140th Legislative Day

June 1, 1994

Speaker Steczo: "The House will come to order. The Chaplain for the day is Rabbi Micheal Datz of Temple B'rith Sholom in Springfield, Illinois. Rabbi Datz is the guest of Representative Curran. All guests in the gallery may wish to rise for the invocation."

Rabbi Michael Datz: "Our God and Creator, we thank you for sense of justice you have implanted within us and which always seeks, though at times haltingly, to express itself in daily life. Make us, oh God, more steadfast in our desire to do Your will. Teach us that the men and women around us are our brothers and sisters, and fill us with such regard and respect for our fellow creatures that we will never wrong them, or exploit them or take advantage of their weakness or ignorance. Kindel in us a passion for righteousness. Grant us the vision to see that only justice can endure and that only in being just to one another can we make our lives acceptable to You. May we, by our thoughts and our deeds, hasten the time when wrong and violence shall cease and justice be established in all the earth. Lord God of Heaven and Earth You are the great timekeeper of the Universe. Scripture exhorts, teach us to number our days that we may get us a heart of wisdom and elsewhere we are reminded that the day is long, time is short, and the workers are weary. Save us from the arrogance which allows us to think that one person's time is more valuable than another's, or that one person's meeting are of greater urgency than another's. Help us always to remember that 12:00 means 12:00. Let justice roll down like waters and righteousness like a mighty stream. And together let us say. Amen."

Speaker Steczo: "We will be led in the Pledge of Allegiance by Representative Novak."

140th Legislative Day

June 1, 1994

Novak- 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."

Kubik: "Mr. Speaker, there are no Republican absences today."

Speaker Steczo: "Representative Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. Representatives Erwin, Jones and Raschke-Lind are all excused today."

Speaker Steczo: "Representative Currie, which Jones?"

Currie: "Shirley Jones."

Speaker Steczo: "Mr. Clerk, please take the record. One Hundred
Fifteen Members having answered the roll call, a quorum is
present. Agreed Resolutions."

Clerk Rossi: "House Resolution 2846, offered by Representative Giglio; House Resolution 2847, offered by Representative Hicks; House Resolution 2848, offered by Representative Novak; House Resolution 2851, offered by Representative Saviano; House Resolution 2852, offered by Representative Saviano; House Resolution 2853, offered by Representative Cowlishaw; House Resolution 2854, offered by Representative Cowlishaw; House Resolution 2855, offered by Representative von Bergen-Wessels; House Resolution 2856, offered by Speaker Madigan; House Resolution 2857, offered by Speaker Madigan; House Resolution 2858, offered by Representative Andrea Moore; Senate Joint Resolution 169, offered by Speaker Madigan; Senate Joint Resolution 170, offered by Speaker Madigan."

Speaker Steczo: "Representative Granberg moves for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. All those in favor will signify by saying 'aye'; those opposed by saying 'no'. The 'ayes'

140th Legislative Day

- June 1, 1994
- have it. The Agreed Resolutions are adopted. Death Resolutions."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Resolution 2849, offered by Representative Novak, with respect to the memory of Arthur P. Durell. House Resolution 2859, offered by Representative Lou Jones, with respect to the memory of Darlene Hanley."
- Speaker Steczo: "Representative Currie moves for the adoption of the Death Resolutions. All those in favor will signify by saying 'aye'; those opposed by saying 'no'. The Death Resolutions are adopted. Mr. Clerk, please read House Resolution 2734. Representative Homer in the Chair."
- Clerk "House Resolution 2734, offered by Representative Homer. WHEREAS, The members of the House were saddened to learn of the death of John Keets of Canton on May 16, 1994 at the age of twenty; and WHEREAS, John Keets, the son of Chuck Keets and Liz Keets, spent the past five years of his life living with AIDS; and WHEREAS, He became nationally known as the AIDS activist after being diagnosed at fifteen with having the disease which he contracted through a blood product; and WHEREAS, John Keets is a hero in the Canton community; he dedicated his life to educate the public about AIDS and AIDS research; he gave personal talks clubs, schools, and organizations; and WHEREAS, In 1991, he the John Keets March for AIDS Research in Lakeland Park, and the John Keets Foundation for AIDS Research and Education was established after that march; and WHEREAS, John Keets leaves a legacy of involvement with AIDS education and research that will long inspire the citizens this State and the nation; and WHEREAS, His concern and determination were his hallmarks, and his every endeavor was characterized by his commitment to those suffering with AIDS; and WHEREAS, His passing is a grievous loss to his

140th Legislative Day

June 1, 1994

family and community, and he will be sadly missed by his father, Chuck Keets; his mother, Liz Keets; his brother, Matthew; his grandmother, Billie Russell; many relatives; and countless friends: therefore, be i t RESOLVED. ву THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE EIGHTY-EIGHTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS. that we express our profound respect for John Keets extend our sincere condolences to his family and friends: and be it further RESOLVED, That suitable copies of resolution be presented to his parents with our deepest sympathy.

"May I have your attention? It's an honor today to have Homer: with me the parents and family of a young man who died on May 16th by the name of John Keets. John was hemophiliac, who learned at the age of 15 that he contracted AIDS, the AIDS virus through blood transfusions. For the next five years of his life, his brief life. spent it in an attempt to educate others and to raise money for AIDS. He appeared on the Phil Donahue show, he was named Extra Ordinary Teen of America by the Noxzema group and each year sponsored a March For AIDS. Last year, I think, it brought in over 10,000 people marching in Canton for AIDS research and AIDS education. He fought a valiant struggle, he's a hero to all who knew him and it is a great pleasure today that I present to you the people that are behind me, Liz and Chuck Keets, will you raise your hands, his parents. His Aunt Renee Lewis, his grandmother, Billie Russell, and his brother Matthew Keets, who is finishing his Freshman year. Matthew is also a hemophiliac who received transfusions, but was fortunate to escape. although it took his brother's life. And I would like Liz to speak to you."

140th Legislative Day

June 1, 1994

Liz Keets: "I prayed all the way down here today about the message John and I spoke in a five county area. And I contemplated on what message John, in heaven, would want me to leave with you today. And if I look out in this group the message I would like to say to you the most is, that each and everyone of you sitting in this room the year 2000 will know someone with AIDS, a family member, a friend, someone close to you will either die of AIDS or you will know them with AIDS. John, when we went public five years ago, we were forced to live a mere five years in fifty years and John, I had written something myself. I often spoke off the cuff and I think the most impact and the thing that I would like to say to you is something that John, he himself, wrote when he started the march and why he wanted to do such and I would like to read that to you. What it's like to have AIDS, you don't feel the pain from the AIDS virus except the mental and emotional The physical pain you feel is from opportunist infections or the side effects from the drugs. You have to be careful for yourself and others always, 24 hours a day, 7 days It's also hard for me to think about the future, I have no idea what's to happen to me, but do any of us? I try to live each day to its fullest. I can't lie to you though, I'm very scared of what might happen soon in Ι know I'm going to heaven when I die so that doesn't scare me, it's just I don't want to leave everyone. My life is just beginning, I don't want to die There are so many things that I want to do yet and see, such as, get married someday and have a good job. To be able to work in a field where I'm helping others. to go places and see things. When I think of this really makes me hurt, knowing that I may not get a chance

140th Legislative Day

June 1, 1994

at life if I shed a tear for everything that hurts, I would probably evaporate. And a message that I would like to give to all of you that John gave the AIDS Foundation of Chicago is, AIDS and what HIV and AIDS prove far too often is that we all much too young to die so old. I watched my otherwise 20 year old son turn rapidly into a 80 year old. And please, please listen to my words and John words of wisdom. Each and everyone of us can make a difference, each and everyone of us, John did and I know others can as well. Thank you for passing the Resolution."

- Homer: "This time I move the passage of House Resolution 2734.

 All those in favor say 'aye'; opposed, 'no'. The 'ayes'
 have it. The Resolution is adopted. Thank you.
 Representative Steczo in the Chair."
- Speaker Steczo: "On the Order of Speakers Table on page 59 of the Calendar appears House Joint Resolution 96, Representative Dart. Representative Dart.'
- Dart: "I believe there's an Amendment to this, if I'm not mistaken."
- Speaker Steczo: "Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Rossi: "Amendment #1, offered by Representative Cross."
- Speaker Steczo: "The Chair recognizes Representative Dart on Amendment #1."
- Dart: "I believe Amendment #1 is a Cross/Dart Amendment and if I'm not mistaken, there is two Amendments and we were going to withdraw Amendment #1 and go with Amendment #2."
- Speaker Steczo: "So the Gentleman withdraws Amendment #1. Mr. Clerk, any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Rossi: "Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Cross."
- Speaker Steczo: "The Chair recognizes Representative Dart on Amendment #2."

140th Legislative Day

June 1, 1994

- Dart: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the Assembly.

 Amendment #2 is...makes a technical change with the Resolution that it was introduced and it deals with the composition of the people who would be involved with this committee. The committee's task is to try to attempt to rewrite the Juvenile Court Act and put a little more predictability into them and I would move for its adoption."
- Speaker Steczo: "Is there any discussion? There being none. All those in favor of the adoption of the Amendment will signify...Mr. Black...we're on the Amendment."
- Black: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. When you say you're on the Amendment, I know you mean you're on the Amendment, unlike the starting time. I'd like to speak to the Amendment."
- Speaker Steczo: "Please proceed."
- Black: "Yes. Will the Sponsor of the Amendment yield. It's Representative Cross."
- Speaker Steczo: "He indicates he will. Representative Cross will yield."
- Black: "I see. Does this have anything...is there anything in the Amendment, I don't have a copy of the Amendment and that's why I'm asking you, is there anything that urges a change in the age of copeability?"

Cross: "I what area?"

Black: "Criminal."

- Cross: "There is nothing spec...there is specific change in the statute in this Resolution."
- Black: "What...what's the purpose of your Resolution...this
 Amendment? What are you attempting to get the Criminal
 Justice Authority to do?"
- Cross: "Well, we are attempting through the Criminal Justice

 Authority and the Juvenile Justice Commission to take into

140th Legislative Day

June 1, 1994

account that the juvenile criminal offender today and see whether or not we need to amend or change the Juvenile Court Act and to address that and evaluate it."

Black: "In other words, you are after, I hope, recognizing that juvenile crimes may be a little different in 1994 than they were in 1950."

Cross: "You're saying it better than I could, Representative.

That is exactly what we are trying to do."

Black: "Do you have a funding mechanism, do you have a sales tax
increase in here to fund juvenile courts?"

Cross: "Not in this Amendment."

Black: "Oh, I see, that must of been another Amendment. I see,
 yes."

Cross: "I think it was."

Black: "Yes. Thank you very much."

Speaker Steczo: "Any further discussion? All those in favor of the adoption of the Amendment will signify by saying 'aye'; those opposed by saying 'no'. The 'ayes' have it.

Amendment #2 is adopted. Representative Dart, on the Resolution as amended."

Dart: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members οf Assembly. the This...this Resolution is rather straight forward in what it is attempting to do and the attempt here is to make a little bit more sense out of our juvenile code right now. And as it presently stands now, there is not a great of rhyme nor reason to how it works and more likely how it doesn't work. And we read and hear about it every...everyday in the papers. What this will attempt to do is by the use of this committee working with task force. which have already been in existence, to evaluate some of the studies that have been done and attempt to put a little bit more predictability into the law and make things...so

140th Legislative Day

June 1, 1994

it makes things, so it makes a little bit more sense in the juvenile code. I would move for its adoption."

Speaker Steczo: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of the Resolution. Is there any discussion? The Chair recognizes Representative Biggert."

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

Speaker Steczo: "He indicates he will."

Biggert: "Representative Dart, you mentioned that you were going to be working with a task force. Is this the family justice task force or is this the juvenile justice task force, or which one is that?"

Dart: "This is the Juvenile Justice Commission. Dale Sigmondson, it was a group that he has been working with for quite a while now, and they have actually issued some reports on setting up tiered systems of dealing with juveniles as opposed to the present system where it doesn't seem to be a great deal of rhyme or reason. That is the primary group that we plan on working with. They have done a lot of work in this area already."

Biggert: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Steczo: "Is there any further discussion? There being none. All those in favor of the adoption of the Resolution will signify by saying 'aye'; those opposed by saying 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Resolution is adopted. 61 of the Calendar under the Order of Motions, Motion with relation to House Joint Resolution 139 by Representative Turner. Pursuant to Rule 77 (a) I move the discharge of the Committee of Health and Human Services from further consideration of House Joint Resolution 139 and advance to the Order of the Speaker's Table. Is there leave for the Gentleman's Motion? There being leave is granted. The Chair objection, recognizes

140th Legislative Day

June 1, 1994

Representative Turner on House Joint Resolution 139. Mr. Clerk, are there any Amendments filed?"

- Clerk Rossi: "Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Turner."
- Speaker Steczo: "The Gentleman wishes to have the Resolution taken from the record. On page 61 of the Calendar on the Order of Motion, appears a Motion with the relationship to...with relationship to House Joint Resolution 154 by Representative Schoenberg. Pursuant to Rule 77 (a) I move to discharge the Committee on Health and Health Care and Human Services from further consideration of House Joint Resolution 154 and advance to the order of the Speaker's Table. Does the Gentleman have leave? There has been an objection. All those in favor of the Motion will signify by voting 'aye'; those opposed by voting 'no'. The voting is open. The Chair recognizes Representative Skinner."
- Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, this Senate Joint Resolution or House Joint Resolution, was...did not make it out of the Health and...Health Care and Wining Committee or whatever we call it. And it didn't make it out despite the fact that the Democrats have a large majority, there must be a reason for that. Why don't we have a committee hearing? We've got all month to do it. There is no reason to bypass committee on this Resolution."

Speaker Steczo: "Representative Schoenberg."

Schoenberg: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Perhaps it would help the people on the other side of the aisle to have a greater comprehension of why they should be voting to discharge committee. I have been working and have been keeping the Members of the Health Care Committee aprized on a weekly basis, of my conversations with Members of our Congressional Delegation.

140th Legislative Day

June 1, 1994

It shouldn't come as any surprise to Representative Skinner or anybody else who sits on the Health Care Committee and I'm sure that Representative Krause can attest to this, that she and I have been working with the Members of the Congressional Delegation to insure that we are able to get more money from Medicaid, from the federal government through a new redistribution formula. Mr. Speaker, I believe if you call on Representative Krause, she will verify this fact and she will speak in support of this measure. And I see no reason why anyone should be opposing this."

Speaker Steczo: "Representative Krause."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I do join in support for this Krause: Resolution. This Resolution addresses a most serious point on behalf of the issue of Medicaid here in Illinois. it strongly urges our Congressmen in Illinois to address the issue that we are funded here at the minimum rate of only 50%. What we are attempting to do here, is to urge our Congressmen to take a serious look, once again, at the amount of funding that is given back to Illinois, to look at that issue and to readdress it so that we could start to receive a greater amount of funding. At this point, we are only receiving the bare minimum. We must be assertive in this area and try to receive more, we are entitled to more. I think that this Resolution would go a long way to putting us on the record with our Congressmen in support of the issue here in Illinois. And I do ask for a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Steczo: "Representative Weller."

Weller: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in support of consideration of this important Resolution. The federal government has shortchanged Illinois for far too long, in fact, Illinois

140th Legislative Day

June 1, 1994

only receives a 50/50 match. States like West Virginia get to 80% of a match from the federal government. Certainly considering the fact that Illinois' population is, considerably, much larger than states such as West Virginia or Mississippi and our urban population is much more diverse. We certainly need a much fairer. responsible reimbursement by the federal government. frankly, if you're concerned about federal mandates you also want to support this legislation because the federal government, particularly the Congress and the Clinton Administration, has passed many mandates down on the State Illinois, including those that effect the Medicaid program. And of course we need to be properly reimbursed by the federal government. So if you're concerned about what the Clinton Administration is doing to the State of Illinois, you want to vote 'yes' on this Resolution."

Speaker Steczo: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 108 voting 'yes', 2 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. And the Motion is adopted. The Chair recognizes Representative Schoenberg on House Joint Resolution 154."

"Thank you. Schoenberg: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies Gentlemen of the House. In asking for your immediate consideration of this matter. Let me articulate something that both Representative Krause and Representative Weller eluded to. Currently we are indeed reimbursed by Medicaid at a rate of 50%. That is largely the result of policy decisions that were made 30 years ago. The general accounting office has issued a report providing for alternative models where states, such as Illinois, could receive significantly more money by changing the

140th Legislative Day

June 1, 1994

variables in the Medicaid reimbursement formula. Depending on which model is adopted, this could be worth anywhere \$152 million to 248 additional Medicaid dollars...million additional Medicaid dollars for the State of Illinois on an annual basis. President Clinton has gone on record indicating, within the last two weeks, indicating that states, such as, Illinois and New York and other states which are reimbursed at a rate of 50% should indeed. as a result of their increased need and their relevant tax basis, should indeed receive higher reimbursement rates. the New York Congressional Delegation can say that they're going to hold out their votes on health care reform because they want more than 50% reimbursement, then we sure as hell better do that in Illinois too. And I favorable vote for this. And let's send the message to our Congressional Delegation which has already sent the letter to President Clinton signed by all but one Member of the Congressional Delegation. That in light οf our circumstances we demand a greater share of the federal pie for Medicaid reimbursement and that we stand together, shoulder to shoulder, Democrats and Republicans, to urge them to get more money and bring it home to address gaping Medicaid haul which currently exists in our budget. Thank you."

- Speaker Steczo: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of House Joint Resolution 154. On that question, is there any discussion? The Chair recognizes Representative Skinner."
- Skinner: "So, let's see, the Congressional Delegation which are the real important players here have already unanimously signed the letter to the effect of this Resolution. Is that correct, Mr. Sponsor? If you will answer that question."

140th Legislative Day

June 1, 1994

Speaker Steczo: "Representative Schoenberg."

Schoenberg: "I'm sorry. Could the Gentleman repeat the inquiry?"

Skinner: "I thought I heard you say that all Members of the

Congressional Delegation had signed a letter to the effect

of the whereas' and the now therefore be it resolved

clauses of this Resolution. They have already sent it to

the President, is that correct?"

Schoenberg: "The letter which has been sent...not exactly, The letter which has been sent to the President has urged him not to delay any further consideration or study. currently exists in the General Accounting Office recommended alternatives. The contents of this Resolution sets up a group of individuals appointed by leadership and also representing the relevant agencies government, to work with our Congressional Delegation, to insure that the relevant legislation is indeed going to be passed in the Congress and that we in Illinois are indeed going to receive a greater share. This compliments the measure which was taken in Washington. And as I indicated and I believe you were present in committee when I've been updating everybody on this, this has been something that all the Members of our Congressional Delegation have concerned with, but particularly the Members on both sides of the aisle, who are currently involved in the markup of the health care reform legislation."

Skinner: "I hope that doesn't come out of my time, all of that answer. It sounds to me like this is the last ripple in the pool after you have thrown a big...after a big rock has been thrown in. Will these folks get junkets to Washington, the people that are appointed to this committee?"

Schoenberg: "Sir, if anybody goes to Washington, it will be at

140th Legislative Day

June 1, 1994

their own expense."

Skinner: "Oh, marvelous. I do not remember having been kept up to date on this Bill and I missed precious little time in the committee during the Senate consideration of these Bills."

Schoenberg: "I will, if I may Sir, I will tell you also that my..."

Skinner: "I haven't asked the question yet."

Schoenberg: "Okay. Well, I'm anticipating what you are going to say but go on."

Skinner: "Did you mean to say, you had kept the Republican Spokesman informed?"

Schoenberg: "I have kept..."

Skinner: "Rather than the Members?"

Schoenberg: "I have indeed given people who have been part of the Sub-Committee on health care reform, weekly updates on the progress of my discussions. If I thought that you were a Member of that Sub-Committee, I apologize if you're not, but I have indeed been attempting to give Members of the committee regular update. And I would encourage you to speak with Representative Krause, who has met with me, and who is privately and publicly worked to insure that we are able to get a greater share of this."

Skinner: "Well, Representative Krause, wasn't the one that made the assertion of the House floor that all the Members had been kept abry...aprized of what you are doing, you did.

Thank you very much."

Schoenberg: "Certainly, Sir."

Speaker Steczo: "Is there any further discussions? There being none. All those in favor of the adoption of this Resolution, this House Joint Resolution, will signify by voting 'aye'; those opposed by voting 'no'. The voting is

140th Legislative Day

June 1, 1994

Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? open. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 114 voting 'yes', none voting 'no', none voting 'present'. And the House Joint Resolution is adopted. On page 61 on the Order of Motion, appears a Motion with relation to House Joint Resolution 159 by Representative Currie. Pursuant to Rule 77 (a), I move to discharge the Committee on Health Care and Human Services from further consideration of House Joint Resolution 159 and advance to the order of the Speaker's Table. Does the Lady have leave? By use of the Attendance Roll Call leave The Chair recognizes is granted. Representative Currie on House Joint Resolution 159."

- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. This
 Resolution creates a task force in the Department of
 Children and Family Services, to look at the question, how
 Federal McKinney Act money is spent to aid the education of
 homeless youngers in our state. Representative Biggert
 joins me as a principle Co-Sponsor of the Resolution. I
 know of no opposition and I would appreciate your support."
- Speaker Steczo: "The Lady has moved for the adoption of House Joint Resolution 159. On that, is there any discussion? There being none. All those in favor of the adoption of the Resolution will signify by saying 'aye'; those opposed by saying 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Resolution is adopted. Let the record show that House Joint Resolution 159 was adopted with...by use of the Attendance Roll Call. The Chair recognizes Representative Granberg."
- Granberg: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. It is...it is my distinct pleasure today and Ladies and Gentlemen if I could have your attention just for a moment. We would like all of us extend a hearty welcome to

140th Legislative Day

June 1, 1994

Mrs. Novak to the floor of the Illinois House. So to Mrs. Novak, we welcome you and hope you can stay all day."

