30! Maybe I should turn my attention to legislation on day care centers, instead of trying to give people a chance to take care of their children in a home environment. A home environment that doesn't cost the taxpayers money! I would also say to you that these are licensed and inspected and regulated If you care about kids and you want to give them a what in the world's safe about leaving them safe place, alone? This is а good Bill. It's been misrepresented, and I resent those who have misrepresented You've supported me before, I ask you to support and help get kids out of their homes where there's nobody to watch them and put them in a loving home environment. I urge you to vote 'aye', concur with the Senate Amendments."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 677?' All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Representative Curran."

Curran: "I was going to rise in support of this obviously

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

fantastic measure, but I don't think I need to. This is a tribute to Representative Black and his hard work. And I think the 82 votes up there...83, is a fine tribute to a great Legislator."

- Speaker Satterthwaite: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 88 voting 'yes', 20 voting 'no', 4 voting 'present', and the House does concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 on House Bill 677, and this Bill having received the required Constitutional Majority, is declared passed. 691, Representative White. Representative White on House Bill 691."
- White: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move to concur with Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 691. Senate Amendment 2 makes this Bill...1 and 2 makes this Bill permissive rather than mandatory. I move for its adoption."
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 691?' All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 113 voting 'yes', 1 voting 'no', none voting 'present', and the House does concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 on House Bill 691. This Bill having received the required Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Representative Phelps on House Bill 735. Representative Phelps."
- Phelps: "Thank you, Madam Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move to concur with Senate Amendment 2 to House Bill 735. After all is said and done, this Bill returns to its original item which permits a nursing home to purchase insurance in an amount to form sufficient amounts to guarantee all residents funds are secure from loss. And

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

this is in addition to the surety bond provision that they have now. I move to concur."

- Speaker Satterthwaite: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment 2 on House Bill 735?' All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 114 voting 'yes', none voting 'no', none voting 'present', and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 735. This Bill having received the required Constitutional Majority, is declared passed. Representative White on House Bill 739."
- White: "Mr...Madam Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House.

 I move to concur with Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 739.

 It is clarifying language. It adds dental screening to the list of services currently being provided to children under the age of 21. I move for its adoption."
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "Question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 739?' All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 116 voting 'yes', none voting 'no', none voting 'present', and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 739, and this Bill having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Burke on House Bill 751. Representative Burke."
- Burke: "Yes, Madam Speaker. I move to concur with Senate
 Amendment #1."
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 751?' All in favor vote 'aye', opposed, 'no'. The 'ayes'...the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 112

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

voting 'yes', none voting 'no', none voting 'present', and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 751. This Bill having received the required Constitutional Majority is declared passed. Representative Daniels on House Bill 954. Representative Steczo...on House Bill 954."

Steczo: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I would move to concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 954. The Senate Amendment changes the requirements with relation to the local structure in inter-agency councils. It also changes the procedures for implementation; adds a requirement that the Auditor General conduct an evaluation of the system regarding its effectiveness in providing services to enhance the capabilities of families in meeting the special needs of their eligible infants and toddlers and to submit a report by April 30th, 1993. I would move, Madam Speaker, for concurrence in this Amendment."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 954?' All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 116 voting 'yes', none voting 'no', none voting 'present', and the House does concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 954. This Bill having received the required Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Representative White on House Bill 1139."

White: "Madam Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move to concur on House Bill 1139, Senate Amendments 1 and 2. The language in the Bill is agreed upon by the Illinois Public Health Department. It states that only if the Department exceeds its budget, up to \$200,000 will be provided to underserved areas for the reduction of infant

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

mortality. I move for its adoption."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 on House Bill 1139?' All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 111 voting 'yes', none voting 'no', none voting 'present', and the House does concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 on House Bill 1139. This Bill having received the required Constitutional Majority, is declared passed. House Bill 1162, Representative DeJaegher, Representative DeJaegher." DeJaegher: "Thank you, Madam Speaker and Members of the General Assembly. House Bill 1162 deals with alzheimers and a respite program. It's basically a nothing Bill at the present time, and because of lack of funding nothing is really going to develop. And basically what it does it guts the Bill, because it requires the Department of Aging to work with the Alzheimers Task Force and members of the Alzheimers Association and other senior citizens organizations, to develop these new procedures by December 30th, 1931 (sic - 1991). So, basically, there's no funding mechanism in this particular Bill. We are going to try to involve different type services that we hope to involve. regarding respite care for those that are in But...so, I do concur and hope that everyone will support me in this endeavor and, hopefully, as time progresses that we won't lose sight of those people that are affected with alzheimers disease, and that funding will become made available to these people. Thank you."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1162?' All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

the record. On this question there are 114 voting 'yes', none voting 'no', none voting 'present', and the House...Representative Weller."

Weller: "Please vote me 'yes'."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Wishes to be added as voting 'yes'. On this question there are 115 voting 'yes', none voting 'no', none voting 'present', and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 on House Bill 1162, and this Bill having received the required Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1216, Representative Phelps."

Phelps: "Thank you, Madam Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the This the Committee Bill that came out of the is Health Care Committee in the House. And there's new Amendments...agreements that were incorporated when it went to the Senate. It creates a new 15 member State Board of Health to replace the current Board of Public Health The Board is directed to coordinate, consolidate and restructure existing health systems and to establish a system of public health to assure conditions in which people could be healthy. The Medical Society had negotiated part of the changes in this provision. So. the Amendment was developed in cooperation with them and the Public Health Association and the Department of Public It makes technical changes in the...nurses in Health. Medicine Initiative Act, and it also changes qualifications for the Director of Public Health. requires only that the Director be a physician, licensed to practice medicine in all of its branches, and it deletes the proposed qualifications that we had previously in the Bill when it left here. So, I move to concur with Senate Bill, excuse me, Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 1216."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Dunn."

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

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

Phelps: "Yes."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "He indicates he will."

Dunn: "It is my understanding that Senate Amendment #1 deletes provisions that were in the House version of the Bill, which required the Director of the Department of Public Health to possess three years of practical experience in the practice of medicine and specific training and three years of experience in public health. Do you think this is a wise public policy for us to adopt qualifications for the state's highest public official, that do not include any training and experience in public health or practical experience in the practice of medicine?"

"Representative Dunn, we were very adamant about wanting Phelps: the qualifications of standards to be raised. Especially, a person that represents us as the Director of Health, considering some of the sensitive concerns that we can get into like salmonella and all those things. I think it's good to have someone at head of the helm. But this is quite an improvement, I think, over what we have now. does require...to be a physician. We wanted...this does delete the provision requiring at least five years of practical experience in the practice of medicine, but given the circumstances and what's involved in negotiations this is quite an improvement. So, we'll take it and that's why I'm concurring. It's not all we wanted."

Dunn: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I appreciate the answer to the question. I support the concurrence Motion. I hope that some of the comments noted in debate will be taken into consideration as we move along here. Thank you very much."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Weaver."

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

Speaker Satterthwaite: "He indicates he will."

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

- Weaver: "Representative, the effects of Senate Amendment #1, as we understand it, also includes a definition of what a nurse is, is that your understanding as well?"
- Phelps: "Yes, I alluded to that quickly in my explanation that it did change that...modified the definition of which left here. It now requires that...defines that a nurse as any professional who has achieved a bachelor's degree from an accredited institution."
- Weaver: "Would this eliminate from scholarship possibilities an individual who wants to be an LPN or go through a two year program at a community college?"
- Phelps: "None what so ever, no, not that I'm aware of."
- Weaver: "Would this in any way eliminate or limit a LPN or graduate from a community college nursing program from working in say a nursing home or hospital as an LPN?"
- Phelps: "I don't believe any of that definition got into the LPN at all."
- Weaver: "Okay, just wanted to clarify, thank you."
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Phelps to close."
- Phelps: "I simply move to concur. I think we explained it,

 Amendment 1, and move to concur in that."
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 1216?' All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 110 voting...lll voting 'yes', 2 voting 'no', none voting 'present', and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1216. This Bill having received a Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Representative Phelps on House Bill 1218."
- Phelps: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. To be very brief, this just corrects grammatical

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

and spelling error. The Amendment, Senate Amendment 1. only makes those...makes no substantive changes. We passed out of here with this Bill, the underlying Bill, as requiring the Department of Children and Family Services in a licensed care facility to provide proof that children enrolled facility have been immunized against in а hemophilias influenza B (HIB), which is the leading οf bacterial meningitis. And...so, it just makes grammatical changes of what we sent out of here...over 100 votes. Concur with Amendment 1."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 1218?' All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 112 voting 'yes', none voting 'no', none voting 'present', and the House does concur...Representative White wishes to be added making 113 voting 'yes', none voting 'no', none voting 'present', and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1218. This Bill having received a Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Representative Parke."

Parke: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. By chance, by chance, if we happen to get out of here before the Fourth of July, I am happy to pass out the Fourth of July speeches as a guideline to those of you that may be interested in making such a speech. And I will be around to pass it if you would like a copy."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative DeJaegher on House Bill 1230. Representative DeJaegher."

DeJaegher: "Thank you, Madam Speaker and Members of the General Assembly. This Bill deals with kids. Originally, this had a provision dealing with ages three to six. Now we have opened that up considerably, it deals with children that

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

have alcoholic parents and it defines the area because this is, basically, a pilot program. And there's also a sunset provision in this Bill. If the Bill is not effective and it doesn't do what it's suppose to do, of course, it will terminate. DASA has enough money in their budget to fund this pilot program and has the support of DASA. This program is working exceptionally well in the State of Minnesota. Hopefully, we can bring it to reality in this particular state. I ask for support of House Bill 1230 with Amendment #1."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill...The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1230?' All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 114 voting 'yes', none voting 'no', none voting 'present', and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1230. This Bill having received the required Constitutional Majority is declared passed. Representative White on House Bill 1268."

White: "Madam Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move to concur with Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 1268.

It is clarifying language and it refers to inserting the word 'project medical director' and I move for its adoption."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 1268?' All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 111 voting 'aye', none voting 'no', none voting 'present', and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1268. This Bill having received a Constitutional Majority is hereby

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

declared passed. Representative White on House Bill 1270."

White: "Madam Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move to concur with Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 1270.

This is clarifying language and it inserts the word 'teaching of CPR'. And I move for its adoption."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 1270?' All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 115 voting 'yes', none voting 'no', none voting 'present', and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 on House Bill 1270, and this Bill having received the required Constitutional Majority, is declared passed. Representative Hasara, on House Bill 1269."

Hasara: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I move to concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 1629. The underlying Bill provides child care and development funds, so that we can receive the federal funds from the new Child Care and Development Block Grant Program that takes effect October 1. The Amendments simply add an August 1 effective date, and provide that the fund is subject to appropriation. A pretty technical Amendment. I move for a concurrence."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 1629. All favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 113 voting 'yes', none voting 'no', none voting 'present'. Representative Marinaro wishes to be added to the Roll Call. Representative McNamara and Rotello voting 'aye'. On this question there are 115 voting 'yes', none voting 'no', none voting 'present', and the House does concur in

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 1629. This Bill having received the required Constitutional Majority is declared passed. Representative Parcells on House Bill 2021."

Parcells: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the I move to concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House 2021. The underlying Bill specifies the procedures and kinds of equipment used by clinics, doctors, hospitals in performing mammographies. It was then brought up by the Department of Nuclear Safety that we have some people out there who are using radiation to buildings, bridges, cement, etc., and as a precaution for themselves as well as the public at large they need to have some certification in order to use this equipment. put it on as the Amendment. It is a very good idea and I move that we concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2021."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 2021?' All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 113 voting 'yes', none voting 'no', none voting 'present', and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2021. This Bill having received a Constitutional Majority is declared passed. Representative Trotter wishes to be added to the last Roll Call, making that 114 'yeses', none 'no' and none 'present'... Representative Hasara on House Bill 2177."

Hasara: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I move to concur in Senate
Amendment #1 to House Bill 2177. It changes one word and
makes the disability provision a permanent disability to
assure that...when we talk about looking for disabled state
workers we really mean someone with a permanent

75th Legislative Day disability."

June 28, 1991

- Speaker Satterthwaite: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2177?' All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 114 voting 'yes', none voting 'no', none voting 'present' and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2177. This Bill having received the required Constitutional Majority is declared passed. House Bill 2227, Representative White."
- White: "Madam Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move to concur on Senate Amendments 3 and 4 to House Bill 2227. This provision is acceptable to the Illinois Public Aid Department. It will provide electronic transfer of food stamps and funds to a financial institution. I move for it's adoption."
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments 3 and 4 to House Bill 2227?' All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 115 voting 'aye', none voting 'no', none voting 'present' and the House does concur in Senate Amendments 3 and 4 to House Bill 2227. House Bill 2234, Representative Giglio. Representative Giglio."
- Giglio: "Thank you, Madam Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move to concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2234. What it does is...it's an Agreed Amendment. It takes out...Section...line 7 through 23 which pertain to the attorneys fees. The ADC, the Department of Public Aid's for it, and I would ask for your approval."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Ropp."

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

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

Speaker Satterthwaite: "He indicates he will."

Ropp: "Representative, does this Amendment mean that attorneys would not get paid for doing something?"

Giglio: "Only if successful."

Ropp: "Only if they're successful?"

Giglio: "Only if they win."

Ropp: "If they're unsuccessful they get paid?"

Giglio: "They don't get paid."

Ropp: "Tremendous Amendment."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 2237?' All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Excuse me. The question is 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 2234?' Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 115 voting 'yes', none voting 'no', 1 voting 'present' and the House does concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 2234. House Bill 2464, Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "Yes Madam Chairman. We...I want to concur on 2464 and what this Amendment does is remove the cost areas in relationship to the monetary aspects that were built in to this Bill. It's taken out with Amendment."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2464?' All in favor vote 'aye', opposed... Representative Black."

Black: "Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Satterthwaite: "He indicates he will."

Black: "Senate Amendment #1, if our analysis is correct, removed the language that put a cap on the amount of state dollars that can be used for the program. Is that the way you

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

interupt that Amendment?"

Walsh: "That's correct."

Black: "The Department is still neutral even though they've removed the cap?"

Walsh: "That's correct."

Black: "And the underlying Bill is still subject to available appropriation?"

Walsh: "That's correct."

Black: "Alright. Thank you very much, Representative."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2464?' All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 114 voting 'yes', none voting 'no', 1 voting 'present' and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2464. House Bill 24...and this Bill having received the required Constitutional Majority is declared passed. House 2465, Representative Jay Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 2465 passed out of this chamber and what it does it...it indicates that...it sets up within the Department of Public Health, establishes and maintains a registry for all individuals who are nurses aids. And what it does, Amendment #1 is essentially a technical change which specifically says that...a facility...for employing a person not on the nurses aid registry unless the individual is enrolled in a training program currently required by law. Amendment #2 has been added in the Senate. It requests the Department of Public Health...the Department of Public Health, it's their initiative. And what it does it's an Act in relation to certain injuries to require hospital reports, head and spinal injuries on a quarterly

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

basis rather than on a 30 day basis. I believe that the Hospital Association is in favor of it. I ask for a concurrence."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "I understand that Representative Tom

McMaster, a former Member of the House, is in the chamber

with us today. Welcome. Representative McMasters.

Representative Ropp."

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

Speaker Satterthwaite: "He indicates he will."

Ropp: "What do...what does the Department of Public Health do with the information relative to spinal cord and head injuries?"

Hoffman: "I couldn't hear."

Ropp: "Well, is it pretty important that they get it now quarterly versus every 30 days?"

Hoffman: "They maintain a registry that...all that's done is it's used, I think, to keep a registry and keep track of what the incidents of these types injuries are; things like that. Right now you have to report every 30 days and this would just...the Amendment...I mean right now the they bat...batch it, the information given out quarterly, instead of having to do it every 30 days."

Ropp: "Well, I think this is a tremendous saving from once...from twelve times a year to four times a year. I wonder why they didn't just do it once a year and really save. Thank you."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 on House Bill 2465?' All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. Representative Black, did you wish to explain your vote?"

Black: "I'll wait till you take the record and then I have an

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

inquiry of the Chair."

- Speaker Satterthwaite: "Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 111 voting 'yes', none voting 'no', none voting 'present', and the House does concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 2465. This Bill having received the required Constitutional Majority is declared passed. Representative Black."
- Black: "Madam Speaker, an inquiry of the Chair. Now that your through with the first round on Human Services, would it be the Chair's intention to go back and pick up those Bills that were bypassed?"
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "I'll check on that. We do have one additional Bill...House Bill 2038 which we missed on the way down...I'll discuss that with the Parliamentarian while we do this Bill."
- Black: "Well, I would certainly appreciate that, Madam Speaker.

 Thank you."
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Munizzi on House Bill 2038."
- Munizzi: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill #1 amends the Crime Victims Compensation Act to include reasonable expenses for psychological treatment of mental or emotional conditions caused by the crime. I move to concur with the Senate Amendments."

Black: "Madam Speaker, inquiry of the Chair. The Lady said Senate Bill 1."

Munizzi: "I'm sorry."

Black: "I've gotten burned on Senate Bill 1 once before."

Munizzi: "I'm sorry." No, no...I take it back."

Black: "What are we on here."

Munizzi: "Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2038, Saint Anthony, Jes..."

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

Black: "Oh, okay. Thank you very much."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2038?' All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 114 voting 'yes', none voting 'no', none voting 'present'. The House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2038. This Bill having received the required Constitutional Majority is declared passed. Representative Hicks. Representative Hicks wishes to be recognized for a Motion."

Hicks: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Pursuant to Rule 74(a), I move to take Senate Bill 835 from the table and place the Bill in interim Study. Would like leave of the House to do so."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "You've heard the Gentleman's Motion. Is there leave for the Gentleman to place Senate Bill 835 in the Interim Study Calendar, to take it from the table and place on Interim Study? Seeing no one objecting, leave is granted. Representative Black, in answer to your earlier inquiry there has not been any word yet about returning to the Bill you're interested in. We will continue on the Special Order of Concurrence on Senate (sic - State) and Local Government. House Bill. Representative Black."

Black: "Well, Madam Speaker. I do appreciate your checking for and getting back to me, but House Bill 678 is a companion Bill to my Day Care Home Bill, 677, that received a substantial number of votes for passage. If we don't act on 678, we're simply going to create identical categories in two different day care operations, and I wouldn't think that would be what we'd want to do, and I would just again ask the Chair. I would very much like to call House Bill 678, and I'm not sure why we even went over it, but I'll

75th Legislative Day

- June 28, 1991
- defer to the Chair for awhile longer and hopefully we'll get back to House Bill 678."
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "Thank you. House Bill 762,
 Representative Lang. Out of the record. House Bill 942,
 Representative Keane. Out of the record. House Bill 1478,
 Representative Steczo. House Bill 2349, Representative
 McGuire. Representative McGuire."
- McGuire: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I would like to concur with the Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2349, and I will read the Amendment. It's very short. It provides for technical changes in the Bill to make the language consistent with Illinois law. Are there any questions?"
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2349?' All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 114 voting 'yes', none voting 'no', none voting 'present'. The House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2349. This Bill having received the required Constitutional Majority is declared passed. Representative Hartke on House Bill 2530."
- Hartke: "Thank you very much, Madam Speaker and Members of the House. I move to concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2530. This Amendment reduces the fine from \$1,000 a day to \$250 per day, and I would appreciate your support for this concurrence."
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 2530?' All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 114...116 voting 'yes', none voting 'no', none voting 'present' and

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

the House does concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 2530. This Bill having received a Constitutional Majority is declared passed. On the Special Order Concurrence — Government Operations. Representative Stern. Senate...House Bill 12."

Stern: "Madam Speaker and Members of the House, Senate Amendment #1 is a technical Amendment that simply clarifies the grammar and the words in House Bill 12 which was the gender balance Bill...much moderated, which simply asks that we're going to have substantial representation on the boards, commissions and councils of the State of Illinois. I ask your 'aye' vote on the concurrence Motion."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Wennlund."

Wennlund: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I recall the Bill when it first came through the House, and frankly I don't know any Governor who has appointed more females to substantial positions in this state and in the history of the State of Illinois. Ιt simply is not necessary to require that appointed boards, commissions and committees to be balanced. think that the State of Illinois has made wonderful progress in making appointments, and take a look at the agency directors. Take a look at women who are in substantial positions in the State of Illinois appointed by their Governor who is committed to increase the number of females and minorities in those high positions in the State Illinois. I think the Governor is to be commended. I don't think legislation mandating and requiring it necessary anymore than we should be mandating what schools are teaching."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative McCracken."

