141st Legislative Day

June 2, 1994

- Speaker Giglio: "The House will come to order. The Chaplain for today is Todd Magruder. Campus Minister of Christian Student Fellowship at Sangamon State University in Springfield. Todd Magruder is the guest of Representative Moseley. The guests in the gallery may wish to rise for the invocation."
- Todd Magruder: "Let's pray. God we're thankful for Your presence here in this room today. Father, we're thankful that the creator of the Universe would be concerned with us and with our affairs here in Springfield today. God I pray that as the men and women gather here to legislate that they would be reminded to be concerned with Your values and with Your plan. Father, I pray that we would all represent You today and I ask these things in Jesus Name, Amen."
- Speaker Giglio: "We'll be led in the Pledge by Representative Weller."
- Weller et al: "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."
- Speaker Giglio: "We're going to start the day off right. Roll Call for Attendance. Representative Dart."
- Dart: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just wanted to comment that
  Representative Weller does such a great job with that, that
  maybe we ought to keep him here in Illinois and have a
  special position created for him."
- Speaker Giglio: "Representative Ryder."
- Ryder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wish to compliment the Chair on the even handiness, but I am, I take great humbridge at any cheap shots that folks on that side of the aisle want to have. Of course Congressman Weller will live in Illinois. That's where they all live."

141st Legislative Day

June 2, 1994

- Speaker Giglio: "Representative Black."
- Black: "Yes, I have an inquiry of the Chair. I thought after yesterdays invocation that we were going to add permanently the words and let the leadership of the House learn that 12:00 o'clock means 12:00 o'clock. Could we just always put that in."
- Speaker Giglio: "I'll take that into consideration."
- Speaker Giglio: "The Chair was under the impression that we gave you an extra half hour."
- Black: "Well, all I get for lunch is some Maalox and some blood
   pressure medicine and I'd like to take it on time if I
   could."
- Speaker Giglio: "I'll see that doesn't happen again,

  Representative Black. Representative Currie."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. Let the record reflect that Representatives Shirley Jones and Raschke-Lind are both excused today."
- Speaker Giglio: "Representative Kubik."
- Kubik: "Let the record reflect that all Republican Members are present, Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker Giglio: "Take the roll, Mr. Clerk. One hundred and fifteen Members answering present, the quorum is present and the House is ready to do it's business. On the Order of Second, Bills Revenue, Second Reading, page 55 of the Calendar appears Senate Bill 1726. Representative Walsh. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk McLennand: "Senate Bill 1726 has been read a second time, previously. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. No Motions filed. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Prussing."

141st Legislative Day

June 2, 1994

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "Sorry for the delay there, Mr. Speaker. It's easy to forget your name down here, that's why when it was called I was a little bit surprised. Thank you."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative, Representative Walsh,
Representative Prussing has an Amendment, do you want to
take this Bill out of the record? We'll get back to it,
today. All right, take it out of the record. No."

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker, I move to table Amendment #2."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Currie, are you seeking recognition?"

Currie: "I thought perhaps instead of a tabling Motion, I could offer to present the Amendment?"

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "That would be fine. If Representative Currie would want to present Amendment, Floor Amendment #2."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. The provision of this Amendment is identical to House 2617, which was unanimously approved by the Revenue Committee and unanimously approved by the House, but of course got stuck in the Senate Rules conflagration. What this would do, would be to provide for nursing home residents subject to the granny tax during the fourth quarter, the last quarter of fiscal '93 who hadn't yet received a grant because they didn't, they weren't already in that home that we would provide for that grant to those who applied by December 31, 1994. So, that's all that the Amendment does, as I say it has already received unanimous approval by this chamber and I hope that this Amendment will face a similar fate. I'd be happy to answer your questions."

141st Legislative Day

- June 2, 1994
- Speaker Giglio: "Any discussion? The Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black."
- Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. An inquiry of the Chair."
- Speaker Giglio: "Proceed."
- Black: "The underlying Bill amends the Lottery Act. Amendment #2 is in the Revenue Code in amending the nursing home grant Act. I don't think it's germane, I would ask the parliamentarian to so rule?"
- Speaker Giglio: "Representative Black, the parliamentarian informs the Chair that the Act relates to the functions of State Government and that the Amendment is germane.

  Further discussion? Representative Kubik."
- Kubik: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. After hearing that explanation of how this Bill, this Amendment is germane to the Bill. I was wondering if the parliamentarian would want to take up Representative Walsh's earlier suggestion that they switch places for today, that was a very interesting, it deals with the functions of State Government. Wouldn't that make just about anything germane to this Bill?"
- Speaker Giglio: "This particular, on this particular Amendment it does, Representative Kubik. It say's right up on top, very germane. Representative Murphy."
- Murphy, M.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. We already had made an agreement to purge how the Revenue Committee is one of the best bipartisan committees of this House and in order to move this legislation which is latent with many, many other Amendments and House Bills that we considered it in committee. There was an agreement on both sides of the aisle to not have Floor Amendments added at this time. So, not dealing with the merit of the legislation and arguing strenuously that any function of

141st Legislative Day

June 2, 1994

State Government makes anything germane is really rather a broad brush to say the least. I have Amendments coming up that we were going to agree to remove and I find it dilatory that this Amendment is brought at...to the floor at this time when there was an opportunity before when we put at least 8 other Bills as Amendments in committee to Senate Bill 1726. So, I would urge that we do not accept an additional Amendment in the spirit of the bipartisan cooperation in hammering out the Amendments drafted in committee to Senate Bill 1726. Thank you."

Speaker Giglio: "Further discussion? Representative Granberg."

Granberg: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would suggest if there's a problem on the Amendment that maybe we should ask for a roll call and give the opportunity to the Members to, to vote against the Amendment. If the Lady or anyone else would like to have this Amendment debated I would suggest that maybe she should ask for a roll call and if they are joined by the requisite number of Members we'll be more than happy to have a vote on the Amendment."

Speaker Giglio: "I don't believe that's necessary Representative Granberg. All those in favor of the Amendment signify by saying 'aye'; opposed, 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it. The Amendments adopted. Are there further Amendments?"

Clerk McLennand: "Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative Gash."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Gash on Amendment #3."

Gash: "I withdraw."

Speaker Giglio: "Withdraw Amendment #3, Mr. Clerk. Further
Amendments?"

Clerk McLennand: "Floor Amendment #4, offered by Representative Maureen Murphy."

141st Legislative Day

- June 2, 1994
- Speaker Giglio: "Representative Murphy on Amendment #4, withdraw.

  Are there further Amendments?"
- Clerk McLennand: "Floor Amendment #5, offered by Representative Giolitto."
- Speaker Giglio: "Representative Giolitto. Withdraw Amendment #4.

  Further Amendments?"
- Clerk McLennand: "Floor Amendment #6, offered by Representative Moffitt."
- Speaker Giglio: "That was Amendment #5. Amendment #6. Withdraw, withdraw Amendment #6. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk McLennand: "Floor Amendment #7, offered by Representative Black."
- Speaker Giglio: "Representative Black on Amendment #7. Withdraw
  Amendment #7. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk McLennand: "Floor Amendment #8, offered by Representative Moffitt."
- Speaker Giglio: "Withdraw Amendment #8."
  - Clerk McLennand: "Floor Amendment #9, offered by Representative Giolitto."
- Speaker Giglio: "Representative Currie, Amendment #9."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker, Members of the House. This is the Amendment that would provide that the lottery building is named in honor of Representative Zeke Giorgi. I'd appreciate your support."
- Speaker Giglio: "Any discussion? Representative Black."
- Black: "Yes, thank you very much, Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker Giglio: "Excuse me, Representative Black."
- Black: "Representative Giolitto talked to me about this some time ago. We have absolutely no opposition to Floor Amendment #9, we think it's probably a tribute long overdue."
- Speaker Giglio: "Representative Giolitto."
- Giolitto: "Yes, as was already stated that because, in Zekes

141st Legislative Day

- June 2, 1994
- memory we thought it would be very appropriate to name the lottery building in his memory."
- Speaker Giglio: "Representative Granberg. All right, there's no further discussion on the Amendment. Representative Skinner."
- Skinner: "Yes, I'd like to know if the state owns the building?" Speaker Giglio: "Representative Giolitto."
- Giolitto: "At this time, the building is being leased. However, we have been able to do this in other situations and should we lease another building or build another building it will be named for Zeke Giorgi."
- Skinner: "Don't you think it would be more of Zekes tradition to have a lottery to find out which legislature we ought name this building for."

Giolitto: "No."

Skinner: "No, okay."

- Speaker Giglio: "All those in favor of the Amendment signify by saying 'aye'; opposed, 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it. The Amendments adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk McLennand: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Giglio: "Third Reading. Representative Walsh are you
  seeking recognition, Sir?"
- Walsh: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to ask for immediate consideration of this Bill?"
- Speaker Giglio: "We're doing Second Readings now, when we'll get to third we'll be happy to accommodate. State and Local Governments, Second Reading, appears Senate Bill 398.

  Representative Granberg. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk McLennand: "Senate Bill 398 has been..."
- Speaker Giglio: "I'm sorry, excuse me, excuse the Chair. Take that Bill out of the record, Mr. Clerk. State and Local

141st Legislative Day

June 2, 1994

Governments, Second Reading, appears Senate Bill 1232, Representative Homer. Representative Homer in the chamber? Out of the record. Representative Cowlishaw on Senate Bill 1595. Does this Lady wish to hear this Bill. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk McLennand: "Senate Bill 1595 has been read a second time previously. Amendments #1 and 2 were adopted in committee.

No Motions filed. Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative Cowlishaw."

Speaker Giglio: "The Lady from DuPage, Representative Cowlishaw.

Any Amendments?"

Cowlishaw: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I apologize for the delay. Floor Amendment #3 is identical to an Amendment that we adopted yesterday by voice vote because it is not at all controversial. This is the Amendment, and we discussed this at great length yesterday. This is the Amendment that removes some of the language that is no longer needed because an accord has been reached among all of those people concerned about these issues including the Illinois Education Association and all the others who met and came to an agreement. Consequently, since this is not at all controversial and it simply in keeping with that agreement, I move for the adoption of Floor Amendment #3."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Flowers in the Chair."

Speaker Flowers: "Any discussions? Representative Granberg on the Amendment."

Granberg: "Thank you. Will the Lady yield?"

Speaker Flowers: "She indicates that she will."

Granberg: "Representative, this is the, the very same Amendment that I asked you about yesterday, this is an agreement between..."

Cowlishaw: "Yes, Representative."

141st Legislative Day

June 2, 1994

Granberg: "The IEA and all the other educational groups."

Cowlishaw: "That is correct, it is exactly the same thing."

Granberg: "Very good, thank you."

Cowlishaw: "Thank you."

Speaker Flowers: "Further discussion? Hearing none, the Lady moves for the adoption of Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 1595.

All those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. The voting is now open. All those in favor say 'aye'; opposed, 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it and the Amendment is adopted.

Any further Amendments Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk McLennand: "Floor Amendment #4, offered by Representative
Skinner."

Speaker Flowers: "Representative Skinner on Amendment #4."

Skinner: "May I have permission to withdraw this Amendment.

Thank you."

Speaker Flowers: "Withdraw, Mr. Clerk. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk McLennand: "Floor Amendment #5, offered by Representative Cowlishaw."

Speaker Flowers: "Representative Cowlishaw on Amendment #5. Representative Cowlishaw on Amendment #5."