- Speaker Steczo: "On the Order of Senate Bill, Second Reading, State Operations, appears Senate Bill 580, Representative Granberg. Out ٥f the record. Senate Bill Representative Novak. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1730, Representative Churchill. Out of the record. Order of State and Local Government, Senate Bill, Second Reading appears Senate Bill 1181, Representative Wennlund. Wennlund? Out of the record. Senate Bill 1232, Representative Homer. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1595, Representative Cowlishaw. Senate Bill 1595, Second Reading, State and Local Government. Out of Senate Bill 1693, Representative Black. Representative Black."
- Black: "An inquiry of the Chair. As time grows short on this Senate Bill, it is my understanding that the Revenue Committee was suppose to have an Amendment prepared, the Clerk informs me that it hasn't been prepared. So, I hope they will prepare it shortly and we will take the Bill out of the record."
- Speaker Steczo: "The Gentleman wishes Senate Bill 1693 to be taken from the record. On the Order of State and Local Government, Senate Bill, Second Reading appears Senate Bill 1707, Representative Cross. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 1707, has been read a second time previously. Amendments 1, 3, 5, 6 and 7 have been withdrawn. Amendments 2 and 4 have been adopted to the Bill. No Motion are filed. Floor Amendment #8, offered by Representative Lindner."
- Speaker Steczo: "The Chair recognizes Representative Lindner, on

140th Legislative Day

Amendment #8."

June 1, 1994

- Lindner: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Floor Amendment #8 states that when there having...when someone is on bail for a criminal offense, in which the victims of family are a household member and as that is defined in the Code of Criminal Procedure or for a felony. And then he or she is charged with another criminal offense in which the victim is family or a household member or any other felony. While on such release that person must appear before the court before bail is statutorily set."
- Speaker Steczo: "The Lady has moved for the adoption of Amendment #8. On that is there any discussion? There being none. All those in favor of the adoption of the Amendment will signify by saying 'aye'; those opposed by saying 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk, any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Rossi: "Floor Amendment #9, offered by Representative Maureen Murphy."
- Speaker Steczo: "Representative Maureen Murphy. The Lady withdraws the Amendment. Mr. Clerk, any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Rossi: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Steczo: "Third Reading. On the Order of Government Administrations, Second Readings. Second Reading, appears Senate Bill 1715, Representative Hassert. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 1715, the Bill has been read a Second time previously. Amendments 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 were adopted in Committee. A Motion has been filed to table Amendment #5, by Representative Wennlund."
- Speaker Steczo: "Representative Wennlund has moved to table Amendment #5. On that question, is there any discussion?

140th Legislative Day

June 1, 1994

There being none, all those in favor of the Motion, will signify by saying 'aye', those opposed by saying 'no'. The 'ayes' have it the Amendment is tabled. Mr. Clerk, any further Amendments? Or Motions?"

- Clerk Rossi: "Floor Amendment #6, offered by Representative Leitch."
- Speaker Steczo: "Representative Turner, for what purpose do you
 seek recognition?"
- Turner: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. In our law, I know it may be a violation of rules, but I would like for us to welcome the eight grade class, of the Andrew Jackson Language Academy. They are in the gallery, directly to the rear."
- Speaker Steczo: "Amendment #6, Representative Hassert. The Chair recognizes Representative Hassert on Amendment #6."
- Hassert: "This, Amendment #6, amends the Township Code by authorizing township appropriate less than 200,000 during a fiscal year, exclusive of road funds, to levy a tax at a rate sufficient to produce the amount not exceeding \$6,000 to cover the cost of an audit, by a certified public accounted. Performed with the respect to a period ending on or before the last day of the township's fiscal year 1995, authorizes an annal levy to produce the amount, not exceeding \$1,500 in each year, for the audits performed, respects the periods ending on or after the first day of the fiscal year 1996."
- Speaker Steczo: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #6. On that question is there any discussion? The Chair recognizes Representative Granberg."

Granberg: "Thank you, will the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Steczo: "He indicates he will."

Granberg: "Representative is this the initiative, the township officials..."

140th Legislative Day

- June 1, 1994
- Hassert: "Representative I am not sure, this was basically for my understanding used for small townships that have to audit, I am not sure whether township officials are."
- Granberg: "We've seen this before I think, Representative that is
 why for our downstate Members. Because I believe that the
 township officials had a position on this, but I wasn't
 sure if this was, if this was the one or not. So to your
 knowledge they have no position on this Amendment?"
- Hassert: "I do not have knowledge, they might have a position, but I am not sure of it. This is Representative Leitch's Bill."
- Granberg: "Thank you, Representative. Mr. Speaker, I would ask for a Roll Call Vote on this Amendment, though. Thank you."
- Speaker Steczo: "Representative Skinner."
- Skinner: "I wonder if the substitute Sponsor, could tell us if this represents a potential tax increase without a referendum?"
- Speaker Steczo: "Representative Hassert."
- Hassert: "Could you hang on Representative, we're trying to find that answer out for you. Representative Skinner, could you repeat your question please?"
- Skinner: "Yes, I am wondering if this might result in additional tax without a referendum on township taxpayers? I see on page 2, line 34 and page 3 line one, the phrase, 'without approval at a referendum', which makes me somewhat suspicious."
- Hassert: "Representative Skinner, Representative Leitch has come
 on the Floor. Maybe he can explain it a little bit better.
 Thank you."
- Speaker Steczo: "The Chair recognizes Representative Leitch."
- Leitch: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Yes, this is an Amendment that

140th Legislative Day

June 1, 1994

is very much supported by the township officials. It's directed at the smaller townships. It was controversial last year because it would have had higher amounts. The Amendment, and that is to say, last years Amendment would have permitted \$1,500 or up to \$4,500 to cover the audit. What this does, is reduce that amount to \$750, so that these small townships can accumulate some money to pay for their state mandated, CPA audits."

Skinner: "But it is still, without a referendum, right? Is that right, Representative?"

Speaker Steczo: "Representative Leitch, Representative Skinner is asking further questions."

Leitch: "I can't hear him."

Skinner: "As I read this Amendment, it says that you can levy up to \$750 a year, without a referendum."

Leitch: "Yes, that is correct."

Skinner: "Thank you."

Speaker Steczo: "Representative Saltsman."

Saltsman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am definitely in favor of this Amendment. It helps our small townships who don't have a high enough EAV, to work under audit only, this is only for their audit. It does not have anything else to do with road work or anything else. The township officials are asking for this. It helps our small townships, are the only ones that pay. Yet, they have to run over the amount that the EAV sets for them, no other township around them pays, they pay it themselves. This is not a referendum, but it's a good program, and these small townships need this very much, and I am going to ask all the downstaters and people from the northern sections of the state to vote for this because, it just helps our small townships out."

140th Legislative Day

June 1, 1994

Speaker Steczo: "Is there any further discussion? Representative Moffitt."

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

Speaker Steczo: "He indicates he will."

Moffitt: "Can you tell me how many townships this effects in the State of Illinois?"

Leitch: "Just a minute, I don't remember that number, but it is a considerable number. The smaller townships who's populations are...what do we have here, that it impact those townships who's annual budgets are up to \$200,000 a year. So their are a substantial number of very small townships, especially those in downstate Illinois, who very strongly request this, this help to comply with a state mandate."

Moffitt: "Okay, so this would just allow them to comply to meet their obligations of a state mandate?"

Leitch: "That is exactly right."

Moffitt: "So, where we come in, we mandate that they do something but in the past we've not given them a way to pay for it, is that correct?"

Leitch: "That is right."

Moffitt: "Thank you, thank you Speaker."

Speaker Steczo: "Representative Hartke."

"Thank you very, much Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. This Amendment is absolutely necessary for small townships to follow state law and the mandates that we on them. And I think that you are correct, it would be a substantial number of the 1,400 townships. The township officials are in support of this legislation. It was part of their agenda, and I would urge each and every Member, whether they be upstate or downstate. This accountability, in government. We know that when office

140th Legislative Day

June 1, 1994

changes, and so forth, in every four years and in coming supervisor and so forth takes over an audit must be performed. And so we have mandated an audit be performed, this gives them the means and whereabouts to hire a necessary audit, to get the job done and to pay for that. Many of these small townships are really strapped for cash and this could be a great help to them and I support Representative Leitch in the Amendment."

- Speaker Steczo: "Is there any further discussion? The Chair recognizes Representative Hughes."
- Hughes: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Amendment, this did pass out of Counties and Township, overwhelmingly it is supported by township officials and I am aware of no opposition. It does address a serious problem for small rural townships and allows them to meet a mandate that was imposed upon them by the state, and I think it makes a lot of sense and deserves your support."
- Speaker Steczo: "Representative von-Bergen Wessels Wessels."
- von-Bergen Wessels: "Thank you, Speaker. Will the Sponsor
 yield?"
- Speaker Steczo: "He indicates he will."
- von-Bergen Wessels: "Representative Leitch, there has been a lot of discussion about a state mandate on the townships to use a certified public accountant, wasn't the Bill changed last year to just be a public accountant, no longer a CPA?"
- Leitch: "No, it is, at one point it was proposed that way, at the request of the township officials, but after some reflection, we decided not to go ahead and pursue that and that was changed."
- von-Bergen Wessels: "Representative do you know who requested the original legislation or worked on the original legislation that required the CPA?"

140th Legislative Day

June 1, 1994

Leitch: "No, I know where the initial request to comply with this came from, and that was in LaMoille township in Viro County, where I was at a town meeting and this was first brought to my attention by people in that township who have a very little resources with which to operate their township, and they are struggling to keep afloat."

von-Bergen Wessels: "Thank you, Representative. the Amendment. I was first made aware of this mandate if you will, by state government, last year and I discussed it with the township officials and learned that the township officials had actually, that organization had actually worked on this Amendment favored this Amendment. So I am not sure it is a state mandate when the township officials come to us and say, they want this, they want a CPA to audit their books. I think that they wanted it, because of some difficulties in some large townships, not difficulties in small townships, and perhaps it should have been crafted in such a way, as to not effect the small townships at all, where there hadn't been a problem. But I would certainly caution people about a tax increase without referendum, when it is the very organization itself, that it requested the original legislation and now is supporting and backing the non-referendum tax increase."

Speaker Steczo: "Is there any further discussion? There being none, Representative Leitch to close."

Leitch: "Well, this is a classic case of where the state did mandate, and I think mandated for very good reasons. And with the agreement of the township officials, that there be an audit. Because that is a very appropriate piece of business proto-call, to have an audit every four years. But having done so, it is equally appropriate that we enable them the wiggling room to raise \$750 a year to help

140th Legislative Day

June 1, 1994

comply with that mandate and to perform that audit in a professional and responsible fashion. It is a measure that will help good government, it will help us keep financial matters straight in the townships and I would urge your favorable support."

Speaker Steczo: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #6. All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye'; those opposed by voting 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. Representative Hartke. Representative Hartke."

Hartke: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I spoke in debate but I see where there's more red lights than green lights. I guess what we are saying is, that we are demanding that the townships be..."

Speaker Steczo: "Representative Hartke, you did speak in debate, so you are out of order. Representative John Dunn."

Dunn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentleman of the House. I rise in support of this Amendment. Ιn township communities where funds are tight and where local government is closest to home and does the very very best job, and it does the very, very best job, what they are asking for here is a line item, so they can pay for their Township officials are for this. There is no reason to oppose this Amendment and we need more green lights up there to adopt this Amendment on behalf of the people. And it provides for accountability in Government, which we could certainly stand some more of at every level, and where accountability is the best, local government closest to home, township government, we should support their efforts to prove their accountability to their citizens. So please put those green lights up there."

140th Legislative Day

- June 1, 1994
- Speaker Steczo: "Representative Skinner."
- Skinner: "I guess my point of order is moot now that he stopped talking."
- Speaker Steczo: "Representative Kubik, please vote Mr. Kubik
 'aye'. Representative Deering, wishes to recorded as 'no'.
 Representative Rutherford, please record the Gentleman as
 'aye'. Representative Black."
- Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I have an inquiry of the Chair."
- Speaker Steczo: "Please proceed."
- Black: "Did you not take the record on this? I thought you took the record and in that case the board should be locked out."
- Speaker Steczo: "I have not announced the roll call, so up until that point and time, Members can switch their votes."
- Black: "All right."
- Speaker Steczo: "Representative Leitch."
- Leitch: "Thank you, at the appropriate time, I would like to poll the absentees."
- Speaker Steczo: "Mr. Clerk, please poll the absentees. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. Representative Leitch has asked for the Poll of the absentees, please proceed with poll of the absentees."
- Clerk Rossi: "Poll of those not voting. Representative Flowers.

 Representative Giles. Representative Morrow.

 Representative Pugh and Representative Turner."
- Speaker Steczo: "Representative Leitch the absentees have been polled. Representative Leitch."
- Leitch: "Would you verify the negatives, please."
- Speaker Steczo: "The Gentleman has requested a verification. Mr. Clerk, would you proceed with a poll of those who are voting 'no'."

140th Legislative Day

June 1, 1994

Clerk Rossi: "Representative Ackerman. Balanoff. Balthis. Black. Brady. Brunsvold. Cowlishaw. Curran. Currie. Deering. Edley. Gash. Giglio. Giolitto. Hannig. Hanrahan. Hawkins. Hicks. Homer. Johnson (Tom). Kaszak. Krause. Lawfer. Martinez. McAfee. Meyer. Moffitt. Moseley. Mulligan. Murphy, Maureen. Noland. Novak. Ostenburg. Parke. Pedersen. Phelan. Phelps. Roskam. Rotello. Salvi. Schoenberg. Sheehy. Skinner. Steczo. Stephens. Tenhouse. von-Bergen Wessels. Weaver. Weller. Wennlund. Wirsing. Wojcik. Woolard and Zickus."

Speaker Steczo: "Representative Persico."

Persico: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. There might be a small malfunctioning of my vote, even though it was green here, there was nothing upon...now there is. Thank you."

Speaker Steczo: "Questions of the Negative Roll Call, Representative Leitch, Mr. Leitch."

Leitch: "Representative Brady?"

Speaker Steczo: "Representative Brady, is the Gentleman in the chamber? Mr. Clerk, please remove him from the Roll Call.

Mr. Leitch."

Leitch: "Representative Homer?"

Speaker Steczo: "Representative Homer, is the Gentleman in the chamber? Mr. Clerk, please remove him from the roll call."

Leitch: "Representative Hannig?"

Speaker Steczo: "Mr. Leitch, please restate that name."

Leitch: "Representative Hannig?"

Speaker Steczo: "Representative Hannig. Mr. Leitch, Mr. Hannig is in the Budget negotiations."

Leitch: "He is not on the Floor. Representative Edley?"

Speaker Steczo: "Mr. Leitch, I understand that Mr. Edley is in those budget talks as well. If you want to proceed, you want to proceed? Does Representative Maureen Murphy have

140th Legislative Day

June 1, 1994

leave to be verified? There's no objection the lady has leave. Mr. Black, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Black: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I have an inquiry of the Chair?" Speaker Steczo: "Yes, Sir."

Black: "I am not aware of any, historical tradition, certainly not in the rules. That if a Member is in budget negotiation or whatever thev are not subject to verification, is that..."

Speaker Steczo: "No, no. Mr. Black, the purpose of the Chair doing that, as we do when the Members are in the nurses station, to make that fact known to the person seeking the verification. It is still up that person to pursue removal of the name if he or she so chooses."

Black: "Okay, well those people, what is the status of those people are supposedly involved in budget negotiations, they're recorded as voting? I would think you have a right to challenge that vote."

Leitch: "Representative Murphy?"

Speaker Steczo: "Representative Maureen Murphy, she just asked for leave, to be verified, Representative Leitch."

Leitch: "Representative Hicks?"

Speaker Steczo: "Representative Hicks. Is the Gentleman in the Chamber? Please remove him."

Leitch: "Representative Giles?"

Speaker Steczo: "Representative Giles, Representative Giles. Mr. Leitch, Representative Giles is not voting."

Leitch: "Okay, that is it."

Speaker Steczo: "Representative Prussing, the Lady wishes to be recorded 'present'. Representative Cowlishaw."

140th Legislative Day

June 1, 1994

Cowlishaw: "May I please have leave to be verified?"

Speaker Steczo: "The Lady asked leave to be verified, is there any objection? Mr. Leitch? No, objection leave is granted. The Lady shall be verified. Mr. Leitch any further questions?"

Leitch: "Representative Edley?"

Speaker Steczo: "Representative Capparelli changes his vote to 'no'. Representative Edley, is the Gentleman in the chamber? Mr. Clerk, please remove him. Mr. Leitch any further questions?"

Leitch: "No."

Speaker Steczo: "On this question...on this question there are 52 voting 'yes', 51 voting 'no', 3 voting 'present'. The Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk, any further Amendments?"

Clerk Rossi: "Floor Amendment #7, offered by Representative Cross."

Speaker Steczo: "The Chair recognizes Representative Cross on Amendment #7."

Cross: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is an agreed Amendment. To the best of my knowledge, it Amends the Counties Code. It allows the county board in counties with a population of between 300,000 and 400,000, or those counties contiguous to counties that size to regulate unincorporated areas less than five acres."

Speaker Steczo: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #8. On that is there any discussion? There being none, all those in favor of the adoption of the Amendment will signify by saying 'aye'. I am sorry, #7. Will signify by saying...Representative Mulligan for what purpose do you rise?"

Mulligan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield for a question?"

140th Legislative Day

June 1, 1994

Speaker Steczo: "He indicates he will."

Mulligan: "In the matter of a contiguous county who rules, either a county of that size or is county that is contiguous?"

Cross: "Right."

Mulligan: "So, if the county, there is a county that is that size and that is the county that is contiguous, who would be one that would rule that area?"

Cross: "It is not a matter of whether, it would just give either one of those counties the ability, or the authority to regulate what we are talking about. It is not going to be an issue between county and county. It just gives counties between 300,000 and 400,000 population and those contiguous to those counties the authority and the ability to regulate. It is not going to be a fight between counties."

Mulligan: "There's not going to be, it won't create a conflict, between..."

Cross: "Not between counties."

Mulligan: "Thank you."

Speaker Steczo: "Representative Wennlund."

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

Speaker Steczo: "He indicates he will."

Wennlund: "Exactly what power does this give to those counties?"

Cross: "Well Representative, if you look on page 1 and 2 of the Amendment. It gives them authority to regulate and restrict locations and use of structures. For example, horse barns, barn structures. It's an Amendment we talked about a year ago, if you..."

Wennlund: "Yes, but who has that authority to regulate those now?

Townships, is this the battle between townships and the counties, as to who is going to regulate those areas?"

Cross: "Right now, in counties with populations over 400,000, the county board has the authority to. Right now we're trying

140th Legislative Day

June 1, 1994

to include, Kendall, actually we are trying to include Kendall and some other counties contiguous to Kendall, it would give the county board the authority."

Wennlund: "You mean, they do not have the authority to regulate..."

Cross: "Not a county..."

Wennlund: "Is it unincorporated land?"

Cross: "Yes."

Wennlund: "If it is unincorporated land they absolutely have the power to regulate them."

Cross: "Not under the present statute, not under the present law.

There was a supreme court case that said, if you want to address this, you have to do it through the legislature, we don't have...counties like Kendall County, with the population of 40,000 does not have the authority to regulate."

Wennlund: "Well, who regulates, are talking about parcels of less than five acres in size."

Cross: "Yes, that's the...we worked out this language with the Farm Bureau."

Wennlund: "Well, less than five acres are you saying that the current law is that if you less than five acres the county can't regulate, with respect to zoning?"

Cross: "Yes, that is it exactly. What is happening in Kendall County for example, we have an area of about 12,000 homes, it is unincorporated someone right now, the belief of the county board, and following the Supreme Court case I am talking about. Some one could put a horse barn in their back yard in an unincorporated area, in a lot 12,000 square feet, and we do not have the authority to regulate that, and this would allow us to do that."

Wennlund: "Well, counties between 300,000 and 400,000, certainly

140th Legislative Day

June 1, 1994

have that power."

Cross: "At this point they do at the current statute, it is in counties of population of excess of 400,000. This was the only way we could move it out to Kendall, by saying between 300,000 and 400,000 or those counties contiguous. The current statute under 4,000 they do no have the authority."

Wennlund: "Under 4,000?"

Cross: "Under 400,000."

Wennlund: "Under 400,000. Okay, thank you very much."

Speaker Steczo: "Representative Hartke."

Hartke: "Yes, will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Steczo: "Proceed Representative."

Hartke: "Representative Cross, could not these counties if they had a zoning ordinance, regulate that."

Cross: "It is our understanding from the case that I am talking about, they do not have the authority to regulate. That is why we're..."

Hartke: "If a county had zoning, you are saying your...they could not regulate by building permits, or set backs, or some things like that. Where they could require that these facilities not be built?"

Cross: "We don't believe that we have the authority to do that at this time.

Hartke: "Can not you regulate set backs and building styles and so forth in an area?"

Cross: "This particular provision of the statute deals with location and use..."