McCracken: "Well, this Governor certainly has no need for this

Bill, but above and beyond that, I think we should not be

accepting the underlying philosophy of this Bill and I rise

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

in opposition. The only good thing you can say about this is that it is no longer mandatory, it's merely directory. But other than that, it has come to no-good even number of considerations both in the House and Senate. When are we going to stop with quotas? Quotas are inherently unjust and we would like the world to believe that everybody in the world is either an aggressor victim. That is not how life is. The great strides in western civilization have been that it is the individual who is greater than society, who is greater than who has the claim on the protection government, is absolutely silly and it absolutely This sends us in the wrong direction. Ιt is individuals who have dignity, it is individuals who should be considered for appointments. If women want to apply for them and if they are qualified, God Bless em. But I for one do not believe in a quota and that's all this Bill does. extent it doesn't, it's only as a sop to those us who do not like it and it has not gone far enough. I would like to propose an Amendment to this Bill which strikes the enacting clause. That is a Senate Amendment I could concur in."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Stern to close."

Stern: "Madam Speaker and Members of the House and my friends on the other side of the aisle, there is nothing in this Bill that casts any aspersion on the present Governor or his policies. I think, indeed, he has been very forthcoming in his appointments. This is simply a way to exploit the wonderful pluralistic quality of our society. We need to exploit the brains and life experience of 53% of our citizens, and this is simply a way of reminding government to do so. I think it's an important Bill. It is not a quota Bill. It is a Bill for everybody and I urge your

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

'aye' vote on concurrence."

- Speaker Satterthwaite: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 12?' All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. If we could have your attention for just a moment. We have changed the order, but I notice that some of the Members are not visible on the House floor, so, while we're waiting for the people with Bills on Government Operations to return, we will pick up House Bill 772 on Civil and Criminal Law, Representative Turner. Representative Turner."
- Turner: "Thank you, Madam Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move that we concur on Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 772. It's an agreed upon Amendment between A.E.I., between the Department and all the interested agencies."
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 772?' All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 115 voting 'yes', none voting 'no', none voting 'present', and the House does concur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 772. This Bill having received the required Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. On Concurrence -Government Representative Steczo, House Operations. Bill Representative Curran, House Bill 452. Representative Hultgren, 1470. Representative Hultgren."
- Hultgren: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Would move to concur in the Senate Amendments. House Bill 1470, as it left here, made a change in the Insurance Code regarding homeowners insurance, and with regard to the appraisal policy and provided that for the appraisal where the three appraisers agree with the

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

policyholder that the company would pay the amount of the appraisers and the umpire. It was a Senate Amendment, and I'd like to yield, if I may, to Representative Stern to explain the Senate Amendment."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Stern."

Stern: "Madam Speaker and Members of the House. House Bill 1470 incorporates the body of what was House Bill 133 a while ago and which requires that health insurance policies have pregnancy coverage also include in vitro fertilization technologies. Now, we passed this Bill out of here about a month ago, and we have worked... I have worked as hard on this Bill as I have on any Bill since I've been down here. have talked to many of you, more than once, about this. You may recall when we passed it the first time, the young and women in the balcony, some of them with babies in their arms, and perhaps...someone has just pinched one of my...there, there they are! This is a Bill that means a very great deal to the people who are involved. Now, number of people covered by health insurance policies is enormous, and only a very few of them are going to want to participate in infertility technologies; however, for those who do, it is an extremely important thing, perhaps, the most important part of their lives. It is called Building Bill, and what it does is permit these young people who want, more than anything in the world, to a baby to have that child. This is a truly pro-life piece of legislation. It brings babies into families who could not otherwise have them. I urge your 'aye' vote and concurrence on this Senate Amendment #2."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative McCracken."

McCracken: "This is not a question of approving or disapproving of in vitro fertilization. Has it ever occurred to anybody that there is not yet formulated in political philosophy a

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

means for saying no? Isn't every cause worthy? Now, some may be worthier than others, but surely they're all worthy. Who...who...who can disagree with the underlying purpose or doubt the intentions or motivations of the Senate and House But, that is not what it's all about. Let's Sponsors? engage in a little analysis of the historic function of insurance. Isn't insurance to protect against catastrophe? Isn't catastrophe traumatic injury; a tornado blowing down your house, a car wreck in which you're injured or your car is damaged. This is not the function of insurance, and to force this insurance on our community is not wise policy. Now, call me mean, call me insensitive, accuse me of the politically incorrect things I do, I don't care! I can silent no longer. This is not what this Bill is about. is not about families; it's not about in fertilization. is about the right, our right as a Ιt legislature, of taking away funds from our business community by introducing another mandate. That's what this is about; and, remember, when we take away funds, don't kid yourself, it is not an act of compassion. An act of compassion is where you take the money out of your own pocket and give it to somebody. Government is where you take it out of some other guy's pocket and give it somebody else. That is not compassion. I am against this, know I'll be quoted, and I'll be painted as an unreasonable throwback to the middle ages, but let me you, I am not wrong about this."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Parcells. Representative Parcells."

Parcells: "Thank you, Madam Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I, too, rise in reluctant opposition to this Bill. I know it's with a great deal of anguish that people find they can't conceive a child, and it's a matter of

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

their heart and their emotion, but we here are elected, not use our hearts, which certainly we should, but also, to use our heads and to weigh facts and costs fairness. Now, the costs of this have been variously debated as being not very much on up to being quite a fairness issue; it would be wonderful if we could do everything for everybody. Are you aware that there lot of cancer protocols that we do not pay for at this time, and wouldn't it be wonderful if we could help all those people? There are a lot of transplants we don't pay for at this time. Wouldn't it be wonderful if we could help all those people? This is really a noninsurable event. This isn't a matter of illness, and it would wonderful to help those that truly are ill, but we can't do that, and in fairness to the insurance companies, this is not for individual policies. this is not for policies of people in companies of under 25, and it's not for the self-insurers. This is for a small group of maybe 25 companies...I mean 25% of the business insurers that were going to have to pay for this, which means of course, lot of these couples will not have this service either, but a very small group of companies are being forced to pay for this. And this brings me to my final point, and that is that if we pass this, we have made a travesty of what we down here. Just last year we passed Public Act 86-1365 said that health care mandates, that and Ladies this is a mandate, should not become law unless and until they are applicable to self-funded plans. The self-insurers do not have to pay for this, so it is unfair that we make the other insurance companies, by our own law that flew out of here last year, we made the law, and now we're thinking, 'well, we'll just go ahead and ignore that law.' Why are we here? That is acting in a

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

unresponsible manner, and, although I have the greatest compassion for these people, we're putting it on a very few insurance companies, and we're not following our own laws that we make, and I reluctantly ask for your 'no' vote on this concurrence."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Wojcik."

Wojcik: "Yes, Madam Speaker and Members of the House. First of all, I would like to address a few of the comments that have heard: (1) that insurance covers catastrophes. Ιs pregnancy a catastrophe? If it is, the insurance companies pay for it. Also, I'm hearing that there's many travesties that go on in this state, and we always are voting for travesties. This isn't a travesty. This is something to help a man and a woman who have become one through marriage become parents, parents. These are people who children. These are not people who are having 'em and putting 'em on the street. They want children, and believe me, you in this room who have never gone through this will never know the trials, the tribulations, and the traumas of trying to have a baby between two people who are in love. Now, you want to talk about cost, \$1.82 a month; that's the cost. Now, you want to talk about the obligation to the employer; employers who have 25 or under are not in this piece of legislation. Now, let's talk about what we're looking at. We're looking at an area of where we can help people for the first time have life, to give life, and to share their oneness together. I ask your favorable passage."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Preston."

Preston: "Thank you, Madam Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I find it incredulous that some of the previous speakers who are proud of their pro-life voting record are nonetheless opposed to this legislation, which only gives

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

life. This is a very good Bill, that as Representative Wojcik so eloquently stated, allows people to have children, doesn't require the killing of a fetus, doesn't require the killing of a baby, it permits and authorizes and enables exactly the opposite, it enables people who want to be parents to be able to be parents. If, indeed, you consider yourselves in any remote way a pro-life Legislator...if you're indeed for life, you have to indeed be for this Bill. It is a good Bill."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Harris."

Harris: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. My remarks that I'm about to make were similar to what I said on House Bill 133, which was the Lady's initial Bill on this...on this subject. The Senate did not correct what I consider to be two flaws, and I tried to work with the Lady a little bit to see if she would be willing to place some limit on the amount of coverage that would be authorized under this Bill; didn't work out so there is limit. Well, what does it cost? We don't really know. Ιt could cost \$15, \$20, \$30, \$40 thousand, maybe it only cost \$5 or \$10, but it could cost a lot more. I have several friends, young couples, friends of mine who have suffered the problem of infertility. I am not insensitive to that. It really is a problem. It really is a psychological hurt, pain to them, but what is the nature of insurance? The nature of insurance is to help when someone is ill, to help someone get whole, and that's partly what pregnancy is. Someone is not necessarily ill, but there is a danger to one...to ones health there, and we want to make sure that they get whole. That's not the case here. parties in question are indeed already whole. There is no harm to them; yes, there is a mental pain because of the fact that they cannot conceive, but there is not a physical

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

harm or damage, and I'm not sure we want to force all of us or other...other people covered by insurance, want to force all of them to help provide coverage for in vitro fertilization when, indeed, there are lots of other things that we don't cover under insurance, like various forms of transplants as was mentioned earlier. So, it's a tough question, it's a hard question. We're not being insensitive by voting 'no' here. I think we're being reasonable. I don't think the Bill is appropriate for all of the reasons you heard previously, and on the concurrence Motion I think the right vote would be a 'no' vote."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Weller. Representative Weller."

Weller: "Thank you, Madam Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. If I understand the arguments of the proponents of this legislation, it would sound as if there's a law currently on the books that's preventing these people from having families and having babies. I think that if you just look at what this legislation simply is, it's saying who's gonna pay for the process. What this legislation does is it requires insurance companies that they must do this, and it's simply a mandate. It's not...this legislation doesn't make it easy for someone to have a baby, and I think it's great and wonderful for people to have families, but this legislation, by listening to some of the proponents, you'd think that they saying that there's a law in the books that says that they can't have families, that they can't have babies. not the case at all. What this legislation says is the insurance companies have to foot the bill. It's simply a mandate, and it's gonna drive up everyone else's costs. I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Turner."

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

Turner: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I move the previous question."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "The Gentleman moves the previous question. All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it and the previous question is put.

Representative Stern to close or Representative Hultgren, which? Representative Stern to close."

Stern: "Madam Speaker and Members of the House, there's been a lot said on this highly emotional, highly personal say simply that infertility is established as a This is an illness. Is this the only illness that we will not attend to as officers of Illinois? This is something that disrupts family and destroys lives. extremely significant to the extremely. You have heard the discussion. I don't know if involved. mentioned that the efforts at getting pregnant cannot exceed four times. I don't know if we mentioned that estimate by the Insurance Department of Illinois brought the cost down to, and I'm within a few cents of it, \$1.62 a month per policy. This is not an expensive technology. This is not something that we are saddling the voters with, the citizens with. It is a personal, important pro-life issue. I ask your 'aye' vote on this concurrence."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 1470?' All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Representative Pullen, to explain her vote."

Pullen: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. It's always entertaining to hear certain people call something a pro-life issue when they don't usually vote that way, and pro-life lobbyists have been lobbying on the other side of this issue. I would like to explain my vote, because I think this is a very difficult one for people who do respect human life and

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

want people to have the ability to build families and have good healthy babies and bring babies into the world. Beyond the insurance mandate issue, which is an economic one and certainly important, is something that is more important to me, and that is that in vitro fertilization always involves the conception of more than one life and the discarding of some for the implantation of one, and so it is a matter of whether we are going to be having, forcing people who buy insurance to subsidize abortions with this, because abortion is a part of the in vitro fertilization process, and it is for that reason that I cannot support this legislation."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Cronin."

Cronin: "Yes, Madam Speaker, to explain my vote: I am pro-life, and I'm voting for this measure because I believe it promotes life. The purpose of insurance, indeed, is to cover catastrophes. To many infertile couples, they are experiencing catastrophes. They pay for insurance to cover pregnancy care and delivery. Medical technology is available to cure their pain of not having a child. I, therefore, vote 'yes' for this pro-life Bill."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Parke."

Parke: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. May I remind this Body that the concept of insurance is that the many who join together to form an insurance company, do so, so that those few people who have a catastrophe or have a need, whenever that arises statistically, have the insurance to take care of it. We know these people who use this plan. What you're doing is you're forcing the cost of insurance on to all of us. This is a bad concept, a bad idea. I ask for a 'no' vote."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative McGann."

McGann: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Members of the Assembly. I,

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

also, have been a great proponent of pro-life long before I ever came into the Legislature, probably will be long after I leave, but this Bill is not really about so much pro-life of killing but providing life. It is my understanding that with this legislation that if an abortion was to occur during the term there would be no insurance coverage. With this understanding and the understanding of the families that do want children and cannot have little infants to raise, I am therefore going to vote 'aye'."

- Speaker Satterthwaite: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. Representative McCracken. The Gentleman has asked for a verification. On this question there are 61 voting 'yes', 38 voting 'no' and 13 voting 'present'. The Gentleman has asked for a verification. Representative Turner asks leave to be verified. Leave is granted. Mr. Clerk, poll the absentees."
- Clerk Leone: "Poll of those not voting. Capparelli. Granberg.

 Mautino and Ronan. No further."
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "Poll of the affirmative, please."
- Clerk Leone: "Poll of those voting in the affirmative. Balanoff.
 Barnes. Black. Bugielski. Burke. Cowlishaw. Cronin.
 Currie. Davis. Deering. DeJaegher. DeLeo. Deuchler.
 Dunn. Virginia Frederick. Giorgi. Hoffman. Homer. That
 was J. Hoffman. Homer. Hultgren. Shirley Jones. Keane.
 Kirkland. Kulas. Lang. Laurino."
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "Excuse me, Mr. Clerk. Representative Steczo asks leave to be verified. Does the Gentleman have leave? Representative Steczo, up here at the front. Thank you. Proceed, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "Laurino. Levin. Martinez. Matijevich. McAfee.

 McGann. McGuire. McNamara. McPike. Morrow. Mulcahey."

 Speaker Satterthwaite: "Excuse me, Mr. Clerk. Representative

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

Lang, also, requests leave to be verified. Representative McCracken. Representative Lang has leave. Continue, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Munizzi. Obrzut. Persico. Phelan. Preston. Rice. Rotello. Saltsman. Santiago. Schakowsky. Schoenberg. Steczo. Stepan. Stern. Trotter. Turner. Walsh. Weaver. White. Williams. Wojcik. Wolf. Anthony Young. Wyvetter Younge, and Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Are there questions of the affirmative? Proceed."

McCracken: "Representative DeLeo?"

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative DeLeo. Is the Gentleman in the chamber? How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Remove him."

McCracken: "Representative Persico?"

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Anthony Young requests leave to be verified. Representative McCracken. Does Representative Anthony Young have leave to be verified."

McCracken: "Yes."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Persico. Representative Persico is in the back of the chamber. Further questions of the affirmative?"

McCracken: "Wyvetter Younge?"

Speaker Satterthwaite: "She's in the middle aisle."

McCracken: "Representative Hultgren?"

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Hultgren's in the front of the chamber."

McCracken: "Representative Laurino?"

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Laurino. Is the Gentleman in the chamber? How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Remove him."

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

McCracken: "Representative DeJaegher?"

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative DeJaegher? Is the Gentleman in the chamber? Just a moment. Representative DeJaegher? He is not in the chamber. How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Remove him."

McCracken: "Representative DeJaegher?"

Speaker Satterthwaite: "We just removed Representative DeJaegher."

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

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative J. Hoffman is at his seat."

McCracken: "Representative...Representative Rice?"

Speaker Satterthwaite: "I'm sorry. I didn't hear you."

McCracken: "Madam, I thought we had verified Bugielski. He's still on the board. Have I not done that?"

Speaker Satterthwaite: "I don't believe we have...have verified Representative Bugielski, no."

McCracken: "Alright. Representative Rice."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Rice? Is the Gentleman in the chamber? How is he recorded? Mr. Clerk, how is Representative Rice recorded?"

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

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Remove him."

McCracken: "Representative Shirley Jones?"

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Jones? Representative Shirley Jones? Is the Lady in the chamber? She is not. How is she recorded?"

Clerk Leone: "The Lady is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Remove her. Representative...excuse me,
Representative LeFlore, for what reason...Representative
LeFlore wishes to be voted 'aye'."

McCracken: "Representative Bugielski?"

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Bugielski. Is the Gentleman in the chamber? He is not. How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Remove him."

McCracken: "Representative Anthony Young?"

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Young had leave to be verified."

McCracken: "Okay, I'm sorry. Representative John Dunn?"

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Dunn is in his chair."

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

Speaker Satterthwaite: "The Lady has already been verified, and she's in the back of the chamber."

McCracken: "Representative Williams?"

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Williams is in the aisle."

McCracken: "Representative...Walsh?"

Speaker Satterthwaite: "I'm sorry. I didn't hear you."

McCracken: "Representative Walsh."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Walsh. Representative Tom Walsh is in the back of the chamber. Representative Shirley Jones has returned. Return her to the Roll Call as voting 'aye'. Representative Lou Jones wishes to be recorded 'aye'."

McCracken: "I'm done. Nothing further. That's it."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Have all voted who wish? Representative DeJaegher wishes to be returned, voting 'aye'.

Representative Matijevich, for what reason do you arise?

Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "How am I recorded?"

Speaker Satterthwaite: "The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye'."

Matijevich: "Well, Madam Speaker, I think that's the correct vote. You know, all...all women...all women aren't as fortunate as Mary Flowers. All women aren't that

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

fortunate. There are many women and many men who...who don't have the power to produce children. is...there's nothing more important...nothing more important than human life. If it weren't for human life, you could not object. That's how important it Everybody."

- Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Hoffman. Representative Manny Hoffman. Representative Manny Hoffman wishes to vote 'aye'. Representative...is anyone else seeking recognition? On this question...on this...Representative McCracken, for what purpose do you arise?"
- McCracken: "I seek recognition...I seek recognition. How am I recorded? I'd like to make a speech about this Bill. May I explain my vote? I'm on the wrong side of this so, I can't explain my vote, right?"
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "Mr. Clerk, how are...how is Mr. McCracken recorded? Mr...Mr. Clerk, how is Representative McCracken recorded?"
- Clerk Leone: "Representative McCracken is voting 'no'."
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "On this question there are 60 voting 'yes', 35 voting 'no', 13 voting 'present', and the Bill...and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 1470. This Bill having received the required Constitutional Majority is declared passed. Representative Steczo on House Bill 118. Representative Steczo on House Bill 118. Out of the record. Representative Curran on House Bill 452. Representative Curran."
- Curran: "Madam Speaker, I move to concur with Senate Amendment #1
 to House Bill 452. The underlying Bill sets provisions for
 architectural engineering and land surveying contracts to
 be awarded by CDB. House Amendments were put on for the
 Capital Development Board. In the Senate, basically, a
 technical Amendment changing man—hours of work to hours."

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

- Speaker Satterthwaite: "Excuse me, Representative. There is a great deal of background noise. The Chair cannot even hear those who are speaking. Please take the conversations to the back of the chamber. Representative Curran is on House Bill 452."
- Curran: "Wish to concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 452. The changes are man—hours of work to hours and other largely technical language which doesn't disturb the intention of the Bill."
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur...excuse me...in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 452?' All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 114 voting 'yes', none voting 'no', none voting 'present', and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 452. This Bill having received the required Constitutional Majority is declared passed. House Bill 1699, Representative Santiago. Representative Santiago."
- Santiago: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I move to concur on Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1699. This Bill, it's an agreed Bill. It's a Bill in relationship to the Insurance Code and relation to the subordinate indebtedness, provides for the interest rate limits and that shall be 3%. I move 'do passage'."
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1699?' All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 111 voting 'aye', none voting 'no'...excuse me...2 voting 'no', none voting 'present', and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1699. This Bill having received the required

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

- Constitutional Majority is declared passed. Representative Granberg on House Bill 1854. Representative Granberg."
- Granberg: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would move to concur with Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 1854. It deals with the Department of Professional Regulation in the validity of permits, it lengthens that permit process to 180 days rather than the current 90 days, and I would ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 1854?'