Cowlishaw: "Yes, thank you, Madam Speaker. Pardon me, but I, was distracted for a moment. What happened to Amendment #4? It was withdrawn? On, very good, thank you very much. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Floor Amendment #5 is identical to the provisions that began as House Bill 4035. This particular Amendment is identical to one that we debated at considerable length yesterday. This is the Amendment which abolishes the current Chicago Board of Education and the Chicago School District and creates instead nine independent brand new school districts, each with a seven member elected school board. The details of this legislation were discussed, I believe, Madam Speaker

141st Legislative Day

June 2, 1994

at considerable length yesterday. However, I have had opportunity during the evening and again this morning to discuss this issue with some of my colleagues and I believe that, in fact, there is more support for this right now than there was yesterday and therefore, Madam Speaker I would certainly be glad to answer any questions, but I would respectfully request a recorded Roll Call Vote on this Amendment and if I am, it is required that I be joined by any of my colleagues I would hope that enough of them would raise their hands to qualify for that Roll Call Vote. Do I have that privilege, Madam Speaker?"

Speaker Flowers: "You do have that privilege Representative Cowlishaw."

Cowlishaw: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Flowers: "On the question, Representative Granberg, on the Amendment. Representative Brunsvold on the Amendment."

Brunsvold: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I stand opposed to this Amendment as I did yesterday for the same reasons. There was much discussion yesterday and the Amendment lost 55/57 and I would ask the Democrats to vote 'no' on this Amendment. This does not include the input from the Chicago from the school district that this affects and I would ask my side of the aisle to vote 'no' on Amendment #5."

Speaker Flowers: "Representative Ostenburg on the Amendment."

Ostenburg: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I also rise in opposition to this Amendment as I did yesterday. It was a bad Amendment yesterday and it's no better today even though there may be a few more people who supposedly support it. The issue at hand is the fact that we're creating nine bureaucracies. We have one system now and we're going to divide that into nine bureaucratic

## 141st Legislative Day

June 2, 1994

arrangements that are going to be filled with administrative bureaucracy than ever before. Every time we create more units of government, we only expand the costs of the taxpayers. Illinois now has more units of government than any other state in the nation, more than Texas, more than California, more than New York and what we want to do is take one school system and divide nine, nine times as many administrators, nine times as much costs, nine times as much bureaucracy. What we need to start looking at is ways that we can consolidate and not expand government. In addition to that, this measure will increase the biggest problem that exists in elementary and secondary education in the State of Illinois today and that's disparity among the various students in terms of the opportunities that are extended to them. We now have situations, I have it in my home district, my legislative district, where I have local school boards where local property tax yields as little as \$1,700 per pupil and three to five minutes away, it's yielding as much as \$9,500 per pupil. We're going to do the same thing now within the City of Chicago, we're going to create even more disparity among school children. This is not a well though out measure, the idea of an elected school board may be one that is good, but it's not a good idea to expand bureaucracy nine times what we currently have. This was a bad Amendment yesterday, it's an even worse Amendment today."

Speaker Flowers: "Representative Black on the Amendment."

Black: "Yes, thank you very much, Madam Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The previous speaker has gotten himself all worked up, I, he's gotten himself worked up nine times. I mean, you can multiply his anxiety and his

# 141st Legislative Day

June 2, 1994

agitation by a figure of nine. But, much of what he said I found absolutely enlightening. If you could tell me how many bureaucrats exist now at Pershing Road Headquarters to think that nine districts would multiply that engrossly inflated figure by nine, I'd like to know what I can't count that high, absolutely can't count that high. I don't know how you could add more bureaucrats to a system now that has more bureaucrats than they have students but heaven forbid, heaven forbid that anybody would want to bring nine times the accountability to the states largest school system, oh, no. We wouldn't want to that and it amazes me how this Amendment has sat on the table for 24 hours and it's worse now than it was 24 hours ago, I tell you. I'm going to come over and give that Gentleman some of my medication by factor of nine and I'll get him calmed down, but you know in the mean time, Madam Speaker, in all do respect to the Members of this chamber. why don't we just revise and extend our remarks from yesterdays debate, everybody got a chance to say their thing yesterday and it took 90 minutes and it just barely lost. So, in all do respect, Madam Speaker, I would like move the previous question and allow Representative Cowlishaw to close and let's get on with the vote, it's the same Amendment that we spent 90 minutes on yesterday. don't think we need to go through 90 minutes again today. If somebody really has something to say, just revise and extend your remarks in the journal, let's get on with the business of the State of Illinois. So, I would move the previous question and hopefully let Representative Cowlishaw close."

Speaker Flowers: "The Gentleman moves for previous, to the previous question. The question is 'Shall the previous

141st Legislative Day

June 2, 1994

question be put?' All those in favor say 'aye'; opposed, 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it, the previous question is put.
Representative Cowlishaw to close."

"Thank you very much, Madam Speaker, Ladies Cowlishaw: Gentlemen of the House. We are all familiar with this issue, we did discuss it at considerable length yesterday. probably that in trying to summarize the, the content of yesterdays debate, it would be well for me iust to point out a couple of...of, a couple of very important things. One is that the City of Chicago school system is a failure. It is not educating children that has an enormous dropout rate, we have youngsters who are actually graduating from High School in Chicago who cannot read beyond the sixth grade level. Now that is not exceptable, that is not exceptable for any student in any school district any where in Illinois. The young people of this regardless of where they live deserve opportunity to be educated than the students in Chicago are currently receiving. Secondly, I think it is apparent that we are going to be asked probably next year to come once again to the financial rescue of the Chicago public schools, because by their own admission at that point they will be falling off of a \$700,000,000 cliff. Now, if expect us to gallop to the rescue, they ought to be willing to do something to reform those schools so that not only are the students taught, but the money is well used finally, I would submit to you, Madam Speaker and my colleagues that if the nine brand new school districts which would each finally have an opportunity to elect their own school board members, were to each put into effect exactly the same number of administrators now employed by the Chicago public schools. Take that number and multiply

141st Legislative Day

- June 2, 1994
- it by nine and guess what you have, the whole population of the City of Chicago. I move for the adoption of Floor Amendment #5."
- Speaker Flowers: "The Lady moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #5. All those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk, shall take the record. On this question there's 59 voting 'no', 54... Representative Steczo would like to be recorded as voting 'no'. On this question there are 60 voting 'no', 54 voting 'yes'. This Bill having, this Amendment having...this Amendment fails. Any further Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk McLennand: "Floor Amendment #6, offered by Representative Rotello."
- Speaker Flowers: "Representative Rotello on Floor Amendment #6.

  Representative Rotello on Amendment #6."
- Rotello: "Thank you, Madame Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the This Amendment will take the language that was in House. House Bill 3449 to establish a Curriculum Committee. concept of the committee is to create an education for school to work transition for the 21st century. It will prepare kids for the high technology work place. I think it's time that we look at changing what we teach kids, and kids at all levels of give options to education. particularly elementary and secondary. And that we prepare for the work place so that we can compete economically. I ask for your favorable consideration."
- Speaker Flowers: "The Gentleman moved for the adoption of Amendment #6. Are there...is there any discussion? Representative Wennlund, on Amendment #6."
- Wennlund: "Thank you, Madame Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

  Speaker Flowers: "Yes, he will."

141st Legislative Day

June 2, 1994

Wennlund: "Representative Rotello, is this Amendment the exact same thing that was passed out of this House already in House Bill 3449?"

Rotello: "Yes. It should be the exact same language."

Wennlund: "But it already passed out of the House and over to the Senate. What's the need to amend it on this Bill now?"

Rotello: "Just making sure that deadlines are recognized, there's been a lot of confusion during this Session, unfortunately.

And I think it's important that we cover the legislative initiative that we're looking to get passed this year."

Wennlund: "And what status is Bill in the Senate? Was it passed by this House after May 3rd, which is the Senate deadline?"

Rotello: "To the best of my knowledge it's still in Senate Rules

Committee and that's why the Amendment has been drafted for
this Bill."

Wennlund: "Now what exactly, now what is this 21st century?"

Rotello: "I'm sorry."

Wennlund: "What exactly is this 21st century?"

Rotello: "Well this is 1994 and in the year 2000 we'll enter the 21st century. Six years."

Wennlund: "And in 6 years, okay. And in what way does this help to, in this committee, how are they going to help prepare educators for this?"

Rotello: "The curriculum in todays education are unfortunately the same curriculums that you and I had when we were in grade school, back you know when. So I think it's time to look at having experts brought in from business, and education, and to work together towards coming up with concepts to prepare kids for the work place. I think that the important thing we should keep in mind when you talk about education reform is that 75% of the kids that graduate high school in this state will not go on to

141st Legislative Day

June 2, 1994

receive a four year degree. Under the current system they receive a high school diploma, they have no particular skills, they have no ability to go out and sell themselves in a job market. I think the concept here is to create a committee, to create curriculum, to give kids the opportunity to work while they're in school, particularly at the high school level of course, to work in the work place, learn a skill, and then have an ability to get a job when they graduate high school."

Wennlund: "And what is the goal of this committee?"

Rotello: "To recommend to the State Board of Education curriculum changes for exactly what we're talking about."

Wennlund: "All right. Thank you very much."

Rotello: "Thank you."

"To the...to the Amendment. Ladies and Gentlemen of Wennlund: the House. This just creates one more committee and to quote my colleague, Mary Lou Cowlishaw, 'for God so loved the world that he didn't send a committee to create it', and she is right. The one thing that we don't need is another committee, to study yet another project, to study yet another educational program. That's what we don't need is another committee. And, Madame Speaker, I would ask for Roll Call Vote pursuant to 55 (c) and I'm joined by the requisite number of colleagues, number four colleagues, and requesting that vote on this issue to create yet another committee. It's a bad idea and it ought to be done away with."

Speaker Flowers: "Representative Gash."

Gash: "I would like the record to reflect that I was inadvertently shown as voting 'no' on Amendment 5 to Senate Bill 1595 and I would like the record to reflect that I had intended to vote 'yes'."

141st Legislative Day

June 2, 1994

Johnson, Tom: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Flowers: "Yes, he will."

Johnson, Tom: "Representative, who is going to serve on this committee? What does your Amendment provide for there?"

Rotello: "Would you like for me to read it?"

Johnson, Tom: "No, I mean who's appointing and can you give me an idea?"

Rotello: "The leaders...the leaders of each chamber and the Governor. This is something the Illinois Manufacturers Association has been working with me on, the Illinois Education Association. If you are satisfied, as Mr. Wennlund is, year after year, graduating class after class, school after school, city after city, county after county, in this state and sending kids in minimum wage jobs at the mall then you should vote against this. If you want to turn this thing around and compete internationally, and compete in terms of high technology in the jobs of the future then you should support this Amendment. Otherwise I think you can read the Amendment and find out about the appointments or I will read it to you."

Johnson, Tom: "Okay. Who is currently responsible for curriculum selection then, what's being taught in the schools? Isn't that planning already taking place?"

Rotello: "There's been no changes, to the best of my knowledge in any curriculum anywhere in this state as far as the general curriculum offered to students at the public education, elementary, and secondary level. So the State Board of Education, to answer your question, in my opinion hasn't moved in the direction quickly enough to look at this school to work thing. This is something that is taking

141st Legislative Day

June 2, 1994

place nationally. In the Rockford area we have some wonderful programs going on where kids in the Tech-Prep program in manufacturing are learning job skills while they're in high school. They graduate with some skills, go to the company they've been training with, and hopefully get a job. That can avoid my manufactures having to go to Europe to find skilled tradesman to do the work that their company requires. So in our economy, we can't afford to have that thing going on anymore."

Johnson, Tom: "Would this committee be reporting back to the General Assembly, would they be reporting to the State Board of Education or what is the...?"

Rotello: "It will report back to us, and that we should implement with the State Board of Education a curriculum that makes sense for the new century. We can't study the last centuries subjects and compete economically in the next century's economy."