Hartke: "A simple outlaw of the use of facilities for the raising of livestock including horses and whatever."

Cross: "We don't believe that we have that authority right now."

Hartke: "Are you saying that the county through their zoning ordinance does not have that authority to regulate horse

140th Legislative Day

- June 1, 1994
- barns and things like that or riding stables."
- Cross: "In counties, at this time with a population of less than 400,000 they do not. That is exactly right."
- Hartke: "I think that counties that adopt a zoning ordinance, have all kinds of authority to do that. They can regulate livestock buildings, chicken facilities anything they want.

 Manufacturing facilities."
- Cross: "Maybe to clear it up. All we're talking about is agricultural areas with less than five acres. And we're saying..."
- Hartke: "You are saying over five acre they can regulate that, under five acres they cannot?"
- Cross: "Would you repeat the question?"
- Hartke: "You're saying that in counties where they have zoning they can regulate this type of use, over five acres, but under five acres they cannot?"
- Cross: "We only included in this Amendment less than five acres, to work with the Farm Bureau on it. I do not think there is a distinction currently in the law on the acreage, on the structures."
- Hartke: "I think that the zoning ordinance could require that in order to house a horse or whatever you have go to have, at least six acres of pasture or ten acres of pasture, which could outlaw the use of a five acres or less for pasturing horses or cattle or whatever. You could require to have five acres for each horse or ten acres for each horse."
- Cross: "All we are talking about is structures."
- Hartke: "Yes, I understand that. But if, why would you want to have a structure if you outlawed the animal. It is just that simple, I think that that could be regulated from aspect as opposed to regulating the structure."
- Cross: "It is the feeling, Representative our state's attorney

140th Legislative Day

June 1, 1994

and our county board that this is needed to give them regulatory authority. They do not believe that they do not have any at this time, and they're taking the direction of the Supreme Court. That they do not have the authority."

Hartke: "Well, I am not an attorney, and I do not want to argue
 with the Supreme Court, but I am not crazy about this
 Amendment."

Speaker Steczo: "Representative Hughes. Mr. Cross did you wish to respond to Representative Hartke? Or should I recognize Representative Hughes? Representative Hughes."

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

Speaker Steczo: "Please proceed, Representative Hughes."

Hughes: "Representative Cross, is this not intended to correct a loophole of parcels that are still zoned agricultural, but are less than five acres?"

Cross: "Yes."

Hughes: "And is this not, does this not provide exemptions for those parcels less than a 1,000 which are generating in excesses of \$1,000 of income to address the concerns of Farm Bureau?"

Cross: "That is correct."

Hughes: "Thank you. To this Amendment. This also came through Counties and Townships. It passed unanimously. I am aware of no opposition to it. It is supported by the Farm Bureau, and it does take care of a loophole, in the collar counties, where we have numerous five acre parcels, which are still zoned agriculture, and because of state exemptions, the counties are frustrated with not being able to regulate buildings on those sites. This will take of that loophole. Thank you."

Speaker Steczo: "Is there any further discussion? There being none. All those in favor of the adoption of the Amendment,

140th Legislative Day

June 1, 1994

will signify by saying 'aye'; those opposed, 'no'. The 'ayes' have it the Amendment adopted. Mr. Clerk, any further Amendments?"

Clerk Rossi: "Floor Amendment #8, offered by Representative Kubik."

Speaker Steczo: "The Chair recognizes Representative Kubik, Mr. Kubik."

Kubik: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Inquiry of the Chair."

Speaker Steczo: "Proceed."

Kubik: "It is my understanding that, Amendment #5 was tabled?"

Speaker Steczo: "That is correct."

Kubik: "Okay, if Amendment #5 had been tabled, then we withdraw this Amendment."

Speaker Steczo: "The Gentleman withdraws Amendment #8. Mr. Clerk, any further Amendments?"

Clerk Rossi: "Floor Amendment #9, offered by Representative Levin."

Speaker Steczo: "Representative Levin."

Levin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentleman of the House. Amendment #9 corrects a typographical error that was discovered in the Condo Act. That we discovered has been there since 1983. It is purely technical in nature. And has been run by Ron Otto with Ticor Title. The Chicago Buyer's Association, Condo Sub-Committee. The Various other groups that have been involved. It amends Section the Condo Act, which is an applicability Section, and simply states which other portions of the act apply to all condominiums in which portions apply only to newer condominiums, and we discovered that for one Section we did not have a complete summary. We only covered part of that Section. And so this simply clarifies that fact. If there are any questions, I am happy to answer, otherwise I would

140th Legislative Day

- June 1, 1994
- just ask for the adoption of Amendment #9."
- Speaker Steczo: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #9. On that question is there any discussion?

 The Chair recognizes Representative Skinner."
- Skinner: "I question the germaneness of the Amendment?"
- Speaker Steczo: "The Gentleman questions the germaneness of Amendment #9. Mr. Clerk, may we have the Bill and the Amendment. Mr. Black were you seeking recognition as well? He was not. Mr. Skinner in response to your question, the Chair would rule that Amendment #9 would be germane. Amendment #9 is germane. Mr. Skinner."
- Skinner: "Well, Mr. Chairman...Mr. Speaker, could I respectfully point your eyes at Amendment 6, which I think is concerns the title of the Bill as it exists now. It says an Act concerning government."
- Speaker Steczo: "Mr. Skinner..."
- Skinner: "Condominiums are not governments."
- Speaker Steczo: "In response to your inquiry, I should refer you to Amendment #7, which changes the title to an Act concerning real estate, and on that basis that Amendment #9 is germane."
- Skinner: "Well, Mr. Speaker, he is changing it to, with an Act regarding real estate and property interest. Why does he have to change at all?"
- Speaker Steczo: "The Chair would rule, Mr. Skinner that the Amendment is germane, which responses to your question."
- Skinner: "Thank you for your courtesy."
- Speaker Steczo: "Any further discussion? All those in favor of the adoption of Amendment #9, will signify by saying, 'aye'; those opposed by saying 'no'. The 'ayes' have it.

 The Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk, are there any further Amendments?"

140th Legislative Day

- June 1, 1994
- Clerk Rossi: "Floor Amendment #10, offered by Representative Lindner."
- Speaker Steczo: "The Chair recognizes Representative Lindner or Amendment 10."
- Lindner: "Yes, thank you Mr. Chairman. This Amendment is needed so that the Department of Military Affairs can start the design for a new armory, which is the Aurora Armory, which will be at the Aurora Airport which is in Sugar Grove Township. This Amendment, merely is a transfer of property between Aurora and the Department of Military Affairs in the State of Illinois, so that the Armory can be built."
- Speaker Steczo: "The Lady has moved for the adoption of Amendment #10. On that is there is there any discussion? There being none. All those in favor of the adoption of the Amendment will signify by saying 'aye'; those opposed by saying 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk, any further Amendments?"
- CLerk Rossi: "Floor Amendment #11, offered by Representative Granberg."
- Speaker Steczo: "The Chair recognizes Representative Granberg on Amendment #11."
- Granberg: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Floor Amendment #11, allows quick take procedures in six different incidents. It also allows the changing of the boundaries for a special service area. I believe that this is agreed to. It has bipartisan support, and I would be happy to answer any questions if there are any."
- Speaker Steczo: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #11. On that question is there any discussion?

 The Chair recognizes Representative Black."
- Black: "Thank you, very much. Mr. Speaker, will the Sponsor
 yield?"

140th Legislative Day

June 1, 1994

Speaker Steczo: "He indicates that he will."

- Black: "Representative, on the quick take procedure is the quick take procedure only applicable to the Chicago area circulator?"
- Granberg: "No, Representative Black. It is not, it applies for Franklin Park, for railroad grade separation, Prospect Heights in Wheeling, for acquisition of a parcel land for the airport, Aurora for easements for construction of flood control in addition to Cook County."
- Black: "What in this Amendment are you giving? Are you giving some new powers to the Chicago Building Commission?"
- Granberg: "That goes for the quick take for the public schools,

 Chicago Board of Education for elementary schools."
- Black: "It says something about, to acquire property for the Chicago Board of Education. Does that mean they can...I guess my question is do they have some plans to build some elementary schools, or I assume if they want quick take they have their eye on building some new schools in the City of Chicago, is that the idea?"
- Granberg: "Representative Black, I certainly would assume so.

 They would not ask for it in anticipation of twenty years down the road. So I believe..."
- Black: "Well, it better be quicker than that because they have quick take for 24 months."
- Granberg: "It would be slow take, it would be slow take in that..."
- Black: "Okay, but there also is some material in here for the City of Aurora, I see."

Granberg: "Yes."

Black: "Okay, for what is it, flood control?"

Granberg: "Correct."

Black: "And then we're doing something with the is it 'power

140th Legislative Day

June 1, 1994

walkie' airport?"

Granberg: "If that is the airport for Prospect Heights, in Wheeling which I have been informed that it is, that would be a that airport."

Black: "Okay, and they, oh, I see I thought maybe they wanted to build a new run way, but it's for drainage and safety purposes."

Granberg: "Correct."

Black: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Steczo" "Any further discussion? The Chair recognizes Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Could you list the addresses of the properties in the City of Chicago that the school board wishes quick take power to gain ownership of?"

Speaker Steczo: "Representative Granberg."

Granberg: "Representative, I know, it's not. It would be listed in the bond document, when they issued the bonds for the building. The actual legal description will be in the bond document itself."

Skinner: "You do not know where they are?"

Granberg: "They do. The legal description is not in the Amendment."

Skinner: "Do you or don't you know where the school board wishes to take land without the owner's willing consent."

Granberg: "The school board knows."

Skinner: "The school board has not told you?"

Granberg: "No they have not."

Skinner: "Well, Representative it seems to me, that if the school board is unwilling to tell us what property they're talking about, we should be unwilling to give them quick take power. You have described this Amendment as a agreed Amendment."

140th Legislative Day

June 1, 1994

Granberg: "Representative, it's my understanding they gave out the complete list in the Executive Committee, when this was brought before that Committee for a hearing."

Skinner: "I am sorry I could not hear a word you said."

Granberg: "That...it's my understanding all those parcells were given out in the Executive Committee when the Bill came before the committee for a hearing. So that information was provided in committee."

Skinner: "Well, I appreciate that but now we are dealing with a 118 people, and I've asked a question, which I think is a reasonable question. And that is what property does the school board want to grab, without the willing consent of the grabees?"

Granberg: "Sure, and I would be more than happy to provide that to you."

Skinner: "Well I would ask for a roll call on this Amendment, I think I am joined by four others under I think it is Rule 55 (c). Thank you."

Speaker Steczo: "The chair recognizes, Representative Saviano."

Saviano: "If the Sponsor will yield?"

Speaker Steczo: "He indicates he will Representative Saviano."

Saviano: "Also included in this Amendment is a quick take Bill for the Grand Avenue Railroad Separation project, of Franklin Park. That's in my district. This is part of a project that been on going for about 22 years. We got, we finally got to a point where we are ready to move on it, and there's a few commercial partials left that we have to take to further the project and I would ask for support on this Amendment. Thank you."

Speaker Steczo: "Representative Levin."

Levin: "Would the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Steczo: "He indicates he will."

140th Legislative Day

June 1, 1994

Levin: "Going back to the issue of the Chicago Board of Education. The....is there any limitation on the category of property that could be taken. I mean can you under this could they take somebodies residence, in a residentially zoned area for single family dwellings, or is it limited just to commercial business or zoning?"

Saviano: "Representative, I will find out about the classification. It is limited to acreage and the size of the quick take, I am not sure about the classification, I will get that to you before that Amendment, before it gets voted on."

Levin: "Okay, because I, because I, personally share some of Representative Skinner's concerns. I think this maybe a first. You know, unless we have something in the record, that indicates what locations are going to be taken, there is no legislative history and therefor there is no way challenging, the board if the board goes beyond what, you know, what was claimed that they want to do. I know that we need more schools in certain parts of the city. But given the judgement making capability of the Chicago Board of Education at times. I think we need to be very careful in terms of giving them any kind of quick take authority, unless we know the locations and have some guarantees, in terms of what they are going to do."

Speaker Steczo: "The Chair recognizes Representative Biggert."
Biggert: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker will the Sponsor yield?"
Speaker Steczo: "He indicates he will."

Biggert: "Representative Granberg, did this appear as a House
Bill before. I am thinking of The Chicago Circulator. Was
that a house Bill that you had?"

Granberg: "It was not a House Bill that I had, no ma'am."

Biggert: "Was it a House Bill that was presented in one of the

140th Legislative Day

June 1, 1994

committees?"

Granberg: "It could very well be, I do not know."

Biggert: "Thank you."

Speaker Steczo: "Representative Churchill."

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

Speaker Steczo: "He indicates he will."

Churchill: "Have we sent we set up any other language in any of the Bills that we have done this year to authorize the circulator"

Granberg: "Bob, I am sorry. I couldn't hear you."

Churchill: "Have we set up any other legislation, this year to authorize the circulator?"

Granberg: "Yes, I have just been informed that that was, in fact,

Representative Lang's House Bill."

Churchill: "And are we funding the circulator?"

Granberg: "No, Representative, this would allow for the quick take and the Amendment to the special service area."

Churchill: "The point I have is , are we going to, is the state going to put state dollars in to the circulator system?"

Granberg: "Representative, that has nothing to do with this Amendment, I do not believe. This provides merely for the quick take, and the change of the boundaries of the special service area to accommodate, the circulator."

Churchill: "Right."

Granberg: "If, in fact, that would happen."

Churchill: "If, in fact, that would happen. So, in other words what you are saying is that the circulator isn't going to happen."

Granberg: "If, I am sure if there are funds available, either on the federal or state or local level. Then that would happen."

Churchill: "Right, so we are back to my funds question again.

140th Legislative Day

June 1, 1994

Are we funding the circulator?"

Granberg: "That is not the subject of this Amendment,

Representative. There is no dollar amount, this is not an
appropriation Bill."

Churchill: "Well, you have taken us in convenient circle. But you end up in the same place. What we're doing in Amendment, is to create the boundaries of this special service area, to amend the property tax code, property taxes can be used for this, and authorizing the City of Chicago, to use quick take, for the purpose of in a circulator, for those of you who have not heard this debate before the circulator, is a trolly system in downtown Chicago. It is what I called in debate a couple of years ago, one giant step backwards in transportation. What we're going do is try and emulate San Francisco by putting trolley cars in downtown Chicago. takes a major step in making that process this Bill available by taking quick take and authorizing the City of Chicago to come in take property away from people and not pay them up front, not go to court up front, but to just to in and grab their land so that they can use this circulator system. The circulator is one of the dumbest ideas that we've had in this state for years, and to do anything to try to enhance it or further its cause, it is ridiculous We should be voting 'no' on this Amendment, and I too, would ask for a roll call on it."

Speaker Steczo: "Representative Lang."

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen. I rise in support of the Amendment #11. The quick take we talk about here, relative to the City of Chicago, for the circulator, is a good idea. The circulator is a matter of economic development for the City of Chicago, it will help

140th Legislative Day

June 1, 1994

the downtown area, it will help that area of the city bring in more people, it will help create a greater interest the stores and in the retail establishments there and it will bring more sales tax dollars to Chicago. This is a good idea. Relative to the quick take portion of this, in the General Assembly, we do not really like quick take but have always allowed quick take for a community, where it's been for a specified purpose, for a specified period of time, for a specified area of land. That's what this does. So given the economic development advantages of this, given the fact that it meets the criteria of the kind of quick take that we have allowed in this General Assembly, this is the kind of quick take Amendment that requires your 'aye' vote."

- Speaker Steczo: "Is there any further discussion? There being none. Representative Granberg to close."
- Granberg: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Thank you. said this allows quick take in six specific instances. This effects Representative Deuchler's district, they've I asked for this. Representative Cross. Representative Pedersen. Representative Saviano. These communities have come and they've requested these limited guick take abilities. That is all this is. This is not unlimited. Very specific instances to allow these communities to do take for flood control, for safety reasons, their specific purpose, that is all. So I'd ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Steczo: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of
 Amendment #11, all those in favor will signify by voting,
 'aye'; those opposed by voting 'no'. The voting is open.
 Representative Levin."
- Levin: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. Because of a potential conflict of

140th Legislative Day

June 1, 1994

interest with respect to part of this Amendment, I am
voting 'present'."

Speaker Steczo: "Representative Granberg."

Granberg: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To my friends on both sides of the aisle, Representative Deuchler, has not stood up on this, but she is voting 'yes', because this effects her district. Representative Saviano has asked for an 'ave' vote, because this impact his district. To my downstate friends, this is not a limited quick take, Ladies and Gentlemen this is for six specific instances. We have done this in the past when communities have come to us for life, safety, health purposes, flood control, we have allowed them to do this. The state does this now, all of the time for road purposes. Quick take, it is eminent domain. is in six specific instances. This is not an evil thing. do it all the time in governments. To all my downstate friends who are voting 'no'. I am not sure why they are, because it's not...at some point your communities are going to need this, they will be in the desire of doing this for whatever their purpose is, and they do it all the time. If you are afraid about voting to a lot some community their own do this for schools, or for road, or for an airport, or for flood control, they should do it. come to us, and we have historically allowed them to do that. And if you are scared about some type of property deprivation, that is not the case."

Speaker Steczo: "Representative Andrea Moore."

Moore, A.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I had a question that relates to funding. It is my understanding that recently there was a large amount of funding that was approved federally for this project. Does anyone know about this?"

Speaker Steczo: "Mr. Granberg would you like to respond to

140th Legislative Day

- June 1, 1994
- Representative Moore's inquiry, she had a question for you. Representative Moore, would repeat that inquiry, please."
- Moore, A.: "Recently it was my understanding that recently there was a large amount of money, something like \$30,000,000 that was approved through the Ways and Means Committee, federally approved. And I wondered how this quick take issue would effect that funding."
- Granberg: "Representative I am not familiar with what happened in the Ways and Means Committee. I have no knowledge, I don't want to know."
- Moore, A.: "Thank you."
- Speaker Steczo: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question there are 36 voting 'yes', and 68 voting, 'no', and 7 voting 'present'. The Amendment fails.

 Mr. Clerk any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Rossi: "Floor Amendment 12 offered, by Representative Granberg."
- Speaker Steczo: "The Chair recognizes Representative Granberg on Amendment #12."
- Granberg: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Amendment #12, adds easements on properties that have a fair market value has been determined to let those property owners in adjacent properties purchase that property from the Department of Transportation."
- Speaker Steczo: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #12. On that is there any discussion? The Chair recognizes Representative Black."
- Black: "Yes, will the Sponsor yield?"
- Speaker Steczo: "He indicates he will."
- Black: "Representative, do you have an approximate total value of all these easements. You know, how much money we're

- 140th Legislative Day June 1, 1994 talking about in all these easements?"
- Granberg: "Representative, we're doing that right now. I think by our rules, they have to be on file. The fair market value."
- Black: "Okay, do you know whether all these easements have had the necessary appraisals?"
- Granberg: "It's my understanding that they have. This is at the request of the Department of Transportation."
- Black: "Do you know whether the Department of Transportation has the necessary easements or the necessary appraisal done on these easements?"
- Granberg: "It is my understanding, they have done that."
- Black: "At market value? How many easements are in here, I have not counted it up? One, two, three..."
- Granberg: "I believe that there were six or seven, Representative Black. I'll go through the Amendment right now."
- Black: "...four, five, six, seven, eight, looks like nine, nine of them. Are these easements pretty well spread throughout the General Assembly, I mean do we have Representatives, a good Representative count, on who's districts these in?

 Like any in my district, in this Bill?"
- Granberg: "I assume the Department of Transportation, doesn't go
 by Members. I am sure that they take the best interest in
 the constituents in to consideration."
- Black: "Well, yes, I am sure that they do. Let me just see if I could, oh, I have it here, I just should have read a little further. Yes, one of them lies in Representative Hannig's district, surely this isn't right, a \$1,850,000 easement? Oh, no, the comma is in the wrong place. It is \$1,800. I am sorry. The next one seems to be in Representative Prussing's district."
- Granberg: "Representative Black, on your map, I just want to

140th Legislative Day

June 1, 1994

make, I just want to check on this, on your map, are working on the Governors Medicaid Bond Program as well?"

Black: "Well, you know, I wish we were working on the Governor's Medicaid Project because that is something we should be working on, regardless of our differences, that's what we are here to do. This is a budget year. But be that as it may, I am sure we will work on Medicaid sometime between now and Halloween. Anyway the next, the next appraisal that I see is in Representative Prussing's district, and that's, well that's only 58,000. Now the next one, oh my goodness, the next three are in Representative Granberg's district."

Granberg: "No, no, no you are incorrect. That is in Representative Deering's district, I believe."

Black: "Oh, where is that? You mean the posto farm?"

Granberg: "Correct."

Black: "That is in Deering's district?"

Granberg: "Yes, it is. And he will take that up with you."

Black: "So, the next two are in Representative Deering's
 district. Is that right?"

Granberg: "Correct."

Black: "But I will say this in Representative Deering's defense they are the smallest amount of money on here, a mere \$675 conveying some, it seems he is conveying some...what do they call that when the coal mine shaft has cave in? Subsidence, yes well I do not have any problem with that. But then I see then the next one is in Representative Phelps district, and that is for \$19,000. And let's see, then there is one in Representative Moseley's district, for a \$1,000, that's we're transferring the horse barnes. Oh, I remember that. Yes, this is okay, because it's only Illinois horses that are in this barn anyway, so we want to

140th Legislative Day

June 1, 1994

give it back, that is okay. I can understand that. But now wait a minute, what is this one in Representative Granberg's district, is this the Sigma Chemical Company? That's not in your district either? Is that in Representative Deering's district too? Well it is nowhere near the value of in Representative Prussing's district though. I mean Representative Deering is only \$6,700 in this one. Oh, I am sorry Representative, there is one in here from a Republican, there is one here from Representative Ackerman district. I'll be darned."