 Representative Black."
- Black: "Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "He indicates he will."
- Black: "Representative, there were a couple of Bills on this topic in committee, and I may be thinking about the other Bill, but let's see if I bring my memory up to speed here. Ιs this the Bill that the...the Medical Association...Medical Society and the Department of Professional Regulation and others opposed or is this the one they favored?"
- Granberg: "Representative, this is the one that the department and the Illinois State Medical Society agreed on."
- Black: "Okay, then the other Bill was something about you could practice without a license or something if you came in from another state. I..."
- Granberg: "I believe that was a different Bill, Representative.

 That has no bearing, and that is not in this piece of legislation."
- Black: "Well, I...I would be very surprised if you would be carrying that other legislation, but I just wanted to make sure. Sometimes we go awful fast in here, you know that."

 Granberg: "I'd be surprised, too."

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

Black: "But I have a lot of faith in you Representative, and after that explanation, I'm going to vote for this Bill."

Granberg: "Representative, likewise."

Black: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Granberg, to close."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 on House Bill 1854?' All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 114 voting 'yes', none voting 'no', none voting 'present', and the House does concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 on House Bill 1854. This Bill having received the required Constitutional Majority is declared passed. Representative Ryder on House Bill 1864. Representative Ryder. Out of the record. Representative Steczo on House Bill 1934. Representative Steczo."

Steczo: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Members of the House. Senate Amendment #1 is a technical Amendment that has been requested by the Illinois Department of Public Health. It states that a hearing aid dispenser licensing exam will be offered every two months rather than every one month. There's no opposition. I'd ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1934?' All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Representative Black."

Black: "Thank you. Madam Speaker, there must be a problem seeing our light up there. We'll have to have the electrician check that out. I just wanted to ask the Sponsor a question. Is there any kind of grandfather clause in this?

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

If you're already selling these things, already selling hearing aids?"

- Steczo: "Representative Black, could you repeat the question, please?"
- Black: "You know, every time we...get into this particular area of the law, Representative, I seem to have a lot of people in my district that run hearing aid businesses, et cetera, and they always ask me anything we do or do they have to comply or if they've been selling these products for 30 years are they grand-personed in the law or whatever, or do they have to then pass a test?"
- Steczo: "I'm not sure, Representative Black, what the ...what the law currently says. This...the original language dealt with the passage of...of written or practical examinations prior to receiving temporary hearing aid dispensing licenses. The question related to this is when should they be offered..."
- Black: "Okay, I see it...I see it, Representative. This only deals with a temporary license that can't be renewed."

Steczo: "That's correct. That is true."

Black: "Alright, thank you."

- Speaker Satterthwaite: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 115 voting 'yes', none voting 'no', none voting 'present', and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1934. This Bill having received the required Constitutional Majority is declared passed."
- Speaker Giglio: "Giglio in the Chair. House Bill 1955, Representative Weller."
- Speaker Giglio: "You heard the Gentleman's Motion. Any discussion? Hearing none, the Motion is that the House

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

nonconcur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1955. All those in favor say 'aye', opposed, 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it and the Motion carries. Government Operations, House Bill 1968, Representative Ronan. House Bill 19..."

Ronan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to accept Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 1968. This is the Bill that...I've worked with the Retail Merchants Association. These are some clarifying Amendments that were asked by some of the universities in the state. Bill passed overwhelmingly out of the House and glad to answer any questions."

Speaker Giglio: "Any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 1968, and on that question all those in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed, 'no'. The voting is open. This is final action. Have all voted who Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 115 voting 'yes', none voting 'no', and the House does concur with Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 1968, and this Bill having received the required Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Representative Trotter, House Bill 2017. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk. Representative Trotter, 2017."

Trotter: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I move to concur on 2017. During consideration in the Senate, Amendment #1 was adopted which deleted provisions in the Bill relating to the regulation of work hours for 16 and 17 year olds."

Speaker Giglio: "Any discussion? Hearing none, the question is,

'Shall the House concur on Senate Amendment #1 to House
Bill 2017?' All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed, 'no'.

The voting is open. This is final action. Have all voted

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 113 voting 'yes', none voting 'no', and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2017, and this Bill having received the required Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Representative Granberg, House Bill 2362. Granberg, 2362. Twenty-three sixty-two. Out of the record. Representative Keane, you have two Bills, 2716. Proceed, 2416."

Keane: "On...thank you Mr...thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to concur with Senate Amendment #1 to 2416. The Senate Amendment is the Amendment...it's a technical Amendment. It was put on by Senator Schuneman to clarify..."

Speaker Giglio: "Any discussion? Hearing none, all those in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed, 'no'. The voting is open. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 112 voting 'yes', none voting 'no', and the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2416, and this Bill having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Keane on 2418."

Keane: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to concur with Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 2418. The Amendment specifically defines what a supplemental appropriation Bill is. It specifies when the note's to be written, how it'll be filed and distributed and what's to be contained."

Speaker Giglio: "Any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall the House concur with Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 2418?' All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed, 'no'. The voting is open. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

question there are 109...108 voting 'yes', none voting 'no'. Representative Stepan...Representative Stepan votes 'aye'. Representative Ropp votes 'aye'. Anybody else? On this question there are now 110 voting 'yes', none voting 'no', and the House does concur with Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 2418, and this Bill having received the required Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Representative McNamara, House Bill 2524. McNamara, 2524. House Bill 2524, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative McNamara."

McNamara: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. House Bill 2524 is the pay-per-call 900 numbers in an attempt to regulate some of the 900...pay-per-call service consumer protections. What House Amendment #1, which was passed out of this House overwhelmingly, it...that the pay-per-call means a call to a sponsor of a program rather than a call to an information program and regulates the telephone corporation...took out the regulation of the telephone corporation. On Amendment...on the Senate Amendments, there were two Amendments that were put on in the Senate. Senate Amendment #1 provided that the charges for calls must be displayed during the course of commercials rather than during the course of announcements, and the Senate Amendment #2 provides that the requirements set forth in Bill for games of chance do not apply to games sponsored by the Department of the Lottery. There Senate Amendment #3 which provides that the introductory messages are not required for calls costing less than one dollar rather than the seventy-five cents per minute originally offered in the Bill; for polling services, synchronous technology (that's computers talking to each other), or political fund-raising activities by established political parties. We are in agreement...with the

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

Amendments...Senate Amendments #1, 2 and 3, and I urge for their concurrence."

- Speaker Giglio: "Any discussion? The question is, 'Shall the House concur with Senate Amendments #1, 2 and 3 to House Bill 2524?', and on that question all those in favor vote 'aye', opposed, 'no'. The voting is open. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 112 voting 'yes', none voting 'no', and the House does concur with Senate Amendments #1, 2 and 3 to House Bill 2524, and this Bill having received the required Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Representative Satterthwaite in the Chair."
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "On Special Order, State and Local Government, House Bill 762, Representative Lang. Out of the record. House Bill 942, Representative Keane. Out of the record. House Bill 1478, Representative Steczo."
- Steczo: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Members of the House. I would move to concur with Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 1478.

 The Amendment #2 deals with vacancies on park boards, and it indicates that if a vacancy occurs with more than 28 months left in a term or less than 88 days before the next scheduled election for the office, the person filing for the vacancy shall serve until the second regularly scheduled park board election. This Amendment has the approval of the Illinois Association of Park Districts. There's no opposition, and I would ask for a concurrence."
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 1478?' All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 115 voting 'yes', none voting 'no', none voting 'present', and the

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

House does concur in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 1478. This Bill having received a Constitutional Majority is declared passed. Representative Steczo on House Bill 2309."

Steczo: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'd ask for concurrence in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2309. This represents an agreement between the Illinois Library Association and the Illinois Municipal League regarding the annexation of public library property by municipalities that have...that have...public libraries. It allows for a voluntary agreement for the sharing of revenues for a five year period, unless extended by mutual agreement of the parties, and I would ask for a 'yes' vote, Madam Speaker."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2309?' All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 115 voting 'yes', none voting 'no', none voting 'present', and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2309. This Bill having received the required Constitutional Majority is declared passed. Supplemental Calendar #1 is being distributed. Representative Currie on House Bill 67 on the Order of Revenue and Banking."

Currie: "Thank you, Madam Speaker and Members of the House. I move the House do concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 67. The Amendment brings this Bill into conformity with the provisions of Senate Bill 33, which we adopted last week. The changes from the Bill, as it originally was approved by this chamber, are essentially one: the Bill, at that time, said that no more than 80% of the equity in a home could be mortgaged under this reverse payment program, but I'm informed that that provision would make these

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

mortgages a lot less attractive to the lender and, in fact, would mean that mortgages granted under this provision would not be guaranteed by the federal 'Fannie-May' program that provides support to this approach to the problems of senior citizens, so I move concurrence with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 67."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 67?' All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 116 voting 'yes', none voting 'no', none voting 'present', and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 67. This Bill having received the required Constitutional Majority is declared passed. Supplemental Calendar #2 is being distributed. On the Special Order of Civil and Criminal Law, Representative John Dunn on House Bill 2334. Representative Dunn."

Dunn: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move to concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 House Bill 2334. These are Amendments which were put on the Bill in the Senate at the request of...of...those who some concerns about this legislation. legislation, as you know, is the Health Care Surrogate Act, which is supported by the Catholic Conference of Illinois, comprises the archdiocese of Chicago, Cardinal which Bernadine and all the Catholic Bishops of the State Illinois. the Chicago Bar Association, the Illinois Hospital Association, the Illinois State Bar Association, the Illinois State Medical Society. I'd be happy to answer questions. Basically, these Amendments qualify some defining terms, change of definition about who is an adult, the language provides that you must be 18 years of old...of

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

age to be an adult within the meaning of this legislation or you must be an emancipated minor, and to become an emancipated minor you must have a court order saying that you are an emancipated minor. If there are questions, I'll be happy to answer them. I ask for your favorable vote."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative McCracken."

McCracken: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise in opposition to the Bill. There were Amendments adopted in the Senate. least one of them, maybe both of them, were requested by opponents to the Bill; however, adoption of those two minor matters does nothing to change any opposition in this In fact, the opposition has been consistent. We've considered this as a Senate Bill, as well, at least...well, no we never did consider it, the Senate Bill was not called here. So, this Bill is back a second time. We've considered this matter once already. I have in my hand a letter from the Department of Health and Services. I've shown the letter to Representative Dunn and few others on the floor. I've sent you correspondence regarding the impact that passage of Bill will have on federal funding. I can assure you, and anyone who has any doubts is free to look at this letter, there will be a loss in federal funding under a related Act. The language which is at issue regards what called neonates in the Bill. In fact, federal regarding this matter prohibits, under all circumstances, withdrawal of food and water from a child through the age of one. Now, the Gentleman has sent around a letter saying that, in his opinion, it's not a problem. I can assure you that this letter is to the contrary, and I ask anyone who has any doubts on that matter to come over and take a look at this letter, but let's get to the maybe the more central issue of this entire matter, and this is the withdrawal of

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

food and water administered by a tube or artificially. There are three qualifying conditions under which the water or food may be withdrawn; one is called terminal since only one of the three conditions is called terminal illness, I believe you must conclude that two conditions qualify where a person is not terminally ill. Do you want a third party to be able to withdraw food and water under circumstances whereby its own definition, there is no terminal illness involved. I ask you to pause and give that some consideration. By its own definition there two qualifying conditions other than terminal illness under which food and water may be withdrawn. Now, we're thinking, I'm sure, of the cases of Greenspan or Longway, these decisions of these cases where there are tragic circumstances. A person living in what the...some proponents of this measure call a reduced quality of life. Should they be required to hang on? Should food and water be administered? Food and water is not medicine. Food and water, even administered artificially, is...is not tantamount to a respirator. It is not a good analogy. Food and water sustains each of us. Food and water will not, I submit..."

Speaker Young: "Excuse me, Representative McCracken, Anthony Young in the Chair, and John Dunn, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Dunn: "A Point of Order. This is a very serious piece of legislation, and I didn't want to cut the Gentleman off, but we are here addressing concurrence of two Senate Amendments, and I wish the Gentleman would confine his remarks to the merits of those Amendments, please."

Speaker Young: "Representative McCracken."

McCracken: "Now, let's see, Representative Dunn, where was I?

Oh, yes, I recall. Food and water is not medicine, it's

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

not medical treatment. I acknowledge that, and it's being administered artificially does not change that fact, food and water is something that we all need to live. Let me ask you this, 'If your grandfather's arms were broken and he couldn't get food in his mouth on his own, would you feed him?' think the answer is yes. This is not so different as the proponents would like you to believe because unlike the withdrawal of the...of the respirator, unlike the withdrawal of therapeutic drugs, the withdrawal food and water causes death by starvation and/or dehydration, a very painful death, which even proponents of this legislation admit. I think the point is this, not unanimity among religions, there is not unanimity among the Catholic religion. I, also, have a treatise, whatever the term is in the church, from the Archdiocese of New York arguing that it is morally impermissible to withdraw food and water in these situations, although so, Cardinal Bernadine may purport to speak for...however many million Catholics there are in the archdiocese, Cardinal O'Connor in New York does not agree. In point of fact is this, although there is language to the contrary, imagine the scenario. As soon as the person slips into the qualifying condition, the doctor is required to the surrogate's mission is to determine surrogate, and whether food and water and treatment should be withdrawn. Now, the proponents will tell you that it's...that it's a...it's a decision either to continue treatment or not continue treatment. Let me ask you this, 'who needs to be consulted about continuing treatment? Who needs to sign a surrogate necessary to sign off on the off? status quo, if not to change the status quo?' It makes sense to call for a surrogate, to require a surrogate, unless there were the question of changing the provision of

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

medicine. So, inherent in this entire act is more and more, and as time goes on I believe I'll be proven correct, the presumption, in effect, no matter what the Bill says, is that death is the course of action to take. Why else would the surrogate be consulted? My friends, this goes far beyond what you would like to believe is in here. I acknowledge the tragedy inherent in so many of these cases, but that tragedy, in and of itself, cannot justify unwise public policy, and that's what this comes down to. By its own definition, it does not apply only in cases of terminal illness. Now, I ask you, is that we should countenance as a society? Is that the public policy? I submit to you it is not the public policy. I recommend a 'no' vote."

Speaker Young: "Representative Wennlund."

Wennlund: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of House. This issue has become a very serious issue with me. For the last five years that I've served in this House, each year I have had a 100% voting record with the Pro-Life Coalition. I have received their award every year for the last five years. I've had an opportunity to review this matter. I've spent a lot of time with it, I've spent a lot of thinking time with it. I sat in committee, went and heard the testimony on both sides of the issue. I rise in support of this legislation. This is not a pro-life issue, this is a right-to-die issue with dignity, without court interference, without going to court, who has never met the individual that has lapsed into a permanent coma, has no ideal what that person's desires and wishes and wants were. This allows a surrogate, who has known this person, who knows the intent and wishes of that person, and avoids a court who has never seen or heard of this person and cannot possibly guess what the person wanted. This does not violate federal law, and anybody who says it does is bunk,

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

because Section 40 says neonates, nothing in this act supersedes the provisions of Section 45, Code of Federal Regulations, and the Section number concerning the provision of appropriate nutrition. hydration and medication for neonates. It does not violate the law, and no doctor in the State of Illinois will violate the federal law and subject himself to a fine of and, worst of all, the loss of his license. Now, that's important. The Catholic Conference of Illinois, the Illinois Hospital Association, the Illinois Medical Society and the Illinois State Bar Association all support this, and that is important. The assertion that this violates federal law is wrong. The correct vote on this issue is a 'yes' vote. Let's get this done. They acknowledge tragedy that exists, and it continues to exist and will continue to exist because the court system does not what the wants and desires of the individual were. This involves the right of a person to die with peace and dignity and in the way he wanted to and when he wanted to, not leaving it up to a court decision to some judge who has no idea, no knowledge of what this person wanted. You can law, you'll be able to tell your loved now...under this ones, your brother, your sister when, in fact, you want the time with peace and dignity. I urge a 'yes' vote on this issue, and let's put it to bed forever."

Speaker Young: "Representative Ropp."

ď,

.

Ropp: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I guess these are always issues that we would always prefer not to have to vote on, these are always issues that are very problem causing and that many times you're not going to win on these issues, whichever way you vote. I think the thing that we need to give some consideration, and, once again I always preference this by saying that...we're not all

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

attorneys, so I think from time to time we have to be a little bit practical. In this particular case, I do not believe that the feeding with tubes is a natural process. I do not believe that the individual involved, they may be, truly wants to also have tremendous amounts of pain and suffering by those loved ones who sit by with care and compassion and observe that person in that particular kind of state. It is my opinion that those individuals who may, and we may all be in this situation at some point time, would surely not like to see your own wife, mother or father or some other relative see you in that kind of a condition, going on and on with no reverse, and so, I it gives us some degree of concern when we may now have a provision statutorily that would allow this death to come about with some degree of dignity and hope that this will be passed in order to kinda deal with a very serious problem that we have in the state. I urge a favorable vote."

Speaker Young: "Representative Pullen."

Pullen: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Bill has nothing to do with death with dignity. Indeed, it provides for a very undignified death. It authorizes, by state law, the forced starvation of a patient who does not even have to be terminal. It is an extreme euthanasia measure. There are no protections in this Bill. This Bill does not apply when a patient has made an expression of his or her own decision in this matter through a living will or a durable power of health care...durable power of attorney for health care matters, in fact, it specifically applies only in instances where the patient has given no such expression of will. This Bill authorizes the withdrawal of food and water from a patient who does not even have to be dying. You know,

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

water is as basic to the human life, to the human being, as the air we breathe. This is equivalent, Ladies and Gentlemen, to putting into law that it's okay as long as a relative or a close friend or a court appointed guardian says so. It's okay for a doctor, it's equivalent to saying it's okay for a doctor to take a pillow and put it over somebody's face, except that might be more humane This is not to prevent pain. Starvation is a very this. slow and painful death. I have read this Bill carefully, and with each time I read it I found more wrong with it. I'm sure the Gentleman who sponsors this is well-intended, but this is not something that you should vote on by title or by label. I beg you to listen to those of us who are raising the alarm on this Bill and understand that this Bill truly is an authorization...a license, if you will, a license to kill. This is the most important vote of this Session for the people of Illinois, for it is a way for you to declare on which side you really stand, for life or a terrible, painful, intentional death. Please vote 'no'."

Speaker Young: "Representative Stern."

Stern: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. We seem to be dealing with life and death issues today, don't we? Ιn scientific technology has arrived at a point far beyond the imagination of man ten years ago, 20 years ago, years ago. We can keep people alive, though not conscious, though not thinking, though not reacting, we can keep them alive for weeks and months and years. We have read about these situations in the newspapers, we all grieve for the individual and for the families involved, and this is a cause for great concern to those of us who...can imagine, can...can empathize with the patient and with the family. We all see ourselves as perhaps that poor, curled, crippled patient in the dark room with only

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

the sound of the ventilator going day and night at the back of the nursing home or the hospital, forgotten except by our family who is slowly being destroyed and impoverished, coming daily to look at what is left of us. Slowly we become a husk of what we once were. This Bill will permit those who know that individual best to make the decision they believe that individual would want to have made for him or her, to permit him to die. I urge your empathetic and concerned and loving vote for this piece of important legislation."

Speaker Young: "Representative Robert Olson."

Olson, Robert: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the concurrence issue. A previous speaker, the immediate previous speaker, said we were dealing with a life and death issue, are. An earlier speaker said that in every year he had been down here, he had received the pro-life and right-to-life awards, and I have too, and I am proud of those awards. I've also been very intimate in my personal life with this issue and my father. I participated in these events. It was very traumatic, and, as we hash out the issue here today, it brings back those traumatic moments for me. It's an issue which I don't know if is an answer. I am going to vote 'no' on this concurrence today, because I don't know if we are capable of coming up to the right answer, and I feel I have to vote on the safe side of the issue in my own mind, and I would like a lot of you to join me in 'no' on this matter. Thank you."

Speaker Young: "Representative Deering."

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

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

Representative Dunn, to close."