Johnson, Tom: "How do you propose even if this committee came back with a curriculum to resolve this sort of an issue in this chamber when, in fact, we have mandates being passed by this chamber year after year to teach this and to teach that and et cetera? You expect that this committee is going to be able to come back and tell this General Assembly that the State Board of Education, in terms of its own curriculum, needs to change all of that and all of us need to change our ways. Is that correct?"

Rotello: "Well, either you want to change a curriculum in education."

Johnson, Tom: "I want to, believe me."

Rotello: "We have a lot of debate here. You do?"

Johnson, Tom: "Yes."

Rotello: "So why the filibuster?"

141st Legislative Day

June 2, 1994

Johnson, Tom: "I'm not filibustering. I'm just trying to understand the purpose of another committee, when I believe that we have come up with suggestion after suggestion as far as curriculum in this chamber. What's the committee going to do?"

Rotello: "The State Board of Education, under the Governorship of Jim Edgar, is not moving in this direction quickly enough. So we need to look at a committee to force them to do something. We can't...this is something you can't wait five or ten more years or wait 20 more years or let's just drift along, as we have been for a long time in this state, it's something that we should be doing now. The inaction of the State Board of Education requires that we create a committee to get this process moving."

Johnson, Tom: "Thank you."

Speaker Flowers: "Representative Mautino."

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

Speaker Flowers: "He indicates that he will."

Mautino: "Representative Rotello, on this committee are there members of manufacturing as well as organized labor?"

Rotello: "Yes. That is the intent."

Mautino: "Is this the next step from legislation passed last Session which would move us towards a school to work transition?"

Rotello: "Yes it is, Representative. As you know both of us have worked on this concept and I think it's something that we should have a full court press, to use some basketball terminology since that is real popular right now, a full court press like the Nicks needed last night, to implement these changes. We can't drag our feet, we're falling behind the Europeans, we're falling behind the Japanese in education systems, and economic systems, and we need to

141st Legislative Day

June 2, 1994

have a school system that takes the, particularly the non college bound student, and trains them for gainful employment."

Mautino: "Approximately, what percentage, at this current time, are non college bound students?"

Rotello: "I have heard between 75 to 80% of kids that graduate public high schools and those are the ones that graduate high school, will not go on and receive a four year degree.

And studies show by the year 2,000 that 80% of the jobs in the economy will require some type of skill."

Mautino: "So under this commission would set forward a curriculum or suggest to the State Board of Education a curriculum that would better train the work force for the future."

Rotello: "That's correct."

Mautino: "Thank you."

Rotello: "Thank you."

Mautino: "To the Amendment, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. number of years back a report was published, A Landmark Report, A Nation At Risk, and we began gearing our educational curriculum towards the college bound students and we started to walk away from the vocational programs that exist in the State of Illinois. Within my district I have a vocational center where we can walk in and see about \$200,000 worth of dust. Those are machines because we don't have the teachers and the programs set for machine toolest, for some of the other trades. Business has come with an idea that we need to at this point take those students who are not planning on going on to college, create a pathway that they can gain the skills necessary to compete in a global economy. I commend the Sponsor of the Amendment, and believe that it is necessary that if students are not going to continue on to a college, they

141st Legislative Day

June 2, 1994

should then have a path or a direction where they can learn a trade or learn those portions of curriculum that industries say are necessary to get them the work force they need to compete. I support the Amendment and I ask for your 'aye' votes."

Speaker Flowers: "Representative Parke on the Amendment."

Parke: "Thank you, Madame Speaker, Members of the House. I believe that there is some confusion on our side. I would just like to remind all the Republicans, on this side of the aisle, that quite frankly this Amendment passed earlier on a House Bill 113 to 1. This Amendment has merit, yes it is another committee. I think there's confusion on our side and to be consistent with good ideas that we all want to support. I would suggest that the Members of our side joined with the Members of the other side, and pass this meaningful, and worthwhile Amendment, so that there's no confusion."

Speaker Flowers: "Representative Mulligan on the Amendment."

Mulligan: "Thank you, Madame Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield for some questions?"

Speaker Flowers: "Yes, he will."

Mulligan: "Representative Rotello, did you say earlier in this debate that the Illinois Education Association was in favor of this?"

Rotello: "Yes, I did."

Mulligan: "Could you tell me if the members of this committee will serve without any compensation?"

Rotello: "Yes, they will."

Mulligan: "They will serve without compensation?"

Rotello: "That's correct."

Mulligan: "What weight would the committee report have, if any?"

Rotello: "What weight will it have?"

141st Legislative Day

June 2, 1994

Mulligan: "Will they come back with a report..."

Rotello: "Depends on how thick it is."

Mulligan: "That doesn't mean we would implement it or?"

Rotello: "Right."

Mulligan: "It just is a committee that would make a report like a lot of other reports, and not necessarily have...carry any weight, I presume. Only the value that the Members of this Body might take from it in looking at the report."

Rotello: "Well I think that's true, assuming that I will be back here, I'll make sure that the recommendations brought forward will be put into proper Motion so that we can have an education system that's meaningful."

Mulligan: "Is this a one time only committee?"

Rotello: "Yes, it is."

Mulligan: "It does not say in the Amendment when by what date certain they would be appointed?"

Rotello: "I don't have a particular date on there, now."

Mulligan: "But yet their report should be returned by..."

Rotello: "Well, I think we have to realize that one thing that our business community, and our government community in this country and in this state have not realize. Is that the economy is ever changing and technology is changing and maybe this committee should be ongoing. I don't...you're not going to have a stagnant curriculum, that is what we have now. We're dealing with curriculums that made sense in 1940, in 1950, they don't make sense for the year 2,000. So I can't sit here today and say that a curriculum study made today, to be implemented in the year 2,000, is going to make sense in the year 2,010, particularly with the way technology changes."

Mulligan: "Perhaps that would be part of their report that..."
Rotello: "Correct."

141st Legislative Day

June 2, 1994

Mulligan: "...an I'm going and I think that is part of a large body to have an ongoing committee to study curriculum but perhaps that could be part of their report."

Rotello: "Well, you tell me how...how curriculums have changed in the last 50 years? The only difference today in public education are computers and the vast majority of school this state do not have enough computers in their classrooms. I had a meeting of my Chamber of Commerce Rockford, and a small trucking firm needs to hire some people to drive trucks, and they can't find a truck driver that can operate a computer so they can better control their inventory. So truck drivers in the future will need computer skills, that's just an example of what I'm talking We have to have people come out of high school with skills that can go into the job market. I don't understand all of the questions and debate, I understand the partisans rhetoric. This is a very serious situation, we have an education system that needs to change, and if you're either willing to change it or you have to sit down and vote 'no'."

Mulligan: "I'm interested in this and that is why I'm asking the questions. Because I feel although the concept here is good that there are a few things missing in the Amendment that I'm curious about. Such as, the date certain when they would be appointed, whether they'd serve without compensation, how long it would be ongoing. Those you have answered that perhaps need be spelled out just a little bit better, in either a subsequent Amendment or a in a manner of how they are doing it. But I certainly agree with you and I agree with remarks made by Representative Mautino about changes in curriculum that we need. So perhaps, you know, my idea is that perhaps I

141st Legislative Day

June 2, 1994

would vote for this but I think you need to add a few things that make it a little more certain. Thank you."

- Speaker Flowers: "The Gentleman move for the adoption of Amendment #6. Representative Rotello to close."
- Rotello: "Thank you, Madame Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I think we should look at this as just not another committee but as something that is an attempt to try and get education bureaucracy to move in the direction of making education meaningful for kids. I think kids need hands on experience in terms of learning, they need the opportunity to have options for their curriculum. To make career decisions earlier in their educational career, is a real important part of this school to work transition. And I would ask that we would move forward with this, certainly the committee can have a framework after the appointment by the Governor, as far as a time frame. The important thing is to do a good job, and get it done, and get it implemented. And I ask for your favorable support."
- Speaker Flowers: "The Gentleman move for the adoption of Amendment #6. All those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed, 'no'. Voting is now open. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk, shall take the record. 113 voting 'aye', 2 voting 'no'. This Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk McLennand: "Floor Amendment #7, offered by Representative Rotello."
- Speaker Flowers: "Representative Rotello on Amendment #7."
- Rotello: "Amendment #7 is the language that was contained in House Bill 3452. This initiative is a...also endorsed by IEA and the IMA, and this would set up a system to train people in the work place to work with the vocational education teacher in implementing programs like Tech-Prep.

141st Legislative Day

June 2, 1994

We've had a very successful effort in that area in Rockford in terms of manufacturing. We are recognizing both the Governor and this Legislature that this is an area that we And the other area that we can look at should move in. are, medical careers, careers in technology, manufacturing. et cetera. We need to have a system to have these kids not only trained in school in the old fashioned vocational education system, but also in the work place. And this particular Bill would set a framework for certifying, so to speak, I guess that is the wrong word to use because it is not a certification. But a recognition that the work place individual working with the kids would be trained for education to make these school to work transitions effective. And I ask for your support."

Speaker Flowers: "The Gentleman move for the adoption of Amendment #7 to House...Senate Bill 1595. Is there any discussion? Representative Cowlishaw."

Cowlishaw: "Thank you very much, Madame Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Flowers: "He indicates that he will."

Cowlishaw: "Representative Rotello, is it correct that this

Amendment is very nearly identical to House Bill 3452 of
which the Sponsors where Rotello, Cowlishaw, Curran, Weller
and Mautino which passed the House by a vote of 115 to
nothing?"

Rotello: "That is correct, Representative."

Cowlishaw: "Very good. Madame Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I stand in strong support of this Amendment.

Representative Rotello is to be commended for working very hard on this along with people who have a real interest in this whole subject of school to work transition. What I would like to point out is, it seems to me that this is

141st Legislative Day

June 2, 1994

particularly timely in relation to what is going on with the Department of Education in Washington, D.C. Ι that Representative Rotello is aware of this and certainly I am through my work with the National Conference of State Legislatures. There is a real effort on the part of our federal government to promote really worthwhile school to work transitions, so as to assure that our young people can put their skills to real use in the real work place, in the real world. This is in keeping with the trends of times and with the initiatives of the federal government. And in that respect I think that, once again, I stand in support of Amendment #7 to Senate Bill 1595. And thank you for your patience."

Speaker Flowers: "Representative Tenhouse on the Amendment."

Tenhouse: "Thank you, Madame Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Flowers: "He indicates that he will."

Tenhouse: "I think they have let us in here too long.

Representative Rotello, could you fill us in, it is a little hard to hear with all the noise in the background.

Can you give us a list of some of the proponents and if there are any opponents as far as their list as far as this legislation is concerned?"

Rotello: "I'm...Representative, I'm not aware of any opponents.

The proponents are the Manufacturers Association are strong supporters of this, the Illinois Education Association.

And I think that is an important message that shouldn't be lost in this discussion, that the education system, and the business community want to work together to help change our education system. I think that the marriage between the two is real education reform. That college bound kids are going to do relatively well, in terms of obtaining degrees,

# 141st Legislative Day

June 2. 1994

whether they get a job later or not is another question. But in terms of education, they do very well and it is pretty much the top 20 to 25%. The 75% that we send out with a high school diploma, that would work 30 or 40 years ago when our economy was growing dramatically and people find their niche after floating around. I think in today's competitive work force and today's competitive economy worldwide, we can't afford to have people spending 10 years of their life floating around, and we need to zero in on getting them trained for employment. And I think that the IMA and the IEA working together with this can this successful and it's important for to understand that and the State Board of Education."