- Granberg: "Representative Black, I know that you would never consider politics and I know that you are certainly very open minded..."
- Black: "Oh, no absolutely."
- Granberg: "And so I know you're considering Senator Ralph Dunn district. Senator Frank Watson..."
- Black: "Well, the Senators are not even here. They will have to speak for themselves."
- Granberg: "Senator Hasara, and I so I know you look at both Houses of this legislature..."
- Black: "Oh, you know, what the Senate does, just isn't any concern of mine. I do not even know where they are. I mean, who knows where they are. They're not even in Session. but I would just like to point out this, this land in Representative Ackerman's district. He's only conveying \$9, no that is not right, a little more than that. I will have to talk to Representative Ackerman about that. But that's all of the easements that I see. So we have one Republican easement, and then most of the rest of them for Representative Deering, I think."
- Granberg: "I would not classify them as Republican easements, and
 I am sure that Representative Deering would love to talk to

140th Legislative Day

you about this later on."

June 1, 1994

Black: "I hope he...because I want to know where this is,
I...this is 7.95 acres, in the 89th District. Okay,
well...."

Granberg: "We work here Representative..."

Black: "My staff has come here and explained this to me now.

This is really kind of a Agreed Bill. Right?"

Granberg: "We do this for the Department of Transportation, because we are bipartisan. And our best interests are serving the people of this state. And so we put politics aside, and we'll handle administration Bill, whatever it takes."

Black: "Listen, I, absolutely. You know, it just dawned on me, that the Department of Transportation is doing this and I will say this, these are all downstaters and these are probably to, probably to improve some of those gravel roads, I was talking about last week, and that's why I am going to vote for this Amendment. I, it comes back to me now, I forgot that the department had said that we want a Bill built...we want to get rid of some of those gravel roads, down in southern Illinois. So if this is all in southern Illinois, where the state police do not get to patrol, expressway. I think this is a good Amendment, and I am glad you brought it to our attention. And I intend to vote for it."

Granberg: "Thank you, Representative Black, we're honored."

Speaker Steczo: "Representative Stephens."

Stephens: "Thank you, will the Gentleman yield? Representative Granberg, can you assure us that each of these land transfers does not leave any land owned by someone else landlocked from access from the state highways?"

Granberg: "Representative, as far as the Department

140th Legislative Day

- June 1, 1994
- Transportation goes that has never been the case to my knowledge. So I cannot imagine that this would be the case now."
- Stephens: "No, no it has been the case, and it has happened in the past. And the reason it has happened is that we have, I know that these are very ordinary, and I carried this kind of legislation last year and I just wanted to ask that question, so that we can have it on the record that, to our knowledge, there is no land being land locked. And if the answer to the question is to the best of your knowledge 'yes', then I'll be satisfied."
- Granberg: "Yes, I have no knowledge that would be the case, Representative Stephens."
- Stephens: "Thank you."
- Speaker Steczo: "Is there any further discussion? There being none, all those in favor of the adoption of the Amendment, will signify by saying, 'aye'; those opposed by saying 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk, any further...Mr. Hassert it is my understanding, you wish to have the Bill held on the Order of Second Reading?"
- Hassert: "Yes, I wish to remove the Amendment #14, and hold this
 on second for an other Amendment."
- Speaker Steczo: "Mr. Hassert, it is my understanding that
 Representative, or Amendment #13 is ready and 14 are
 printed and distributed. So we can proceed to Amendment
 #13. Mr. Clerk, could you..."
- Clerk Rossi: "Floor Amendment #13, offered by Representative Cross."
- Speaker Steczo: "The Chair recognizes Representative Cross,
 withdraw Amendment #13. Amendment #14."
- Clerk Rossi: "Floor Amendment #14, offered by Representative

140th Legislative Day

June 1, 1994

- Hassert."
- Speaker Steczo: "The Chair recognizes Representative Hassert, on Amendment #14."
- Hassert: "Yes, Mr. Speaker I would like to withdraw Amendment #14, and hold this Bill on second for another Amendment."
- Speaker Steczo: "The Gentleman withdraws Amendment #14, and Senate Bill 1715 will be held on the Order Second Reading.

 On the Order of Revenue, Second Reading, appears Senate Bill 1191, Representative Hughes. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 1191, the Bill has been read a second time previously. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee.

 No Motions have been filed. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Maureen Murphy."
- Speaker Steczo: "The Chair recognizes Representative Maureen Murphy on Amendment #2. Withdraw the Amendment, Mr. Clerk.

 Any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Rossi: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Steczo: "Third Reading. On the Order of State and Local Government, Second Reading, appears Senate Bill 1181. For what purpose does Representative Walsh seek recognition? Mr. Walsh."
- Walsh: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We were on the Order of Senate Bills, Revenue, Second Reading, there's Senate Bill 1726. Did you..."
- Speaker Steczo: "Mr. Walsh, our plan is to get to all the Bills
 on Second Reading, but right now we're on the Order of
 State and Local Government."
- Walsh: "Senate Bill 1726 is on the Order of Second Reading, the same order of business that we were just on. I think..."
- Speaker Steczo: "However, in the intervening time, we switched to State and Local Government, and the Chair has called Senate

140th Legislative Day

June 1, 1994

Bill 1181, Representative Wennlund."

Walsh: "Maybe, you're..."

Speaker Steczo: "We will get to it. We will get to it. We will get to it. We promise."

Walsh: "Thank you."

- Speaker Steczo: "Representative Wennlund, are you prepared to call Senate Bill 1181? Mr. Wennlund. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 1181 has been a read a second time previously. Amendments 1 and 2 were adopted in committee.

 No Motions have been filed. Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative Skinner."
- Speaker Steczo: "The Chair recognizes Representative Skinner on Amendment #3. Representative Skinner."
- Skinner: you, Mr. Speaker. Since Ι didn't see Representative Hughes up there as a joint Sponsor, I was a little unsure as what the Amendment was. This Amendment which will benefits the collar county school districts. When the tax cap was passed it was passed in an atmosphere of confrontation, rather than in an atmosphere taking a look at the unintended consequences. And one of the unintended consequences of the way the Bill went through, was that collar county school districts unfairly penalized in the way the formula looks at assessed valuation per pupil. As you know, the relative wealth of local school districts is measured in terms of assessed valuation per pupil. Well, assessed valuation is skyrocketing in the collar counties and because of that. the collar counties look extremely wealthy to the school aid formula, and as a direct result the state aid goes down. Unfortunately, well unfortunately for the school districts, fortunately for the taxpayers, when the assessed

140th Legislative Day

June 1, 1994

valuation skyrockets, the local districts cannot school capture the entire flow of revenue which they would have been able to capture prior to the passage of the tax cap. They are limited. Their tax rate is limited to the amount of money that will bring in the extension of last the increase allowed under the cost of living or 5%; in the last two years it's been 3.2, 3.1%. This Amendment would cure that problem. If the assessed valuation could not be accessed by the...the tax rate, it would not count against the collar county school districts in the state aid I'd respectfully ask for your support, and I formula. would ask for a record roll call. I think would be joined by at least four others under Rule 55 (c)."

Speaker Steczo: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #3. On that question, is there any discussion? The Chair recognizes Representative Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. I join the Sponsor in his request for a record Roll Call Vote. think this should be an interesting one. His suggestion is that when the property tax cap was put in place in the collar counties that there was inadequate consideration given to the affect of that cap on the ability of districts in those collar counties to provide appropriate educational services to their young. Every consideration. fact, was given. Every consideration was appropriately made on that very question and the answer is, that if aren't prepared to tax yourselves, we're not prepared as a state to take money away from youngsters in less affluent areas in order to fill your coffers for you. You had a choice: Did you want a cap; did you want to say no excessive school spending? You said you wanted the cap, and my view is you should live with its consequences.

140th Legislative Day

June 1, 1994

would be an outrage for this Assembly to say that because the people of the affluent collar counties don't want to do their bit for their young, then taxpayers across the state should jump in to foot that bill. My view is that those youngsters living in less affluent, uncapped areas, fact, many of the properties are so little valued, that they can hardly raise enough through the property now are at least able to access some modicum of state aid. You would take that money right out of their school books, right out of their teacher's salaries, right out of the opportunity for them to learn as they ought to. have it both ways. You want a cap? You want to make sure your homeowners aren't paying more, aren't paying as as mine? Fine, you do that; impose the cap. But don't try to come at us with your hand in my back pocket taking from our taxpayers money that should go through the legitimate formula to state school aid depending on considerations like what rate you're taxing and what value your properties have? This proposal is one that would encourage all of us subsidize the affluent school districts in the collar counties. I think it's an objectionable proposal. and I welcome the opportunity of a record Roll Call Vote."

Speaker Steczo: "Representative Granberg."

Granberg: "Will the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Steczo: "He indicates he will."

Granberg: "Representative Skinner, I always thought you were a proponent of the property tax caps."

Skinner: "I absolutely am. We just want our fair share of state aid to education."

Granberg: "But, maybe...maybe I'm misunderstanding something.
Doesn't this Amendment, isn't a way to get around the
 property tax cap limitation?"

140th Legislative Day

June 1, 1994

Skinner: "Not at all."

Granberg: "It isn't?"

Skinner: "No."

Granberg: "So, the schools can't capture the AAV, increase the AAV because of the property tax cap?"

Skinner: "They cannot capture over the increase of the cost of living."

Granberg: "They cannot...right...because of the property tax caps."

Skinner: "Yes."

Granberg: "So, this would allow you to increase..."

Skinner: "The one you probably voted for."

Granberg: "So this would allow you to have the state subsidize...your school districts because you enact the property tax caps in your district?"

Skinner: "It is a shift of approximately 1% of the total state aid to education."

Granberg: "But you shift it because you enact the property tax caps..."

Skinner: "I did not enact it. I am a proponent of it. I was not here."

Granberg: "Are you..."

Skinner: "Forty percent of us were not here..."

Granberg: "Well, if you don't like the idea, maybe you should try to repeal it."

Skinner: "Oh, I like it."

Granberg: "You like property tax caps."

Skinner: "Yes."

Granberg: "You like property tax caps so you can have the state pay for..."

Skinner: "No, our local folks passed a referendum this last fall to build a new school. I'm in favor of people voting for

140th Legislative Day

June 1, 1994

- referendums to increase their tax burden above the property tax cap, their property tax burden. What we are asking for is our fair share of the income tax and the sales tax that we pay in abundance back."
- Granberg: "Because they are limited by the property tax cap itself."
- Skinner: "Because the school aid formula was not changed to reflect the impact of the property tax cap in that July...that fateful July day."
- Granberg: "Oh, I see. So we should change the school aid formula
 for property tax caps?"
- Skinner: "To reflect that, yes."
- Granberg: "So you want the school aid formula to change so our downstate schools get less money (we don't have property tax caps), so our downstate schools get less money cause we have lower property tax assessments, and you want the..."
- Skinner: "Anytime you want to trade tax bills with me, property tax bills, I'll be happy to do it. I think virtually everybody else in the collar counties would be willing to trade their property tax bill with virtually anybody outside of the collar counties."
- Granberg: "Well, Representative, I understand, but if you're for property tax caps, you should be for property tax caps and not for exceptions to the property tax cap."
- Skinner: "I am, and you will...you will certainly see that in future debate if a certain Bill comes to the House floor."
- Granberg: "And this is an exception to the property tax cap legislation."
- Skinner: "No, we're talking about the state aid to education formula."
- Granberg: "Because you're doing this because of property tax caps in your district."

140th Legislative Day

June 1, 1994

Skinner: "I will concede that, yes."

Granberg: "Okay. So to my friends on both sides of the understand, please understand that you have a property tax caps in the collar counties. That's all well and good. to my other friends who live outside those collar counties, not only do these friends want the property caps so they can say they have lower property taxes but then they want the state to subsidize to get around the property tax cap. It's...you can't have it both ways. If you are a true believer of property tax caps, that is what you should do. You cannot have property tax caps and then turn around and say, 'We want an exception to property tax Either you believe them or you don't, and I would urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Steczo: "Representative Hoeft."

Hoeft: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This has nothing to do with property taxes. I have gone on record as disliking many of the aspects οf This Amendment talks about that. consistency of state funding. You use the property tax cap for the distribution of property tax. Why don't we use it for the distribution of the state aid formula? If we use it for one, we should use it for the other. This Amendment asks one thing: Let's be consistent in the distribution of the funds. It has nothing to do with the tax cap. It has to do with the distribution in the state aid formula asking the state board to use the unrestricted, excuse me, the restricted tax cap figure so that the state can consistent in distributing this money. I would definitely urge anyone who cares about equality to vote 'yes' on this issue."

Speaker Steczo: "Representative Phelps."

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

140th Legislative Day

June 1, 1994

House. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Steczo: "He indicates he will."

Phelps: "Representative Skinner, perhaps you can, for philosophical reasons, share with me your opinion perhaps or maybe expertise as to why you think property taxes are as high as they are in your area as opposed to other areas that you seem to envy to be so low? Why are they high?"

Skinner: "Because the collar counties are the economic engine of the State of Illinois."

Phelps: "I can't hear you. I'm sorry, I couldn't hear you."

Skinner: "The collar counties in suburban Cook County are the economic engine of the State of Illinois."

Phelps: "So if the taxes are high in your area, is there some outside source that force those taxes to be so high, or was...would you say, in your opinion, being one that I know that would believe in local control, local government, did they set those limits to finance the services that that particular community needs?"

Skinner: "I can give you one example..."

Phelps: "Okay."

Skinner: "...that does not have to do with referendums. Park districts, prior to the tax cap and even right now in your part of the state, have the ability to sell non-referendum bonds up to 5% of their assessed evaluation."

Phelps: "Right."

Skinner: "In my home town, the non-referendum tax rate at the park district amounts to 31.8% of the total tax rate. Now, that was not done with citizen approval. That was done by the Legislature, I believe, in 1968 or 69, giving park district board members the authority to raise taxes without a referendum."

Phelps: "But...but..."

140th Legislative Day

June 1, 1994

Skinner: "In addition, this Legislature gave school districts, prior to the tax cap and in your part of the state right now, the ability to sell life safety bonds without a referendum for ridiculous things such as rubberized tracks in some...in some school districts, having nothing do, I mean, unless you consider falling down on the cinder track having something to do with..."

Phelps: "I guess what I'm having trouble following is your reasoning, which I suspected that I would, is the fact that you seem to indicate that these people that end up on the park board or end up on another board are there by not the endorsement of the public. Could they not be rejected if they force these taxes on these people that don't get to exercise through a referendum? What happens to them the next election?"

Skinner: "They have been."

Phelps: "I'm sorry?"

Skinner: "They have been rejected."

Phelps: "Okay, so the new replacements follow the same bad habits or do they lower the rates?"

Skinner: "No, the new replacements are under the tax cap."

Phelps: "I'm sorry?"

Skinner: "The new replacements are under the tax cap so they can't be tempted."

Phelps: "So, what you're saying is that if you get the property tax by the proper people put in place you hope the good government that replaced those that want to increase the taxes that are necessary through the levies to finance the demands and services that the public's saying they're wanting. I believe it would be a very expensive proposition down my way to go out in the middle of a cornfield of about 100 acres and subdivide that land and

140th Legislative Day

June 1, 1994

provide a...a park system, we could have swimming pools, shopping centers; that would be a very expensive financial matter by the greatest entrepreneur I could think of in my area. Now there would have to be a taxing mechanism put in place. So now you're telling me that the people in your area who choose to develop land that's very expensive to develop, and then know that there has to be a process to finance it, now are saying, 'We can't...we don't want to even though I choose to live here'. Is that what you're saying?"

Skinner: "Representative, what I'm saying is that as we define the...the phrase 'a fair share of the state aid education', we're not getting it."

Phelps: "Would you..."

Skinner: "I mean, unlike the City of Chicago which ends up having \$130,000 per classroom to finance its education, let me repeat that, \$130,000 a classroom. There's not one classroom in my county that approaches that level of expenditure."

Phelps: "Do you think it would be a fair system for, let's the State Board of Education or some governmental body that we could agree on, that would, at the present rate of financing, reimbursing school kids all over this state, let's say your district that's property tax rich compared to mine that is property tax poor, and that I get a amount reimbursement of the state aid than you do, would you agree it would be a good system to try to assess, assess the product that results through school construction, through the instruction through the teachers to our kids by the quality that they score on their tests, proportional to the amount of dollars that they receive? Would you be willing to put that up against my area

140th Legislative Day

June 1, 1994

according to what you spend per student according to what I spend per student and the product that we turn out?"

Skinner: "Actually the question has been asked of the Legislative Research Unit by Representative Al Salvi and..."

Phelps: "I saw that."

Skinner: "...he has the answer and..."

Phelps: "I saw that, and you know what? Carterville, Illinois that is neighboring my district was very high, one of the highest in return according to that assessment, so I saw."

Skinner: "Doesn't it say...doesn't the study say that there is very little evidence of a positive correlation between good test scores and the amount spent per student?"

Phelps: "Yes. I think that's in general terms what it says."

Skinner: "Right, I would agree with that."

Phelps: "Right. Well, to the Amendment, Mr. Speaker. The Gentleman is trying to set up an artificial means of trying to bypass what was put in place through a very gridlocked Session a few years ago. But the winners prevailed, fact, by putting the tax caps on the collar counties. There a lot of decisions that we have to live with when as government Leaders, as well as constituents that we represent, that demand the type of government role that we this instance, they evidently introduced legislation and were successful in representing their constituents of what they said they wanted to happen. you...they either have to live with it or try to change and overhaul the whole system. And when you do that there would be many like us that would like to say, 'There property tax rich areas that we feel needs to share that property tax wealth as well as the state aid income tax dollars.' So, there's all kinds of ways and alternatives that we can offer to remedy the disparity that does exist.

140th Legislative Day

June 1, 1994

But this is not one of them, and I say we reject this Amendment."

Speaker Steczo: "Representative Maureen Murphy."

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

Speaker Steczo: "He indicates he will."

Murphy, M.: "Thank you. Representative, isn't it true that currently the span in inequity in education as it stands in Illinois runs from less than 5% to in excess of 70% funding for the various areas in the state?"

Skinner: "Well, the suburban school districts certainly don't get a very large percentage. We're down at the low end of that rank order."

Murphy, M.: "Okay. To the Amendment. Again, in pointing out that in my area there are school districts currently receiving 7% funding, with an average of 15% funding. interesting to continue hearing that there are property tax poor districts, when there are those of us who bristle under being called property tax rich districts. A lot of our income tax dollars are coming down to areas getting 70% funding, the City of Chicago getting in excess of 48% funding, and there are those of us in Cook County burdened with a classification system would not call people with property tax poor adjectives, but we would say you're under-assessed and to use our President Clinton's term fair contribution for 'you're not paying a your schools.' General Assembly, after General Assembly grappled with this inequitable formula that now exists. The Amendment goes far in bringing more of an equity in regard to the school state aid formula. It's not about needing more money, more of my constituent's money districts outside of Cook County or the City of Chicago. It's about the equitable distribution of those state

140th Legislative Day

June 1, 1994

dollars coming from all over the state. It is with that that I stand in support of Representative This is the first time in 15 months we've been able to address equitable funding for education. Equitable is the magic word. Equitable has to do with per capita money going for that kid in Chicago, that kid in downstate, or in suburban Cook County, a fair return their tax dollars are coming back to the school district. So it is with that in mind I ask. Mr. Speaker, and I'm joined by two of my four of the required Members, according to Rule 55 (c) for a Roll Call Vote on this Amendment. Thank you."

Speaker Steczo: "Representative Clayton."

Clayton: "Thank you. I would like to speak in favor of Amendment. There's been a lot of discussion about the property tax cap and the reason that we have the property tax cap in my area and the collar counties is because the cost of the tax is so high. The 80% of the tax bill, property tax bill, goes to the school districts. And the reason that we have to put so much of our property tax money into the school districts is because the funding of our schools is they receive less than 5% state funding; therefore. 95% of their funding comes from the property This Amendment would just even that out a little bit more and to help our schools in getting a more equitable share."

Speaker Steczo: "Representative Levin. Representative Levin?"

Levin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would encourage every Member of this House to check the printouts as far as how your school districts do under this Bill. Representative Murphy, for example, if she would look at the printout, she would see that her

140th Legislative Day

June 1, 1994

school districts lose \$129,464 under this Amendment. This is an Amendment to the school aid formula and what it does, therefore, is it means there are winners and there are losers if you make a change. And according to the printout, there are like 19 winners and there are 99 losers as far as Representatives in this chamber go. So unless you want to subsidize the Sponsor's school district to the tune of about \$2 million, which the printout suggests this Amendment would do, I would encourage people to vote the interest of their school district and if you're not one of the ones...one of the 19 that would gain money, in terms of the subsidy this would provide, would encourage you to vote 'no'."

Speaker Steczo: "Representative Persico."

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

Speaker Steczo: "He indicates that he will."

Persico: "Representative, in your district approximately how much money from the state do your school districts receive?"