Dunn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Just to..try to set a couple of things straight...for the

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

There has been reference record in closing. letter...which has been circulated on the floor of the House, raising some concerns. Those concerns involve young children, infants up to one year old, I believe. This Act specifically excludes from its coverage those defined to be neonates. I'm not, especially, educated this area, but neonates are very, very young children. Ιt is possible that they may not...the neonates...the definition of neonates may not include infants as have been suggested in discussion. Ιn the event, unfortunate event that there is a disabled infant...who meets the qualifying conditions of this legislation and a surrogate must step into place, this Act specifically provides that the decision must be made in the best interest of the child, and the surrogate shall take into account any other information available to the surrogate. If the federal law, if the law of the United States of America prescribes that certain things be done or not be done to infants and neonates, then this legislation as its policy intent and actual wording, prescribes that what shall be done is what the federal law requires. some confusion at this moment as to exactly what the federal law requires, but this legislation clearly states the federal law shall control. I am advised that if this legislation passes, the legislative counsel for Illinois Hospital Association, as well as the...legal counsel for the Illinois Hospital Association and the legal counsel for the Illinois State Medical Society will promptly, as they do with other legislation that effects their members, notify them of this Act and they will specifically include in their memo, directions to their health care providers or licensed medical physicians that they must be aware and conform to federal So.

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

whatever federal law says will be done. The next point I would like to in closing, is to indicate what the make present situation is. In the event someone suffers a tragedy, at this time, which incapacitates them and they have no decision-making capacity and they have one of qualifying conditions set forth in this legislation, there is nothing that can be done except to go to court. poor person, the patient, who has suffered a tragedy is now situation where there's a double tragedy. family, the loved ones, surrounding that person have option but to go to court to find out what to do, and be certain that you understand that when you go to court it is up to the judge to decide. The judge can decide the you would like the judge to decide, or the judge can decide against your wishes. The purpose of this legislation is to allow families who are in this position, to avoid the double tragedy for their loved ones, to avoid going to court. That's all this legislation is about, it is about avoiding going to court. The legislation very specifically, very specifically indicates that the wishes of the patient control. We have heard objections from those who subscribe to the policies of the pro-life movement, and a number of us who will be voting for legislation also subscribe to many of the policies of the pro-life movement. Ιf а patient wishes have life-sustaining treatment prolonged, that patient can execute a living will saying that they wish life-sustaining treatment to be prolonged and it will be done. They can execute a durable power of attorney for health care indicating that they wish life—sustaining treatment to be prolonged and it will be done. That person can tell those around them, that person might even be able to express their intent by discussing this legislation on this floor

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

of this House, and if they do not have either of those documents, the surrogate must decide whatever the patient wants. So, the...the surrogate will decide whether, in consultation with the physician, whether there should be life—sustaining treatment withdrawn or not, and the patients wishes will control. This is very, very important legislation. It has been a long time in the making. It has passed both chambers. The Amendments we are discussing now were put on this Bill at the insistence and urging of the pro—life movement, yet they remain in opposition. I would ask everyone in this chamber now to support this important piece of legislation and to cast an 'aye' vote in support of House Bill 2334 and Senate Amendments #1 and 2, thereto. Please vote 'yes'. Thank you."

- Speaker Young: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 2334?' All those in favor vote 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative McNamara, to explain his vote."
- McNamara: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill is...probably could be described as a euthanasia Bill. There is one provision in there that is absolutely inconsiderate, that is the withdrawal of food and water from a person. Food and water is not...is definitely not a medicine. Food and water, when it is withdrawn from a person, is withdrawn simply to eliminate the life of that person. This is wrong. We were not put here in order to eliminate people from this earth. So, therefore, I would urge more 'no' votes on this Bill."
- Speaker Young: "Have all voted who wish? Representative Preston, to explain his vote."
- Preston: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I wasn't going to speak on this Bill because it's a very serious and very difficult and very personal issue,

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

but some of the remarks that were made by the previous compels me to respond. We can't treat the withdrawal of food and water as if it is taking away a sandwich and a cup of coffee from an injured individual. That's not what we're talking about. The food and the water being administered in the purview of this legislation being administered intravenously or with a feeding tube to a person who cannot eat, think, express or react to any stimuli. That's what we're talking is not any different than a medicine, in fact, about. Ιt it's exactly the same. This isn't a hamburger sandwich, it is a liquid...the food that we're talking about is liquid form that is generally administered by intravenous or...or interdigestive system tube, and that's what this is talking about and what need not be administered. It is not taking something away as much as it is saying that we are not going to administer this...this artificial product to a person who is beyond any means of...of recognition as a human being or any means of response as a human being or feeling or thinking. Because it's so personal, I have to tell you, I don't want to be preserved any longer under such a set of circumstances than is absolutely minimally possible. I don't think any loved one of mine would want and I don't think any loved one of you or you yourself in this room would want to be preserved at the expense of your family and your own expense. So, I... I urge people to vote 'yes'."

Speaker Young: "Representative Santiago to explain his vote."

Santiago: "Mr. Speaker, thank you. I wasn't going to speak on this Bill, but I see a necessity that we must do and address these situations where patients under limited circumstances cannot make decisions for themselves plus, but must rely on family and loved ones to do so for them.

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

It's very important that when someone is critically ill and that person cannot make that decision for themselves, someone in their family will be able to do that instead of keeping that individual to suffer and suffer and suffer. Not only would the family suffer, but the economic burden on that family is always critical. So we must sit down and..."

Speaker Young: "Bring your remarks to a close."

Santiago: "So we must rely and realize that we must come to a decision. This is a Bill that has been supported by the Hospital Association, the Catholic Conferences of Illinois, the Illinois State Bar Association, the Illinois Medical Society Association. And what this indicates, that this is a joint effort by organizations which not...which normally do not agree. So we have seen that everyone's on board on this Bill and we should put some more green votes on that board. Thank you very much."

Speaker Young: "Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. Representative McCracken."

McCracken: "I was just going to say if this appeared to get 60 votes I wanted a verification."

Speaker Young: "Poll of the absentees."

Clerk O'Brien: "There are no Members that are not voting. Two Members excused."

Speaker Young: "Representative Steczo."

Steczo: "Mr. Speaker, how am I recorded?"

Speaker Young: "Your recorded as voting 'present'."

Steczo: "Please vote me 'aye'."

:7

Speaker Young: "Representative McCracken seeks a verification.

Representative Lang, for what purpose do you seek recognition? Have you polled the absentees, Mr. Clerk?

Poll the affirmative votes."

Clerk O'Brien: "Balanoff. Brunsvold. Bugielski."

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

- Speaker Young: "Excuse me, Mr. Clerk. Representatives Lang and Balanoff seek leave to be verified."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Burke. Currie. DeJaegher. DeLeo. Dunn. Edley. Farley. Frederick. Giglio. Granberg. Hicks. Jay Hoffman. Manny Hoffman. Hultgren. Lou Shirley Jones. Keane. Kirkland. Kubik. Kulas. Lang. LeFlore. Levin. Marinaro. Mautino. McAuliffe."
- Speaker Young: "Excuse me, Mr. Clerk. Representative Mautino seeks leave to be verified. Does he have leave? He's in the center aisle, and change Representative McGann from 'no' to 'present', please. Representative Wyvetter Younge asks leave to be verified. Does she have leave?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Continuing the Poll of the Affirmative. Jones. Shirley Jones. Keane. Kirkland. Kubik. Lang. Laurino. LeFlore. Levin. Marinaro. Mautino. McGuire. McPike. McAfee. Morrow. Munizzi. Obrzut. Myron Olson. Parcells. Phelan. Preston. Rice. Richmond. Ronan. Ropp. Rotello. Ryder. Saltsman. Santiago. Satterthwaite. Schakowsky. Schoenberg. Sieben. Steczo. Stepan. Stern. Trotter. Wennlund. White. Williams. Wyvetter Younge and Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker Young: "Representative McCracken, do you have questions of the affirmative vote?"
- McCracken: "Yes, thank you. Representative Laurino?"
- Speaker Young: "Representative Satterthwaite and Representative McPike ask leave to be verified."

McCracken: "Yes."

Speaker Young: "Representative Laurino, is the Gentleman in the chamber? How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Young: "Please remove him."

McCracken: "Representative Farley?"

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

Speaker Young: "Representative Farley. Representative Bruce Farley. Is the Gentleman in the chamber? How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Young: "Please remove him from the Roll Call."

McCracken: "Representative DeLeo?"

Speaker Young: "Representative DeLeo. Is Representative DeLeo in the chamber? Representative Keane asks leave to be verified."

McCracken: "Yes."

Speaker Young: "Leave is given. Remove Representative DeLeo from the Roll."

McCracken: "Representative Rice?"

Speaker Young: "Representative Rice. Is Representative Rice in the chamber? How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Young: "Please remove him."

McCracken: "Representative Lou Jones?"

Speaker Young: "Representative Jones. Representative Lou Jones.

Is the Lady in the chamber? How is she recorded?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Lady's re..."

Speaker Young: "Representative Lou Jones is in the rear of the chamber."

McCracken: "Okay. Thank you. Representative Levin?"

Speaker Young: "Representative Ellis Levin. Is the Gentleman in the chamber? How is the Representative Levin recorded?"

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

Speaker Young: "Please remove him."

McCracken: "Nothing further. Nothing further."

Speaker Young: "On this question there are...Representative
Turner votes 'aye'. On this question there are 56 voting
'yes', 52 voting 'no', 3 voting 'present' and the House
does not concur with Senate Amendments 1 and 2. Rep...I

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

said the House does not concur. Fails to concur then. Representative McCracken."

McCracken: "No, that's it."

- Speaker Young: "Representative Martinez votes 'aye', and now there are 57 voting 'yes', 51 voting 'no' and the House fails to concur in Senate...the Bill...the record was taken and the Amendments fail. Representative Giglio. Representative Giglio on House Bill 703."
- Giglio: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentleman of the House. I move to nonconcur on Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 703 and request a Conference Committee."
- Speaker Young: "The Gentleman moves to nonconcur on Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 703. On that Motion all in favor say 'aye', those oppose say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it, and the House does not concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 703. Representative Giglio on House Bill 1483. Fourteen eighty-three."
- Giglio: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentleman of the House. Fourteen eighty—three was a Bill that came out of here with regards to the codification of the architectural ordinance that we have in the state. Amendment #1 changed the appointments under the board which the Architect Association agrees with and Department of Rules and Regulation. Amendment #2 recodifies and explains further the ordinance that's on the books with regards to publishers and printers on advertising of those that are legitimate plumbers. So I would ask to concur with Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 1483"
- Speaker Young: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 1483?' All those in favor vote 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 111 voting 'yes', none voting 'no', none voting 'present', and the House does concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 1483 and this Bill having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Under announcements..."

- Clerk O'Brien: "Supplemental Calendar #3 is being distributed."

 Speaker Young: "On the House Supplemental Calendar #1, Senate

 Bill 37. Representative Granberg. Out of the record.

 Senate Bill 42, Representative Curran. Representative

 Curran on Senate Bill 42. Representative Curran."
- Curran: "Mr. Speaker, I wish to nonconcur...I wish to refuse to recede from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 42 and to move to appoint a Conference Committee."
- Speaker Young: "The Gentleman moves that the House refuse recede from Senate Amendment #1 to Senate refuse to recede from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 42. All those favor say 'aye', those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it, and the House refuses to recede from House Amendment #1 and requests a Conference. Senate Bill 249. Representative Preston. Representative Preston. Senate Bill 249. Representative Preston on Senate Bill 249. Out of the record. Representative Preston on Senate Bill 250."
- Preston: "Mr. Speaker. I'll be glad to go forward with Senate
 Bill 250 if we can go back to Senate Bill 249, thereafter,
 I...I am...I would like to move to refuse to recede from
 House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 250 and ask that a
 Conference Committee be appointed."
- Speaker Young: "The Gentleman moves that the House refuse to recede from Senate from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 250. All those in favor say 'aye', those opposed say 'no'. In opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it and a Conference

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

- is requested. Senate Bill 249. Representative Preston."

 Preston: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'd move to refuse to recede from House Amendments

 1 and 2 to Senate 249 and ask that a Conference Committee be appointed."
- Speaker Young: "The Gentleman moves that the House refuse to recede from House Amendments 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 249.

 All those in favor say 'aye', those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it, and the House refuses to recede from House Amendments 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 249 and requests a Conference. Senate Bill 307, Representative Cowlishaw. Representative Cowlishaw, Senate Bill 307."
- Cowlishaw: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to non...I would like to refuse to recede from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 307."
- Speaker Young: "The Lady moves that the House refuse to recede from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 307. All those in favor say 'aye', those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it, and requests a Conference."
- Cowlishaw: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And I would ask that a Conference Committee be appointed. Thank you very much."
- Speaker Young: "Senate Bill 446, Representative Burke.

 Representative Burke."

Burke: "Mr. Speaker, I concur with the Amendments."

Speaker Young: "Representative Burke."

- Burke: "I concur. I move to concur. Mr. Speaker, I would respectfully request a Conference Committee on Senate Bill 446 and the Amendments 2, 3 and 4."
- Speaker Young: "The Gentleman moves that the House refuse to recede from House Amendments 2, 3 and 4 to Senate Bill 446.

 All those in favor say 'aye', those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it, and the House

75th Legislative Day

- June 28, 1991
- refuses to recede from House Amendments 2, 3 and 4 and requests a Conference. Senate Bill 453. Representative Curran. Representative Curran. Senate Bill 453."
- Curran: "Mr. Speaker, I move to refuse to recede from House
 Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 453 and appoint a Conference
 Committee."
- Speaker Young: "The Gentleman moves that the House refuse to recede from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 453. All those in favor say 'aye' those opposed say 'no'. In opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it, and the House refuses to recede from House Amendment #1 to 453 and requests a Conference. Senate Bill 616, Representative Keane. Out of the record. Senate Bill 619, Representative Currie. Representative Currie."
- Currie: "I would like to make a Motion to recede. Is that Motion in order or are you just doing refusals to recede?"
- Speaker Young: "Yes, could you explain the Amendment."
- Currie: "This is an Amendment that was an effort to try to define who's responsible for bill payments in a situation where there is a casual separation. There are serious problems with the language of the Bill and so I would urge the House to recede from that Amendment."
- Speaker Young: "The Lady moves that the House recede from House
 Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 16. On that Motion, is there
 any discussion? Gentleman from DuPage, Representative
 McCracken.'
- McCracken: "As much as I don't like the Bill, I fear this going to Conference Committee even more, so I am in full agreement of this."
- Speaker Young: "The question is, 'Shall the House recede from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 619?' All those in favor vote 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Representative Preston, one minute to explain your vote."

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

- Preston: "Mr. Speaker, I can't ask the previous Speaker a question, but did I understand Representative McCracken that he was in favor of this? If he would just nod his head that would be of some...He's in favor of this. Okay, thank you."
- Speaker Young: "Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 110 voting 'yes', none voting 'no' and none voting 'present'. The House recedes from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 619, and this Bill having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 678, Representative Capparelli. Representative Matijevich, for what purpose do seek recognition?"
- Matijevich: "I want to introduce a former seatmate of mine.

 Representative Eugenia Chapman, former Representative

 Eugenia Chapman. Yeah!"
- Speaker Young: "Representative Cap..."
- Capparelli: "Mr. Speaker, I refuse to recede from House Amendment #1 and request a Conference Committee."
- Speaker Young: "The Gentleman moves that the House refuse to recede from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 678. On that question, the Lady from Cook, Representative Pullen."
- Pullen: "I'd like to ask the Sponsor a question, please?"
- Speaker Young: "He'll yield for a question."
- Pullen: "Representative, what intentions do you have with this

 Bill when you put it into Conference? What do intend to do

 with it, if this is I believe the Bill on which you pledged

 in Committee that there would be no Amendments that it

 would go through just as you had it."
- Capparelli: "I don't ever remember...this is a Senate Bill. It belonged to Mr. Lechowicz and he asked for me to recede from the Amendment and I've sent it back to him, and I have no idea what he's going to do with it yet."

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

- Pullen: "Do you recall your commitment in the House Executive Committee that you would not amend this Bill at any stage?"
- Capparelli: "I'm not going to amend it. Lechowicz may amend it.

 I don't know."
- Pullen: "If he does are you going to present the Conference Committee Report?"
- Capparelli: "After I look at it. I'll consider it when I see the Amendment."
- Pullen: "Okay, we'll remind you of your commitment. Thank you."
- Speaker Young: "The Gentleman moves that the House refuse to recede from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 678. All those in favor say 'aye', those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it, and the House refuses to recede from Senate Bill 678 and requests a Conference. House Bill 697. Representative Steczo."
- Steczo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move that the House refuse to recede from House Amendment #1 on Senate Bill 697 and would ask for the appointment of a Conference Committee."

Speaker Young: "Representative Black."

Black: "Inquiry of the Chair, if I might, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Young: "Yes."

- Black: "On Senate Bill 678 that Representative Pullen inquired about, we find no record of a House Amendment being added to that Bill, so I would question the Chair if indeed one was added. If one was not, then I'm not sure there's anything to recede from or refuse to recede from."
- Speaker Young: "There was an Amendment. House Amendment #1 was adopted to Senate Bill 678."
- Black: "Could you give me the date on which that was adopted?"
- Speaker Young: "June 25th, Representative Capparelli's Amendment."
- Black: "Alright. Okay. Thank you very much."
- Speaker Young: "Representative Steczo moves that the House refuse

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

- to recede from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 697. All those in favor say 'aye', those opposed say 'no'. 'In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it, and the House refuses to recede from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 697 and requests a Conference. Senate Bill 699, Representative Steczo."
- Steczo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move that House refuse to recede from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 699 and would ask for the appointment of a Conference Committee."
- Speaker Young: "The Gentleman moves that the House refuse to recede from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 699. All those in favor say 'aye', those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it, and the House refuses to recede from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 697 and requests a Conference. Senate Bill 728, Representative McAfee."
- McAfee: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to move to refuse to recede from House Amendment #2 for purposes of a Conference Committee."
- Speaker Young: "The Gentleman moves that the House refuse to recede from House Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 728. All those in favor say 'aye', those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it, and the House refuses to recede from House Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 728 and requests a Conference. Senate Bill 741, Representative Hannig."
- Hannig: "Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House.

 I would move that we refuse to recede from House Amendment
 #1 and that a Conference Committee be convened."
- Speaker Young: "The Gentleman moves that the House refuse to recede from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 741. All those in favor say 'aye', those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it, and the House

75th Legislative Day

- June 28, 1991
- refuses to recede from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 741 and requests a Conference. Senate Bill 774, Representative Wolf."
- Wolf: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move that the House refuse to recede from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 774 and that a Conference Committee be appointed."
- Speaker Young: "The Gentleman moves that the House refuse to recede from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 774. those in favor say 'aye', those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it, and the House refuses to recede from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 774 and requests a Conference. Senate Bill Representative McPike. Representative Saltsman. Out of the record. Senate Bill 841, Representative Woolard. Representative Woolard. Out of the record. Senate Bill 923, Representative Kulas. Out of the record. Senate Bill 992, Representative Williams."
- Williams: "Yes, I would like to refuse to recede to...from whatever Senate Amendment it was and ask that a Conference Committee to be appointed."
- Speaker Young: "The Gentleman moves that the House refuse to recede from House Amendments 1 and 3 to Senate Bill 992.

 All those in favor say 'aye', those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it, and the House refuses to recede from House Amendments 1 and 3 to Senate Bill 992 and requests a Conference. Senate Bill 1030, Representative Munizzi."
- Munizzi: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentleman. I
 move to refuse to recede from the House Amendments to
 Senate Bill 1030 and ask that this be placed in a
 Conference Committee."
- Speaker Young: "The Lady moves that the House refuse to recede from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1042. All those in

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

favor say 'aye', those opposed say 'no'. Ten-thirty. Excuse me. The Lady moves that the House refuse to recede from House Amendments 2 and 3 to Senate Bill 1030. All those in favor say 'aye', those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it, and the House refuses to recede from House Amendments 2 and 3 to Senate Bill 1030 and requests a Conference. Senate Bill 1042, Representative Munizzi."

Munizzi: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I ask leave of the Body to be able to handle this Bill in order to get it to a Conference Committee to state that we refuse to recede House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1040 and that we get it to a Conference Committee."

Speaker Young: "The Lady moves that the House refuses to recede...Representative Black."

Black: "...Just...a question of the Sponsor, Mr. Speaker, if I might. Just one, absolutely. Just one, but the hour grows late and we're moving awful fast. Representative, if you'd just tell me why you are refusing to recede from a Vehicle Bill where the Amendment was still a Vehicle Bill and you're refusing to recede from the Vehicle Bill and it's still a Vehicle Bill, what do you have in mind for this?"

Munizzi: "I haven't the slightest idea, Representative."

Black: "I'll tell you what, on that honest an answer I have no objection whatsoever."

Munizzi: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Young: "The Lady moves that the House refuse to recede from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1042. All those in favor say 'aye', those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it, and the House refuses to recede from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1042 and requests a Conference. House Bill...Senate Bill 923, Representative Kulas."