- Tenhouse: "Thank you, Mr. Representative. The other thing, as far as the genesis of this, where did you come up with the idea or did someone approach you with it or...?"
- Rotello: "It's the vocational education programs in the state have been something that I have worked on and the Bill itself was originally presented from the vocational education area."
- Tenhouse: "As far as the 20 person working committee, isn't that

  a little cumbersome? Why are there so many people
  involved?"
- Rotello: "I tend to agree that the size of the committee might be large but it was important, I think, to get a good balance from educators and from various entities of business and that was, I think the reason that there's that many people in it."
- Tenhouse: "Okay. I'm looking at 13 members, I guess. The other thing is, when is the effective date, when will this become law? We don't have it here in our analysis."
- Rotello: "It would be an effective date, would be immediate."

141st Legislative Day

June 2, 1994

Tenhouse: "When would you...I assume the working group is going to be involved, but how long do you perceive before the ideas that are presented here will actually be implemented as far as the schools are concerned actually or in the work place, how long before...?"

Rotello: "We need the cooperation between the State Board of Education, and they have budgeted dollars for Tech-Prep. through the Governor's budget and I think that we need to implement this as quickly as possible. It's a key part of recognizing that our state is moving in this direction, in terms of education, and that the federal government is making moneys available for school to work. Administration signed a Bill, I think about three weeks ago, to put dollars at the state and local level for these programs. And we were fortunate enough to have three my district attend the signing at the White House for that. And I think that the sooner the better, answer to your question. My hope would be that the State Board would grab this and get to work on it immediately, as soon as we can get it passed."

Tenhouse: "For someone who represents a district that has a lot of rural school districts, how do you perceive this impacting on them, I can see like for instance in the communities of Rockford or Quincy but how about your small schools, how will this...won't it be harder to interrogate this into the program?"

Rotello: "It is a little tougher with rural communities, however, the rural districts that are located within my legislative district or my county, in North Central Illinois, are moving in the direction of Tech-Prep. Their a little more limited because of their accessibility to manufacturing firms. But it just depends, I suppose, on whether or not

141st Legislative Day

June 2, 1994

an arrangement can be made to move kids in and out of a city the size enough to have...to have a manufacturing firm. We're also looking at, as I said, the health care industry, another area of high technology, as we know all the advances of medicine and high technology that every job in that area requires technological skills. So nursing homes and hospitals and other health facilities can also qualify, if we move beyond manufacturing and we need to do that as well. So that I think would help some of those rural areas if children are interested in health care field."

Tenhouse: "Thank you, Mr. Representative Rotello."

Rotello: "Thank you."

Tenhouse: "To the Bill. I would just like to say that obviously he worked very hard to put together a fine piece of legislation here and worked on a basis of bringing together various groups that traditionally would not be working together on this type of legislation. I congratulate you on your efforts and I intend to support it and I would urge other Members to do it on this side as well."

Speaker Flowers: "Representative Biggert on the Amendment."

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

Speaker Flowers: "He indicates that he will."

Biggert: "Thank you. Representative Rotello, on the second page of the Bill, you talk about the rules should not create any new state mandates, as on school districts is a condition of receiving federal, state and local funds."

Rotello: "Yes."

Biggert: "Which I think is commendable because we certainly don't want to have anymore state mandates. Do you think that is possible to do without additional funds that the school districts would have to provide or how is this going to

141st Legislative Day

June 2, 1994

work?"

Rotello: "What we are hoping is to have a commitment of the Tech-Prep moneys that the Governor has in his budget. move in the direction...in this direction first. If this is going to be successful, you have to think of the old fashioned vocational education system in this country which has basically been a shop class. So...and they're still there, vocational education teachers are still within the system, it is not creating anything new. But we're changing the concept of vocational education, taking it out of the classroom and putting it into the work place. So this would take the people, and the companies that make the commitment to both helping education and training a work force for themselves. Which is why I think this can be successful. We'll work together to create this in school education and in work place education."

Biggins: "So that the teachers that are involved in vocational education now will still want to be..."

Rotello: "Yes."

Biggins: "Employed at the same rate..."

Rotello: "Oh, yes."

Biggins: "There won't be anymore moneys spent by..."

Rotello: "No."

Biggins: "The school district?"

Rotello: "It, it's...what it is, is a reform of vocational education to make it meaningful for kids to really have some good job skills."

Biggins: "Some of the school districts now have a program which involves a center where many of the school districts have a resource center and many businesses have provided...well we have one in our area, called Davia. And it's really is a consortium of several school districts and they provide

141st Legislative Day

June 2, 1994

that type of education. Is this the kind of thing that will be done, or is this for students will actually go into the work place where there is the modern equipment?"

Rotello: "Well, I think there is certainly a flexibility there, if I am understanding your question correctly. There...I think one part of education that I think fails is that we don't give options to kids, we put them on a college bound track. Our whole public school system is college prep, and 75% of the kids not going on to receive the degree are prepared to go to college with no job skills, so if we can create, that's what the importance of the last Amendment, was to create curriculums to allow flexibility. Particularly, even at the elementary school level they have kids who begin to understand what, you know, to think about where they want to go with their life to begin thinking about it rather than thinking about it while they are at college. And then...I don't think our economy can afford that type of activity."

Biggins: "Thank you very much, for your answers."

Rotello: "Thank you."

Speaker Flowers: "Representative Brady on the Amendment."

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

Speaker Flowers: "He indicates that he will."

Brady: "Representative, I applaud your effort. I just have a couple technical questions. How long will this commission last?"

Rotello: "The intent is to have this system set up through the State Board of Education, I assume when that is accomplished that the commission would be able to dissolve."

Brady: "I'm sorry, I didn't hear you."

Rotello: "When the work is completed to set up this system of

141st Legislative Day

June 2, 1994

implementation, I think the committee's work will be done."
Brady: "What would anticipate that?"

Rotello: "My hope is that it can be done as soon as possible. I would imagine that it's going to take a couple of school years or so, to get the thing implemented. And it should start, its going to have to start, small and work with the communities that already have the school to work transition and there are very few. I think our goal statewide would be to have a couple hundred apprentices in the Tech-Prep manufacturing system by next year. I mean that is what we're talking about here, we're at a situation of..."

Brady: "Within a couple years you would expect the state board to oversee?"

Rotello: "To oversee, I'm not sure what you're asking."

Brady: "Oversee the results and implement the continuation of those results that, in fact, this commission would dissolve within a couple of years."

Rotello: "That would be the intent, yes."

Brady: "Do you anticipate any costs?"

Rotello: "Yes, there will be costs because it's a program to train work place, or private sector people in working with the kids. We're talking about about a million and a half dollars."

Brady: "About a million, say that again."

Rotello: "About a million and a half."

Brady: "A million and a half dollars?"

Rotello: "Right."

Brady: "Over what period of time?"

Rotello: "The million and a half dollars would be over a couple of, I think over the...three years is what we have here."

Brady: "Okay. Who...who's budget would the million and a half come out of?"

141st Legislative Day

June 2, 1994

Rotello: "The State Board of Education. My intent and my hope is that they would have \$5 million the Governor has put in his proposed budget for the Tech-Prep area. It's my hope that we can look at that area to fund this."

Brady: "So what you would in essence be doing is redirecting some of the funds..."

Rotello: "Correct."

Brady: "Already appropriated to an investment plan for longer term versus the short term?"

Rotello: "That's correct. And the State of Illinois missed out on the first round of school to work federal dollars, grants that were issued, there will be an additional \$100 million in federal moneys for these programs and hopefully if we get these things in place we can qualify to receive some of those dollars."

Brady: "Is that an ongoing federal program?"

Rotello: "I assume it will be."

Brady: "Thank you very much."

Rotello: "Yes."

Speaker Flowers: "Representative Novak, on the Amendment."

Novak: "Yes, Madam Speaker. I move the previous question."

Speaker Flowers: "The Gentleman move to...Representative Novak, no one else is seeking recognition. Representative Rotello to close."

Rotello: "Thank you, Madame Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is a key component to making school to work transition program effective will be to have the work place, work with the school district, work with that vocational teacher to implement a program to give these kids the opportunity for work, vocational education at the work site. And I think it's something that we need to move in the direction of as quickly as possible, and I ask for

141st Legislative Day

June 2, 1994

your support on this Amendment."

Speaker Flowers: "The Gentleman move for the adoption of Amendment #7 to Senate Bill 1595. All those in favor say 'aye'; opposed, 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk McLennand: "Floor Amendment #8, offered by Representative Davis."

Speaker Flowers: "Representative Davis on Floor Amendment #8."

Davis: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. Floor Amendment #8 is an Amendment that certifies the training of LSC members by having them trained by the people who hold the type 75 certificates that the state requires. They would have the education that they would be teaching to the LSC members."

Speaker Flowers: "The Lady moves for the adoption of Amendment #8, Amendment #8 to Senate Bill 1595. Is there any discussion? Representative Levin on the Amendment."

Levin: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Flowers: "She indicates that she will."

Levin: "Okay, I didn't, I apologize, I didn't hear the full explanation of this Amendment. Under current procedures, I believe that the local school councils have the option of having the, the board of education do the training of local school council members and/or having various outside groups generally not for profits who are on a list that has been approved by the Chicago Board of Education. How does your Amendment change who is qualified or eligible to provide the training from what it is now?"

Davis: "All it states Representative, is that those people who do
the training have themselves had the training. It's an
attempt to keep the training at a very professional level,
we realize that currently there is a list and from that

141st Legislative Day

June 2, 1994

list LSC members can choose. This Bill will protect fly by night organizations from coming to the fore and offering training to LSC members when they actually do not have people perhaps capable of delivering that service."

Levin: "Now, whose, I don't understand, are there standards in this Amendment in terms of, does somebody have to, have the teaching degree under your Amendment."

Davis: "Well, it doesn't say a teaching degree, it says a certificate, you know, the State of Illinois provides administrative certificates to people who meet certain administrative levels of education and that certificate is currently required by people who do training for the board of education or who do staff development probably in every school district. The administrative certificate means that you have had certain courses and met certain requirements that equip you to provide others with this very important information."

Levin: "Well, have we had a problem up to this point. I'm not aware Representative of any problems. The problem if there is one is in, encouraging the training. Not enough local school council members are getting the training, we had an issue with respect to a Bill of mine when it was in the Senate that they wanted to mandate that right after the person is elected to local school council before they can be seated they have to have the training because not everybody is getting trained and so I'm not, I don't...I'm not clear on what the problem is that your Amendment seems to want to address. The problem seems to be the reverse and we're not getting enough training right now..."

Davis: "Well, well what it states, Representative is as you know, there is a requirement for eight hours of training and for local school council members to be adequately trained they

141st Legislative Day

June 2, 1994

should be trained, in my opinion and others, by people who are equipped to do the training. Currently, we have some organizations who administratively are capable themselves, but the people sometimes they sent out are not really capable of providing the kind of training that is required for the LSC. For example, educational theories, school finance those, those are very very important topics at the LSC does need to be trained on, but the people who provide it should also have received some training in those topics."

Levin: "Representative, it would seem to me that this is an issue which, and I recently, normally don't say this, but the one that, you know, is setting up the list of whose eligible the Chicago Board of Education certainly takes into account the quality of the training and, you know, in fact monitors and should be monitoring the training. My concern is that your, what your Amendment would do would be to cut back on the number of groups that will providing the training and therefore, would cut back on the number of local school council members that are going to be trained."

Davis: "It certainly would not cut back on those who are doing the training if anything, I think it would probably increase the number of people who will reach out to do the training. I think it will increase that number..."

Levin: "How's it..."

Davis: "We, you do know that the eight hours that's required at this point there is no certification provided. What we're asking is that once the type 75 training is administered by whomever that the LSC member gets a certificate for the eight hours of training that is given. I think it's crucially important Representative that people who are offering training to LSC members are qualified to do that.