Skinner: "Well, the analysis that I had done prior to the referendum, the Constitutional Amendment we voted on two years ago indicated McHenry County gets about one-third of the income tax money it pays in. But I've had complaints from school districts that they get much, a much smaller percentage of that in as a percent of their budget."

Persico: "You mean, you're saying that they give one-third of the income tax that is generated in the state to the school aid formula but yet they're not receiving a third back? Is that what you're saying?"

Skinner: "Well, some of the school districts have complained about that, yes."

Persico: "So would you say it's around 5%, 6% of your money comes

140th Legislative Day

June 1, 1994

from the state...?"

Skinner: "I...I would be surprised if any of my school districts are that bad off."

Persico: "One of the things that concerned me and concerned a lot of the school districts when we did discuss the property tax caps, and I did vote in favor of it because I do believe in it, but one of the things that we didn't know if there was going to be...what the ramifications were was something called a 'double-whammy'. Is that what your Amendment will do is eliminate the double-whammy and exactly what is the double-whammy?"

Skinner: "That is the shorthand description that my local school board members and administrators have used."

Persico: "And so basically the double-whammy is as when in a capped county as the assessed evaluation goes up, they receive even less state money than they normally would have if there was no cap. Is this what your Amendment is addressing?"

Skinner: "Not only that, but they as a result of the assessed valuation going up faster than the cost of living, they end up getting less state aid than they got previously."

Persico: "Does your Amendment..."

Skinner: "Hence, the double-whammy."

Persico: "Does your Amendment address another concern of the school districts which is under new growth and according to the tax cap new growth is it new construction, but one of the things that many school districts are complaining about with this cap is that generational turnover where family, an elderly family let's say moves out of the district and a family of three or four...with three or four children move in, according to the tax cap they're not eligible to increase that under the new growth? This Amendment does

140th Legislative Day

June 1, 1994

not address that; it just addresses..."

Skinner: "This is a more narrowly focused Amendment than what you're discussing."

Persico: "Thank you, Representative. To the Bill. stand strong support of this Amendment. You know, as I said, I was a proponent of tax caps. I did vote for tax caps. felt they were needed in...in areas such that I represented where almost 80%, 90% of the school bill comes through their local property taxes, but with the tax cap some of the ramifications that we did not anticipate like the double-whammy and like the generational turnover, has made it very difficult for these school districts to educate the children in the way that they were previous to that. I'm not saying that, you know, we have spent the money all the time, but this is something that is needed. It is something that was not anticipated, and I do urge that you vote 'yes' on this Amendment."

Speaker Steczo: "Representative Maureen Murphy, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Murphy, M.: "I asked to be recognized because my name was used in debate. We had a friendly exchange on the other the aisle, couple of Representatives, and in trying to get the figures on who the losers and winners are, it appears losers are the children of the State of Illinois. Some...some Democrat staffer wearing a purple shirt dark glasses tried to tell me his name was Tim Mapes, but I seem to know Tim Mapes and he's no Tim Mapes. At any rate. the Chairman of Revenue was going to be very kind and provide me with the figures and the gentleman in the purple shirt will not give us the figures with which to make a So, now seriously, if there are figures decision. that show that are accurate instead of just figures written

140th Legislative Day

June 1, 1994

on a piece of paper, I think they should be distributed for this Body to make a decisive, informed decision. Thank you."

Speaker Steczo: "Representative Lang."

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

Speaker Steczo: "He indicates he will."

Lang: "Representative Skinner, let me see if I can understand this Amendment properly. I think I'm bright, but I want to make sure I have all this put together, okay? So this would, in counties that have the tax cap, basically provide more dollars for education. Is that correct?"

Skinner: "That is correct."

Lang: "Are you...were you for the tax cap, Representative?"

Skinner: "Absolutely. Without equivocation."

Lang: "And isn't 60 or 70 or in some areas 80% of the property taxes that are paid going to education?"

Skinner: "In some unincorporated areas, I imagine it would approach that level."

Lang: "Well, so perhaps you can explain to me how you can be for the cap and for this Amendment at the same time and have it make any logical sense."

Skinner: "Well, I'm suggesting that local property taxes ought to be controlled by referendums, which is what the tax cap requires, and that areas which are the economic machine of the State of Illinois ought to get a larger share of the state aid to education, and this Amendment does that. I said previously, the computer run I had done last year indicated that there was a shift of state aid of approximately 1% statewide."

Lang: "Isn't one of the reasons that the people were for the cap for it and weren't you for it because of the great growth of property taxes?"

140th Legislative Day

June 1, 1994

- Skinner: "I was for it because I saw my local school boards taking up to an 18% increase in the amount of money that they took out of my pocket without a referendum."
- Lang: "So you thought that there was a problem with property taxes, and I didn't agree about a cap, but I understood that people wanted to control property taxes. But is it not a fact that if this Amendment passes and the Bill passes and gets signed into law by the Governor, that what you will have done here is avoid the cap and put the same taxes back on or additional taxes that can't be put on because of the cap?"
- Skinner: "No, there's no increase in taxes here."
- Lang: "But what does this Amendment do? Maybe I'm misunderstanding it."
- Skinner: "I thought I just explained that."
- Lang: "Well, as I say, I think I'm bright but apparently not bright enough to understand your Bill, so try again."
- Skinner: "Well, what I suggested was that the computer run I had done last year by the State Board of Education indicated that there was approximately a 1% shift in state aid from non-collar county districts to collar county districts."
- Lang: "But I don't understand. Why do we need the shift? You folks in the collar counties wanted the caps. You voted for the caps. You got the caps. Why do you need relief from the caps?"
- Skinner: "I am suggesting that we are not getting our fair share of state aid education because..."
- Lang: "Didn't you know that was going to happen when you passed the caps?"
- Skinner: "Well, as a second veteran Legislator to stand up and suggest that all of us freshmen Legislators had a chance to vote on the caps (which we did not, of course)..."

140th Legislative Day

June 1, 1994

Lang: "You were for the caps though, were you not?"

Skinner: "Yes. But..."

Lang: "So being a bright person and being on the floor of this House even before you were re-elected, you know that those caps were floating around here. Did you not know at that time and did the people that support you on this issue not know at that time that it was going to cost money for local school districts? And if so, why were you for the caps if you need relief from them today?"

Skinner: "Are you pausing now?"

Lang: "I'm pausing."

Skinner: "Thank you. I did not understand this implication of the cap at that time. I'm not aware that other people on this side of the aisle understood this implication. They may have. I did not hear them mention it. That's not, however, surprising considering the atmosphere of confrontation that occurred when the tax caps were being passed."

Lang: "You would submit, however, that you're asking today for a relief from the tax caps that you were for previously?"

Skinner: "I'm asking for relief from the unintended consequences of the tax cap on the school aid formula."

Lang: "But you're asking for relief from the caps?"

Skinner: "No, I want the caps to stand exactly as they are."

Lang: "Mr. Speaker, to the Amendment. Mr. Speaker..."

Speaker Steczo: "Proceed, Mr. Lang."

Lang: "I don't understand what we're doing here today. There were people on the floor of this House when we voted on property tax caps that were jumping up and down, screaming and yelling about how they need relief for those beleaguered property taxpayers, and you know what? They do. But those of who...some of us said, 'Caps are not the

140th Legislative Day

June 1, 1994

way to do this. Let's find another way to do it. If you propose caps, you're going to have problems'. All those school people are out there in the rotunda and around the rail and they said to us, 'Don't give us caps. If you give us caps, we won't be able to afford to run the schools and you will rue the day, and there will be a Representative on the floor of the House in two years or in three years and they will say 'we need relief from those caps. We can't afford to run the schools'. That's what's happening today, and I would submit to you that this is wrong. It was wrong then, and it's wrong today. And if people want relief from the caps which were wrong in the first place, the Amendment today should be to remove the caps, not to do something artificial. This is a terrible idea. Vote 'no'."

Speaker Steczo: "The Chair recognizes Representative Hicks."

Hicks: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Representative yield
for a question?"

Speaker Steczo: "He indicates he will."

Hicks: "Representative Skinner, I've sat and listened to this debate now. I wasn't on the floor when you started, but I sat and heard on the box for several minutes and I heard you continually say, 'Well, it's veteran Legislators like Representative Granberg who you spoke about a while ago'. Representative Skinner, weren't you formerly a Member of this House at one time?"

Skinner: "Not when we voted on the tax caps."

Hicks: "Well maybe not when we voted on tax caps but when we voted on a lot of other things, were you not?"

Skinner: "Yes."

Skinner: "I'm sort of a retread."

140th Legislative Day

June 1, 1994

Hicks: "Okay, Representative, you know, and to the Bill, Mr. Speaker. I come from downstate Illinois, which I've heard Representative Skinner say, 'Oh, they get all the money downstate. They get all the money in Chicago'. Well, tell you, Representative. Ιf, in fact, you want to change the formula of Illinois, there's a lot of would allow that to be changed and we go along with that being changed. But what we'd like to see is we'd also see the property taxes of this state equalized around the state and us share in some of that. I got teachers starting at \$16,000 a year, and there's not a teacher in your district that starts at anything less than Representative, give me a break. Give me a mean, I've got \$16,000 a year. Your people on welfare more money than that. Gimney-Christmas. I'll tell you. The reality is we'd be happy to share in this on tax dollars in this state. If my kids in downstate Illinois got a share of the proper education, got a share of being able to have an equalized education along with the kids in northern Illinois and the suburbs, I'd be happy to see them get an equal share of that education just like kids are any day of the week. I'd take your property taxes; I'd put them all in one pool of dollars and them up equally among every kid in this state. Be happy to do that with you, Representative. Thank you very much."

Speaker Steczo: "Is there any further discussion? Representative Salvi."

Salvi: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative, we're not asking you to give us any additional share of any of your money. We're simply asking you to allow us to have a little bit greater share of our own money. As Representative Clayton and Representative Persico said earlier, we only receive a

140th Legislative Day

June 1, 1994

very small percentage of our tax dollars back to educate our children. Now your suggestion that in addition to our income tax dollars helping you educate your kids, you want now our property tax dollars. That's absolutely outrageous. What we're asking for here is equity. Fairness and equity in the distribution of moneys This is a good Amendment. I strongly support education. it, and I ask all of you who support equity and a small change toward a more fair system of funding education to vote 'yes' on this Amendment."

Speaker Steczo: "Representative Persico, for what purpose do you
seek recognition?"

Persico: "Point of personal privilege. My name was mentioned in debate."

Speaker Steczo: "Proceed."

Persico: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think one of the things that there's some misunderstanding on this Bill. We're not trying to change the tax cap legislation. We...many of us voted for that legislation. We felt it was needed; we still feel that it's needed. This Amendment does not change it. What happened as a result of the cap legislation was basically you can arque in unintended windfall for downstate school districts. Because with cap legislation, the higher your assessed evaluation went up you would receive less state money because of that. Now that I don't believe was the intent of this legislation that was passed two years ago. The intent was to try reduce the reliance on property taxes to schools. Because of this and because of the unintended consequences, downstate received an unintended windfall from this. All this will do is change it, allow the small amount of money to come back into the local school

140th Legislative Day

June 1, 1994

districts that have this problem, and I do urge your strong support of this Amendment in the issue of fairness."

Speaker Steczo: "Representative Schoenberg. Mr. Schoenberg?"

Schoenberg: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. As one who represents an exclusively suburban area, don't quite understand why some suburbs are more equal under the law of this Body than others. I would like additional relief perhaps for the Evanston township high schools. I'd like some more money for New Trier high I have a brother who bought a house in Buffalo Grove which is on the Cook and Lake border. Now I don't even know where he bought that house, but if he bought it on the Cook side, he's out of luck. If he bought it on the Lake side of Lake/Cook Road, he might be in business. is a bad measure because it does not treat all suburbs fairly. And, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to move the previous question."

Speaker Steczo: "Is there any further discussion? There being none, Representative Skinner, to close."

Skinner: "Was there anyone else seeking recognition, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Steczo: "Mr. Skinner, you're closing at this point.

There's nobody else seeking recognition."

Skinner: "There was no one else?"

Speaker Steczo: "No one else."

Skinner: "Okay, fine. I would suggest that the rest of the...those of you who are not in the collar counties have now seen one of the items that is surely going to be on the suburban agenda until this problem is solved. We do not come from school districts, most of us do not come from school districts that are expending extraordinary amounts of money on their education. I pointed out previously that

140th Legislative Day

June 1, 1994

Chicago spends \$130,000 per classroom on its education. \$130,000 is more than any school district in McHenry County spends on its children. And, of course, one of unintended points I ought to make is that almost virtually proves that the amount of money you spend per kid doesn't make any difference in the quality of the education that you get. During this debate, one Legislator has pointed out that as a result of the tax cap legislation passing, and people not fully thinking through what the consequences are, that districts outside the collar counties ended up getting basically an unintended bonus or windfall. that is correct. believe The windfall amounts to approximately 1% of the state aid to education. We are asking to have that windfall returned to its original Now some of the downstate Legislators have waxed eloquently with regard to irrelevant matters such beginning salary οf teachers. I assure you, the Representative that suggested no beginning teacher collar counties gets paid less than \$30,000, that he is incorrect. They are paid substantially less than to start with. But there's one other point that perhaps would allow you to identify with what I'm talking about, and this the people in suburban Cook County and Chicago should pay particular attention to, should pay particular attention to during the 1980's the downstate Legislators with large farming districts pulled a real fast one of all of us that are from the more metropolitan part of the state. The fast one was that they got us to agree to assess farmland differently. Now I cite a source is no less than the Speaker of this House, I know that he knows and has commented about it in the press openly at least one time that downstate districts actually get more than their

140th Legislative Day

June 1, 1994

share of state aid to education because the farmland is not assessed anywhere near market value or one-third of market value as is the property on the average in Cook County and in the collar counties. Now what that means is, that as an unintended consequence again of the agricultural assessment that the early 80's. passed in school aid was transferred from those areas with less farmland to those areas with more farmland. So you see, we may have something more in common than you may think. I finally would note that in Cook County we're going to have a referendum this fall on whether or not to have a property tax cap. If this referendum passes, I expect every Cook argued vehemently against Legislator who this legislation to support it next year after the...actually the tax caps are passed or perhaps as a part of a tax cap package because if you don't do that, you'll be the same sorry state of receiving less state aid than you deserve as the collar counties are now. So I ask 'yes' vote in the name of fairness, not expecting to pass this Amendment today, but expecting, perhaps to, have aired an issue which heretofore has not been aired on this House floor during this Session. Thank you."

Speaker Steczo: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #3. On that question, all those in favor will signify by voting 'aye'; those opposed by voting 'no'. The voting is open. Representative Novak, one minute to explain your vote."

Novak: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. I'd just like to explain my vote.

After listening to all this acrimony on the floor, you know in July of 1991, many of us, besides all the freshmen that weren't there before, we were down there till July 19; 19 days after July 1, raggling and haggling with the tax cap

140th Legislative Day

June 1, 1994

- issue. And we finally passed it and it became law. Then lo and behold, this surfaces, especially from a suburban area. I just can't believe it. This Bill shouldn't have any votes at all."
- Speaker Steczo: "Representative Mulligan, one minute to explain your vote."
- Mulligan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm voting 'no' on this because I represent Cook County, but I tend to agree with Representative Skinner. That if we pass tax caps we will back here asking for something like this, which only points at the fact that the dire need to change the school aid formula which is incorrect now and has a lot inconsistencies in a variety across the state that not benefit the children of Illinois."
- Speaker Steczo: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 25 voting 'yes', 86 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. The Amendment fails. Mr. Clerk, any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Rossi: "Floor Amendment #4, offered by Representative Cowlishaw."
- Cowlishaw: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. You look very comfortable up there. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Floor Amendment #4 deletes the provisions providing that teachers may not be required by a school board, local school council, superintendent, principal or other school official to spend more than eight hours a semester on a school improvement plan and also deletes the provisions that would have required there to be a one-year moratorium on the state's school recognition process.

140th Legislative Day

June 1, 1994

These two provisions which, originally, were each the subject of a separate Bill were very controversial. The...there were, in fact, some major groups on both sides; some opposed, some in favor. Those groups have now met together and agreed to what is contained in this Amendment. And so I want to assure my colleagues that the provisions in this Amendment have been agreed to by the Illinois Education Association. I know that is of concern to many of us because we certainly do not want to do anything that would be an impairment for our teachers; and, therefore. Mr. Speaker, to the best of my knowledge, now that all of these negotiations have been concluded and these have all signed off on this, to the best of my knowledge there are no opponents to Floor Amendment #4. And, therefore, I would be glad to answer any questions, but I would move for its adoption."

Speaker Steczo: "The Lady has moved for the adoption of Amendment #4. On that, is there any discussion? The Chair recognizes Representative Granberq."

Granberg: "Will the Lady yield?"

Speaker Steczo: "She indicates that she will."

Granberg: "Representative, we just...for purpose of our Members,
there is no formal opposition to this language? Is that
what you just said?"

Cowlishaw: "That is my understanding, Sir."

Granberg: "So, the Illinois Education Association, all of the education groups, have now signed off?"

Cowlishaw: "Absolutely."

Granberg: "And this is in regards to, I believe, Representative Ostenburg's Bill earlier..."

Cowlishaw: "Yes."

Granberg: "...in the Session?"

140th Legislative Day

June 1, 1994

Cowlishaw: "Yes, and, in fact, I went and spoke to Representative Ostenburg, I think it was Thursday of last week, which I think was the day for these negotiations (maybe it was Friday), but at any rate, it was last week. I went and spoke to him about this because one of these was his Bill originally. And he...I told him if he wanted to he could...he could call whoever he wanted and confirm that, in fact, the negotiations had been concluded and that the Illinois Education Association was in accord with this, and I assume that he did so."

Granberg: "Okay. Thank you very much."

Cowlishaw: "You're very welcome. Thank you."

Speaker Steczo: "Representative Brunsvold."

Brunsvold: "Thank you, Ladies and Gentlemen. I would stand in support of the Lady's Amendment, Amendment #4. An agreement has been worked out, and we should adopt the Amendment."

Speaker Steczo: "The Chair recognizes Representative Monique Davis. Representative Davis? Representative Monique Davis?"

Davis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Lady yield?"

Speaker Steczo: "She indicates that she will."

Davis: "Representative, this Bill does two things, this Amendment does two things, and one of them is to prohibit teachers from working more than eight hours on the school improvement plan. Is that correct?"

Cowlishaw: "No, Representative. Let me try to explain this.

There was a proposal that we should put into the School

Code a requirement that no teacher shall be required to

spend more than a total of eight hours on preparations of a

school improvement plan. There has now been an agreement

worked out amongst all of the people involved, including

140th Legislative Day

June 1, 1994

the Illinois Education Association, there is a separate proposal that will replace this, that is the agreed to proposal. And I believe, although I am not certain, I believe that that agreed to proposal has already been adopted as an Amendment to a Bill that is currently over in the Senate and will be coming back here for concurrence. Does that answer your question?"

Davis: "Well, yes it does answer the question. But when you say it has been agreed to and it's been agreed to by whom?"

Cowlishaw: "The Illinois Education Association and all of the others who evidenced an interest in this...in these provisions."

Davis: "Thank you, Representative."

Cowlishaw: "You're welcome."

Speaker Steczo: "Is there any further discussion? The Chair recognizes Representative Ostenburg."

Ostenburg: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. What the Lady is saying in regard to this Amendment is true. There has been an agreement that's been reached by the Illinois Education Association, by the State Board of Education and others. Given that fact, I suppose it's appropriate for us to go along with this Amendment. I want to say, however, though, that as the person who sponsored at least one of the parts that is included in this, having been consulted in that negotiating process, I feel as though the legislative process itself has been betrayed. Now I have high respect for the individuals who lobby on behalf of the various organizations and the departments of none of them have been elected this state, but constituents Springfield to act and enact and sent to legislation on behalf of the general public. I think that there's something drastically wrong with the system,

140th Legislative Day

June 1, 1994

drastically wrong with the system when individuals who are not elected, but who are paid to represent special interests, can negotiate and can sidetrack legislation. They've all agreed on it, so that's all well and good. But there's something wrong with that kind of a process. The process should involve Legislators making the decision on when Bills should be amended, not lobbyists. With all due respect to their good efforts and their hard work, they are not elected representatives of the citizens of this state."

Speaker Steczo: "The Chair recognizes Representative Black."

Black: "Yes, thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Ι just rise because I knew if the Session went long enough Representative Ostenburg and I would be in complete agreement on at least one point. And I agree with what he just said. We're all elected to serve our constituents down here, and I'll just change a little bit from what he said about lobbyists. I was elected to my constituents and I introduced several Bills at their bequest; and unfortunately, I can't get those Bills called. And so I think that's an abuse of the process. So I join Representative Ostenburg in saying there are many abuses of the process that go on down here, but I think the abuse given to many of us on this side of the aisle are more agregious than what he was talking about. And I feel much better for having said that. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Steczo: "Representative Brady."

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

Speaker Steczo: "He indicates that he will."

Brady: "Representative, if this Amendment becomes law, is it your understanding that what that would mean is that no teacher would be required more than a certain amount of time on

140th Legislative Day

June 1, 1994

this program or explain to me what..."