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

- Kulas: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move...I move to refuse to recede on House Amendments #1, 2 and 3 to Senate Bill 923 and ask for a Conference Committee."
- Speaker Young: "The Gentleman moves that the House refuse to recede from House Amendments #1, 2 and 3 to Senate Bill 923. All those in favor say 'aye', those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it, and the House refuses to recede from House Amendments #1, 2 and 3 to Senate Bill 923 and requests a Conference. Senate Bill 1048, Representative Hannig. Representative Hannig. Representative Hannig. Senate Bill 1048."
- Hannig: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would move to refuse to recede on Senate Bill 1048 and ask that a Conference Committee be convened."

Speaker Young: "Representative Black."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. We...we're moving so fast that I am developing just a powerful headache and it's very, very hard to hear, so what I would like to do with your permission, Mr. Speaker, is to ask the Sponsor two questions."

Speaker Young: "He indicates he'll yield for questions."

Black: "Thank you. Thank you."

Hannig: "Yes, Sir."

Black: "Representative...Senate Bill 1048 doesn't have any of the scrubber legislation that many of us worked so hard on in here. You are not refusing to recede from any of that language are you?"

Hannig: "Representative, the Amendment actually made this pure vehicle and we're asking that we refuse to recede to put it into Conference..."

Black: "I'm sorry, you said a pure vehicle or a cold vehicle?"
Hannig: "It amends...Yeah. It amends everything after...it

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

strikes everything after the enacting clause."

Black: "So, it would be your intent then if..."

Hannig: "My intent would be to put it into Conference Committee."

Black: "It pays for ... "

Hannig: "We've reached the point in the negotiations where the Bill that we passed the other day failed and perhaps some subsequently..."

Black: "Okay."

Hannig: "...negotiations took place and..."

Black: "Well."

Hannig: "...we needed a vehicle, it would be there. Perhaps in the fall when we come back in the Veto Session and we need cleanup language it would be there. Perhaps if some other issues arose between now and October, it would be there."

Black: "That's all."

Hannig: "It's a backup."

Black: "That's all I wanted. You explained that and I can dig that now. Okay. Alright."

Speaker Young: "The Gentleman moves that the House refuse to recede from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1048. those in favor say 'aye', those opposed say 'no'. Ιn the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it, and the House refuses to recede from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill and requests a Conference. Senate Bill 1147. Representative Hartke. Representative Hartke. The Gentleman moves that the House refuse to recede from House Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 1147. On that question, those in favor say 'aye', those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it, and the House refuses to recede from House Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 1147 and requests a Conference."

Hartke: "I couldn't have said it better myself."

Speaker Young: "Senate Bill 1171. Representative Curran.

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

Representative Curran. Senate Bill 1171."

Currie: "Mr. Speaker, I refuse to recede from House Amendments 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 8 on Senate Amendment...on Senate Bill 1171 and wish to appoint a Conference Committee."

Speaker Young: "Representative Black."

Black: "Mr. Speaker, in all due respect to the Chair, you don't want to go any faster than I do, believe me, but my light has been on since before you called 1147. In the meantime, Mr. Hartke and I have had a chance to have a discussion here on the floor. If you'll just keep your...your eye on my light button and I'll try to make this very briefly, but 1147, a very controversial Bill when it left this chamber...when it was introduced, and all I wanted, for the record, was to ask Representative Hartke that he has no intention of bringing back the probation office collecting the fees which is a highly...very controversial matter on 1147. I know there's not a whole I can do about it if he says 'yep' that's what I am going to do with it, but at least I would like him on the record."

Speaker Young: "Representative Black, I did not see your light.

I apologize. Right now we're on Senate Bill 1171."

Black: "I understand that, but my light was on for so long it's about to burn out. I mean, just look at my light and we'll get along just fine. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Young: "Representative Ryder. Representative Ryder. Representative Curran moves that the House refuse to recede from House Amendments 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8 on Senate Bill 1171. All those in favor say 'aye', those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it, and the House refuses to recede from House Amendments 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 8 to Senate Bill 1171 and requests a Conference. Representative Hartke."

Hartke: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Members of the

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

House. I want to assure Representative Black and Members here that I realize that 1147 was controversial as introduced, but if they recall we amended that Bill doing with the Probate Act, and I assure you when it comes back here it will not contain anything having to do with the probation officers and the fees."

- Speaker Young: "Senate Bill 1192. Representative Rice.

 Representative Rice. Senate Bill 1192."
- Rice: "Mr. Speaker. I refuse to recede and request a Conference Committee."
- Speaker Young: "The Gentleman moves that the House refuse to recede from Senate Bill...from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1192. All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it, and the House refuses to recede from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1192 and requests a Conference. Senate Bill 1218, Representative Keane. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1303, Representative Tenhouse."
- Tenhouse: "Mr. Speaker, I move to refuse to recede from House

 Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1303 and ask that a Conference

 Committee be appointed."
- Speaker Young: "The Gentleman moves that the House refuse to recede from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1303. All those in favor say 'aye'...all those in favor say 'aye', those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it, and the House refuses to recede from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1303 and requests a Conference. Senate Bill 1329, Representative Currie."
- Currie: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I move the House refuse to recede from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1329."
- Speaker Young: "The Lady moves that the House refuse to recede from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1329. All those in

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

favor say 'aye', those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it, and the House refuses to recede from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1329 and requests a Conference. Senate Bill 1470. Representative Wolf."

- Wolf: "Mr. Speaker. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move that the
 House refuse to recede from House Amendment #1 to Senate
 Bill 1470 and that a Conference Committee be appointed."
- Speaker Young: "The Gentleman moves that the House refuse to recede from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1470. All those in favor say 'aye', those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it, and the House refuses to recede from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1470 and requests a Conference. Senate Bill 1471, Representative Shirley Jones."
- Jones: "Mr. Speaker, I refuse to recede Amendments #2 and 3 and I
 would like a Conference Committee, please."
- Speaker Young: "Representative Ryder."
- Ryder: "I don't wish to speak on this. After you take action, I do have points...a point of personal privilege."
- Speaker Young: "Representative Keane. The Lady moves that the House refuse to recede from House Amendments 2 and 3 to Senate Bill 1471. All those in favor say 'aye', those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it, and the House refuses to recede from House Amendments 2 and 3 to Senate Bill 1471 and requests a Conference. Representative Ryder."
- Ryder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise on a point of personal privilege. Unfortunately I've been off the floor quite a bit today, and as a result at some of the meetings I haven't been able to listen to the news media, and I was wondering if the Chair can inform those of us downstaters if there's a report on the ballgame that was played this

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

afternoon in Chicago. Does the Chair have any information about the ballgame? Cardinals and Cubs I was wondering if we might lighten up the festivities this afternoon. Anyone happen to know?"

Speaker Young: "Representative Granberg."

Granberg: "Representative Ryder, the Cubs 3, the Cardinals 12."

Ryder: "Representative Granberg, was that after the first inning or is that a final? Fifth inning, oh. Alright. Mr. Chair...Mr. Speaker, I thank you for your indulgence, and I hope that throughout this weekend we might be able to keep up with these exploits. Thank you."

Speaker Young: "Well, for all the Cubs...Representative Ryder, for all the Cub fans let's go to the Order of Government Operations and call House Bill 1864. Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Well, I have to admit that you certainly took the advantage of the situation there. I would move to concur with Senate Amendment #1 which...an Administration Amendment which did not change the underlying Bill. I find it to be agreeable, and I have consulted with the insurance industry and the administration who considers noncontroversial and acceptable, and therefore, I move to concur with Senate Amendment #1."

Speaker Young: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1864?' All those in favor vote 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question...Representative Ryder. On this question there are 111 voting 'yes', none voting 'no' and none voting 'present'. The House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1864, and this Bill having received the required Constitutional Majority, is declared passed. Representative Ryder."

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

- Ryder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate the vote, but I want you to know that I was prepared to indicate that if there had been a significant number of negative votes, that I would have reminded the negative voters that red is the Cardinal color; therefore, I might have been able to succeed. Thank you."
- Speaker Young: "On the Order of Criminal Law, House Bill 65, Representative Santiago."
- Santiago: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to concur in Amendment

 1 to House Bill 65. The...House Bill 65 creates the

 Cannabis and Controlled Substances Tort Claims Act. This

 is a Bill that passed the Senate overwhelmingly, and I move
 to concur."
- Speaker Young: "Representative Williams."
- Williams: "Will the Sponsor yield? Exactly what does this particular Amendment do?"
- Santiago: "Basically, if you looked at the Bill...on line 5, on page 8 by inserting 'comprising any school' wherever it appears on the following, and then you go to line 5 or...it says, 'or any conveyance owned, leased or contracted by a school to transport students to or from school or a school related activity.'"
- williams: "Does this make school buses part of the safe school
 zone? Is that what you're trying to do?"
- Santiago: "No, that's not the way I interpret this."
- Williams: "Okay, well then...that's what...it seems to say it includes...I guess in land or I'm assuming some sort of instrumentality used for the transporting of schools to and from school as schools properly subject to certain penalties. So that would just include school buses as a part of safe school zone. That correct?"
- Santiago: "That's not my interpretation. That's not the way the Amendment was explained to me."

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

Williams: "Could we take this out for a second and make sure we understand the same thing?"

Santiago: "Let's take the Bill out of the record."

Speaker Young: "Out of the record. On House Supplemental Calendar #2. Before we go to House Supplemental #2, Representative McAfee on House Bill 477. Representative McAfee."

McAfee: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to concur on Senate Amendments #1, 2 and 3 on House Bill 477 which is the extension of the hazardous waste incineration moratorium. Senate Amendment #1 continues with the exemption for incineration of hospital waste, and, in addition, sets up a waste reduction assessment and implementation plan by the This Amendment was drafted and approved by the hospitals. Illinois Hospital Association. Senate Amendment #2 includes in the elimination of burning of waste oil that is presently used as a fuel, and Senate Amendment #3 permits the research and development facilities to be developed during this time period, as well, to develop new technology and incineration."

Speaker Young: "Representative Black."

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

McAfee: "Yes."

Black: "Representative even...even with the Amendments and some of them certainly address some concerns that were expressed in Committee and testimony. I guess I'm concerned about the underlying Bill. I just simply don't understand, given how fast technology can work today why do we want to say you cannot develop or construct a waste incinerator in the State of Illinois until December 31, 1996."

McAfee: "If I may respond? The necessity for creation or construction of new hazardous waste incinerators is not

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

necessary at this time. We presently have based on figures that we presented during initial discussion on the Bill, 20 year capacity of hazardous waste incineration with the five existing hazardous waste incinerators. We don't need any more new toxic waste being burned in Illinois, and furthermore, we are present net importer of hazardous waste in Illinois. We take in more hazardous waste from other jurisdictions than we have in Illinois."

Black: "Thank you very much for your answer, Representative. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentleman of the House. Even as amended and the Sponsor should be commended for addressing many of the concerns, but even as commended or as amended, the Illinois Environmental Protection Agency opposes The Illinois Farm Bureau opposes this Bill among others. I think I know why. From the evidence we it would appear that hazardous waste incinerators can be operated safely, at a time when we are struggling deal with the comprehensive issue of waste, why would it be prudent to limit what apparently is a viable waste disposal method at this time, and all of you downstaters on either side of the aisle should pay particular attention. Ιf can't develop incinerators and no permit can be issued until December 31st of 1996, I've got a hunch where that is going to go. I think that waste is going to end up in somebody's downstate county, where it's going to packaged as economic development for the poor folks in southern Illinois. Watch yourselves on this one? Bureau knows what your up to. Even the IEPA, even the IEPA doesn't support this, so all of you environmentalist should be advised to vote 'no'."

Speaker Young: "Excuse. Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker. I'm only on the microphone so that

Representative Persico would quit bothering that woman up

75th Legislative Day

- June 28, 1991
- in the gallery and come down, come down here and do his job. Come down here and do his work."
- Speaker Young: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative Kulas. Could we have it a little quiet in the chamber, please?"
- Kulas: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield to a couple questions? Representative McAfee, in Senate Amendment #2 you extended the moratorium also to incinerators which burn waste oil. Can you explain to me, is waste oil a hazardous waste?"
- Speaker Young: "Representative Kubik, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"
- Kubik: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would just interrupt the proceedings to tell Representative Persico that one of our recently departed Members, Representative DiPrima once told me that he told the Member not to feel bad that he had been here ten years before he got stuck in the gallery, so it even happens to a veteran occasionally."

Speaker Young: "Representative Persico."

Persico: "I've been waiting, and obviously I still fell for it, but I always do welcome the opportunity to meet a beautiful woman especially about a month before I get married, and not that I'm changing my mind at all, but...and it's always better that it happened to me than Representative Cronin."

Speaker Young: "Back on House Bill 477, Representative Kulas."

Kulas: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is an important Bill, so I would like the Members maybe to listen a little bit. It was a bad Bill when it came out of this House and it's a worse Bill coming back by the Amendment put on in the Senate. I had a question of the Sponsor on Amendment #2, Representative McAfee. You extended the moratorium to incinerators which burn waste oil. Now is waste oil considered a hazardous waste?"

McAfee: "Representative Kulas, the issue about the burning of

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

waste oil as a fuel oil has to do with the cement kills...kilns and it primarily relates to the heavy metals that have been found when those kilns burn hazardous waste and waste oil, and that was reported by a 1987 USEPA study which reported that the air emissions of lead, chromium and zinc were 82%, 167% and 662% higher at the Illinois cement kilns when these wastes were burned."

Kulas: "And how many hazardous waste incinerators do we have in the State of Illinois at the present time?"

McAfee: "To answer your question as I answered in debate when the Bill first came out of House, there are presently five hazardous waste incinerators in the State of Illinois.

Three in the Metropolitan Chicago area and two downstate."

Kulas: "Do you know, Representative McAfee, how much hazardous waste is produced in the State of Illinois?"

McAfee: "Yes, if you give me a second, I can give you some figures. Using the base year of 1987, waste generated in Illinois was 1.89 million tons, and yet Illinois facilities manage 2.01 million, which as I indicated earlier, reflects that we are a net importer of hazardous waste."

Kulas: "But how much of the hazardous waste is landfills and how much of this hazardous waste is incinerated?"

McAfee: "I can't give you a breakdown as I stand here on that."

Kulas: "Do you know approximately? Is it 50-50, is it 75-25?"

McAfee: "As I indicated before that...I'm not quite sure if it was debated in the initial debate on the Bill. I can't give those figures."

Kulas: "Okay, thank you, Representative. To the Bill, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentleman, you know nobody wants hazardous waste, but we've got to do something....and we all produce hazardous waste and that hazardous waste has to go some place. If it's not going to be incinerated, then it's going to go to a landfill. Would you rather have the

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

waste...the hazardous waste incinerated or would you rather have it put in a landfill? I know, some of you would rather not have it all, but unfortunately it's here and it's here to stay and you're going to have to put it some place. To put a moratorium now on...when were trying to address not only the hazardous waste problem, but the whole solid waste problem in Illinois, it's a bad time. out a signal that were ducking the issues instead of facing the issues we're hiding from these issues. Now if you're a downstater you better watch out especially if your from around Fulton County because, you know, they're going to start bringing that hazardous waste down there. That hazardous waste has to be put some place. We can't ship it to the moon. We can't put it on the Mississippi River and send it to the ocean. It's going to go some place here in the State of Illinois, and it's not going to go in my district because the yuppies won't allow it, but it's going to go down south. So I urge you to look carefully at this Bill and to nonconcur in these Senate Amendments because these Senate Amendments made it even worse than it was when it left this House."

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

Flinn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentleman of the House, I rise in support of this Bill...of these Amendments rather, to this Bill. They improve the Bill tremendously in a sense that Amendment #3 exempts the R & D, Resource and Development, in the Monsanto Company, which is a constituent company in my district, is very much involved in that. It's something that needs to done and it exempts those sorts of incinerators from the Bill and likewise Amendment is one that is very important from a standpoint that it directs hospitals to seek ways to reduce

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

their hazardous waste. That's two things that really need to be done and should have been in the Bill to start with. I would urge everyone to vote 'green' on the Bill."

Speaker Young: "The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Peterson."

Peterson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Concurrence Motion.

This was a bad Bill when it was voted a couple years back after a company had gone through all the procedures, had spent many years many dollars to site an incinerator in Bedford Park. This is a local issue. Now they've taken a local issue and they want to make it a statewide issue. We know that incinerators are going to come. We know there's going to be state of the art incinerators down the road. We have to find a place for the waste. This is a bad Bill and it should be defeated. I would recommend a 'no' vote on this Concurrence Motion."

Speaker Young: "Representative Robert Olson."

Olson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentleman, hazardous waste is being created right now and it's not going to stop in the future. It has to be handled in some fashion. In my district in Clinton, Illinois is a medical hazardous waste incinerator. It is operating, been operating for a couple of years now. I have yet to have one complaint from anyone in that community about that incinerator. the knowledge, what comes out of the smokestack best of my there passes everything...every criteria that EPA should. Ιt is a viable industry in that community, and I you that it's much more safer coming out a say to smokestack...than any residue coming out of a smokestack that's being analyzed on a regular basis, than it take this material and put it in a landfill. The landfill industry is growing by leaps and bounds in as far technology and how they bury material, but there's always

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

room for an accident, a leak or whatever. If we put hazardous material leaching into our groundwater that cannot be cleaned up. It can be stopped, but it cannot be cleaned up. The incinerator is a much safer way of doing things than putting the hazardous material in landfills. just a method of moving the disposal of hazardous material out of the urban areas and into the rural In the urban areas, your water is treated. You have enough users that they can apply and afford all the technology to clean up water, but out in the rural areas where people operate on wells, maybe one home on a well, maybe 15 on a well, maybe a small community, maybe a larger community that doesn't have a lake, they're operating on groundwater. We cannot contaminate groundwater. I urge you, I plead with you to vote no on the Motion to concur on these Amendments. Thank you."

Speaker Young: "Representative McNamara."

McNamara: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield for some questions? He indicates he will. Representative, does this incinerator pro...moratorium that your talking about, this pertains only to hazardous waste. Is that correct?"

McAfee: "That's correct."

McNamara: "It was my understanding from some figures that I had seen that in this state we are importing hazardous waste because we have excess capacity in the incinerators we now have."

McAfee: "That is correct. And we would remain that way even with the importing of out of state hazardous waste for the next 20 years during which time we can develop new and better technology."

McNamara: "Thank you. To this Bill. As the Representative has precisely said, we have the capacity in this state of

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

importing right now to our incinerators hazardous waste for the next 20 years. It is time for us to stop and look at all of the planning on hazardous waste incinerators for a period of five years just to make sure that we are doing it correctly. The arguments that said that it going to go downstate are absolutely incorrect. In my district we are building a municipal waste facility which I am supporting. We are going to take our own municipal waste and dispose of it within our own district. There is a reason that I support the moratorium on hazardous waste. It is a different animal. It requires hazardous waste materials to be trucked in and out of sometimes residential areas. That is dangerous. is wrong. That requires study. What this Bill says, lets give the EPA, let's give the experts the ability to for five years to study how to do it better for our future and make Illinois a better Illinois. I urge the support of this fine piece of legislation."

Speaker Young: "Representative Pedersen."

Pedersen: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentleman of the House. We spent all kinds of time this spring about scrubbers in the coal industry. Just another way cleaning up the air. What we're talking about here is burning fuel that is cleaned up with state of the scrubbers of a different kind that make it very safe; latest EPA standards, the whole shot in the areas people live. And for the people who live there, they don't even know that it's going on. It's just like burning another form of fuel. This is the kind of thing that we're going to be doing sooner or later anyway because we don't have enough place to put all the waste anyway and we're going to end up having to burn it, and this is just one of the initial steps in that process. This is a bad Bill and

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

we should not concur on this Amendment."

- Speaker Young: "Gentleman from Madison, Representative Wolf.

 Representative Wolf."
- Wolf: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move the previous question."
- Speaker Young: "The Gentleman moves the previous question. On that Motion, Representative Parke."
- Parke: "Just that...if this passes with the required numbers.

 I'd ask for a verification of the Roll Call."
- Speaker Young: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question.