# 141st Legislative Day

June 2, 1994

Now, we have had some cases in which LSC's have paid \$5,000 to a group who had a lovely looking brochure and who had a lot of packets to provide but when they gave the training, the training was given by people or persons who did not have the educational skills or knowledge to deliver information to the LSC on educational theory or school budgeting or school finance. Now, this legislation is supported by the subdistrict councils of the school boards who are elected from the LSC, all the LSC's submit members to the sub-district council. This legislation is supported by those groups."

- Levin: "Does the Board of...Chicago Board of Education have a position. Because it seems to me they have the authority right now to monitor the quality of the training, we don't need..."
- Davis: "Representative, the Board of Education cannot monitor training with limited staff and 650 schools and people being allowed to use their Chapter 1 money for training they can not monitor all of those training sessions. I think you know that."
- Levin: "You agree they have the authority to do it, so what you want to do is you want the state board to spend it's money to do something that the Chicago Board of Education..."
- Davis: "The State Board doesn't have to spend a dime. This Bill does not cost anybody one dime. There are people already qualified who teach in universities, who have, who have, they just have state certification, there are people all over this state who have type 75 certificates. They are people vastly qualified to do this. It would not cost anybody one dime, I don't know of anyone who would have to go back and get the training unless your saying to me you know of people who are doing the training who perhaps are

141st Legislative Day
not qualified."

June 2, 1994

Levin: "Well, you know, I just, I don't understand again the reason for this Amendment that, you clearly don't need to have a teaching certificate. I have gone through teachers college in order to be able to teach one of these courses.

I'm not sure if your Amendment would require that. It's fairly morfous, does it grandfather in anybody whose done it up to this point?"

Davis: "That's a possibility, that's a possibility to grandfather in, that's certainly, that's possible, we could do that."

Levin: "My concern is not with the concept of what you're talking about, is that the affect of this may very well be to cut back on the amount of training that's available and therefore the number of local school council members that are trained."

Davis: "Well, as you stated, Representative not enough local school council members are taking part in the training and part of the reason is because they don't feel it's valuable that some of the people that's offering it are not quite capable of delivering what the LSC expects. So, if we could improve upon the, the kind of training that they're receiving and make certain that they realize it's valuable because it's what we required of them, then I'm sure many more of them will take that training. I think it's a very crucial piece of legislation that is required or requested sub-district councils. Sub-district councils come as Representative, Representatives from their local school Now, if you have opposition, I don't know of anyone who has...has, there's no opposition that I know of, I have received absolutely not one bit of opposition to this legislation."

Levin: "I think part of the problem is that I don't think anybody

141st Legislative Day

June 2, 1994

knows about it, this is the first I've heard about it. I have not, you know I work closely with the various coalition of...of school reform groups. We just got a Bill, in fact, out of the Senate that's back here in the House, which is their major effort and it involved hundreds of hours of work on a bipartisan basis to get that back to the House. Where, where does the groups like designs for change, where do they stand in connection with this legislation. They haven't told me that they were even aware of it, this proposal. Do you know if they have a position?"

Davis: "I don't work for designs for change, I'm sorry, I really,
 I don't know, I have not heard from them. I do not work
 for them. I don't know, are they in some way connected
 with the board of education or are they offering the
 training?"

Levin: "They, you know there is a whole coalition of groups that are out there..."

Davis: "Well, I'm sure designs for change has qualified people.

Those people aren't qualified, I think..."

Levin: "When legislation comes up..."

Davis: "I believe those are qualified people. Those people probably have a type 75, they've been doing training for quite a long time and many of them are retired professionals. I'm sure that these people are qualified at this time."

Levin: "Is your intent to grandfather in anybody that's done training..."

Davis: "Yes, we can do that Representative. I have no problem with that."

Levin: "You have no...that's part of your intent?"

Davis: "Yes, Sir."

141st Legislative Day

June 2, 1994

Levin: "All right, thank you."

Speaker Flowers: "Representative Black on the Amendment."

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

Speaker Flowers: "She indicates that she will."

Black: "Representative, is there any legislation to the Amendment, is there any legislation out there that requires the local school council members in Chicago to have eight hours of training?"

Davis: "There is, Representative. I don't know where that legislation is, but there is legislation out there that does require that they have eight hours of training."

Black: "Is that current law or is that a proposal?"

Davis: "It's, it's in House Amendment #1 on this Bill."

Black: "Okay. Is it, has anybody given an opinion as to whether it would be constitutional to require an elected official to take eight hours of training?"

Davis: "Well, it's the Amendment #1 on this Bill."

Black: "Okay, well, what is a..."

Davis: "I think sometimes you, you do require that people take certain things and this Bill does say that there is a requirement of eight hours."

Black: "What is, what is a type 75 administrative certificate?"

Davis: "It is the administrative certificate that is required by the State of Illinois for most school administrators who do staff development or train other teachers or other professionals and in this case it would be local school council members."

Black: "What, what endorses..."

Davis: "It's a state board of education requirement."

Black: "I have several of them, but what endorsement would this require, is this the principals endorsement, superintendent

141st Legislative Day

June 2, 1994

endorsement?"

Davis: "Superintendents have this type of 75..."

Black: "I know."

Davis: "Well, I don't know what you mean by would it require their endorsement. I don't understand your question."

Black: "How many type 75's certificates are there in the State of Illinois?"

Davis: "I do not have those answers, Sir. I just know that a number of, Representative Hoeft is raising his hand so maybe he knows. Three? There are what, now... There are three endorsements for the type 75, okay."

Black: "Does it require a masters degree?"

Davis: "Yes, it does."

Black: "So, anybody that's going to train a member of a local elected school council in Chicago has to hold a state board of education type 75 administrative certificate with the proper endorsements and requires a masters degree. Is that right?"

Davis: "Representative, the training that they are to receive is training in school finance, educational theory, budgeting, and in order to develop policy and programs for their schools they're those who believe they need people who are knowledgeable in those areas to do the training."

Black: "Do you, do you hold a type 75 certificate?"

Davis: "Yes, I do, but I don't want to do any LSC training. I don't want to do that."

Black: "All right, is it, is it your understanding that these people who hold these masters degree people who hold a type 75 administrative certificate would do this training for free."

Davis: "They could, they could certainly volunteer and do it free."

141st Legislative Day

- June 2, 1994
- Black: "Okay, they could. I wonder then if we know if they would."
- Davis: "Well, I'm sure there are some people who are currently volunteering to do this training and they are retired professionals. Some of them are former superintendent of schools, some of them are just retired professionals and they do the training either for free or very small stipend."
- Black: "Should your Amendment become law, let's say that a corporate comptroller of a company that had been awarded by every group in the country, if not world for streamlining costs and managing cash flow, that person couldn't come in and offer any training to the school counselors, or the school councils, could they?"
- Davis: "They could offer school training, they could certainly do that, but it would not be part of what is required currently by the state. Could they, could they offer training in school finance?"
- Black: "In other words, they could, they could offer training but it doesn't count towards the eight hours that you have to have, so that kind of reduces the attendance wouldn't you think."
- Davis: "Well, the reason they would be required to have it in school finance is because that's the purpose they're going to use it for and even though your, your cooperate person I'm sure is extremely knowledgeable he may not be familiar with the administrative activities of...of a school budget."
- Black: "Okay. Thank you very much, Representative. Madam Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in opposition to Amendment #8. If you listen very carefully the conversation, some of the finest minds in physiology in

# 141st Legislative Day

June 2, 1994

accounting, in auditing, in early childhood development, in the theory of education could not offer training to local school councils in the City of Chicago unless they had a You could take the...loriate certificate. professor of education from Harvard or Columbia or Mexico State or wherever as college professor do not have to have type 75 certificate. Most of them do not. they couldn't offer the required training for local school councils. You see what this Amendment really does, this makes sure that the reform effort is controlled by those who are inside the system. Heaven forbid, we'd every bring anybody from outside the system who might be able to show new and innovative ways to motivate children. maintain cash flow, and to maintain an accurate set of books. Oh, contrive that we bring anybody in from the outside to help us put the Chicago schools or any school system, for that matter, in the State of Illinois and have their board members or local council members trained by some of the leading experts in any and everything that relates to accounting or educational philosophy. This Amendment simply says, what we have is good enough and only those of us who holds a certificate and know the inside secrets of education will be allowed to give the required training. It's a self serving Amendment, Misguided, at worse. I rise in opposition to Amendment #8. Madam Speaker, pursuant Rule 55 (c), I'm jointed by four of my colleagues in requesting a Roll Call Vote on Amendment #8."

Speaker Flowers: "Representative Brady, on the Amendment."

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

Speaker Flowers: "She indicates that she will."

Brady: "Representative, is it...understand that only effects the

141st Legislative Day

June 2, 1994

- school district of Chicago?"
- Davis: "I'm sorry. Yes, it only does effect Chicago and it does not prevent any other person who wishes to give information or training to our school district from doing so. It merely says, the required eight hours that are required, that those people have the knowledge to partake...to input to those people."
- Brady: "So, we are requiring that the City of Chicago, elected school board...appointed school board members complete eight hours of training and this is established in the curriculum?"
- Davis: "Their not appoint, this are elected local school...you see, we have..."
- Brady: "Okay, the local school. So, these are elected and it's requiring that they complete eight hours of training and it's stating that the training must be provided by someone with this certificate. Is that right?"
- Davis: "Someone who meets the State of Illinois requirements to do staff training and development."
- Brady: "Okay. Could...could the Chicago School Board direct that this requirement exists?"
- Davis: "The Chicago School Board has been antedated with a number of people who wish to do the training and they, themselves, may be capable but those they sent out to do the training may not really may not be equip. Now, you do know, that each local school in Chicago, there's 650 schools and each one has governing board existing of eleven people..."
- Brady: "My question to you, is could the Chicago School Board require this same thing?"
- Davis: "I would imagine they could, I would imagine."
- Brady: "I would too. And this is where your philosophy confuses me somewhat, Representative. Yesterday, you accused us,

141st Legislative Day

June 2, 1994

118 Members of the Illinois House of dictating on nine member boards in the Chicago School Districts."

Davis: "Yesterday is dead and gone."

Brady: "But now you come to us today, you come to us today and ask those of us to mandate something that the school board of Chicago could do itself. As you so articulated yesterday, we don't know...why are you asking us to do something that Chicago School Boards could take care of on their own. Did your philosophy change overnight?"

Davis: "Well, I believe that there are a lot of things that we do here, local government..."

Brady: "Well, wait a second, I'm just comparing your argument yesterday."

Davis: "...could do themselves. This is really a continuation of what we started here in 1988, and that was a school reform legislation..."

Brady: "Do you understand why I'm a little bit confused."

Davis: "Do you know the people that you're training. Do you recognize Representative Brady, who's being trained here.

Do you know who they are?"

Brady: "Well, no. But my question is, is more philosophic...why you want us to mandate something of the Chicago School Board that they can do themselves. With 27 members, I think you used yesterday. But you didn't want us to have anything about nine school boards."

Davis: "No, I'm asking you to support...I'm asking you to support...I'm asking you to support legislation that will provide standards of those coming forth to do the training."

Brady: "Providing or mandate?"

Davis: "No, no. We're providing standards."

Brady: "This is not mandatory?"

141st Legislative Day

June 2, 1994

- Davis: "It will not exclude, Representative... Representative."
- Brady: "Are we not mandating, are not 118 Members of the Illinois

  House mandating on the Chicago School Board, what they have
  to do?"
- Davis: "It will not exclude those that Representative Black was talking about from providing service and information. It will not exclude them from doing so..."
- Brady: "Did you say, Representative Black doesn't know what he's talking about."
- Speaker Flowers: "Excuse me, excuse me. Excuse me, excuse me.