Cowlishaw: "Representative Brady, the School Code is currently entirely silent on how many hours or none or a silent. million any teacher might devote to the development of improvement plan. There was, as I understand, some objection in certain school districts by teachers who believed that they were being asked to spend more time on that than they believed they could accommodate and still be good teachers. And so there was a proposal to limit the total number of hours that any one teacher could spend on this to eight hours. However, there were disagreements about why it should be specifically eight hours, why it shouldn't be some other number or why, in fact, perhaps there should even be such a requirement set forth by the state at all. And so we followed what, I believe, commonly referred to as 'consensus politics'. That is we took all of those groups with an interest in the asked them to sit down together, look at what the issue was and try to determine something that they believed would address that issue, that they could all agree on. Now T have never seen anything wrong with asking the people with the most immediate interest in a given subject to give their views of what we should do about that. That is what the people with an interest in this did. And the agreement that they came to, which is not something we can debate now because it's not in this Amendment, the agreement that they came to has now been, it is my understanding, has now been adopted as an Amendment to a Bill that is in the Senate. Therefore, this Amendment is...what was in this Bill is no longer needed and that's all this Amendment does is take that out."

Brady: "Takes what out?"

140th Legislative Day

June 1, 1994

Cowlishaw: "It takes out the requirement that a teacher cannot have spend more than eight hours on a school improvement plan."

Brady: "But there is no requirement."

Cowlishaw: "There would be a new requirement. If we do not adopt this Amendment, this Bill would still have a requirement that we have no more..."

Brady: "It's in the underlying Bill."

Cowlishaw: "Pardon me?"

Brady: "And that requirement is in the underlying Bill?"

Cowlishaw: "No, that requirement is in the Amendment that was originally adopted which includes, I think, somewhere around 150,000,635 separate Bills that were all put into one Amendment. That might be a slight exaggeration there as far as the number. It just seemed that way."

Speaker Steczo: "Is there any further discussion? The Chair recognizes Representative Rutherford."

Rutherford: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Steczo: "She indicates she will."

Rutherford: "Thank you. Representative, I want to...could you help me understand a bit in here, as I understand it also deletes provisions requiring that a one-year moratorium be established on the school recognition process."

Cowlishaw: "Representative, just as you, I think, now mentioned that you couldn't hear me, I have to tell you I can't hear you either. So..."

Rutherford: "That's okay. That's all right."

Cowlishaw: "Would you please repeat the question?"

Rutherford: "Sure. I just want to...do I understand that this

also deletes provision requiring a one-year moratorium?"

Cowlishaw: "That is correct."

Rutherford: "And that's called the school recognition process?"

140th Legislative Day

June 1, 1994

Cowlishaw: "That is correct."

Rutherford: "Is that the title for this thing we were talking about earlier that they would have to have spent the time on?"

Cowlishaw: "No."

Rutherford: "What is this, then, the school recognition process?"

Cowlishaw: "Hang on a minute, please. Representative, there are actually two portions in this Amendment. The first one has to do with something called a school improvement plan."

Rutherford: "School improvement plan."

Cowlishaw: "That's right. Which every school district in Illinois is required to have."

Rutherford: "Right."

Cowlishaw: "All right? Every school district is supposed to set for itself goals about how it is going to improve learning.

That's called a school improvement plan, and it's required.

Every school district has to have one..."

Rutherford: "I understand."

Cowlishaw: "...and has to submit it to the state. The portion of this Bill...of this portion...the second Amendment relates to something called the school recognition process which is a much newer provision and which is a means of enabling the State Board of Education to make an assessment of whether schools are meeting those goals that they have established as well as other goals that are established by the state board itself. Does that answer your question?"

Rutherford: "It does. So, as I'm reading some analysis here, I'm getting a lot of double negatives and I want to make sure I understand ultimately what we're doing here. That in regards to the school recognition process, this deletes provisions requiring that a one-year moratorium be

140th Legislative Day

- June 1, 1994
- established. So by doing that then we are saying that we started all over again now, that there is no longer a moratorium?"
- Cowlishaw: "Well, it's already begun. The idea was that it would just could come to a screeching halt for a whole year, and since this school recognition process is in keeping, I believe, with the theory of the State Board of Education is the secret to accountability..."
- Rutherford: "So just to clarify it real simply. This, if adopted, would eliminate that one-year moratorium."
- Cowlishaw: "That is correct."
- Rutherford: "Great. Thank you very much, Representative."
- Speaker Steczo: "Is there any further discussion? There being none, all those in favor of the adoption of the Amendment will signify by saying 'aye'; those opposed by saying 'no'.

 The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment's adopted. Mr. Clerk, any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Rossi: "Floor Amendment #5, offered by Representative Cowlishaw."
- Speaker Steczo: "The Chair recognizes Representative Cowlishaw, on Amendment #5."
- Cowlishaw: "Mr. Speaker, before I present this Amendment, I would like to ask please if I may inquire of the Speaker if I may have a recorded Roll Call Vote on this Amendment."
- Speaker Steczo: "Representative Cowlishaw, you may."
- Cowlishaw: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Amendment #5 contains what was originally contained in House Bill 4035, which abolishes the City of Chicago school district and creates in its place nine brand new independent school districts, each of which would have a seven member elected school board just like the elected school boards in nearly all other parts of the state. The boards of education,

140th Legislative Day

June 1, 1994

thus created, would not be appointed by the mayor Chicago or by anyone else; they would be elected just as the school board members in the districts of nearly all are elected. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Ι realize that this is a controversial Amendment. also realize that this is a dramatic change Ι from what now exists, but it hardly has escaped us over the years that we have not fulfilled our obligation as a state to the young people who attend school in the City of Chicago. We all know that there have been visitors to our who have proclaimed that the City of Chicago schools to be the worst in the entire nation. Ι do not be true, but even for it to have been made as an accusation tells us something important. It seems the only way we are ever going to make any real progress in improving the schools in Chicago for the the students who go to school there is by making just such a dramatic change in the organizational structure that school district. And it seems to me that if we do this we are following the model that has been set up throughout the entire rest of this state and that works very well. A manageable number of students in a district a manageable size so that the people can run for election to the school board. That is the ultimate accountability. an elected school board. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I would be glad to answer any questions, in strong support of Floor Amendment #5 and would remind you, Mr. Speaker, one more time, that you did agree that would be a recorded Roll Call Vote on this Amendment. and I thank you for it."

Speaker Steczo: "The Lady has moved for the adoption of Amendment #5. On that, is there any discussion? The Chair

140th Legislative Day

June 1, 1994

recognizes the Representative from Rock Island, Representative Brunsvold."

Brunsvold: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The Lady has a proposal to break up the City of Chicago and probably a lot of people on this floor would say, 'Well, that's...that's a good idea. Let's do But the fact is that if she were trying to break up the school district at Rock Island, I would sure hope that the people of Rock Island had some input on how that was to take place. The fact is that we sit here as Legislators, you're from the collar counties or from downstate. propose grandiose ideas for the worse district in the nation (as Chicago has been described) think that we're going to change it from here. Well, we're going to change it from here, Ladies and Gentlemen of If the Chicago school district is going to change, it's got to change in Chicago. It doesn't...it can't and will not change here. That is a different school district that has different problems than we have. And I would commend the Lady for her efforts to try to do this, but I would oppose her Amendment for the simple fact that I think we ought to get the people of Chicago involved If they're going to break up that district, then we need the people in Chicago to do that. This has got to internal thing. It cannot be an external activity that takes place with the breakup of the City of schools. It's got to happen from in Chicago, and the power structure there. the job structure that drives this \$2.7 billion machine of educating the kids in Chicago has got to work from that area. So, I would oppose the Lady's say that the people of Chicago and the Amendment and Leaders in Chicago would have to instigate a change in

140th Legislative Day

June 1, 1994

way that system works if this is going to take place. I would ask for a 'no' vote on this Amendment."

Speaker Steczo: "Representative Monique Davis."

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

Speaker Steczo: "She indicates that she will."

Davis: "Thank you. Representative Cowlishaw, how much of Chicago do you represent?"

Cowlishaw: "I represent just as much of Chicago as you do of Naperville."

Davis: "You represent as much of Chicago as I represent of
Naperville? Well, my district sits totally in Chicago as
25 other Representatives sitting in this Body do. Do you
know there are 25 Representatives here from Chicago, duly
elected by the people?"

Cowlishaw: "Well, I hope they're duly elected. I understand they do things rather different with elections in Chicago, but I assume they're duly elected."

Davis: "Representative, how many of your children go the schools in Chicago? Maybe that's what..."

Cowlishaw: "How many of yours do?"

Davis: "...Maybe that's the secret you're hiding? How many of your children go to school in the City of Chicago?"

Cowlishaw: "None of my children go to school anymore. They're all married. They are all college graduated, and they all have children of their own. And they all pay taxes."

Davis: "Did you pass the school reform legislation in 1988?"

Cowlishaw: "Pardon me, did I pass it? I believe the entire General Assembly passed it."

Davis: "Do you remember, now maybe that's the question I'll ask you, do you remember or is there someone around who can remind you that you passed a school reform Bill in 1988 for Chicago?"

140th Legislative Day

June 1, 1994

- Cowlishaw: "Yes, Representative, I remember the reform Bill we passed in 1985, which applied statewide but did not apply to Chicago. And then I remember the materials that we worked on long and hard and I believe that you were one of the participants in those meetings that I'm sure you recall that everyone who was engaged in that, worked very, very hard, very long to put together the reform package for Chicago which, indeed, we did all endorse in 1988."
- Davis: "So, the school reform package of 1988, Representative, has about how many elected officials based upon the law that you passed out of here in '88?"
- Cowlishaw: "Well, as far as I know, in the City of Chicago as far as the schools themselves are concerned, there are no elected school board members, they're all appointed by the mayor. The only people who are elected are the local school councils. They are the hope for the reform of the Chicago public schools. And so since they are so successful because they are elected by the people so would these school board members be."
- Davis: "So, there are 630...excuse me, there are 630 schools with 11 elected school board members for that school. Is that correct?"
- Cowlishaw: "No, no, they're not elected. The current members of the Chicago Board of Education are not elected by anybody."
- Davis: "No, no. The Chicago board is selected based upon the subdistrict councils recommendations to a nominating commission. So, in other words, a lot of elected people are making decisions about what happens to our schools in the City of Chicago."

Cowlishaw: "Yes."

Davis: "Is that vastly different than what happens in Naperville?"

140th Legislative Day

June 1, 1994

Cowlishaw: "Oh, most certainly it is because in Naperville we don't rely on the mayor or the members of the city council or the park district commissioners or the ward healers or any of the rest of those people to decide who should be recommended to serve on the board of education. Instead we simply have public-spirited citizens who come forward, file to run for the board of education. They are elected at large by the people."

Davis: "To the Bill, Mr. Speaker. First of all, I'd like to as a duly elected Member from the City of Chicago and one who comes to the General Assembly with the highest vote of the 118 Members here, I proudly say to you that the system that we put in place is working. The people Naperville may not pay taxes there but they sure come and sweeten their honey by coming there and going to all of our locations that are free like our museums, our zoos, come to the universities that are listed, they come hospitals that are there, they come to our Marshall Fields at Christmas time; in other words, they use all of facilities without paying any of the taxes of that city. So, I think we're being extremely good to those Naperville people when we allow them to do those things, but I'll be damned if they're going to run our school system. comment to the Representative who neither has children grandchildren in our school system does not...does not obviously have the interest of our children at There are over 25 elected people from Chicago sitting in this Body and are close to that many in the Senate. When this kind of legislation is initiated because we live in a democracy that will come from the people whom have elected to make those kinds of decisions. Now. I am so glad that Representative Cowlishaw is so concerned about

140th Legislative Day

June 1, 1994

the children in the City of Chicago, and I'm going to remember that as we continue voting on issues that affect Chicago. I'm going to remember we have an additional concerned citizen to be concerned with what happens to our children in the City of Chicago, and we will continue to allow you to come and get honey out of that city without paying a damn dime in taxes over there."

Speaker Steczo: "Representative Hoeft."

Hoeft: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. When Representative Brunsvold was talking about Rock Island he was saying we do interfere with his district and he would resent that. reason is because that's a well-run district as exemplified by their Leadership. We talked to the Chicago superintendent last year and Argie Johnson said that this Body is going to be facing a \$700 million clip. been trying to address needed reform so that when we are asked to bail out that system and find financial resources for that system, there will be a logical basis for us to say, 'The money is going to go into a system that is working better than what it has in the past'. The reason this Bill is here and other Bills is because we continually asked to help a staggering educational system. That is not being said for the other ones in Elgin or Rock Island or any place else, and that's the big difference. When Chicago no longer needs to come to us for more then they can govern themselves as they want to; if not, then we are going to have to take an active role because it's our money that's going to be used to help them."

Speaker Steczo: "Representative Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. I suggest to the previous speaker that I don't know a single school district in the State of Illinois that isn't here asking

140th Legislative Day

June 1, 1994

for our help. We had a prior Amendment on this very Bill in which the suggestion was that the affluent collar county school districts needed more help from us, the General Assembly. I'd like to point out my appreciation to the Sponsor of this Amendment, Representative Cowlishaw. She clearly cares about what goes on in Chicago, and I'd be happy to offer language that would reorganize her school system in Naperville. I think that's the appropriate response to her generosity and her concern. Let me ask a few questions, if I might, of the Sponsor. Speaker, will she yield to a few questions?"

Speaker Steczo: "Proceed. Please proceed, Representative Currie."

Currie: "Representative, in drawing up your nine districts, how did you do it?"

Cowlishaw: "Representative, I couldn't hear a word you said."

Currie: "Good. When you drew up the nine districts,
Representative, I clearly you had census maps, you were
dealing in census tracks, you sat there at your desk
possibly upon this very House floor determining how to
divide the school population in Chicago into your nine
districts. How did you do it? What framed the decision
how you divided these census tracks to make these nine
districts?"

Cowlishaw: "By population."

Currie: "So, you just took a population number and you divided it. Now, were you concerned, for example, about physical barriers that might make it awkward for a school district to operate across, for example, major expressways or other natural configurations? I guess you decided not to do that. Did you take into account racial information or merely population?"

140th Legislative Day

June 1, 1994

Cowlishaw: "Representative Currie..."

Currie: "It's a yes... Did you take into account racial, no..."

Cowlishaw: "No, Representative Currie..."

Currie: "Just population. Okay. Did you..."

Cowlishaw: "No, no, no, no. If you ask a question, then you ought to at least have the courtesy to wait until it is answered."

Currie: "I thought you were going to give me a lengthy explanation. I asked a simple question..."

Cowlishaw: "It is very difficult for me to hear you because it is so noisy in here. But in answer to how these nine districts were drawn, first, I did not sit here on the House floor and draw them myself. That is clearly..."

Currie: "Oh, I thought this was your Amendment."

Cowlishaw: "That is clearly... It is my Amendment, but I'm sure that many of use professionals and staff help..."

Currie: "So, which professionals did you use?"

Cowlishaw: "Well, we put together a list of those factors just such as those that you have just mentioned. Things like natural barriers and you certainly don't want young children, in particular, to have to cross major streets..."

Currie: "So which professionals? Which professionals did you use in drafting this..."

Cowlishaw: "We used a computer expert to put this whole thing..."

Currie: "Could you tell us the name of the computer expert?"

Cowlishaw: "Yes, his name is... No, I guess I'm not supposed to do that."

Currie: "The person who has a contract with the House Republicans?"

Cowlishaw: "No, I don't believe so. I believe..."

Currie: "Is there someone on your staff then? There's no professional consulting fee involved?"

140th Legislative Day

June 1, 1994

Cowlishaw: "No, Sir...I mean, no Ma'am, not to my knowledge."

Currie: "Well, wait. Yes or no..."

Cowlishaw: "I have a computer expert, but I'm reluctant to mention the name..."

Currie: "You had a computer expert but you can't remember who?

And you don't know if it was on contract or not? Perhaps
you'd go back and ask your staff cause I'd like to look at
the contract, and I'd certainly be interested to find out
who in the City of Chicago your computer consultant on
contract consulted with before determining where there
might be major geographic or other barriers. Did you talk
to the Chicago Board of Education, for example, to get some
advice from them?"

Cowlishaw: "No, we just... Representative, so that we can clear up any misunderstanding here. It was Jerry Clark. He's sitting right here in Lee Daniels' chair."

Currie: "Oh, Jerry Clark, okay."

Cowlishaw: "...who drew this map. We gave him all the parameters to follow. He's very good with computers, and he didn't charge an extra penny to do it for us. You decided through all those staff people of wealth you don't charge anything extra just because they've given Representative Currie a little bit of needed help."

Currie: "You didn't consult with anybody in the Chicago school system or any of the advocacy groups for education in the City of Chicago, for example, the League of Women Voters, Designs for Change, the Chicago panel on public school policy and finance. Did you consult with any of those organizations?"

Cowlishaw: "No."

Currie: "That's too bad. All right, let me ask you this, how does this Amendment work? If we were to divide up the city

140th Legislative Day

June 1, 1994

into these nine districts, how do you divide the resources that now go to the City of Chicago with respect to educating our young?"

Cowlishaw: "They fall under the same provisions of the School

Code as all the school districts in Illinois presently do.

They pose their own local property taxes. They qualify for

certain amounts of state aid and the amount of state aid

they get we send to them."

Currie: "So, the more affluent areas that might be combined in a single district will have a better chance to provide more resources for the education of their young than would, for example, the west side of the city which is a particularly poor area. Is that right? Yes or no. Yes or no."

Cowlishaw: "Representative, the school aid formula..."

Speaker Steczo: "The Chair recognizes Representative Persico."

Currie: "Wait, wait... I wasn't done. I wasn't finished..."

Persico: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I stand in support of this The previous speaker implied that since we do not represent the City of Chicago that we have no right in butting into the way that the Chicago system works. I think one of the things that we as Legislators always to do is balance what we feel is the need of our district as well as the State of Illinois. The City of Chicago's a a needed city for the whole vibrant city, No one denies that. But one of the blemishes that many Legislators and many people in the State Illinois feel is that the Chicago school system needs to change in order to produce the kind of product, the kind of student that we need in order to keep our flourishing. The Representative that spoke and had that implication that we should not butt into the City of Chicago's schools did not say anything last fall when many

140th Legislative Day

June 1, 1994

of us were very frustrated that we had to keep coming down here week after week to try to solve a problem that we, as State Legislators, didn't do but rather the city schools of the City of Chicago did, coming and asking us for \$200, \$400 million, I can't even remember what it was. realizing that in another two years we're going to face the same problem again. Are we, as Legislators, then supposed to not butt into the City of Chicago's school problems and say, 'Whatever you want, we will give you'? Representative Skinner had an Amendment a little while ago that asked this same Body for a small amount of money to solve a that we in suburbia were facing because of some unintended consequences of the tax cap. I didn't see many votes go up in favor of helping the suburbs who they perceive as wealthy but rather there were many, many 'no' votes up there. It's a system that in suburbia we are spending less than the state average on a per pupil basis. You cannot say the same thing for the City of Chicago. So, yes we do as a Body have a right and a duty to interfere if we feel that some interference is needed to help solve a problem. I stand in strong support of this Amendment. I hope every person in this Legislature feels that we do have a duty to help the City of Chicago. I Representative Cowlishaw has a good Amendment and a step in the right direction."

Speaker Steczo: "Representative Roskam."

Roskam: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I was one of the Republicans last year who voted for the Chicago plan. I was one of the Republicans last week who jumped and down and kicked and screamed for Representative Monique Davis and her program for the 5% set aside. I am offended at the notion that Representative

140th Legislative Day

June 1, 1994

Cowlishaw comes forward and because she is trying to intervene on behalf of the City of Chicago for our taxpayers, some of whom are in Naperville, that she is met with syrupy sweet sarcasm. Let me tell you, when we come forward and the tables are changed and in another year everybody's rubbing their hands together and saying, me, the City of Chicago schools are hitting the skids again; give us some more dough', I would submit that the tone of your remarks today are counterproductive. I don't subscribe to the fortress collar counter...collar county I think that we're all in this together. I mentality. think that the City of Chicago and my communities in DuPage are inextricably linked. But somehow the notion Representative Cowlishaw coming forward and putting forth a Democratic ideal that is breaking up the iceberg so that people can be elected to represent the kids in the City of Chicago, that she's met with ridicule, that's troubling. I would submit that our words mean things, and if our words begin to break down, then this legislative engine is going to be broken down. If you want to debate the merits of this, then let's debate the merits. But to be...to be sarcastic and cute and condescending towards Representative Cowlishaw doesn't help anybody."

Speaker Steczo: "The Chair recognizes Representative... For what reason does the Lady from DuPage, Representative Cowlishaw, seek recognition?"

Cowlishaw: "Mr. Speaker, are...pardon me, are there any more people seeking recognition?"

Speaker Steczo: "Representative, a number."

Cowlishaw: "Pardon me?"

Speaker Steczo: "A number of people are still seeking recognition."

140th Legislative Day

June 1, 1994

Cowlishaw: "Oh."

Speaker Steczo: "Are you waiting to close? Is that why your light was on?"

Cowlishaw: "No, I'm just anticipating that somebody else will have a question."

Speaker Steczo: "Well, oh okay..."

Cowlishaw: "I'm indicating to you that I'm more than willing to provide answers."

Speaker Steczo: "Fine. Let's call... The Chair recognizes

Representative Maureen Murphy."