 The question is, 'Shall the previous question be put?' All
 those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'no'. In
 the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it, and the
 previous question is put. Representative McAfee to close."
- McAfee: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentleman of the House. Senate Amendments 1, 2 and 3 have made a good Bill better. As Representative Flinn has indicated, this is an issue that impacts his area. It impacts my area. to impact each and everyone of your areas, because I'll tell you, the air knows no district. We presently in Illinois enough hazardous waste incineration have capacity for the next 20 years given the fact that we are a net importer. We have landfills that are taking in...importing of hazardous medical waste as well. This Bill...this Amendment deals with hospital hazardous is now also not a Bill, and this Amendment #3 specifically deals with the improving of technology in allowing the research and development to go forward. I urge your support and favorable concurrence with Senate Amendments #1, 2 and 3 for all our districts."
- Speaker Young: "The Gentleman has moved that the House concur in Senate Amendments 1, 2 and 3 to House Bill 477. All those in favor vote 'aye', those opposed, 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Representative Balanoff one

75th Legislative Day.

June 28, 1991

minute to explain his vote."

- Balanoff: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is probably the most important piece of environmental legislation that we've considered on the floor this year. As the Sponsor very adequately pointed out, it's not a question of needing more capacity, the answer is, stop producing that which we cannot dispose of safely. The answer is, to reduce our dependence on landfills and incinerators, and when you increase capacity, there's no incentive to find a solution. I would ask everybody to give us a chance to solve that problem. If we have more capacity, there is no incentive. And I really would urge everybody that's voting 'no' or 'present' to think about it and to vote 'aye'."
- Speaker Young: "Representative Weller, one minute to explain your vote."
- Weller: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In explanation of my vote; you know I voted to help pass this Bill out of the House, because I also support the idea of extending moratorium. However, there's been some Amendments added on to this Bill over in the Senate, a couple of which make I can see where the Sponsor has sense. tried to accommodate some concerns, however, more concerns need to be accommodated. Senate Amendment #2 has some technical flaws that need to be addressed in Conference Committee, and I would hope that this Concurrence Motion would fail, and that the Sponsor would nonconcur and send this Bill to Conference."
- Speaker Young: "Representative Woolard, one minute to explain your vote."
- Woolard: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I don't see the Sponsor at his desk right now, so I'll just go ahead and state for the record that I'm going to change my vote to vote 'yes'. I

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

had some serious concerns about a particular project within my district, but I've been informed by EPA, and I'm stating for the record that EPA has assured me that Olin-Matheson will not be affected by this, the operation within Williamson County. I'd like to be recorded as 'aye'."

- Speaker Young: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. Representative Parke has requested a verification. Representative McAfee requests a Poll of the Absentees. Representative Levin for what purpose do you seek recognition? Representative Levin asks leave to be verified, and Representative Capparelli asks leave to be verified. Do they have leave? Poll of the Absentees."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Poll of those not voting. Petka, no further."
- Speaker Young: "Representative Giorgi asks leave to be verified.

 A Poll of the Affirmative vote."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Balanoff. Barnes. Bugielski. Burke.
 Capparelli. Curran. Currie. Davis. Deering. DeJaegher.
 DeLeo. Dunn. Edley. Farley. Flinn. Giorgi. Granberg.
 Hartke. Jay Hoffman. Homer. Lou Jones..."
- Speaker Young: "Excuse me, Mr. Clerk. Representative Curran asks leave to be verified, and Representative Granberg asks leave to be verified. Continue with the Poll."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Lou Jones. Shirley Jones. Keane. Kubik. Lang.

 Laurino. LeFlore. Levin. Marinaro. Martinez.

 Matijevich. McAfee. McGann. McGuire. McNamara..."
- Speaker Young: "Excuse me, Mr. Clerk. Representative Parke,
 Representative Kubik, and Currie request leave to be
 verified. They have leave. Continue."
- Clerk O'Brien: "McPike. Morrow. Munizzi. Obrzut. Phelan.
 Phelps. Preston. Rice. Richmond. Rotello. Santiago.
 Satterthwaite. Schakowsky. Schoenberg. Shaw. Steczo.
 Stepan. Stern. Trotter. Turner. Walsh. Weaver. White.

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

Williams. Wolf. Woolard. Anthony Young. Wyvetter Young and Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Young: "Representative Parke, questions of the Affirmative Vote."

Parke: "Yes. Representative DeLeo?"

Speaker Young: "Representative DeLeo. Is Representative DeLeo in the chamber? How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Young: "Please remove him."

Parke: "Representative Dunn?"

Speaker Young: "Representative John Dunn. Is Representative Dunn in the chamber? How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Young: "Please remove him."

Parke: "Representative Turner?"

Speaker Young: "Representative Arthur Turner. Is Representative Turner in the chamber? Representative Turner is in the rear of the chamber."

Parke: "Representative Santiago?"

Speaker Young: "Representative Santiago. Representative Santiago? Representative John Dunn has returned to the chamber. Please return him to the Roll Call, voting 'aye', and remove Representative Santiago."

Parke: "Representative Shaw?"

Speaker Young: "Representative Shaw. Is Representative Shaw...Representative Schoenberg requests leave to be verified. Does he have leave? And Representative Keane requests leave to be verified. Does he have leave? And Representative Shaw. Is the Gentleman in the chamber? Please remove him from the Roll Call."

Parke: "Representative Novak? Mr. Speaker, Representative Novak?"

Speaker Young: "Representative Novak. Is Representative Novak in

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

the chamber? Representative Novak voted 'no'."

Parke: "Thank you. Representative Laurino?"

Speaker Young: "Representative Laurino. Is Representative Laurino in the chamber? Representative Santiago has returned to the chamber. He's in the rear of the chamber and is voting 'aye'."

Parke: "Representative Laurino?"

Speaker Young: "Representative Laurino. How is Representative Laurino recorded?"

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

Speaker Young: "Please remove him."

Parke: "Representative Jay Hoffman?"

Speaker Young: "Representative Hoffman is in his seat."

Parke: "Thank you. Representative Satterthwaite?"

Speaker Young: "Representative Satterthwaite is in the chamber."

Parke: "I see her."

Speaker Young: "Representative Jesse White requests leave to be verified."

Parke: "Yes. Representative Balanoff?"

Speaker Young: "Representative Balanoff is...Representative Balanoff is in the chamber. Representative Giglio...

Parke: "Representative Levin?"

Speaker Young: "...wishes to be recorded as 'aye'. Giglio."

Parke: "Representative Phelps?"

Speaker Young: "Representative Phelps."

Parke: "Thank you. I see him. Representative Levin?"

Speaker Young: "Representative Ellis Levin had leave to be verified."

Parke: "I don't remember that. I made a note. I don't remember him being verified off."

Speaker Young: "Well, he did. He was the first one.

Representative Shaw has returned to the chamber."

Parke: "Then I have no others."

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

- Speaker Young: "Return Representative Shaw to the Roll voting 'aye'. Further questions, Representative Parke?"
- Parke: "I have no others. Thank you for the verification."
- Speaker Young: "On this question, there are 63 voting 'yes', 40 voting 'no', 10 voting 'present', and the House does concur in Senate Amendments 1, 2 and 3 to House Bill 477, and this Bill having received the required Constitutional Majority, is declared passed. On the Order of Criminal Law, House Bill 65, Representative Santiago."
- Santiago: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We resolved the problems that

 we had. I move to concur on Senate Amendment #1 to House

 Bill 65."
- Speaker Young: "The Gentleman moves to concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 65. All those in favor vote 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open, and this is final Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who passage. wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 112 voting 'yes', none voting 'no' and none voting 'present', and the House does concur to Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 65, and this Bill having received the required Constitutional Majority, is declared passed. On Supplemental Calendar #3 appears Senate Bill 907, Representative Bugielski. Representative Bugielski Senate Bill 907."
- Bugielski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I move to refuse to recede on House Amendments 1 and 4 to Senate Bill 907, and I ask that a Conference Committee Report...Conference Committee be appointed."
- Speaker Young: "The Gentleman moves that the House refuse to recede from House Amendments 1 and 4 to Senate Bill 907.

 All those in favor say 'aye', those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it, and the House refuses to recede from House Amendments #1 and 4 to Senate

75th Legislative Day

- June 28, 1991
- Bill 907, and requests a Conference. On the Order...House Supplemental #2, House Supplemental #2, Senate Bill 62, Representative Lang. Read the Bill."
- Lang: "Mr. Speaker...thank you. Mr. Speaker, I move to refuse to recede from House Amendments 1 and 2."
- Speaker Young: "The Gentleman moves that the House refuse to recede from House Amendments #1 and 2 to Senate Bill 62.

 All those...Representative McCracken."
- McCracken: "Yes. I was curious. What is the plan for this in Conference Committee, Lou?"
- Lang: "I'm sorry."
- McCracken: "What is the plan for this Bill in Conference Committee? I know there was a telecommunication vote yesterday."
- Lang: "The only...we would like to keep the Amendments on, and...if you want to put it in the Conference Committee to discuss that. I don't have any other plans currently for it."
- McCracken: "Okay. Thank you."
- Speaker Young: "All those in favor say 'aye', those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it, and the House refuses to recede from House Amendments #1 and 2 to Senate Bill 62, and requests a Conference. Senate Bill 136, Representative Wolf."
- Wolf: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I move that the House refuse to recede from House Amendments #1 and 2 to Senate Bill 136, and that a Conference Committee be appointed."
- Speaker Young: "The Gentleman moves that the House refuse to recede from House Amendments 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 136.

 All those in favor say 'aye', those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it, and the House refuses to recede from House Amendments 1 and 2 to Senate

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

- Bill 36 (sic 136), and requests a Conference. Senate Bill 271, Representative Martinez."
- Martinez: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of this House. I refuse to recede from..."
- Speaker Young: "The Gentleman moves that the House refuse to recede from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 271. those in favor say 'aye', those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it, and the refuses to recede from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 271, and requests a Conference. Senate Bill 325. Representative Levin. Out of the record. Senate Bill 326, Representative Hicks. Representative Hicks. Senate Bill 326. Out of the record. Senate Bill 484, Representative Rotello. Out of the record. Senate Bill 499. Representative Hartke. Representative Hartke. Senate Bill 499."
- Hartke: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I move to refuse to recede from House Amendment #1 on Senate Bill 499."
- Speaker Young: "The Gentleman moves that the House refuse to recede from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 499. All those in favor say 'aye', those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it, and the House refuses to recede from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 499, and requests a Conference. Senate Bill 630, Representative Currie. Out of the record. Senate Bill 631, Representative Keane. Out of the record. Senate Bill 654, Representative Hicks. Out of the record. Senate Bill 708, Representative Curran."
- Curran: "Move to refuse to recede in House Amendments 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 708 and form a Conference Committee."
- Speaker Young: "The Gentleman moves that the House refuse to recede from House Amendments 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 708.

 All those in favor say 'aye', those opposed say 'no'. In

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it, and the House refuses to recede from House Amendments 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 708, and requests a Conference. Senate Bill 326, Representative Hicks."

- Hicks: "Thank you. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I would move to nonconcur with Senate Bill 326, and..."
- Speaker Young: "The Gentleman moves that the House refuse to recede from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 326. All those in favor say 'aye', those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it, and the House refuses to recede from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 326, and requests a Conference. Senate Bill 654, Representative Hicks."
- Hicks: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would move to refuse to recede from House Amendments 1 and 2 on Senate Bill 654, and ask that a Conference Committee be appointed."
- Speaker Young: "The Gentleman moves that the House refuse recede from House Amendments 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 654. All those in favor say 'aye', opposed say 'no'. opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it, and the House refuses to recede from House Amendments 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 654, and requests a Conference. Senate Bill...on House Supplemental #3, Senate Bill 872, Representative Keane. Out of the record. Senate Bill 930, Representative Currie. Out οf the record. Senate 999, Representative Munizzi.
- Munizzi: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. I move to refuse to recede from House Amendments 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 999, and ask that this be sent to a Conference Committee."
- Speaker Young: "The Lady moves that the House refuse to recede from House Amendments 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 999. All

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

those in favor say 'aye', those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it, and the House refuses to recede from House Amendments #1 and 2 to Senate Bill 999, and requests a Conference. Senate Bill 1031, Representative Munizzi."

- Munizzi: "Thank you again, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. I

 move to refuse to recede from House Amendment #1 to Senate

 Bill 1031, and ask that it be placed in a Conference

 Committee please."
- Speaker Young: "The Lady moves that the House refuse to recede from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1031. All those in favor say 'aye', those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it, and the House refuses to recede from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1031, requests a Conference. Senate Bill 1073, Representative Saltsman. Out of the record. Senate Bill Representative White. Representative Jesse White. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1231, Representative Kulas. of the record. Senate Bill 1295, Representative Hultgren. Representative Hultgren. Senate Bill 1295. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1393, Representative Preston. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1451, Representative Curran."
- Curran: "Move to refuse to recede from House Amendment 1, Senate
 Bill 1451, and form a Conference Committee."
- Speaker Young: "Mr. Clerk, are there two Amendments...two House

 Amendments on this Bill?"
- Curran: "It is my memory that there's just one House Amendment.

 Representative Hultgren's Amendment."
- Speaker Young: "Okay. The Gentleman moves that the House refuse to recede from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1451. All those in favor say 'aye', those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it, and the House refuses to recede from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

- 1451, and requests a Conference. Message from the Senate. Senate Bill 1393, Representative Preston. On House Supplemental #3, Senate Bill 1393."
- Preston: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I'd move to refuse to recede from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1393, and ask that a Conference Committee be appointed."
- Speaker Young: "The Gentleman moves that the House refuse to recede from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1393. All those in favor say 'aye', those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it, and the House refuses to recede from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1393. Senate Bill 1295, Representative Hultgren."
- Hultgren: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I move that the House refuse to recede from Senate Bill 1295 and request that a Committee of Conference be appointed."
- Speaker Young: "The Gentleman moves that the House refuse to recede from House Amendments #1 and 2 to Senate Bill 1295.

 All those in favor say 'aye', those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it, and the House refuses to recede to House Amendments #1 and 2 to Senate Bill 1295 and requests a Conference. On the Order of Human Services, House Bill 678, Representative Black. 678."
- Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would move to concur with Senate Amendments #1 and 2. This is a companion Bill that you passed two or three hours ago with 88 votes. The only difference in this Bill is it affects group day care homes, rather than family day care homes. The Amendments are identical. Amendment #1 strips out any references to age or categories or groups; Amendment #2 adds an immediate effective date; the underlying Bill raises the threshold from 12 people in a group day care home, licensed group day care home, to 16. I talked with director Sue Suter not

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

more than 30 minutes ago. Let me assure you that the rules that people were talking about will not be filed, there will not be emergency rulemaking, and there will be public hearings involved. Given that assurance, I would hope that you could support me on House Bill 678. Move to concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2."

- Speaker Young: "Gentleman moves that the House concur in Senate

 Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 678. On that question,
 the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Preston."
- Preston: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I have to oppose this concurrence Motion on House Bill 678 for the same reasons that were well discussed before. Without there being any age restrictions, it means there's minimal adult supervision for many young children younger than toddlers. There can be one supervisor for many six, five, four, three, two year olds. There'd be no way in case of an emergency of getting these children out of a day care home, and your...by passing this, which I suspect it will pass, you're going to be endangering the lives of young children, and I think it's inappropriate in the absence of age limitations. So, I'm going to vote 'no', I hope others will also."
- Speaker Young: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 678?'

 Representative Black to close."
- Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Let me just set the record straight. We don't need to go through what we went through on House Bill 677. There isn't anything in this Bill that's going to endanger any child. There are no categories. There's nothing in here except raising the base limit. I ask for your support, and I was very pleased that Representative Preston was a co-Sponsor of 677. I would ask for your favorable consideration of this Bill."

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

- Speaker Young: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 678?' All those in favor vote 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 91 voting 'yes', 17 voting 'no', 5 voting 'present', and the House does concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 678, and this Bill having received the required Constitutional Majority is declared passed. House Bill 1431, Representative Sieben."
- Sieben: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would move that the House not concur in Amendment #2. We not concur in Amendment #2."
- Speaker Young: "The Gentleman moves that the House not concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 1431. All those in favor say 'aye', those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it, and the House does not Concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 1431. On House Supplemental Calendar #1 appears Senate Bill 616, Representative Keane."
- Keane: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I refuse to recede from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 616, and request a Conference Committee."
- Speaker Young: "The Gentleman moves that the House refuse to recede from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 616. All those in favor say 'aye', those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it, and the House refuses to recede from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 616, and requests a Conference. Also on Supplemental #1 appears Senate Bill 631, Representative Keane."
- Keane: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I refuse to recede from House Amendment #1 and request a Conference Committee be appointed."
- Speaker Young: "Supplemental #1."

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

Keane: "That's on Supplemental #2."

- Speaker Young: "Supplemental #2, excuse me. The Gentleman moves that the House refuse to recede from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 631. All those in favor say 'aye', those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it, and the House refuses to recede from House Amendment #1 to 631, and requests a Conference. On Supplemental #3, Senate Bill 872, Representative Keane."
- Keane: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I refuse to recede from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 872, and request a Conference Committee be appointed."
- Speaker Young: "The Gentleman moves that the House refuse to recede from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 872. All those in favor say 'aye', those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it, and the House refuses to recede from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 872, and requests a Conference. On House Supplemental Calendar #1, Senate Bill 1218, Representative Keane."
- Keane: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I refuse to recede from House Amendment #3, and request a Conference Committee be appointed."
- Speaker Young: "The Gentleman moves that the House refuse to recede from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1218. All those in favor say 'aye', those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it, and the House refuses to recede from House Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 1218, and requests a Conference. On the Order of nonconcurrence, Senate Bill 1079, Representative Williams."
- Williams: "I move that we refuse to recede from House Amendment #3, and that a...well, I refuse to recede from House Amendment..."
- Speaker Young: "Page 16 of the Calendar, Senate Bill 1079."
 Williams: "I move that we refuse to recede from House Amendments

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

#1 and 2 of Senate Bill 1079, and that a Conference Committee be appointed."

Speaker Young: "The Gentleman moves that the House refuse to recede from House Amendments 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 1079.

All those in favor say 'aye', those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it, and the House refuses to recede from House Amendments 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 1079, and requests a Conference. On page 3 of the Calendar appears Senate Bill 45. Representative Kubik."

Kubik: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker..."

Speaker Young: "Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 45, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Purchasing Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Young: "Representative Kubik."

Kubik: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 45 is a Bill which has Amendment #1 on it, which incorporates 13 substantive Bills introduced by the Governor to implement major elements of his fiscal year '92 budget. It is an agreement...Amendment #1 is an agreed Amendment between the Speaker of the House and Minority Leader Daniels to implement some budget cuts. The total savings of those budget cuts would be 387 million, 900 thousand dollars. I would move for the adoption of Senate Bill 45."

Speaker Young: "Speaker Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in support of the passage of Senate Bill 45 as amended. As you know, this is the first step in the budget reduction process as proposed by the Governor. None of this will be easy; none of this will be pleasurable, but given the condition of the state treasury, given the expectation that we are looking at a budget shortfall now of one point seven billion dollars, I think we have no

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

choice but to begin this process and to support this Bill, and I would recommend an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Young: "Minority Leader Daniels."

Daniels: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of House. agree with the Speaker's comment and want to endorse and encourage the passage of this legislation. I would only add to his comments the monumental task in front of us and this is a first step towards that. We of course must cut, I believe the figure to be \$1.8 billion, deals with the revenue shortfall since March 6, of \$350 million; and at the same time we must do that within the confines of the structure of our Revenue Act as it is today in terms of the dollar amount, not increasing the burden on Illinois taxpayers. I hope when this is all over that education remains at its current level, and I hope that we are able to enact continued agreements between both sides of the aisle. As you know, the contents of this Amendment were sponsored earlier by this side of the aisle, and I commend the Speaker for joining with us to strive for a bipartisan agreement. I think it's the right way to go, the proper way to go, and I look forward to continued progress in our negotiations."

Speaker Young: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Santiago."