  May we please have some order in this House, so we can carry on a very intelligent debate. May we please have some order in this House. Thank you. Representative Brady, please proceed."
- Brady: "And again, I go back to the point. Am I correct to understand, Representative, that you want us, 118 Members of the Illinois House to mandate on the Chicago School Board that the elected representatives of those school councils must meet this requirement. But you don't want us to mandate that Chicago should be nine school boards."
- Davis: "No, they already have to meet the requirement. You passed that on Amendment 1. I'm saying, those that do the training, those people who come and train, mothers and fathers who may not have high school diplomas, parents who may not have high school diplomas who are governing their school. We're asking that those people who come to train them on the very important issue of school finance and school budgeting, they are not in charge of lots and lots of dollars. So, we're asking you to make sure those who come out to do the training of these parents that they have the proper equipment themselves."

Brady: "Mandate, 118 Members mandating. You want 118 Members

141st Legislative Day

June 2, 1994

here to mandate this, something the Chicago School Board..."

- Speaker Flowers: "Excuse me, Representative Brady, would you please bring your remarks to a close."
- Brady: "Representative, thank you, for your comments. And to the Bill, or the Amendment. Ladies and Gentlemen, this is completely in...it's a mandate. We are mandating something on the Chicago School Board that they could take care of themselves. If this legislation passes where there is an eight hour requirement, Representative has suggested, Monique Davis has suggested that the Chicago School Board could...could put this form of requirement for that eight hours in front of them, themselves. I suggest that we let the School Board of the City of Chicago, excuse me, the School Board of Chicago make this discussion and we stay out of this mandate from Springfield."
- Speaker Flowers: "Representative Hoeft on the Amendment."
- Hoeft: "Thank you, Madame Speaker. Will the Sponsor allow me to support her idea?"

Speaker Flowers: "Yes, she will."

Hoeft: "I believe that in education that is so much myth in terms of finance and in terms of law, in terms of administration and leadership. That anytime we can work towards consistency is going to be a big step forward. Obviously, school board members, local school council members need to be educated in terms of the school system and with so much myth going on I think that the stronger the leadership in terms of those people who are giving out the information the stronger the educational system would be. And I would come out very much in favor of this idea."

Speaker Flowers: "Representative Schoenberg.

141st Legislative Day

June 2, 1994

- Schoenberg: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I believe we've heard enough pontificating on this subject. I move the previous question."
- Speaker Flowers: "The Gentleman has move the previous question.

  The question is, 'Whether the main question shall be put?'

  All in those in favor say 'aye'; those opposed, 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. Representative Davis to close."
- Davis: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. This legislation...Amendment #1 requires that local school council members get eight hours of training. This piece of legislation merely states that the eight hours of required training be done by people who themselves have been trained in those topics of school theory, educational budgeting and school finance. It does not state that anyone else who wants to train school members, local school council members, cannot do so, it does not say that. They may still off of their expertise, it's merely requiring that those who do the required training, have themselves been trained in these topics. And I ask for a favorable vote. Thank you."
- Speaker Flowers: "The Lady moves for the adoption of Amendment #8

  to Senate Bill 1595. All those in favor say 'aye';
  opposed, 'nay'. The Lady moves for the adoption of
  Amendment #8 to Senate Bill 1595. All those in favor vote
  'aye'; opposed vote 'nay'...'no'. Voting is now open.
  Have all voted? Representative Ostenburg, to explain his
  vote."
- Ostenburg: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. All this Amendment does is, say that what is in Amendment #1, that we've already said is going to be required will be taught by individuals who are qualified personnel, it does nothing else. I can't understand why there is so many people who are opposed to this after

# 141st Legislative Day

June 2, 1994

Amendment #1 passed. If we're going to have Amendment #1 in place and we are going to say that the training is required, why shouldn't we say that it is going to be provided by qualified individuals, and that's all this does, it sets the standard of quality for the individuals who will be administering the training that's required under the 1st Amendment on this Bill. I encourage an 'aye' vote so that we can make sure that it's quality training that's being provided rather than just wasting the time of individuals with another mindless, needless requirement."

- Speaker Flowers: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Black to explain his vote. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk, shall take the record. 47 voting 'ayes', 61 voting 'no'. This Amendment fails.

  Mr...Representative Deuchler, for what reason do you rise?"
- Deuchler: "Madam Speaker, to ask that all Members of the Conference of Women Legislators move to the front of the podium here for a group picture."
- Speaker Flowers: "Representative Deuchler would like for the House to be at ease for about 10 minutes so the Conference of Women Legislators could come to the front, for the purpose of taking pictures. Thank you. Women only. The House will resume now that the Conference of Women Legislators have taken their pictures. Mr. Clerk, are there anymore Amendments to Senate Bill 1595?"
- Clerk McLennand: "Floor Amendment #9, offered by Representative Harold Murphy."
- Speaker Flowers: "Excuse me, excuse me. Representative Turner, for what reason do you rise?"
- Turner: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I heard about this Conference of Women Legislators and I'm just curious because I don't know what the membership is and it was obvious that there

# 141st Legislative Day

June 2, 1994

were a few women who were not down front on that photo and I didn't know if they had not paid their dues or just...what the requirement. But there was obvious there was three or four women that did not come down to take the picture. I would like to know if you can explain to me what's the requirement to be a member of the Conference of Women Legislators?"

Speaker Flowers: "Representative Davis."

Davis: "To answer Representative Turner, I see no reason to be part of a farce. To pretend that there's a women's caucus who support each other's issues is a big falsehood. And to stand there and take a picture with a group of people who are dishonest, it's true, there is no women's caucus. There's a group of women who get together for discussion, but to use that picture with me on it, they'll never have the opportunity to do."

Speaker Flowers: "Representative Wojcik. Representative Wojcik." Wojcik: "I just want to know if we can have the picture taken

again because Representative Lindner just arrived. Do you think we can do it? She is out of the..."

Speaker Flowers: "Representative Wojcik, I'll be more than happy."

Wojcik: "She would be more than happy also, Representative Flowers."

Speaker Flowers: "The House, again, will be at ease for another ten minutes for the purpose of a picture. Once again the House again will resume. Amendment #9, Representative Harold Murphy on Senate Bill 1595. Representative Art Turner, for what reason now do you rise?"

Turner: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I...it was obvious that you picked up Members but it looked like you lost Members after Representative Davis's last speech. Representative Currie

141st Legislative Day

June 2, 1994

was not in that photo. And I still think there were another three women that were not in that photo. And I'm just curious, again, what the problem was. And, in fact, I...Madam Speaker?"

Speaker Flowers: "Yes."

- Turner: "I request equal time for the Conference of BALLS and that is the Brotherhood of American Legislator Leaders.

  And we would like to take a photo down front."
- Speaker Flowers: "Excuse me, Representative Turner, you were not recognized for that purpose. So at a later date, Sir. Representative Black, for what reason do you rise?"
- Black: "Madam Speaker? If we're going to interrupt the important business of this House. I would request that we get to the Cole Caucus, the Gravel Road Caucus, the Guard Dog Licensing Caucus and last but not least, the Downstate Urban Men and Boys Caucus or DUMB as we call it."
- Speaker Flowers: "Representative Lang, for what reason do you rise?"
- Lang: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I would like to suggest that the Conference of Balding Legislators meet down front later. And of course this could be both men and women. We could meet down in front anytime and take our picture. Thank you very much."
- Speaker Flowers: "Representative...Representative Turner."
- Turner: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I would like a Motion to override the Chair on the ability for BALLS to come down and take their pictures. And I request a Roll Call Vote on that."
- Speaker Flowers: "Representative Biggins, for what reason do you rise?"
- Biggins: "Thank you, thank you, Madam Speaker. And I was thrilled to see the photographic opportunity, not once but

# 141st Legislative Day

June 2, 1994

twice, just recently occurring on the House floor and it is a very historical moment and I was proud to be a witness to it. I also would like to announce, for the Members of the Property Tax Cap Caucus, tomorrow is picture day. Get your caps and remembers they're all good, any color you want, and we will meet down at the well. Thank you."

- Speaker Flowers: "Representative Hoeft, for what reason do you rise?"
- Hoeft: "Thank you, Madam. It came to my attention that Representative Lindner was out eating lunch and since it did take eight and half minutes of additional time, I believe that she needs to reimburse the state for that amount of expense. And I would ask that that be made."
- Speaker Flowers: "Representative Lindner, for what reason do you rise?"
- Lindner: "Thank you, Madam Chairman. I would like to thank
  Representative Wojcik for her courtesy to me. And since I
  was getting a fat free meal, I do not think that I should
  have to reimburse the state. But I do want to announce
  that the next meeting of COW we shall discuss that recent
  book that was written on the State Legislature called Games
  Little Boys Play."
- Speaker Flowers: "Representative Frederick, for what reason do you rise?"
- Frederick: "Madam Speaker. I...I'd like you to know that
  Representative Wyvetter Younge missed our picture and she
  is Senior in Service to all of us. I would like to suggest
  that we meet again and include Wyvetter."
- Speaker Flowers: "The House will be at ease for five minutes for the purpose of another picture. Representative Wojcik."
- Wojcik: "Madam Speaker. In that event I would request, for all those who where not here before, to get to the House floor

141st Legislative Day

June 2, 1994

so we can have our picture taken."

Speaker Flowers: "All those who would like, all Conference of Women Legislators, who would like to have their pictures taken please come down front. This is our final photo session of the day. Representative Skinner, for what reason do you rise?"

Skinner: "I just wonder if Representative Lindner would share with us the woman who wrote the book that she advised us to read."

Speaker Flowers: "Representative Lindner."

Skinner: "The author, yes."

Lindner: "I'm sorry. I don't know the author."

Speaker Flowers: "Representative Coy Pugh, for what reason do you rise?"

Pugh: "Madam Speaker. I humbly move that we adjourn."

Speaker Flowers: "Later, Representative Pugh. Representative Black, for what reason do you rise?"

Black: "Madam Speaker? Madam Speaker? An inquiry of the Chair,

I believe the Gentleman made a Motion. I believe the rules
of the House are very clear, it's not debatable, let's
vote."

Speaker Flowers: "Excuse me...excuse me. The Gentleman was not recognized for that. Representative Harold Murphy on Amendment #9. Representative Harold Murphy on Amendment #9 to Senate Bill 1595. Representative Murphy."

Murphy, H.: "Thank you very much, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Since this is a very important piece of legislation, that's amended to this Bill, I would advise you that it passed out of committee 15 to 3 and two weeks ago it passed the House 91 to 20. Nothing has changed and we would appreciate a favorable vote."

Speaker Flowers: "The Gentleman move for the adoption of

141st Legislative Day

June 2, 1994

Amendment #9 to Senate Bill 1595. Is there any discussion? Representative Black on the Amendment."

- Black: "Madam Speaker. I have another inquiry of the Chair.

  Unless we are going to change the House rules, a Motion to
  adjourn is always in order, and not debatable and I don't
  think you can get by with saying he wasn't recognized for
  that purpose. That Motion is always in order, it is not
  debatable, the Gentleman is entitled to a vote on his
  Motion."
- Speaker Flowers: "Representative Black, the Gentleman did not ask for a vote, he merely made a Motion. So, therefore, he was not recognized for that purpose.

  Representative...Representative Cowlishaw on Amendment #9 to Senate Bill 1595."
- Cowlishaw: "Yes, thank you, Madam Speaker. I think it would be very helpful, to the Body, if the Sponsor of this Amendment would at least tell us what it does."
- Murphy, H. ...this House. But Representative I think you in committee, when I presented the Bill as number one. And number two, you voted against it on the floor. So I think, you know, well what it does. However, the supply and demand and what's happening here is, the notification to the Governor and the legislative is 24 months. I'm asking to change that to 12 months, so that people who have interest in changing jobs have interest in knowing where the new positions are. Do not have to wait 24 months, rather than do that in 12 months. I've been informed that normally people in the library, that's in education, usually taking tests to try to pass the balance. But now they're in the library trying to find out where jobs are and that's what it does."