Murphy, M.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the General Assembly, I represent Chicago and suburban Cook County and just as in committee, here we are on the House floor hearing that it is not the state's business about Chicago schools that when bureaucrats from Chicago come begging for bail-out booty, it is our problem to vote When 50% of the children in Chicago schools are going to fail by not finishing school, those uneducated, unemployed kids become a state problem. As education Chairman for the state for ALEC, a national forum, we have found that smaller schools do better, period. Smaller schools do Not smaller, richer schools; not smaller, poorer schools. There's a political saying, 'If it ain't broke, fix it'. Well, there could be nothing more broken down than the Chicago school system where reform 3,800 more administrative jobs, some including Members of this Assembly, where we are doing nothing for the children of Chicago that do affect the whole state. The business of educating 410,000 students is the state's business, and they are not doing a good job. We did not do Chicago learning zones with bilateral, bipartisan support. At the very least we could do is have elected, responsible,

140th Legislative Day

June 1, 1994

accountable officials overseeing smaller. better school districts. This is the time for debate. What have you done in 1994 for the Chicago schools anyone of us sitting here today. We have done nothing for the Chicago children, and they will be back here with a bigger deficit next year. And what are we doing to help more children get educated, to be jobworthy, to not be falling through the And Detroit, New York, L.A. do not have the poor cracks? statistics that Chicago does. It is broken, Ladies and We need smaller, elected school boards. Let's replicate what does work in the rest of the 101 counties and in the suburbs of Cook County. I beg you to look at the merits of this. And it's not Chicago versus the rest this state, it's all of us are responsible Legislators that should for once let's talk about the kids. What about the kids and what have you done for 410,000 Chicago students? And they do have some wonderful teachers. are some wonderful principals, and let's have some elected school board members that have the guts to do what's necessary. Ι urge a 'yes' vote on this Amendment, and I indulge your patience in my passion. But it is about is...yes, it's passion for the children in education, and those...anyone that has served on a for ten years without pay knows that there is comradely of spirit and truly elected by their district. elected school board members, are quite a dedicated bunch. Chicago deserves elected school boards. and Ι applaud the Sponsor for bringing forth this Amendment, even though it was once my Bill. Thank you, Representative."

Speaker Steczo: "For what purpose does Representative Davis seek
 recognition?"

140th Legislative Day

June 1, 1994

Davis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My name was used in debate so I take this personal privilege..."

Speaker Steczo: "Please proceed."

Davis: "...to merely say...to merely say that the officious behavior and the intent of the legislation does not address the problem of not having enough money for our system. And to pretend...to pretend that an elected school board will solve those dollar problems is truly...is just...it's regrettable that they want to fool the public that way. The fact that over 114 schools are on the financial watchlist states that our...the people are not doing what they should do for education for a number of people. So you can move chairs, you can have elected school boards, but if you're not putting forth enough dollars to educate those people, you're being disingenuous, think everybody knows it. I just want to say there are a lot of new people on that side of the aisle and you know what? Come November there'll a lot of more new faces over there."

Speaker Steczo: "The Chair recognizes Representative Ostenburg." Ostenburg: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the I rise in opposition to this Amendment and aside House. from the various personal things that have been exchanged back and forth, I want to speak to the lack of merit of the I have no problem with elected school boards, and I think that perhaps it's an idea that should be considered even in Chicago. But the point is this particular measure does nothing. In fact, what will happen here is that we'll simply have nine times the problem that we currently have. It's going to be nine times as costly to have nine administrations, administering nine school districts in Chicago. It's going to be nine times as

140th Legislative Day

June 1, 1994

costly in renting space for these buildings to house those administrators. In addition to that, the greatest problem that faces our schools in the State of Illinois today is disparity, disparity among school districts. In my south suburban area, I see it every day, wide disparity and what students have available to them and what other students don't have available to them. What this measure will do is create greater disparity among school children in the State of Illinois by dividing the City of Chicago up so that we have more haves than have nots. That's not a solution to the problem that we face in education today. It's an exacerbation of the problem that we face. measure has no merit whatsoever. It should be defeated resoundly."

Speaker Steczo: "The Chair recognizes Harold Murphy."

- Murphy, H.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. While I don't represent any of Chicago districts, I represent south suburban and we have elected school boards. And my districts are in worse shape than Chicago's. Most of my districts are on the watchlist...and believe what this Body ought to be about is counting. trying to solve the problems in the State of Illinois and not just pick on the City of Chicago, because if you look at most school districts, and that includes my district, the City of Chicago is better funded, better sound than we are. So I rise in opposition of this Amendment. Thank you."
- Speaker Steczo: "Is there any further discussion? There being none, Representative Cowlishaw, to close."
- Cowlishaw: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is a very straightforward Amendment and it does something that really, I believe, is

140th Legislative Day

June 1, 1994

critical to the future improvement of the Chicago public First, let me begin by saying every single person who serves in this chamber has an interest in what happens in the Chicago public schools, partly because that school district enrolls approximately 1/4 of all of the public school students in this entire state. If that reason, if for no other, we all have a solemn obligation to see to it that those students are adequately served. I think it is obvious to anyone who has followed the statistics about the dropout rates and all of the other factors that are used to assess the success of school districts, that the City of Chicago schools are... Well, Mr. Speaker, I know of no more apt phrase than 'an abysmal failure'. And it's those students who are being failed and it's they about whom all of us have not only a right, but an obligation, obligation, to be concerned and to try to improve their lot life. Finally, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that when there are questions asked about whether people who do not live in Chicago should take an interest in the Chicago schools, I would submit to you, Sir, that where I live my constituents send a whale of a lot of dollars to Springfield and we get back a minnow. Now, we don't mind sending all that money down here and having you redirect it to the City of Chicago schools if we thought we were getting something for our money. But as long as we are making a large financial investment in the children of Chicago, we have as much right as anyone else to try to see to it that that money is well used. We all know the numbers of occasions over the years (including one quite recently) when there have been serious doubts about means that are used and the purposes to which the money is put by the Chicago Board of Education. It does not seem to

140th Legislative Day

June 1, 1994

be able to manage its money well. If my people are helping to pay the bills for mismanaged projects and places for the uses of money that have nothing whatever to do with educating children, then it seems to me I have a right and even an obligation to try to see to it that the money my constituents and those of all of us have sent into Chicago to help those children are helping the children, not just hiring more bureaucrats and making repairs. Speaker, there is nobody in downstate Illinois (and by that I mean anybody who doesn't live in the City of Chicago) who does not understand that the future of this state depends to a considerable extent upon how well we are able to improve the education of the children of Chicago. That something that anyone of us can afford to not take an interest in, whether that is from a financial point of view or from the point of view of simply being humane and caring and wanting an adequate preparation for the future every child in Illinois, no matter where that child happens be born or where that child happens to live during the years that he or she goes to school. This is a dramatic change. It is a dramatic change because we have a dramatic problem. I have discussed this proposal with my own constituents and with many others in communities outside of the City of Chicago, and I will tell you, my friends. of you who do not live in the City of Chicago there is almost no proposal you will ever vote on here that will any more popular with your own constituents than this one. This is something the people where you live (if you are not in Chicago) really want. They want those children to be educated and their money to be used wisely. I urge a 'yes' vote on Floor Amendment #5 to Senate Bill 1181."

Speaker Steczo: "The Lady has moved for the adoption of Amendment

140th Legislative Day

June 1, 1994

- #5. All those in favor of the adoption of the Amendment will signify by voting 'aye'; those opposed by voting 'no'. The voting is open. The Chair recognizes Representative Skinner, one minute to explain your vote."
- Skinner: "Now, I assume anybody that's voting 'no' on this thinks that the Chicago school system is succeeding. Because if you don't vote 'yes' what you're doing is voting for the status quo. Now, do we want the status quo in Chicago? They spend \$130,000 per classroom and 50% of the people flunk out. Is that really what we want to vote 'no' to maintain? I certainly hope not."
- Speaker Steczo: "The Chair recognizes Representative Lou Jones, one minute to explain your vote."
- "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in opposition of this Jones, L.: I don't understand. Maybe the Sponsor don't Amendment. know there's 113 school districts in the State of Illinois on the watchlist and Chicago is not one of them. And I was wondering why she didn't take all this energy and these big shoulders that she have and try to redo the 113 other districts. We appreciate the help that you give us in Chicago, but why single us out now when we're not on the And if you're really concerned about watchlist. the children in Chicago, we're going to make sure they Section 8 housing and move them out there to Naperville."
- Speaker Steczo: "The Chair recognizes Representative Cowlishaw, one minute to explain your vote."
- Cowlishaw: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. First of all, I would like to ask for a verification of the 'no' votes. And secondly, I would like to take the opportunity to briefly explain my vote. I am voting to improve schools for the children in Chicago, not because they are or are not on a financial watchlist but because as an educational institution the

140th Legislative Day

- June 1, 1994
- City of Chicago schools are a failure. Oh, I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker. First, could we poll the absentees, please?"
- Speaker Steczo: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. Representative Cowlishaw."
- Cowlishaw: "Mr. Speaker, could we please have a Poll of the Absentees and then please could we have a verification of the 'no' votes?"
- Speaker Steczo: "The Lady requests a poll of the Members not
 voting. Mr. Clerk, please call the names of those who are
 not voting."
- Clerk Rossi: "There are no Members not voting."
- Speaker Steczo: "Proceed with the poll of those voting in the negative."
- Clerk Rossi: "Poll οf those voting in the negative. Representatives Balanoff. Blagojevich. Brunsvold. Buqielski. Burke. Capparelli. Curran. Currie. Dart. Davis. Deering. DeJaegher. Dunn. Edley. Frias. Giglio. Giolitto. Granberg. Hartke, Hawkins, Hicks, Hoffman, Homer, Jones, Lou. Kaszak. Kotlarz. Lang. Laurino. Levin. Lopez. Martinez. Mautino. McAfee. McGuire. McPike. Moore, Eugene. Moseley. Murphy, H. Novak. Ostenburg. Phelps. Prussing. Pugh. Ronen. Saltsman. Santiago. Schakowsky. Sheehy. Steczo. Stroger. Turner. Woolard. Younge. Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker Steczo: "Representative Cowlishaw, any requests of the negative? For what purpose does Representative Levin seek recognition? Mr. Levin?"
- Levin: "Yes, can I be verified?"
- Speaker Steczo: "Representative Cowlishaw, Representative Levin asks leave to be verified."

140th Legislative Day

June 1, 1994

Cowlishaw: "Representative Levin?"

Speaker Steczo: "Yes, Ma'am."

Cowlishaw: "Yes. of course."

Speaker Steczo: "Are there any questions of the Negative Roll Call?"

Cowlishaw: "Yes. Yes, Mr. Speaker. Thank you very much for your courtesy and patience. Representative Edley?"

Speaker Steczo: "Representative Edley is in his chair."

Cowlishaw: "Representative Curran?"

Speaker Steczo: "Representative Curran."

Cowlishaw: "I'm sorry, I couldn't see him. Is he there? Is Mr.

Curran here, Sir?"

Speaker Steczo: "Mr. Curran is in his chair."

Cowlishaw: "Oh, all right. Mr. Curran is here?"

Speaker Steczo: "Representative Cowlishaw, he's in his chair.

Right in the back row, second from the aisle."

Cowlishaw: "Oh yes, I'm sorry. There's someone standing in the way, Mr. Speaker, and I couldn't see over there.

Representative Homer?"

Speaker Steczo: "Representative Homer. Representative Homer. Is the Gentleman in the chamber? Representative Homer? Mr. Clerk, please remove him. Any further?"

Cowlishaw: "Representative Martinez?"

Speaker Steczo: "Representative... Representative Cowlishaw, please restore Representative Homer to the roll call. He's right back there by the back door. Representative Martinez. Is the Gentleman in the chamber? Mr. Clerk, please remove him from the roll call."

Cowlishaw: "Representative Novak?"

Speaker Steczo: "Representative Novak is in his chair. Further
 questions, Representative Cowlishaw?"

Cowlishaw: "Representative Flowers?"

140th Legislative Day

June 1, 1994

Speaker Steczo: "Representative Flowers is at her chair."

Cowlishaw: "Representative Hawkins?"

Speaker Steczo: "Representative Hawkins is in his chair.

Anything further?"

Cowlishaw: "Representative Blagojevich?"

Speaker Steczo: "Representative Blagojevich. Representative Blagojevich is in the center aisle."

Cowlishaw: "Representative Saltsman?"

Speaker Steczo: "Representative Saltsman is in the back of the chamber."

Cowlishaw: "Representative DeJaegher?"

Speaker Steczo: "Representative DeJaegher. Representative DeJaegher. Is the Gentleman in the chamber? Mr. Clerk, please remove him from the roll call. Any further questions?"

Cowlishaw: "Representative Prussing?"

Speaker Steczo: "Representative Prussing is in her chair."

Cowlishaw: "Representative von Bergen-Wessels?"

Speaker Steczo: "Representative von Bergen-Wessels is in her chair."

Cowlishaw: "Oh, I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker. It's sometimes hard to see because there are people standing in the aisle."

Speaker Steczo: "Any further questions?"

Cowlishaw: "That's all. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Steczo: "Please restore Representative Martinez to the roll call. He's in the back of the chamber. There being no question...no further questions on this Motion, there are 55 voting 'yes', 57 voting 'no', and the Amendment fails. Mr. Clerk, any further Amendments?"

Clerk Rossi: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Steczo: "Third Reading. On the order of State and Local Government, Third Reading, appears Senate Bill 1267,

140th Legislative Day

June 1, 1994

Representative Woolard. The Gentleman asks leave of the House to bring this Bill back to the order of Second Reading for the purposes of an Amendment. Does the Gentleman have leave? There being no objection, leave is granted. The Bill is now on the order of Second Reading. Mr. Clerk, any Amendments?"

- Speaker Steczo: "The Chair recognizes Representative Woolard, on Amendment #2. The Gentleman seeks to withdraw the Amendment. The Amendment is withdrawn. Mr. Clerk, any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Rossi: "Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative Currie."
- Speaker Steczo: "The Chair recognizes Representative Currie, on Amendment #3."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. Amendment is very similar to one that we worked on when were dealing in House Bills. It provides for Department of Agriculture regulation and licensor of services offering guard dogs for Illinois businesses. We have worked with the department on the language. The effort here is to make sure that there is some protection for quard dogs, offered through these services, so that they will survive in humane conditions. The Department of Agriculture is neutral as I said, we worked to address their concerns the Bill, about language. Quite clearly, under this Amendment what we are regulating are those animals that are used as guard dogs by services providing that protection to other businesses. We are not dealing with the family dog in anyway, shape or form. I'd be happy to answer your

140th Legislative Day

June 1, 1994

questions and move adoption of Amendment 3."

Speaker Steczo: "The Lady has moved for the adoption of Amendment #3. Is there any discussion? The Chair recognizes Representative Black."

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

Speaker Steczo: "She indicates that she will."

Black: "Thank you. Representative, how many guard dog services are there currently operating in the State of Illinois?"

Currie: "Do we know? We don't know the exact answer because, of course, there is no regulation under current Illinois law of those entities."

Black: "Okay."

Currie: "But we believe somewhere between a dozen to two dozen, would be our estimate."

Black: "All right. So we don't know how many guard dog services there are, so I guess we could say we're not sure whether this Bill is necessary then, could we?"

Currie: "Well, we have some anecdotal evidence from people who are involved in a humane society work, that there certainly are enough of them out there, that ordinary citizens vigilant in their enthusiasm to protect animals have identified place where these animals are housed, are cared for in totally inhuman fashion."

Black: "Yes. Well..."

Currie: "And of course each of these services."

Black: "Yes."

Currie: "Whether it's one dozen, two dozen or three dozen and again we don't know."

Black: "Yes."

Currie: "Because we don't regulate. Could have as many as a 100 or 200 dogs under its control."

140th Legislative Day

June 1, 1994

Black: "Oh. I would probably think even more than that. Might have thousands."

Currie: "Could be. Could be."

Black: "Millions."

Currie: "Doubt it."

Black: "Well, thank you very much, Representative. Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Pursuant to Rule 55 (c), I am joined by four of my colleagues, in seeking a Roll Call Vote on this Amendment and at this time would like to speak to the Amendment. If you read the Amendment, very carefully, this is an unfunded mandate to the Department of Agriculture. And I simply would say to my colleagues, on both sides of the aisle, if we continue duties additional and responsibilities to Department of Agriculture and not, and I say again, and not provide the funding. Then everything the Department Agriculture does suffers as a result. I really don't think this is a very good idea. Let me point out, to those of you who think this is a great idea, this Amendment, as drafted, does not clearly exempt private dog owners. Now I brought this up before and you have defeated this once I submit to you that this Amendment may, I don't know if it will, I say it may mandate a private owner of a Great Dane or a German Shephard or some breed that might be considered a guard dog to comply with the provisions of this Amendment, should it become law. I don't think this is necessary, I don't know about you but I haven't had a great many calls. In fact, I haven't had any calls, anybody, saying that we need to license and regulate quard dog services in the State of Illinois. And since I don't think many of you have been notified either, this may be an Amendment that would wait to an nonemergency Session. This

140th Legislative Day

June 1, 1994

is suppose to be a budget Session and only those Bills that are declared an emergency should be discussed and voted upon. I really wonder if licensing and regulating quard dog services could qualify. And I just simply submit to you once again, this Amendment is not drafted in a narrow enough fashion. You vote for this and you own a big dog you may find yourself having to comply with the provisions of registering that dog. And then somebody will come in your house to see if that dog is being taken care of under the provisions of this Act. We already all are under the Humane Care for Animals Act. I think the Humane Care Animals Act and the Illinois Animal Control Act probably all we need at this point. I urge a 'no' vote on the Amendment."

Speaker Steczo: "Is there any further discussion? The Chair recognizes Representative Woolard."

Woolard: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I think it's important that everyone recognize realize that there has been significant work put in on this Bill since its in...inception a few weeks ago. The Department of Agriculture has worked with the Sponsor of Amendment and has addressed the concerns that have been mentioned by the previous speaker. Ι think imperative that everyone recognize that there are a few people that did get a few phone calls. In fact, friend who contacted me more than once in the last few weeks discussing this issue and wanting us to proceed with some kind of Resolution to the issue. I think it's also important to recognize that there is an urgency to this. Anytime that we have animals that are being treated inhumanely, whether it be by a guard dog service or a farmer, that we have a responsibility, as Legislators, to

140th Legislative Day

June 1, 1994

do everything in our power to see that this is stopped. And there have been some abuses and these have been recognized by many. The phone call of the friend that I'm talking about was the Speaker of the House and the Speaker lives in an area that definitely has some problems. And there are some people that have been taking abuse...abusive ways with animals and dogs in particular. And I think that we have a responsibility to see that we do something to make it right. Doctor Brumley has worked on this, the department is taking a neutral position, they are not opposed to this. I think that they do have some ideas that maybe there needs to be some additional parts to this legislation somewhere down the road. But right now we do have a responsibility to see that if there are animals that are being mistreated in any fashion, that we should correct this will, hopefully, adjust an inhumane situation. I would encourage everyone to support Amendment."

Speaker Steczo: "Is there any further discussion? The Chair recognizes Representative Rutherford."

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

Speaker Steczo: "He indicates that he will."

Rutherford: "Thank you. Representative Currie, a couple of question please. I..."

Speaker Steczo: "No she does. She indicates it."

Rutherford: "Thank you. Representative, I understand there could be a dozen to two dozen facilities. Is there any...Is there anyway to quadify or any guess as to the actual number of dogs we're talking about?"

Currie: "We don't know because we don't regulate these services that provide guard, sentry dogs for protection. What we suspect is that there may as many as a dozen or two, we

140th Legislative Day

June 1, 1994

could be wrong and it could be three. We would imagine..."

Rutherford: "That's the number of businesses."

Currie: "Businesses providing the service."

Rutherford: "Right."

Currie: "We would imagine that the individual entities, whether it's one, two or three dozen could have a hundred dogs, as many as more or less than that. We don't know the exact answer."

Rutherford: "Okay. That's where I'm coming from on this. So, the other...another part of this question, as I read part of this I get so I can understand from a summary here, it says, 'no person shall keep or maintain a guard dog or sentry dog on a premise unless the owner of the dog has complied with rules relating to guard dogs that are profligated by the department.' Is there potential confusion in regards to this language for a farm dog."

Currie: "No."

Rutherford: "Can you help clarify that."

Currie: "Sure, I will be happy and I think this may be helpful to Representative Black, who may have been confused, about this Amendment as against some other legislation that we looked at. If you look on page 3 of the Amendment you will see that first of all guard dog service, which is what we would regulate, is a person or entity who, for a fee, furnish...on page 3 of the Amendment. If you would look on page 3, we define guard dogs service which is that which we will regulate under the terms of this Amendment as a person or entity who for a fee provides the sentry animals. Second, the guard dog itself is defined as any type of dog used primarily for protection and so forth аt any commercial establishment except a farm. So farm dogs are clearly out, so are personal pets, that may also be valued

140th Legislative Day

June 1, 1994

by their owners for their guarding ability. The only entity that is regulated here is the commercial service that to a commercial buyer provides guard or sentry dog services. And then...even then not if that service is provided on a farm."

Rutherford: "Okay. What about...help me understand please,
Representative, the idea or the process for enforcement.
Who's going to be responsible to enforce this if it does
become law?"

Currie: "The Department of Agriculture will have primary responsibility for the licensing part of the program for drawing the rules and regulations that will apply."

Rutherford: "Right."

Currie: "And I believe..."

Rutherford: "That part...that part I understand Representative, but the question is again though, the enforcement of it. I understand the department..."

Currie: "So...both the department that enforcement mechanism would be the department's own investigators, by rule the department could permit local law enforcement or local humane investigators to participate as well, which the department does not pay for."

Rutherford: "I'm sorry."

Currie: "The department would not pay for that local level of humane investigator."