Santiago: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. First of all, I would like to request that my name be removed as a Co-Sponsor of this Bill. Secondly, I know that an agreement has been reached between the Minority Speaker and Speaker Madigan, but I think that someone should stand up and represent the interests of the poor people that are going to be affected by these drastic cuts. No one is saying how much they're cutting. I have an analysis here that says that we're cutting \$387 million, and this is just the first step in

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

the battle to add sufferage to the poor people in the State Illinois, and most of those...those people, individuals live in my district and in the minority districts...in the minority areas of the City of Chicago. We're using the minority...the...the poor people as guinea pigs for a budget process. There are other solutions. There are other alternatives. Why cap the circuit breaker? Why cut the children and family services program and reducing it from taking individuals that are 21 years old and putting them out in the streets? That's what you're going to do. And where are all these individuals going to They're going to go into my neighborhood, into some of your neighborhoods, and they're gonna get guns and buy dope because they need to survive. And most of these kids don't have the skills, do not have the ability, do not have the knowledge to survive in this social and economic problems that we're having. And where are they going to survive? They're going to have to go out in the streets and try to find some money and some economic resources to try to live and survive. What's going to happen? These kids are going end up in the county jail, in the state penitentiary, and that's gonna cost the State of Illinois more money, and it's gonna cost them, instead of \$5 million, it's gonna the state maybe \$30, \$40 million, because it takes an average prisoner, to keep a person in jail, about \$28,000 a year, and no one mentions that. Why? Because we made a a deal was made, and the solution of the deal was...that was made, and the deal was...the result of deal was, let's sacrifice the poor, let's hit 'em over the head because they're poor. Ladies and Gentlemen, where are your hearts? Remember that you are affecting children, senior citizens, people in nursing homes. Now, are we going to let this happen? Well, I'm certainly not going to

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

let this happen, because I stand up for the rights of those people that are poor and those people that are needy and people that are really struggling. We have an economic problem in this nation. Inflation is rising, and you people (especially in my community) that are barely making it right now, as it is, and where are the rest of the people that are on public aid when you start cutting, where are they going to go? There's no jobs. Are they going to go McDonald's? Are they going to go to a Wendy's and get a \$4.45 an hour job? Where are you going...where...how are they going to survive? I hope that you change your mind and, remember, vote for your constituents. I know Speaker has to do what he has to do. I commend the Minority Leader and Speaker for trying to reach an agreement. is the wrong agreement, but you have to do Ιt what you have to do, and I'm going to do what I'm going have do, and I'm going to urge everyone here to put their...hearts in their hands and think of those people; the hungry, the homeless, the senior citizens, the people in nursing homes. Think of them before you cast your vote. I urge a 'no' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Young: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Schakowsky." Schakowsky: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. There are those who have cautioned me as a freshman to do what I have to do but to be quiet about it, that I was elected to stand up for certain feel things, and I feel that I have to speak out against this Senate Bill 45. Were it not for three items, I would be happy to vote for it, because I think it is important make some cuts, but one item, the cut in the Pharmaceutical Assistance Program, will effect 80,000 senior citizens and take \$46 million out of their pocket that would otherwise be to buy much needed lifesaving medication. spent

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

Inflation is going to take away about 10% of that a year, and so we're going to keep losing people who need this Pharmaceutical Assistance Program to live. They're people in your district. Secondly, the...the portion that cuts the 18 to 21 year olds: these are our children, figuratively, but literally. These are children that are wards of the state, who have been victims of abuse neglect, and now they're in our care. Think of your own children. We can't turn these 19 year olds loose without any shelter, without any support and without any services; and, finally, the Substance Abuse Program for General Assistance recipients. This is a...not a well drafted piece of this Amendment. This would hurt those people who need our help to get back into the work force. It is not well crafted. I urge a 'no' vote so that we have time to reconsider these cuts so that we can figure out another formulation so that maybe we can still make some of cuts but not in such a grim and heartless way. I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Young: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Shaw."

Shaw: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House.

My first request: I would request my name be removed from this Bill because this was a decent Bill when I added my name to the Bill. It dealt with amending the Illinois Purchasing Act to require the state to maintain no more than a year's supply of...supplies, but certainly I would ask you to remove my name from this...from this Bill, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker. Could I get my name removed from this Bill, here? And, certainly, I like...I'm like others that have spoke before me, I don't see...I don't see how, with the hard time that the senior citizens are having today, I don't see how you could eliminate approximately \$45 million from the Circuit

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

Breaker Program. I just don't understand this. Certainly, I'm for a tax increase to take care of the...the people's this state, and I'm for increasing the taxes, business of not just the surcharge, because I think that's what's here you're going to balance this budget, and but we are attempting to do that here today on the backs poor people and people, many of those people does not have a voice in Springfield here, and some of us will vote take...remove the services that we are now providing for senior citizens and young people who cannot help themselves. 1 would ask this Body to take a serious look at these...at this Amendment...Amendment 1 to Senate 45, because I think you are cutting at the heart of people that have done so much for this...state, who have taxes, who have paid their dues, but yet today, and most many of these people are on fixed incomes, can't help themselves. You are cutting the nursing home program by, I think, approximately \$27 million. These are people that cannot help themselves. I don't see how anyone in good conscience can cut this type of program, and I would ask the Members of this General Assembly to take a hard look at You...As others have said, young people, you are removing money and throwing them in the street; you are reducing the age from 21 to 19; that is unfortunate. we...what are we supposed to do? Crime is running rampant in the street, but now here we are going to Department of Children and Family Services to kick out all of those youngsters that are over 19 years old. is no jobs in many of these communities, but we're going to them out in the street. You're not going to provide put any general assistance for these people, young people, you're out in the street. The little paycheck that the men and women are working for in this state, they'll need an

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

armed guard to take it home with 'em if you cut all of these programs as you...have this Amendment on the desks of all of the Legislators here. So, I ask Members of this Body to take a serious look at this and think of your own family. Would you vote to do this to your own family and people that you know around this state, and is that really what the people of this state sent us here for? Take a look at it, and I ask...I think it should be voted down, this Amendment."

Speaker Young: "Representative Saltsman."

Saltsman: thank you, Mr. Speaker. "Yes, Just a year and a half ago, we came to an agreement and we negotiated a increment financing district reform package, and it's only been into effect one year. If you people have a district in your area, you can plan on paying those bonds off with real estate taxes. Somewhere the money's gonna have to come from if this cap is put on. We haven't even given this reform package a chance to work as of yet, and again, to take this money away from these municipalities that we've made a commitment to, not once when we Bill in, not twice when it first came out and not the third time after we came with Tax Increment Financing Reform Act. We haven't even give it a chance to operate, and now you're putting a cap on these cities that have already purchased these bonds, and it's going to put them in a position that, like I said before, will raise their real estate taxes. With this Amendment on here anyone who has a tax increment financing district in their legislative district, I'm urging you to vote 'no' until this part of this Amendment is released."

Speaker Young: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Morrow."

Morrow: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the

House. I was looking through what is in Senate Bill 45,

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

and I remember when the leader of this state, the Governor of this state, said he was going to streamline DC...DCCA.. DCCA, and DCCA is a part of Senate Bill 45, but they're only going to streamline \$8 million out of almost a billion dollar agency. Layoff notices are being sent to various employees throughout this state, and we're talking about streamlining DCCA, and DCCA's hiring people. Yes, hiring people! They're not streamlining; they're adding on. I look where they're going to cut substance abuse programs for people that are on general assistance. Well. I guess we're going to be adding some money for...to build new jails around here, 'cause what's going to happen to those people on general assistance, and woe be they happen to be a single adult, because now they won't have any medical coverage, they won't be able to for their drug problem, so what are they gonna do? They gonna hit you or me over the head for some money, then when they're in jail, they're not gonna be able to get treated. So, what's gonna happen when they come out of jail? They're gonna come out, hit you over the head again, smoke some more dope, go back in jail. That means we're going to have to build some more prisons. It's a vicious cycle that Senate Bill 45 is about to create, not only on the people of my district, but on the people of each and every one of your districts in here. Drug abuse every district in here. Senior citizens: you're gonna cap pharmaceutical assistance at \$400. It is shown here over...almost 50,000 seniors spend over \$600 a year for pharmaceutical assistance, 50,000 taxpaying citizens. We're talking about public aid citizens. not Fifty thousand taxpaying citizens. They said that there was an agreement made between the leadership of the House. Well, I say to the leadership, you didn't get to be a leader

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

without our votes. You didn't get to be a leader without our help and our support, but when our people that we represent need our help and our support, our leadership lets us down. I know leadership has the votes to pass Senate Bill 45, and I know there's gonna be a press release saying about how difficult it was for me to make these cuts and I'm sorry I had to make these cuts; but, you know, there's a saying out here, 'Eventually you got to come my way,' and that day is gonna come that you're gonna have to come my way. Thank you very much."

Speaker Young: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Balanoff."

Balanoff: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I also rise in opposition to Senate Bill 45, and I won't go down the specific areas of concern regarding the cuts, because previous speakers have done a very adequate job. But balancing the budget on the backs of working people, poor people and senior citizens living on fixed incomes, is absolutely wrong, but what is also wrong is to try to work out the budget piecemeal. The budget of the State of Illinois must be considered as a whole, looking at revenue and spending in total and then negotiating with everything on the table. And I urge all of us to vote 'no' so we can get down to seriously looking at the budget and solving the crisis that we face."

Speaker Young: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Jones."

Jones: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I rise in support of the senior citizens in the...in the State of Illinois. You know, I'm very confused at this time. I have the Minority Leader on my right telling me not to trust the leader on the left. I don't know who in the hell to trust at this point. They both get together and screw all of us and don't even kiss us, okay! At this point, I-

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

guess we're supposed to go back...go back to my district and tell a senior citizen that's 85 years old, 'Don't you go over \$400 a year for your medicine, and if you do, to hell with you, you go on and die!' Well, I want you to know this is not a black and white issue; this is not a Hispanic issue; it is not a Republican issue or a Democrat issue, it's a human issue; and if you can stand up here for the people that sent you down here to this (I don't know what it is) this House, to represent them and you can tell senior citizens, 'You can only...we will only let you have \$400 worth of medicine.' I know seniors...I have a uncle who is 85 years old who has one prescription that costs Now, I'm going to tell him, 'Use this wisely because \$79. this state will only let you have \$400 worth of medicine.' You know at this point I don't know who the minority is. You're not the minority; they ain't the minority; I guess I'm the minority; and I'm getting screwed by everybody!"

- Speaker Young: "The Gentleman from Will, Representative Wennlund."
- Wennlund: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move the previous question."
- Speaker Young: "The Gentleman moves the previous question. The question is, 'Shall the previous question be put?' All those in favor say 'aye', those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair...in the opinion of the Chair the 'nos' have it and the previous question is not put. The Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative...the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Levin."
- Levin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The fiscal crisis that we faced has forced us to take a fundamental look at everything that we've done, every dollar we've spent. One thing it's led us to do is to ask the question, 'Why do we have government?' After

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

all, we're talking about expenditures by the State of Illinois. Maybe I have a 19th century idea of government, but I think it has an obligation to provide basic services, sustenance to people so they have a roof over their head, they have basic food on the table, they have basic access to medical care so they can survive. Applying that 19th century concept of government, Senate Bill 45 dismally fails. Why do we have government at all? Why are we having a budget at all, if we're not going to meet our obligations to those who cannot take care of themselves? I urge that we defeat Senate Bill 45 and we go back to the drawing boards and find the cuts that going to violate our basic charter and commitment to people of this state."

Speaker Young: "Representative Kubik to close."

Kubik: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. First of all I'd like to respond to a couple of...a couple of statements that have been made by people debate. Ladies and Gentlemen, this particular Bill will cut approximately \$387...\$388 million out of the budget. we take the approach of some of these speakers who Ιf have..who have gotten up to oppose this Bill, we would add \$60 million back, \$60 million back. Doesn't make sense. We've got...we're facing a crisis. Everybody likes to the term 'a crisis'. Ladies and Gentlemen, we really do have a crisis in this state, and this is the first and believe me, this is probably going to be one of the easier votes you're going to have in the next couple of I don't think there's anyone on this House floor who wants to cut these programs. Not a one person! particularly, am concerned about what this program...what this Bill does to senior citizens. I've got a lot of senior citizens in my district, and they're going to be

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

affected by this Bill, but the bottom line is we don't have the money, and if we don't have the money, the only way we can run this state is to cut the budget. yesterday that we have an additional 350 million shortfall. Bill cuts \$387 million out of the budget, yesterday we see that we have a \$350 million additional shortfall, so we haven't even begun to carve into budget problem that we face. I have a great deal of empathy for some of the previous speakers on the other side of the aisle who have been opposed to this Bill. I've supported a lot of those concepts, and...each one taken singularly is a good concept, but the bottom line is we're all gonna have to bear the brunt of these cuts. Now, the reality is that this budget has been said to have been balancing the budget on the backs of the poor. The problem we face, Ladies and Gentlemen, is that almost \$5 billion of our budget is in public assistance, almost \$5 billion. is the largest part of our budget, and therefore part we have to cut. None of these cuts are going to be easy, but I tell you it's a good start. I would like to compliment both the Speaker of the House and the Minority Leader and the Governor. I don't think that either one of these two Gentlemen want to see this budget cut, and I know that it's always a heck of a lot easier to say, 'yes' than 'no'...on...on Bills. In this case, we've got to cut budget. This is a good start. It is a start. It's not going to get better folks, it's gonna get tougher! submit that this is a balanced Bill, and I would urge your support of Senate Bill 45."

Speaker Young: "The Gentleman moves for the passage of Senate
Bill 45. All those in favor vote 'yes', those opposed vote
'no'. The voting is open. This is final passage. Have
all voted who wish? Representative Balanoff.

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

Representative Hicks to explain his vote."

- Hicks: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. You know, Representative Kubik, you're exactly right! None of us want to vote for cuts, three hundred and eighty some odd million dollars. Let me tell you, in 1983, the first major piece of legislation that I sponsored in this House, that passed, was the Pharmaceutical Assistance Bill. It started in 1983. If you think I want to cap it, don't, but the reality is, folks, this vote, in the end, is going to be forgotten because we're \$2 billion short You're a long way. This is the easiest vote you're going to take in the next two weeks when it comes to the The reality is we have to do it; we don't have any choice. You're going to make a lot tougher votes in the next few days. It's nothing anybody likes; it's nothing anybody wants to do, but voting for a tax increase is much more difficult for me and for a lot of other people, voting to take care of this responsibility that we have. If you don't want to take care of the responsibility we have to pay our bills and to balance this budget, then you don't have any business here. You better do the responsible thing, and that's what you have to do with this vote by voting for it. Thank you."
- Speaker Young: "Have all voted who wish? Have all...Representative Balanoff, for what purpose is your light on?"
- Balanoff: "If this should happen to receive 60 votes, we'd like to verify it."
- Speaker Young: "Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. Representative Balanoff, do you withdraw your request for a verification? On this Bill...Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill there are 60 voting 'yes', 49 voting 'no', 7 voting 'present'. Senate Bill 60, having

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

received the required Constitutional...Senate Bill 45, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 15 of the Calendar appears Senate Bill 972, Representative Steczo. Out of the record. On the order of a concurrence appears House Bill 762, Representative Lang. Page nine of the Calendar."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Lang: House. I move to concur with Amendments 1 and 2 to House This is a increase in the court fees for the Bill 762. circuit court of Cook County. And to those that say why should we vote for this, let me tell you that when I first...when I first got these Amendments from the Senate, said these are outrageous. These are too large, these are too many, too much money. It's bad for litigants. It's bad for lawyers. After negotiation with the county with all the responsible parties, we now believe that this a way for the county to raise a few bucks and to not hurt litigants and to not hurt attorneys. The Association is not opposed. There will be a Conference Committee Report on another Bill which exempts all municipalities and all school districts from these fee increases. I ask your 'aye' votes."

Speaker Young: "The Gentleman has moved that the House concurs in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 762. On that question, Representative Black."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield? Representative, in all the confusion and noise, I just want to make sure your Bill only affects fees in Cook County."

Lang: "That's correct."

Black: "Thank you."

Speaker Young: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur...Representative Lang did you wish to close? The

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 762?' All those in favor vote 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 80 voting 'yes', 28 voting 'no', 6 voting 'present'. The House does concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 762 and this Bill having received the required Constitutional Majority, declared passed. On the Order of Criminal Law -Concurrence, appears House Bill 316. Representative Homer."

Homer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would move to concur with Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 316. This is the Statewide Grand Jury Bill. Senate Amendment =1 provided specifically that the venue...that the Supreme Court upon application of the Attorney General for the convening of a grand jury would appoint a circuit judge in the where the venue is sought instead of any circuit judge. And also, establishes prerequisites for the application, including a statement by the Attorney General that all state attorneys in each county in which an offense may have then occurred, under which there will be an investigation, has consented or in the absence of that, is showing of good Amendment #2 provides that, if there is to be a grant of transactional immunity, that it...by the Statewide Grand Jury, it shall only be done with the consent of any and all State's Attorneys which would have jurisdiction in their counties to prosecute that offense, and provides that any granting of use immunity would have to be done in consultation with the State's Attorneys. This Bill does not, let me emphasize, does not in any way establish use immunity or create use immunity. The Bill is completely silent with respect to that issue and the Senate Amendment

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

#2 specifies that...that as I indicated. I would strongly
urge the concurrence in Senate Amendments #1 and 2."

Speaker Young: "The Gentleman moves that the House concur in

Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 316. On that
question the Gentleman from DuPage, Representative

McCracken."

McCracken: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in opposition to this Bill, as I have for a number of years now, regardless whether the Sponsor or the person behind the Bill is Republican or Democratic. I suggest to both sides of the aisle, this is not a vote that should be made on the basis of political accommodation. Do not defer merely because it is your Attorney General this time around who wants the Bill. When it was my Attorney General, no wait, I was too young for that. Wait let me think about this. It's never been my Attorney General, but it was my Governor last year, he wanted it, I voted 'no'. I suggest that it is still the right vote, 'no'. And let me tell you about the Senate Amendments my friends. The Senate may have taken out the use immunity but another Bill has already passed both Houses and is on the Governor's desk which provides for use immunity in drug prosecutions. It would be available to this Attorney General to use and would not be limited merely because use immunity is not included particular Bill. This Bill is no better by virtue of the Senate Amendments. A Republican Amendment was put on, I agree it gives the State's Attorneys a little more say over this, but it still remains the fact that this is the Attorney General's Statewide Grand Jury. No amount of pussyfooting with the issue is going to change that fact. This Bill was bad when it started. It was bad when Governor Thompson wanted it. It was bad when Ty Faner wanted it. It's bad today now that Roland Burris wants it.

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

Don't kid yourself, even if it's your party today, this can be used against you at the next election. Don't kid yourself. Say 'no' to this bad Bill. Say 'yes' to freedom, say 'yes' to liberty, say 'yes' to everything you believe in. Say 'no' to this Bill."

Speaker Young: "The Gentleman from Will, Representative Wennlund."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Wennlund: House. I often wonder how many times we're going to see this Bill before we get out of this town. But, it's back Just remember what Representative Dunn earlier, the Bill regardless of whose hands it may be in, whether it's Republican or Democrat, can and possibly could cause a problem for each and every Member of this General And it could be used politically. Assembly. remember that your State's Attorney is doing a good job. Drug arrests are up tremendously out of all the 28...29,000 people that we have in the Department of Corrections today, 85% of those in the last 5 years have been drug arrests. They are doing an adequate job. In addition to that remember that if you're prosecuted in more than one county, which will be the instance, that sentences will be higher and longer and there'll be multiple convictions. State's Attorneys of Illinois, all 102 of them, are doing an excellent job regardless of their party because they're professionals. They were elected by the people in their county to prosecute drug offenses in their county, and they ought to remain that way. There is absolutely no necessity for this Bill. Talk to your State's Attorney and see they feel about it. In fact, this Bill slaps every State's Attorney in the face and says, you're not doing an adequate job when you and I know, in fact, that they are doing an adequate job. Let's get rid of this Bill once and for all

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

again and vote 'no'."

Speaker Young: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative McAuliffe."

McAuliffe: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of I would like to relate a story that happened the House. here 19 years ago when the Attorney General's name was Bill Scott. And it was a very close vote on the Statewide Grand Jury Bill which he was pushing very hard. He called myself and Senator Geo-Karis off the floor into Fred Selcke's office, he was Clerk of the House then, and he said that if we didn't vote for the Grand Jury Bill he was going to come into our districts in the next primary election and beat us in the primary. About ten years later I ran into Bill Scott in the lobby of the State of Illinois Building. that time he was State Treasurer, I believe, and he had just had an encounter with a Federal Grand Jury and I asked him what he thought of the Grand Jury System now. can tell you that he had a very different opinion of the Grand Jury System after he had been a victim of it what he had 19 years ago, and he was very much opposed to I was opposed to it then, I was opposed to it when Ty Faner and Thompson were Governor and I'm opposed to it now."

Speaker Young: "The Gentleman from Lee, Representative Myron Olson."

Olson. M.: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Having had the good fortune to have served in a court system where we have hard working prosecutors, assistants, judges, support services, it is very oblivious to me that this program is not designed in the best interest of the people whom we elect in our respective jurisdictions to serve us well, but rather it could become a vehicle for someone who has purposes in mind

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

that is not in the best interest of all of us. I would recommend a strong 'no' vote again on this measure."