Cowlishaw: "Let me understand then, this Amendment would require

141st Legislative Day

June 2, 1994

the State Board of Education to report annually to the Governor, General Assembly and Illinois Institutions of Higher Education concerning the relative supply and demand of education staff for the common schools of the state. Is that an accurate synopsis of what this Amendment does? Pardon me, Sir, I couldn't hear you."

Speaker Flowers: "Representative Murphy."

Murphy, H.: "That's correct, I'm sorry."

Cowlishaw: "Oh, very good, thank you. It just seems to me...thank you, Madam Speaker. It seems to me that it is helpful for all of us in this Body to know what it is we are voting on. Thank you."

Speaker Flowers: "Representative Biggert on the Amendment."

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

Speaker Flowers: "He indicates that he will"

Biggert: "Thank you. Representative Murphy, was this a House Bill before or this something new?"

Murphy, H.: "Yes. This was a House Bill before. And I explained that but it was hard to hear in the chambers."

Biggert: "Could you give me the number?"

Murphy, H.: "It was House Bill 3832."

Biggert: "I'm sorry, what was it?"

Murphy, H.: "House Bill 3832."

Biggert: "All right. And what..."

Murphy, H.: "It passed out...pardon me?"

Biggert: "And where is that Bill now?"

Murphy, H.: "Well, I...hopefully it's over in the Senate, I don't know where...hopefully it's in the Senate."

Biggert: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Flowers: "Representative Brady on the Amendment."

Brady: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Will the Sponsor vield?"

Speaker Flowers: "He indicates that he will."

141st Legislative Day

June 2, 1994

- Brady: "Representative, when you instruct people to give you a report on the relative supply and demand of instructors throughout the State of Illinois there's many, many variables which make come into the picture. Did you have any particular variables or any particular ideas in mind about what this report would consist of? Is it just going to say that we're 592 instructors short or is there some other variables or some other information that you would like provided?"
- Murphy, H.: "Nothing in particular. Where will it be?

  That...that...is the problem with the 24 months rather than
  the 12 months. I mean, it could be in English today and
  math, I mean, English this year and math next year. It
  could be just a simple certificate."
- Brady: "I'm sorry, I didn't hear your answer."
- Murphy, H.: "I said, that's the problem, that's what we're trying to correct. We cannot say what error, we go 12 months rather than 24 months. This year it might be a shortage in math and next year it might be in English, So we can not say."
- Brady: "When you talk about supply. How would you arrive at the supply of teachers?"
- Murphy, H.: "We would arrive at the same way we are doing now, nothing changes. The report is just 12 months rather than 24 months."
- Brady: "No. But, I mean, how would you determine the supply of teachers exist?"
- Murphy, H.: "By the report, Representative, by the report we now receive. We receive a report now, the Governor, the state board. They..."
- Brady: "You have...you have teachers who..."
- Murphy, H.: "We will...we will take with the amount of people to

141st Legislative Day

June 2, 1994

certify."

Brady: "You have teachers, okay, but you have teachers who are employed, you have retired teachers who could work and you have unemployed teachers with certificates. Would all of those go into the mix?"

Murphy, H.: "Of course they would. They would know where the supply would be."

Brady: "Thank you."

Speaker Flowers: "Representative Persico."

Persico: "Thank you, Madam Chairman. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Flowers: "He indicates that he will."

Persico: "Thank you. Representative, so basically what you're asking is that every year on October 1st the State Board of Education will report to the Governor and the General Assembly, how many teachers are out there teaching, how many teaching positions are unfilled, what the supply is needed and the demand is needed for, let's say, social studies teachers, counselors, librarians, et cetera. Is this what your Amendment is trying to do?"

Murphy, H.: "That's correct, that's correct."

Persico: "On line 20 of your Amendment it says, in a manner sufficient to advise the public individuals and institutions in regarding career opportunities. What do you mean by, in a manner sufficient?"

Murphy, H.: "What we're saying is, the State Board would publicize it. We have to have it in the libraries, okay?

So they would publicize it so that everybody would know we're they're at."

Persico: "They will publicize it to whom?"

Murphy, H.: "Well the first to the Governor, the Legislature and on to the libraries."

Persico: "What are you exactly trying to do with this Amendment

141st Legislative Day

- June 2, 1994
- then? I mean, is the Governor the one who is going to be hiring the, let's say, social studies teachers or librarians or are the General Assembly..."
- Murphy, H.: "Well the Governor don't hire them now. Nothing has changed to what it is today. The Governor don't have those now, so they would be having them then."
- Brady: "I'm sorry, I didn't catch that."
- Murphy, H.: "No. No, the Governor would not be hiring."
- Brady: "Then why are we reporting to the Governor and the General Assembly, if we're not doing the hiring, why do we have to know the supply and demand out there?"
- Murphy, H.: "Well, that's a good question. I didn't change that, that's the way the law is now, so I had nothing to do with that part of the law."
- Brady: "Why did you pick October 1st?"
- Murphy, H.: "Well, that's reporting date now, in the 24 month period."
- Brady: "And you're trying to change it to a 12 month period?"
- Murphy, H.: "That's correct."
- Brady: "Well by October 1st all of these positions, that might have been available for librarians and counselors. et cetera, would have already been filed by the local school districts. What good is this information going to do to us?"
- Murphy, H.: "Well, if it is filled, then they will not have 24 months which would go to 36 months and we're rolling it back 12 months, whatever the case might be."
- Brady: "It will move it back to 12 months?"
- Murphy, H.: "We...we will pick up 12 months and turn in supply and demand no matter how many jobs we fill October 31st."
- Brady: "And so this will give us an indication of how many jobs are still available out there, is that what you're saying?"

141st Legislative Day

- June 2, 1994
- Murphy, H.: "That's right. How many...how many is needed, available, needed, where they are, what field."
- Brady: "Do you think that most of the teaching jobs are filled by October 1st?"
- Murphy, H.: "Not necessarily. But you can find out where they are, if there are any."
- Brady: "Well, if the teaching jobs are not filled, who's taking care of these classrooms, then?"
- Murphy, H.: "Well, I did not say that the jobs were not filled.

  I'm pretty sure we have substitute teachers and whoever is
  filling those classrooms now, will be filling them then."
- Brady: "I guess I'm having a hard time understanding why this Amendment is even needed. It seems that any local school district is already going to be hiring the necessary personnel that they need in order to, you know, carry on the school year. For my understanding, I guess, you haven't explained in enough detail why October 1st. Why do we need this Bill...this Amendment anyway?"
- Murphy, H.: "Well, I never changed it to October 1st,

  Representative, it is October 1st now, I never changed
  that."
- Brady: "So exactly what are you doing changing it?"
- Murphy, H.: "I am changing it from 12 months rather than 24
   months, that's all."
- Brady: "I don't read that anywhere here, I don't see 24 months to 12 months. I just see a report annually on or before October 1st. In a manner sufficient to advise the public, well if the only people who are receiving this information is the Governor and the General Assembly, I don't see what use this is."
- Murphy, H.: "Well, it's a lot of use."
- Brady: "Thank you."

141st Legislative Day

June 2, 1994

Speaker Flowers: "Representative Hoeft on the Amendment."

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

Speaker Flowers: "He indicates that he will."

Hoeft: "Representative Murphy, have you ever...have you seen this report?'

Murphy, H.: "What report?"

Hoeft: "The report on the staff needs of the state."

Murphy, H.: "No, I haven't."

Hoeft: "And yet you have been a Member of the General Assembly and it is suppose to have been distributed to us every two years and you don't take a look at it every two years. What's the purpose of doubling the state board's requirement and distributing it every year? My question is basically, do we use the report now and is this going to help the efficiency at all, by doubling the work of the State Board of Education for a piece of literature that you and I and the Governor don't use."

Murphy, H.: "Okay. I'm not using it, hopefully, the universities is using it. We've talked about certificates, maybe I'm a math teacher today, this month, this year, maybe next year I would like to be an English teacher. I need to know if that supply and that demand is there."

Speaker Flowers: "Representative Currie on the Amendment."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. This looks like a awfully good idea to me. I would think that people who are preparing careers in education, as well as the institutions of higher learning that help prepare those students, would be well advised to know whether what we need is a lot more librarians or maybe somewhat fewer. Whether the deficiencies are going to be in fifth grade math or whether we have plenty of people capable of teaching and meeting those needs. It seems to me that it

141st Legislative Day

June 2, 1994

has to be a help to anybody in the education field, those who prepare people, those who are interested in joining the education field to know what the odds are that there is room for you out there in the market place. It would certainly help our institutions of higher learning know where they ought to be expanding their class activities, know where perhaps it's time to do a little shift in focus. This looks like an excellent idea to me. I commend Representative Murphy for offering this Amendment to us and I hope that you will join me in supporting it."

Speaker Flowers: "Representative Harold Murphy to close."

Murphy, H.: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I just ask for a favorable vote. Thank you."

Speaker Flowers: "The Gentleman move for the adoption of Amendment #9 to House...Senate Bill 1595. All those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed, 'no'. Voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk, shall take the record. 88 voting 'aye', 25 voting 'no'. This Amendment adopted. Are there any further is Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk McLennand: "Floor Amendment #10, offered by Representative
McGuire."

Speaker Flowers: "Representative McGuire on Amendment #10."

McGuire: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I have Amendment #10 to Senate Bill 1595. Amendment #10 is House Bill 4040 which we passed here about a month ago on the Consent Calendar and it's to help the Manhattan School District in Will County. And if there are any questions, I'd be glad to answer the questions. But I think the Bill is well known and was well supported and I would ask for your favorable response on this Amendment. Thank you."

Speaker Flowers: "The Gentleman move for the adoption of

141st Legislative Day

June 2, 1994

Amendment #10 to Senate Bill 1595. Seeing no discussion. All those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed...say 'aye'; opposed vote...say 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk McLennand: "Floor Amendment #11, offered by Representative Balanoff."

Speaker Flowers: "Representative Balanoff on Amendment #11."

Balanoff: "Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #11 is similar to House Bill that we passed over to the Senate, House Bill 2518. Currently the Chicago Board of Education, this year, is going to spend \$55 million on energy. That's \$20 million more than they're spend on textbooks, \$35 million more than their going to spend on building repairs, \$37 million more than they are going to be spending on educational equipment. Twelve schools are spending over half a million dollars and one school nearly a million dollars on energy costs Recently the school of finance authority released a year. report that had been done by Pete Markwick and whatever the rest of that's company's name is, Washington, Pittman and McKeever. That said, that the Chicago Public Schools spend, on the average, 55% more than the national average and 65% more than a regional average on energy costs. they cited the reason for this as being the lack of board to actively seek ways to become more energy efficient. Now, school principals, staff and LSC's currently have no incentive to save energy. But school districts across the country have recognized the need for an incentive program in Akron, Ohio. They have done this in Hammond, Indiana, in Philadelphia and in a number of other areas. incentive program in place to save energy. And that's what Amendment #11 is. It would do the same for the

141st Legislative Day

June 2, 1994

Chicago School District for some types of energy conservation work. Under Article 19 (b) of the School Code it would allow school boards to enter into guaranteed energy saving contracts, where the contractor quarantees a certain level of savings and agrees to be paid from those savings, at no additional cost to the board. And what this would say is that, after the contractor has been paid, of the savings would be...go to the school board and 50% to the local school council, that came up with the plan. There is no new cost to the taxpayers and what we are creating is an incentive for local school councils to work for energy conservation. Hopefully, it's going to result in not only a savings of energy but a savings in dollars for our cash strapped schools. And so I would certainly be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Flowers: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Amendment #11 to Senate Bill 1595. On that, Representative Brady, on the Amendment."