Rutherford: "Okay. Help me understand what an approximate cost would be to the department, to implement this program. I think that may be one of the things that we've got a question for the department, if it is something that they need to do, if there is cost associated with it. How much would that be and is there an attempt to find some appropriation to help provide for this?"

140th Legislative Day

June 1, 1994

Currie: "Well, in fact, of course this is intended to be self sustaining and while there was an earlier remark suggesting that there would be no fees paid for the opportunity to register to be registered...to be licensed, there will be fees associated with that enterprise. The Department of Agriculture, as you know, is of the view that most of the fees that it gets are really not adequate to sustain all of its programs. But the reason the Department of Agriculture does not oppose this Amendment is because there is a fee involved in the licensor activity a fee that will be paid by the security firm."

Rutherford: "Okay. Could you highlight for us what that fee is, please?"

Currie: "Twenty-Five Dollars."

Rutherford: "Twenty-Five Dollars...okay."

Currie: "Yes. In fact this fits in with the reason you don't see it listed in the Amendment, is because it would fit in with other kinds of entities like this that are currently licensed by the department. There is an issue...there is an issue about whether all of those fees should at some point be raised and I'm informed that the Department of Agriculture is likely to come to us next Session with the request for the raising of fees across the board. But this would fit into an existing fee structure and that fee, I'm told, is \$25."

Rutherford: "I know I can't do it...is that per dog? Per dog or per business? The last question I have, Representative, thank you for your help on this. Is that I also understand this would require that the local law enforcement agencies and fire departments would need to maintain a file on the guard dog assignments. So basically if this became law, then the local firehouse in my hometown, would have to

140th Legislative Day

June 1, 1994

maintain a..."

Speaker Steczo: "The Chair recognizes Representative Noland.

Representative Rutherford your five minutes expired.

Representative Noland."

Noland: "Can I yield a minute to Dan Rutherford?"

Speaker Steczo: "Yield a minute?"

Noland: "He's not done."

Speaker Steczo: "Representative Rutherford, one minute."

Rutherford: "Thank you, Representative. To finish that question.

So a local firehouse would be required to maintain a log of these assignments, is that correct?"

Currie: "Yes. Just so that they would know where the animals are."

Rutherford: "Okay. So, and the part that causes the biggest concern to me is, that what we are doing here then is also putting an additional mandate on a local law enforcement facility to have to maintain a log like this."

Currie: "If there happens to be a security service operating within the jurisdiction of that local firehouse, yes, and it would seem to me that makes sense. We would want them to know where problems might erupt, where problems might develop, to the extent that humane investigators, are by rule, required to help with the enforcement of this program. You surely would want them to know where the enforcement should happen."

Rutherford: "Great. Thank you, Representative."

Currie: "It makes it a lot easier."

Rutherford: "Thank you, Representative Noland for the minute."

Speaker Steczo: "The Chair recognizes Representative Wennlund.

I'm sorry, Representative Noland. Complete your time."

Noland: "Thank you. I rise in opposition to this Amendment. I know she is well meaning but the bottom line is the fees

140th Legislative Day

Amendment."

June 1, 1994

cannot sustain the program, so when there's not enough money, they pulled out agriculture from other areas. going to come out of inspection of scales, processing plants, butchering plants, elevators, fertilizer companies, pull the money out of another fund. And the bottom line is that an unfooted mandate. I know she is well meaning but the fees don't sustain the program. I rise in opposition." Speaker Steczo: "The Chair recognizes Representative Wennlund." Wennlund: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The point of order, Mr. The underlying Bill amends the Beef Market Speaker. Development Act and the Illinois Sheep and Wool Production Development and Marketing Act and at this point I rise to a point of order to question the germaneness of the

Speaker Steczo: "Mr. Wennlund. let's...let's...the Parliamentarian and I will look at the Amendment and get back to you very shortly on the germaneness. Mr. Clerk, may we have the Bill on any Amendments? Mr. Wennlund, in response to your question, the Chair will rule that the Amendment is germane. The Amendment is Representative Black, on the Amendment."

Black: "Yes. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Ī rise to point of personal privilege. My name was used by the Sponsor of the Amendment in her remarks and she said I was confused and that maybe on occasion. But I really don't think, well let's be honest, the process this year, occasion, would confuse Confusious. But I assure you I am not confused on this Amendment. You know, I...is there no end to what we want to regulate and license and tax. Last year some of you voted for the Christmas Tree Licensing Act, oh that was a dandy. Now you want to license guard dogs, I already pay a rabies license, that is in the

140th Legislative Day

June 1, 1994

Illinois law. My dog has to have a county license, I have to follow a leash law. I'm telling you, when are are going to say...we don't need to regulate every aspect of human behavior in the State of Illinois. Now for those have gotten calls about guard dog services, why don't you take it up with the guard dog service, or yet, take it up with the city in which you live or the county in which you live. Why do we need a state registering and regulating quard dog services? Here again...here again while Illinois burns, Mr. Speaker, we're here fiddling about whether or not we're going to register Rottweilers and German Shepards and guard dogs. is, as I said earlier, this Amendment is drafted loosely, I'm telling you, if you own a dog that could be adjudicated by the Department of Agriculture, who has power and authority, they get all the power and authority to set up the rules. You gave them that power and authority last year to regulate Christmas tree sellers, boy that was a dandy. This is going to be just as delightful. Let's get on with the budget, the Medicaid problem and items that we need to deal with. If you're telling me that licensing and regulating guard dog services in the State of Illinois is a nature of an emergency...that it's an emergency nature and that it is something that we have today, I submit to you enough is enough. Why don't we just let humans enjoy their dogs and dogs enjoy their humans and stop trying to regulate every facet of life in the State of Illinois. My name was used in debate. I'm not confused on this Amendment, I still intend to vote 'no' and I urge everyone else to vote 'no' as well."

Speaker Steczo: "Is there any further discussion? The Chair recognizes Representative Cross. Representative Cross."

140th Legislative Day June 1, 1994

Cross: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Steczo: "She indicates she will."

Cross: "Representative, is the purpose of this dog...or this

Amendment to protect the quard dogs of this state?"

Currie: "Those that are used in commercial enterprises provided by firms that specialize in providing guard dogs to commercial enterprises, yes."

Cross: "And to protect from...and protect them from abuse and neglect?"

Currie: "To protect them from abuse and neglect. There are instances that have been observed by citizens of guard dogs that are left without water, that are left without adequate shelter, that are left in very serious debilitated shape by the owners of those firms. The point here has nothing to do with a dog that belongs to a family, it only deals with those dogs that are used in commercial services, rented from commercial guard dog services themselves."

Cross: "And if I violate this section, if it becomes law, it is a
 Class C misdemeanor, is that correct?"

Currie: "Yes. It would apply to the owner of the guard dog service."

Cross: "Wouldn't the Act, as it is currently written in the area of cruelty to animals, apply to someone who owns a guard dog now? And is that yes or no?"

Currie: "It's real unclear, I'm told, in our Humane Care of Animals Act how those regulations would effect animals that are used by a firm, particularly if it is not an Illinois firm doing business in the State of Illinois. So we are told by the Department of Agriculture that...and by local humane enforcers, that there really is not adequate language in the statutes. Under this measure the department would have clear authority to promulgate rules

140th Legislative Day

June 1, 1994

and regulations that would define what counts as a livable habitat. Would enable the department, or by rule, would enable local humane investigators to help enforce the terms of the Act. That's why the Department of Agriculture is not opposed to this measure."

Cross: "Wouldn't the...if someone neglects a dog or kicks a dog.

Wouldn't the owner, couldn't the owner be liable in a

criminal court? Under the statute..."

Currie: "I don't believe so."

Cross: "Under the statute, the way it is written now."

Currie: "I don't believe so, not under current law."

Cross: "Why not?"

Currie: "You know, maybe my impression was there is legislation currently pending in this Assembly that would further define what would count as abusive behavior to a pet. Right. So my understanding was the reason that that in legislation was introduced was because there isn't that clarity in our state statute or in regulation about what would count as inhumane care by the owner of an animal to that animal itself."

Cross: "If I'm not mistaken, that legislation merely increases the penalty for inhuman treatment of animals but..."

Currie: "Okay. You may very well be right. Yes. I'm not..."

Cross: "It would be an aggravated penalty. But, isn't there currently in the law now, a penalty for inhuman treatment for any animal?"

Currie: "Right. But this is not...this is not primarily aimed at that abuse, you're right, could be controlled right now under existing statute. Rather it has to do with under what conditions these animals are left for 24, 48 or 72 hours to protect a commercial establishment. The question is, to what counts as adequate food, what counts as the

140th Legislative Day

June 1, 1994

provision for adequate shelter is very different from a situation of actually kicking, some positive hostile action toward that animal. The other...the other point that I think is worth making is that, an instance of a direct positive hostile action against an animal may be a once in a while thing, under current statute. There is no requirement that would establish what counts as the adequate food, shelter protection and so forth. So without this there would be no way to get at the owner of the firm providing the guard dog who fails to provide that animal with some...some shelter in the event of a snowstorm."

Cross: "Yes. Whether...whether a dog is treated cruelly or not is a question for a jury or a judge, is it not?"

Currie: "Well, if this Amendment is adopted and becomes law, the Department of Agriculture would start out with the ability to regulate and to license those firms that provide these services. It seems to me that that is a whole lot better way to go, than it is to start out with clogging the courts with actions brought by individual citizens, for example, and having no basis in the law, upon which to establish an evidentiary standard."

Cross: "My concern is that we're being....that we don't need this. If I'm a concerned citizen and I see two Doberman Pinchers being ignored for a two or three day period. What prohibits me from calling the Department of Ag. or my local States Attorney's office right now and saying, I think these dogs are being neglected?"

Currie: "Local States Attorney's tell us that they don't have the appropriate statutory authority to enforce the Humane Care for Animals Act in this circumstance."

Cross: "Representative."

Currie: "But that's what we're told, Representative. And that's

140th Legislative Day

June 1, 1994

why we thought it was a good idea to move forward with this legislation. Even if they had, I think there's still evidentiary questions. And it seems to me appropriate to have in statute or in rule something that defines what counts as adequate care, beyond the situation of a positively hostile Act, that I think is pretty clearly covered in the Humane Care of Animals Act."

Cross: "Thank you, Representative."

Speaker Steczo: "Representative Monroe Flinn."

Flinn: "Mr. Speaker. Finally at last, I move the previous question."

Speaker Steczo: "The Gentleman move the previous question. The question is, 'Shall the main question be put?' All those in favor will signify by saying 'aye'; those opposed by saying 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the main question is put. Representative Currie to close on Amendment #3."

Currie: "Thanks, Speaker and Members of the House. It is a simple question, there are guard dogs services providing protection to individual commercial establishments in the State of Illinois, some dozen, some two dozen, we do not know the exact number. What we do know, from efforts of the Humane Society of Illinois, is that many of the dogs that are so provided are in jeopardy, they are not treated to adequate food, to adequate shelter, to protection against the elements. The Department of Agriculture does not oppose this proposal to regulate, to license the owners of the services providing commercial protection through sentry dogs to commercial operations in the State of Illinois. This has nothing to do with the family farm, it has nothing to do with the family dog. it has a lot to do with making sure that when a promises to provide those services, it promises to provide

140th Legislative Day

June 1, 1994

some protection to the animals it supplies as well. The Humane Society strongly supports this Bill, I know of no opposition and I would appreciate your support for this Amendment."

- Speaker Steczo: "The Lady has moved for the adoption of Amendment #3. All those in favor of the adoption of the Amendment will signify by voting 'aye'; those opposed by voting 'no'.

 The voting is open. The Chair recognizes Representative Stephens. One minute to explain your vote."
- Stephens: "Thank you, just looked at my desk Mr. Speaker. I drawer here and I have received a notice of hearing for the Appropriations I Committee which will meet on Thursday, May 20th, 1976 at 8:00 a.m.. I think I have found the is signed by Ted Leckowitz, John O'Brien, Clerk of the I checked with our current Clerk, he tells me that House. was in the 8th grade when this notice was printed. Now some of those things that we've had asked to be printed and distributed, are they going to be found when our next Clerk comes...who is now in the 8th grade, is that what is going happen on this side of the aisle? to explanation, Mr. Speaker?"
- Speaker Steczo: "We will have to go back to the old records and chastise the former Clerk, I guess, Mr. Stephens."
- Stephens: "Well, is this meeting off then?"
- Speaker Steczo: "I think you had better hurry or you're going to be late for it. Is there any further discussion? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Curran."
- Curran: "I have, Mr. Speaker, a more recent announcement. The Elections and State Government Administration Committee will meet tomorrow morning at 9:00, Room C-1 in the Stratton Building for purposes of discussing two Bills,

140th Legislative Day

- June 1, 1994
- subject matter only, that deal with the purchasing reform...state purchasing reform, 9:00 C-1."
- Speaker Steczo: "Representative Black."
- Black: "Yes. I was just wondering if you were going to take the roll. Now or sometime before midnight."
- Speaker Steczo: "Mr. Black, as long as people are seeking recognition, like yourself, I can't take the roll. So.."
- Black: "I don't think so but I'll buy that."
- Speaker Steczo: "Mr. Wennlund...Mr. Wennlund is seeking recognition, for what purpose, Mr. Wennlund? To explain your vote?"
- Wennlund: "To explain...yes...thank you, Mr. Speaker. This
 Amendment, as Representative Black so aptly put it, is just
 like another dog that just don't hunt and that's why it
 deserves to be defeated."
- Speaker Steczo: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 48 voting 'yes', 63 voting 'no'. And the Amendment fails. Mr. Clerk, any further Amendments?"
- Clerk McLennand: "Floor Amendment #4, offered by Representative Woolard."
- Speaker Steczo: "The Chair recognizes Representative Woolard on Amendment #4."
- Woolard: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. What Amendment #4 does is, clarifies the situation that the Department of Agriculture needs in order to affectively address the DuQuoin and Springfield State Fairs this year. This gives them the ability to proceed with a policy of procedure. They would be able to barter or exchange for state fair tickets in regards to advertising and other necessary entities..."

140th Legislative Day

June 1, 1994

- Speaker Steczo: "Please turn on Mr. Woolard."
- Woolard: "Those sitting close to me heard the rest of my speech,
 the rest of you can come on over and listen as we do the
 replay. Thank you very much, would appreciate your vote on
 this very necessary Bill for the fair operations this
 year."
- Speaker Steczo: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #4. On that is there any discussion? There being none. All those in favor of the adoption of the Amendment will signify by saying 'aye'; those opposed by saying 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk, any further Amendments?"
- Clerk McLennand: "Floor Amendment #5, offered by Representative Granberg."
- Speaker Steczo: "The Chair recognizes Representative Granberg on Amendment #5."
- Granberg: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #5 deals with the regulation of tropical fish owners in downstate and Vermillion County. And I move for its adoption."
- Speaker Steczo: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #5. On that, is there any discussion? The Chair recognizes Representative Black."
- Black: "Well, thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Since it obviously is aimed at what is one of my most thriving industries, in Vermillion County, the home of tropical fish, Ι might add. It...they seem to breed very prolifically in our scenic river that we are so happy with, that this Body gave us a few years ago. I don't have the Amendment, we don't have a copy. I'd just like to see...I don't want anything to bother the wild and scenic river and our tropical fish so could I have a copy before we vote on

140th Legislative Day

- June 1, 1994
- it? Has it been printed and distributed?"
- Speaker Steczo: "Representative Black, your copy must have been misplaced. Mr. Novak, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"
- Novak: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield? Will the Sponsor yield, please?"
- Speaker Steczo: "He indicates that he will."
- Novak: "Well, I want to ask this question anyway. Is it not a fact..."
- Speaker Steczo: "Mr. Novak, the Sponsor indicates he will not yield. He will not yield so the Chair..."
- Novak: "Is it not a fact...is it not a fact, Representative."
- Speaker Steczo: "The Chair will recognize Mr. Woolard. Mr. Woolard, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"
- Woolard: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ι think its probably appropriate to ask if this is germane. You know I think...I could understand if we were talking about the aqua fish industry that's a part of the farming operations and the fish are edible and maybe these tropical fish are edible. Let's look at the germaneness of this issue."
- Speaker Steczo: "Any further discussion? Representative Granberg. The Gentleman withdraws the Amendment. Mr. Clerk, any further Amendments?"
- Clerk McLennand: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Steczo: "Third Reading. Representative Deering, for what purpose do you seek recognition? Any announcements? Representative Meyer."
- Meyer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If I could have just for a minute, Ladies and Gentlemen, the undivided attention of the House. I have an announcement which I consider to be very serious and would really like to have your attention, so I could talk to you for a second."

140th Legislative Day

June 1, 1994

Speaker Steczo: "Please give the Gentleman your attention."

Meyer: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Amendment considers what I...excuse me, this announcement considers to be one...something that concerns one of our own. concerns a benefit that will be held to benefit Carolyn Chriswell. And Carolyn Chriswell, for those of you who don't know her, is one of our employees here in the House. She works up in the House Journal Room, she has been an employee of the House for the last 15 years. Carolyn suffers from Cystic Fibrosis. Carolyn needs a double lung transplant which she is on schedule to receive, but there are going to be some expenses that she is going to have to bear that aren't covered by our insurance plan. let you know what she does for us, so that she doesn't miss when we need her here the most. prior to Legislative Session she checks herself into the hospital and she receives intravenous antibiotics so that infections and other ailments that would prevent her from coming to work do not occur. I think that this is something that we can all support. This evening at Sam's, immediately following our Session here, the benefit will They're going to have raffles, a 50/50 prize flip. if you wish to participate in that. For those of might want to invib in some of the refreshments, beer will But I would just ask each of you to come over to share some of our wealth and help Carolyn in this fight. I can tell you first hand having a child that at age 4 1/2passed away from this dreaded disease, that it is something that we should all want to support, from both sides of the aisle. And I ask all of you to attend it. Thank you."

Speaker Steczo: "Representative Lang."

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I for one intend to be at that

140th Legislative Day

June 1, 1994

event at Sam's after Session but that's not why I pressed I want to just remind the Body of some J-1 hearings that will be held over the next several issue of gaming. Tomorrow in Room 118 at 9:00 a.m.. the Judiciary I Committee will consider Pate Philip's That may or may not conclude tomorrow but riverboat plan. if it doesn't not we will go on to Friday morning in the same room. We will also be hearing on Tuesday, June 7th at 10:00 a.m.. in Room 118 proposals from the horserace industry, both the track owners and the horsemen and horsewomen themselves, as to the problems they might have if gaming is expanded in Illinois. And finally, we have a hearing on Monday, June 13th in Room 118 at 10:00 to get final citizens' comments and any other proposals from around the State of Illinois, we have not yet heard. to complete testimony from some groups that came before the Judiciary Committee today that were not able to complete what they were trying to do. We anticipate that as of that time every group or every city or every developer in Illinois that has an interest in riverboat gambling would have appeared before the Judiciary Committee. And if do not I fear dier consequences for them in their efforts to get licenses. Thank you."

Speaker Steczo: "Representative Saltsman."

Saltsman: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. For the benefit for Carolyn Chriswell, which was just announced, if you can't make it over to Sam's they have tickets back here by Representative McPike's office. If you would like to contribute and buy some 50/50 tickets, they're right here by the...both secretaries back here in leadership would like to have your contributions."

Speaker Steczo: "Are there anymore matters to come before the

140th Legislative Day

June 1, 1994

House. There being none. Representative Novak now moves that the House stand adjourned until the hour of noon tomorrow. All those in favor will signify by saying 'aye'; those opposed by saying 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the House now stands adjourned. Noon tomorrow. Twelve noon."

REPORT: TIFLDAY PAGE: 001

HOUSE ADJOURNED

STATE OF ILLINOIS 88TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES DAILY TRANSCRIPTION OF DEBATE INDEX

94/10/19 12:29:27

JUNE 01, 1994

| SB-1181 | SECOND READING | PAGE | 52 |
|---------------------------------|--------------------|------|--------|
| SB-1191 | SECOND READING | PAGE | 52 |
| SB-1267 | SECOND READING | PAGE | 108 |
| SB-1267 | RECALLED | PAGE | 107 |
| SB-1707 | SECOND READING | PAGE | 17 |
| SB-1715 | SECOND READING | PAGE | 18 |
| SB-1715 | HELD ON SECOND | PAGE | 52 |
| HR-2734 | ADOPTED | PAGE | |
| HR-2734 | RESOLUTION OFFERED | PAGE | 3 |
| HJR-0096 | MOTION | PAGE | 3 6 |
| HJR-0096 | ADOPTED | PAGE | 9 |
| HJR-0096 | RESOLUTION OFFERED | PAGE | 9 8 |
| HJR-0139 | ADOPTED | PAGE | 12 |
| HJR-0139 | RESOLUTION OFFERED | PAGE | |
| HJR-0154 | ADOPTED | PAGE | 16 |
| HJR-0154 | RESOLUTION OFFERED | PAGE | 12 |
| | | | |
| | SUBJECT MATTER | | |
| | | | |
| HOUSE TO ORDER - SPEAKER STECZO | | PAGE | 1 |
| PRAYER - RABBI MICHAEL DATZ | | PAGE | 1 |
| PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE | | PAGE | 2 |
| ROLL CALL ATTENDANCE | | PAGE | 2 |
| AGREED RESOLUTIONS | | PAGE | 2 |
| DEATH RESOLUTIONS | | PAGE | 3 |
| | | | |

PAGE

129