Young: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Giglio." Giglio: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. You know, I've been around here almost 19 years and I don't know what it is, every...every person that becomes the Attorney General wants to put a Bill across like this. You know, I wonder if everybody realizes what this does. You talk about being...being attacked by government or being hit by government, you have to have a close call with the law to see what government can do and what the police can do and what the attorneys can do when something happens. If you think that it's bad now, wait till Bill passes and if it does, if you want to have your phones tapped and everything else and have yourself on the carpet. have to have some close calls and I've had some close calls and I'm the first one to say, a lot of times, I'm not fond of a lawyer. But, I'll tell you when you get trouble, you better have one and you'll need one. And if you vote for something like this, you're going to be in deep trouble. This is bad bad Bill. It's a bad precedent and it ought to be voted down."

Speaker Young: "Representative Homer to close."

Homer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I've stood here and listened to these comments in utter bewilderment. I guess I understand some of the opposition from the other side because they are concerned that the Attorney General, who happens to be a Democrat, might be able to use this Bill in some way to advance his political fortunes. I'm convinced that that is the sole thrust behind that opposition. This Bill is supported, Ladies and Gentlemen and Members on the other aisle, you were asked to talk to your State's Attorney, those of you who reside in DuPage County, you should be

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

informed that your State's Attorney, the candidate of your party for Attorney General, has endorsed House Bill 316 as Jim Ryan endorses this Bill and supports it as an effective tool against drug trafficking in this state. let's put to bed the idea that State's Attorneys are against this. This Bill is endorsed by a great many State's Attorneys. It's endorsed by the State Appellate Prosecutor who supports those State's Attorneys. It's endorsed by the Illinois Association of Chiefs of Police. It's endorsed by the Illinois Sheriff Association and many many other leaders in the effort in the war against drugs. Why do they support it? Because they know that this is the missing link in the war against drugs. It's estimated that the Attorney General through the use of the Grand Jury will be able to enforce their narcotics forfeiture laws and take twenty million dollars a year away from drug dealers, through drug profits, confiscation and drug assets. will be done with those twenty million dollars? They'll be used for drug enforcement, to pay the costs and to pay drug education, drug prevention and drug treatment in our...in our communities. During the presentation of this Bill in the Senate Judiciary Committee, the Attorney General of South Carolina testified. He has...their implemented Statewide Grand Jury two years ago, a small State of South Carolina. He testified that in those years, with only two people in that office, charges this, they've shut down eleven different drug rings in State of South Carolina, including one drug cartel that has its origins and traces to the Escabar Cartel in Bogota, Colombia that they put out of business and shut down taken the assets from and used for drug enforcement and drug treatment. This Bill is carefully crafted. limited in scope to drug prosecutions only and it is

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

something that we very much need if we're going to be effective on the war on drugs. I urge your support and your concurrence of Senate Amendments #1 and 2."

Speaker Young: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 316?' All those in favor vote 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 56 voting 'yes', 56 voting 'no', and the House...Representative Homer requests a Poll of the Absentees."

Clerk Leone: "Representative Hicks is not voting. The other Members are excused absences."

Speaker Young: "Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question
 there are 56 voting 'yes', 56 voting 'no', 3 voting
 'present'. And the House does..."

Homer: "Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Young: "Representative Homer."

Homer: "I have a parliamentary inquiry."

Speaker Young: "State your inquiry."

Homer: "It's my understanding that...that these Motions on concurrence are renewable. Is that correct?"

Speaker Young: "That is correct."

Homer: "So...so, in other words, so that it's not necessary to put the Bill on Postponed Consideration if it doesn't get the requisite votes?"

Speaker Young: "That is correct. Representative Rice votes 'no'.

Representative Deering votes 'aye'.

Homer: "So, so that I would have a recorded Roll Call...since I would not have to put it on Postponed Consideration?"

Speaker Young: "That's correct. The Motion is renewable."

Homer: "Thank you. Wait just a moment, I understand my options but I would ask for your indulgence for a moment."

Speaker Young: "As long as the Motion is not dilatory you can

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

bring it again. Mr. Clerk, take the record. Representative Laurino votes 'aye'."

Homer: "Sir, wait, Sir, Sir, whoa...I didn't...I didn't get my answer."

Speaker Young: "I did not take the record. Representative Keane votes 'aye'. I did not announce a Roll Call. Representative Madigan, Speaker Madigan. Marinaro votes 'aye'. Representative Giglio."

Giglio: "Did you call me? How am I recorded?"

Speaker Young: "You're recorded as voting 'no'.

Giglio: "Alright, leave it that way."

Speaker Young: "Representative Homer, for what purpose do you seek recognition? Representative Stern, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Stern: "Mr. Speaker, under duress, under duress will you change my vote to 'aye'.

Speaker Young: "Representative Regan, for what purpose do you seek recognition? Representative Stern voted 'aye'.

Representative Hicks."

Hicks: "Mr. Speaker, how am I recorded?"

Speaker Young: "How is Representative Hicks recorded?"

Clerk Leone: "Representative Hicks is not recorded as voting."

Hicks: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Vote me 'aye', please."

Speaker Young: "Representative Regan. Representative McCracken."

McCracken: "Yes, thank you, I'd like to verify the Roll Call."

Speaker Young: "Representative Black. Would you poll the affirmative vote?"

Clerk Leone: "Poll of those voting in the affirmative. Balanoff. Brunsvold. Bugielski. Burke. Capparelli. Churchill. Curran. Currie. Davis. Deering. DeJaegher. Farley. Flinn. Giorgi. Granberg. Hannig. Hicks. J. Hoffman. Homer. Shirley Jones. Keane. Kulas. Lang. Laurino. LeFlore. Marinaro. Martinez.

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

Matijevich. Mautino. McAfee. McGann. McGuire. McNamara. McPike. Mulcahey. Munizzi. Novak. Obrzut. Phelan. Phelps. Regan. Richmond. Ronan. Saltsman. Santiago. Satterthwaite. Schakowsky. Schoenberg. Steczo. Stepan. Stern. Turner. Walsh. White. Wolf. Woolard. Anthony Young and Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Young: "Representative Tenhouse, are you seeking recognition? Representative McCracken, you have questions of the affirmative vote."

McCracken: "Yes, thank you, Representative Laurino?"

Speaker Young: "Representative Laurino is at Representative DeLeo's desk."

McCracken: "Representative Churchill?"

Speaker Young: "Representative Churchill. Is the Gentleman in the chamber? Remove him. Churchill."

McCracken: "Representative Preston?"

Speaker Young: "Representative Preston? How is the Gentleman recorded?"

McCracken: "Oh wait, he's a 'no', that's alright. Representative Regan?"

Speaker Young: "Representative Regan. Is Representative Regan in the chamber? How is he recorded?"

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

Speaker Young: "Please remove him."

McCracken: "Representative Keane?"

Speaker Young: "Representative Keane. Representative Keane voted in...He orally voted from the well and there he is."

McCracken: "Representative J. Hoffman?"

Speaker Young: "Representative Hoffman is in his seat."

McCracken: "No he's not but he's here. Representative Steczo?"

Speaker Young: "Representative Steczo is in the rear of the chamber."

McCracken: "Representative Richmond?"

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

Speaker Young: "Representative Richmond is in his seat."

McCracken: "Where are all the civil libertarians that inhabit your party? Are they here by any chance? Representative Martinez?"

Speaker Young: "Representative Martinez is in the aisle."

McCracken: "That's not...Where is he?"

Speaker Young: "He's in the...He..."

McCracken: "Oh, alright, you thought you fooled me, huh, Miguel?

I knew it wasn't. Representative Shaw?"

Speaker Young: "Representative Shaw is voting 'no'.

McCracken: "Representative White?"

Speaker Young: "Representative White is in his seat."

McCracken: "Representative Kulas?"

Speaker Young: "Representative Kulas is in the rear of the chamber."

McCracken: "Nothing further."

Speaker Young: "Representative Davis votes 'no'. Representative Black."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. In the event that this perhaps will pass and you would so declare, I have a parliamentary inquiry of the Chair. Rule 60...Rule 60 clearly states that, 'after an electrical Roll Call is completely recorded and the record is taken', which I believe you said, 'no Member may change his vote or add his vote 'aye', 'nay' or 'present', if previously not recorded or remove his vote as recorded.' I would like to listen to the tape. You clearly said, 'take the record' and I would ask that the Chair so rule, that these changing of votes is out of order according to our Rule 60. This rule is not suspendable."

Speaker Young: "Representative Rice...Representative Rice votes
'aye'. Representative Preston. Representative Rice votes
'aye' and Representative Preston votes 'aye'. Mr. Clerk,

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

will you take the record, then we will explain the parliamentary inquiry. On this Bill there are 60 voting 'yes', 53 voting 'no' and the House does concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 316. This Bill having...Representative Matijevich."

- Matijevich: "I heard you announce it that time. Having voted on the prevailing side by which this Motion was carried, I move to reconsider the vote."
- Speaker Young: "This Bill having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Now, I make the Motion you just heard."

Speaker Young: "Representative Homer."

Homer: "I move that that Motion lay on the table."

- Speaker Young: "All in favor say 'aye', opposed say...Okay. All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. The Parliamentarian informs us that in terms of Rule 60, it refers to after a vote is announced and declared, that you cannot even take a verification until after a vote is announced and after the record is taken. Representative McCracken."
- McCracken: "I'd like to verify the Motion to table. It takes 60 votes to table. Why is the Parliamentarian going like this?"
- Speaker Young: "It takes a majority of those voting to table. Do you persist in your verification? On the Motion to table there are 66 voting 'yes', 49 voting 'no' and the Motion to table is adopted. Representative Black."
- Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Now either the rules are the rules or they are subject to interpretation. You show me, Mr. Speaker, where does it say the vote is announced ad infinitum, ad infinitum, whatever spin or twist you want to put on it. There isn't anything in Rule

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

60 that says anything about being announced, it says recorded. And I'll make you a bet, if you get the tape, you would see you were on there three times saying take the record, take the record. Now either Rule 60 is enforced or throw the damn rule book away."

Speaker Young: "Speaker Madigan."

- Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate you. No one has been able to do that since 'Zeke' Giorgi many years ago.

 Congratulations!"
- Speaker Young: "House Bill 1982, Representative Bugielski. I thought it was a statement that was not requesting an answer. The vote was never. House Bill 1982, Representative Bugielski."
- Bugielski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I wish to nonconcur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1982."
- Speaker Young: "The Gentleman moves that the House does nonconcur to Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 1982. Representative Kubik."
- Kubik: "Mr. Speaker, I would ask that the Gentleman explain his nonconcurrence Motion. Why is he nonconcurring? Question of the Sponsor?"
- Bugielski: "Representative, I just got word shortly ago that an agreement has been reached between the industry and the Department of Revenue. And they've been working on this for the last three days, and they just came to me and they notified me now, shortly, that an agreement was reached on new wordage, on new wording."

Kubik: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker"

Speaker Young: "The Gentleman moves that the House does nonconcur to Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1982. All those in favor say 'aye', those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it and the House does nonconcur to Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 1982. Agreed

75th Legislative Day
Resolutions."

June 28, 1991

- Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 830 offered by Representative Ryder; 831, J. Hoffman; 832, Novak; 834, DeJaegher; 835, DeJaegher; 836, Daniels; 837, Kulas; 839, Flinn; 841, Shirley Jones."
- Speaker Young: "Excuse me, Mr. Clerk. Minority Leader Daniels." Daniels: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Immediately after Session you'll have an opportunity to join one of Illinois' current leaders and Congressman, Congressman Tom Ewing, at Baur's upstairs for a reception honoring his 17 1/2 years of service to the people of Illinois. And, of course, if you'd like to say a few other things to him as we approach July 2nd, a very important date for him as that is the general election, as seeks his congressional post. So, I'd ask all of you, i f you have an opportunity after Session, Representative Ewing, soon to be Congressman Ewing, at Baur's upstairs, where you can pay honor to him for all his years of service as one of our colleagues."

Speaker Young: "Further Agreed Resolutions."

- Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 842, Burzynski; 843, Flinn and 844, Schakowsky. Also Senate Joint Resolution 72, McAfee."
- Speaker Young: "Representative Matijevich now moves that the Agreed Resolutions be adopted. All those in favor say 'aye', those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it and the Agreed Resolutions are adopted. General Resolutions."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 838 offered by Representative Santiago, and House Resolution 840 offered by Representative Flowers."
- Speaker Young: "Committee on Assignment. Death Resolutions."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 833 offered by Representative Davis, with respect to the memory of Gertrude Shaw

75th Legislative Day

June 28, 1991

Henderson."

Speaker Young: "Representative Matijevich moves that the Death Resolutions be adopted. All those in favor say 'aye', those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it and the Death Resolutions are adopted. Representative Matijevich now moves that the House stand adjourned until 10:00 a.m. tomorrow morning. First Special Session shall now come to order. All in favor of the Motion to adjourn say 'aye', all opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it and the House stands adjourned until 10:00 a.m. in the morning. First Special Session is now in Session. Representative Matijevich now moves that the First Special Session...Oh, The Attendance Roll Call for the Regular Session will be used for the Roll Call for the First Special Session. Representative Matijevich now moves that the First Special Session stands adjourned to the hour of 10:00 a.m. in the morning...to the hour of 10:05. All in favor say 'aye', those opposed say 'no'. And the First Special Session stands adjourned until 10:00 a.m. in the morning."

REPORT: TIFLDAY PAGE: 001

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

92/04/02 15:59:08

JUNE 28, 1991

	20112 201	_	
HB-0012	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	95
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	151
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	165
HB-0065	OUT OF RECORD	PAGE	152
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	119
	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	15
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	65
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	69
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	23
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	188
HB-0316		PAGE	198
	OUT OF RECORD	PAGE	27
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	66
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	28
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	67
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	29
	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	52
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	110
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	152
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	68
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	31
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	32
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	69
	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	16
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	70
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	70
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	170
	OUT OF RECORD	PAGE	93
	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	77
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	136 77
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE PAGE	78
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	78
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	187
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	97
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	35
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	34
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	35
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	53
	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	68
	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	19
HB-1139	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	79
HB-1162	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	80
HB-1216	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	81
HB-1218	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	83
HB-1230	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	84
HB-1268	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	85
HB-1269	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	86
HB-1270	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	86
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	36
	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	21
	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	13
	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	172
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	56
	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	14
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	60
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	37
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	97
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	118
	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	13
	NON-CONCURRENCE NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	14
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE PAGE	18
	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	62 17
110 - 2724	HON CONCURRENCE	PAGE	1,

REPORT: TIFLDAY PAGE: 002 STATE OF ILLINOIS 87TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES 92/04/02

15:59:08

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES DAILY TRANSCRIPTION OF DEBATE INDEX

JUNE 28, 1991

	•		
HB-1608	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	37
HB-1609	NON-CONCURRENCÉ	PAGE	22
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	38
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	22
	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	20
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	111
	NON-CONCURRENCE CONCURRENCE	PAGE PAGE	16 112
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	54
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	150
	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	51
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	113
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	39
	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	27
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	115
	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	21
	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	22
	NON-CONCURRENCE NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	22
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE PAGE	199 115
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	87
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	61
HB-2038	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	92
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	55
HB-2075	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	39
HB-2125	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	14
	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	20
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	87
	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	43
	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	15
	CONCURRENCE CONCURRENCE	PAGE PAGE	88 88
H6-2243	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	43
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	62
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	63
HB-2306	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	44
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	51
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	119
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	120
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	94
	NON-CONCURRENCE CONCURRENCE	PAGE	15
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE PAGE	116 116
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	89
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	90
	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	18
HB-2524	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	117
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	94
	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	15
SB-0010		PAGE	4
SB-0011		PAGE	4
	NON-CONCURRENCE THIRD READING	PAGE	137
SB-0045		PAGE Page	174 5
SB-0130		PAGE	5
SB-0133		PAGE	51
SB-0136		PAGE	166
SB-0249		PAGE	138
SB-0250		PAGE	137
SB-0257		PAGE	6
SB-0264		PAGE	7
SB-0271		PAGE	167
SB-0307		PAGE	138
30-0326	REFUSE TO RECEDE	PAGE	168

REPORT: TIFLDAY STATE OF ILLINOIS 87TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES DAILY TRANSCRIPTION OF DEBATE INDEX PAGE: 003

92/04/02 15:59:08

JUNE 28 + 1991

SB-0446	CONCURRE	ENC	E	PAGE	138
SB-0453	REFUSE 1	rΩ	RECEDE	PAGE	139
	REFUSE T			PAGE	167
SB-0539			WEGEGE	PAGE	8
	REFUSE 1	rn	PECENE	PAGE	172
	REFUSE 1				
				PAGE	139
	REFUSE 1			PAGE	172
	REFUSE T			PAGE	168
	REFUSE 1	_		PAGE	140
	REFUSE 1			PAGE	141
	REFUSE T	ГО	RECEDE	PAGE	142
SB-0703	RECEDE			PAGE	28
SB-0708	REFUSE 7	ro	RECEDE	PAGE	167
SB-0728	REFUSE 1	ГО	RECEDE	PAGE	142
SB-0741	REFUSE 1	го	RECEDE	PAGE	142
S3-0774	REFUSE T	го	RECEDE	PAGE	143
SB-0835		-		PAGE	93
	REFUSE 1	ΓŊ	RECEDE	PAGE	173
	REFUSE 1			PAGE	165
SB-0922			KLCLOL	PAGE	
	REFUSE 1		0.000		8
SB-0972		U	KECEDE	PAGE	143
			D 51165	PAGE	8
	NON-CONC			PAGE	17
	REFUSE T			PAGE	143
	REFUSE T	U	RECEDE	PAGE	168
SB-1009				PAGE	9
SB-1016				PAGE	11
	REFUSE 1			PAGE	143
SB-1031	REFUSE 1	О	RECEDE	PAGE	169
SB-1042	REFUSE 1	О	RECEDE	PAGE	144
SB-1048	REFUSE 1	0	RECEDE	PAGE	145
SB-1071	RECEDE			PAGE	10
SB-1079	REFUSE 1	0	RECEDE	PAGE	173
SB-1147	REFUSE 1	О	RECEDE	PAGE	146
	REFUSE 1			PAGE	147
SB-1192	REFUSE 1	ro	RECEDE	PAGE	148
	REFUSE 1			PAGE	173
	REFUSE 1			PAGE	170
	REFUSE 1			PAGE	148
SB-1329			RECEDE	PAGE	148
SB-1364		u	KECEÜE	PAGE	
	REFUSE 1	rn	DECENE		12
	REFUSE 1			PAGE	170
				PAGE	169
	REFUSE 1			PAGE	149
	REFUSE 1	U	KELEDE	PAGE	149
HR-0767		r .a.		PAGE	4
nK-0161	KE2ULU11	LON	OFFERED	PAGE	3

SUBJECT MATTER

HOUSE TO ORDER - SPEAKER MCPIKE	PAGE	1
PRAYER - PASTOR MERRILL HALL	PAGE	1
PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE	PAGE	1
ROLL CALL FOR ATTENDANCE	PAGE	1
AGREED RESOLUTIONS	PAGE	2
GENERAL RESOLUTIONS	PAGE	2
DEATH RESOLUTIONS	PAGE	2
AGREED RESOLUTION	PAGE	3
REPRESENTATIVE GIGLIO IN THE CHAIR	PAGE	2
REPRESENTATIVE SATTERTHWAITE IN THE CHAIR	PAGE	21
REPRESENTATIVE MATIJEVICH IN THE CHAIR	PAGE	35
REPRESENTATIVE SATTERTHWAITE IN THE CHAIR	PAGE	35
REPRESENTATIVE GIGLIO IN THE CHAIR	PAGE	114
REPRESENTATIVE SATTERTHWAITE IN THE CHAIR	PAGE	118

REPORT: TIFLDAY PAGE: 004

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

92/04/02 15:59:08

JUNE 28, 1991

SUBJECT MATTER

REPRESENTATIVE YOUNG IN THE CHAIR	PAGE	122
AGREED RESOLUTIONS	PAGE	200
GENERAL RESOLUTIONS	PAGE	200
DEATH RESOLUTIONS	PAGE	200
ADJOURNMENT	PAGE	201
FIRST SPECIAL SESSION	PAGE	201
FIRST SPECIAL SESSION - ADJOURNMENT	PAGE	201