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

Speaker Flowers: "He indicates that he will."

Brady: "Representative, is this similar to a Bill, a House Bill, that we heard last week?'

Balanoff: "I...yes, it is the same as House Bill 2518 which passed the House."

Brady: "2518?"

Balanoff: "Yes."

Brady: "How did that pass the House? Do you know?"

Balanoff: "No. It passed by enough votes to get over to the Senate."

Brady: "I'm sorry."

Balanoff: "It passed by enough votes to get over to the Senate."

Brady: "Okay. And what this does is, it sinitizes the local

141st Legislative Day

June 2, 1994

school agencies to provide cost saving energy measures and if it...once it pays back a certain portion of the cost implement, the cost saving measures, they receive the benefit. Is that right?"

Balanoff: "What it does, is...when you have guaranteed energy saving contracts, where the contractor guarantees a certain level of energy savings. And after the contractor has been...and the contract is entered into and the contract has been implemented and the cost, to pay for contract, has been realized then 50% of the savings on energy would go to the Board of Education and 50% to the local school council. As an incentive to try to find, you know, for them to become more energy efficient. As I in the opening, we are 55% over the national average in cost and energy in the Chicago Public Schools and there's nobody doing anything about it. In other cities where they have done this they have saved tremendously. according to Pete Markwick, not only according to me but according to the Pete Markwick study that was done."

Brady: "What governing body does this only effect?"

Balanoff: "Only the City of Chicago."

Brady: "The City of Chicago."

Balanoff: "The Chicago Board of Education in Chicago."

Brady: "The Chicago Board of Education. Would the Chicago Board of Education support this measure?"

Balanoff: "I don't know, you'll have to ask them."

Brady: "Could they do this on their own?"

Balanoff: "I imagine they probably could put together a incentive program on their own. But they...what they found is that one of the impediments is that they haven't actively and aggressively looked for energy savings. And if they're not doing it on their own then sometimes maybe a nudge or a

141st Legislative Day

June 2, 1994

little push because of, you know, would be helpful."

Brady: "Would this be considered a mandate?"

Balanoff: "No."

Brady: "Would...how would they determine who's idea, in fact, the measure...where the genesis of the idea came from?"

Balanoff: "Well, I imagine that the local school council because of the economic incentive to be able to spend on their local school would...people would come up with ideas and probably try to find ways to save energy. Right now a lot of the schools were heating with electricity in the City of Chicago, which is an absolute outrage because of the very high cost of heating with electricity. As I said, there is schools...one school in particular, that spend almost a million dollars."

Brady: "Does the Bill specify a formula or a procedure in which you would be able to qualify for this program?"

Balanoff: "Not specifically. But it...it talks in terms of entering into guaranteed energy saving contracts, so that, you don't...the savings is not realized until the cost of the improvement is put in."

Brady: "So they would have to apply to the school board for the contract?"

Balanoff: "Oh. Yes. Because currently local school councils can't enter into contracts like that as it is."

Brady: "Thank you."

Speaker Flowers: "Representative Parke on the Amendment."

Parke: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Flowers: "He indicates that he will."

Parke: "Thank you. Representative Balanoff, what happens if the schools decide not to do this?"

Balanoff: "What...do you mean, I don't understand. If the local

141st Legislative Day

June 2, 1994

school council would bring the improvement plan rather than..."

Parke: "Maybe they see that as a time consuming and maybe it might take time away from teachers and classrooms."

Balanoff: "Well, no, no, no. First of all, no, no wait. What we are talking about is local school councils. An incentive for them because what happens is, the energy...the savings that they would realize would come back to the local school where they are at. Local school council members aren't paid."

Parke: "Oh, I understand that. But I'm saying, what if they just say the implementation of this is more bother than it is help and they decide that they're just not going to do some of these things. Do you specifically have specific things that you want them to do or are you just going to give them...give the school board a blank check and..."

Balanoff: "No. What we..."

Parke: "Say do whatever you want to do."

Balanoff: "It is not a matter of the school board. These would be plans that would be brought by the local school councils to the board. In conjunction, I would with...with...what are they called...with the...under guaranteed energy saving contracts. Where they would say, look, this is an improvement that we can make. Every situation is not the same, in some cases it may, I mean I know what it would require, it may new windows, it may, you know, caulking around windows, it might be I'm not sure what, like what, form or fashion it would take because each school building is different in the City of Chicago, as in schools across the State of Illinois."

Parke: "But won't it cost them money to have recaulking and

141st Legislative Day

June 2, 1994

upgrade furnaces?"

Balanoff: "No. What I am saying is, if they brought a plan that way...and was written into the contract was a guaranteed savings, energy savings, then they could, if the school board agreed, they would enter into this contract. And they wouldn't realize any savings until the cost of implementing that had been put in place. Then the cost savings would be split after that point in time."

Parke: "Well, I appreciate that but if you're going to buy a new furnace or if you're going to be caulking that takes skilled labor or labor to do that which is a cost. Where is that money come...we have trouble keeping the doors open year after year in the Chicago school system and I think the idea is laudable but there is going to be up front money. Where is that up front money going to come from, Representative? I mean your idea has merit but I want to know... can you give us some practical ideas of what this is or this more press releases that actually has no real effect on how things are happening."

Balanoff: "Well, Terry, I'm sure you're aware, I'm not the one that is running for re-election for right now. So..."

Parke: "For somebody."

Balanoff: "What?"

Parke: "For somebody they could be doing...I want to know how this is really going to help education and help us save money for the Chicago school systems."

Balanoff: "Well, right now, as I said, we are spending \$55 million a year, this year, on the cost of energy in the City of Chicago. In the Pete Markwick study that was released, they felt that you could probably have that cost. They could probably cut that in half and save \$25 to \$30 million."

141st Legislative Day

June 2, 1994

Parke: "Did they give you any examples in their management report?"

Balanoff: "You know I'll tell you I don't have that report here.

And I'm sure that there were examples given in the report."

Parke: "Yes."

Balanoff: "And it would be one that would be ways in, as I said, other districts have done this have found it to be the incentive program to be one that has actually worked toward saving energy and worked towards saving money at the same time."

Parke: "So you, now let me get this straight, now let's presume that a local school council comes to the school board and presents an idea that they accept. And they save \$10 thousand that year on that. That \$10 thousand savings, did you say, half of it go to the..."

Balanoff: "Well, that is after the cost of the improvement paid off. If the improvement cost \$20 thousand and they save \$10 thousand the first year and they save \$10 thousand the second year, then they wouldn't realize any money until the third year when, you know, after the cost had been. at that point I must assume that they saved \$10 And thousand the third year and the cost of the improvement was taken care of. Then the local school council would half of that or \$5 thousand to spend, you know, in the local school and \$5 thousand would be returned to, you know, to Pershing Road."

Parke: "Well, I think the idea has merit, I'm just concerned about the real world and its real...how to implement it.

And in addition I have a concern on...on the budgeting process of the City of Chicago schools and whether or not a local council can really see something in their school budget for that individual school two, three, or four or

141st Legislative Day

June 2, 1994

five years from now. That means they could see a real result. So I sure would like to see a sunset placed on something like this, that can come back to the Body and show that it really works rather than putting another law in the books that is not going to work. I'll probably support this but I would certainly like to see some kind of results, some kind of report rather than just simply saying, we're going to pass this law. Thank you."

Speaker Flowers: "Representative Biggert on the Amendment."

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

Speaker Flowers: "He indicates that he will."

Biggert: "Representative, why does...why are you proposing this only for the Chicago Schools? Don't we want all schools to save energy?"

Balanoff: "I would absolutely love to have it extended to others, certainly. It just happens that we have local school councils in the City of Chicago. We have a body that is recognized and is doing work within the school and in terms of improving the school. But I would certainly be one that would love to see it, you know, happen across the State of Illinois. But it was limited for that purpose because of our units in place that actually have some ability aided to spend money and have a little bit of control over operation of schools."

Biggert: "But you can't adapt that to school boards or anything for?"

Balanoff: "I suppose you could and I certainly would be very happy if that happened across the State of Illinois."

Biggert: "Okay. Thank you."

Balanoff: "I mean, you know, because school boards can do is...this is the reason that this program is important is because nobody is doing in the City of Chicago, based on

141st Legislative Day

June 2, 1994

that report. And that's wrong, we could save \$25 or \$30 million, if we can do that and it is not happening then we should...then we may need an incentive. As I said, in Akron, Ohio and Hammond, Indiana in Philadelphia they've done this and its worked and its saved money, its saved energy, you know. And that is more money in the classrooms."

Biggert: "But the only way to it then is to force them to do it, you can't..."

Balanoff: "I wish they were doing it on their own."

Biggert: "Thank you."

Speaker Flowers: "The Gentleman move for the adoption of Amendment #11 to Senate Bill 1595. Representative Balanoff to close."

Balanoff: "No. Just simply that on Amendment #11 will insure that at least 50% of energy savings will be reinvested to improve educational services at local schools instead of disappearing into the Pershing Road bureaucracy. And I would certainly encourage everybody to vote 'aye'."

Speaker Flowers: "All those in favor of this Amendment say 'aye'; opposed, 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk, are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk McLennand: "Floor Amendment #12, offered by Representative Santiago."

Speaker Flowers: "Amendment #12, Representative Santiago."

Santiago: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Amendment #12 adds the provisions of House Bill 2639, which passed here awhile ago. And also the provisions of House Bill 4210. House Bill 2639 it's the old Senate Bill 7 which requires transitional by lingo education for pre-school children. And House Amendment 4210 what it does, it provides the beginning in '95 and '96 school year that children that

141st Legislative Day

June 2, 1994

have reached the age of five by December 31st of the school year who by September 1st of the school year will have not...will have completed at least one year of pre-school shall be accessed by the school board to start the school year for kindergarten. And it also, currently, what's going on, if a child is not five years old by September 1st of the current year, they're not allowed to attend kindergarten, thus making them wait a whole year. What this Amendment will do, will correct that problem that a lot of parents are facing now, today. Both of these Bills were passed by this House with unanimous support. I move to adopt these two Amendments. And I will try to answer any questions that you may have."

Speaker Flowers: "Representative Black."

Speaker Flowers: "He indicates that he will."

Black: "All right. Representative, is this the identical
Amendment to the House Bill that you had, House Bill 2639?
And that House Bill passed committee unanimously and the
House unanimously?"

Santiago: "Yes, Sir."

Black: "Thank you. Madam Speaker, perhaps we could have all the Members revise and extend their remarks in the Journal. This Bill has already passed, it is tied up in Senate Rules Committee. I simply rise to say, I intend to support Amendment #12."

Speaker Flowers: "Representative Santiago."

Santiago: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I move to adopt Amendment #12."

Speaker Flowers: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Amendment #12. All those in favor say 'aye'; opposed,

141st Legislative Day

June 2, 1994

'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk, are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk McLennand: "Floor Amendment #13, offered by Representative
Novak."

Speaker Flowers: "Representative Novak...Novak on Amendment #13." Novak: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Floor Amendment #13 extends the time period for which a provisional teaching certificate is effective from two years to three years. This situation arose in my district, Illinois is one of the few states in the nation that requires a masters degree for teaching pathology. Also, as a condition of teaching in the State of Illinois that masters degree has to be achieved within a time period of two years. This individual school district came to me with a problem concerning one of their teachers because of the provisional time...the certificate dealing with the time period due to extraneous factors beyond their Many teachers that go on...that control. get their bachelor's degree, that have to get there master's degree and this particular discipline. And this is a specialized teaching skill that not a lot...that there is not a lot of great abundance of in the State of Illinois. So these individuals with these specialized degrees and...but they're much needed because of human deficiencies that have to be corrected in the educational process. what we are simply asking for here is, a little bit more time for those individuals to gather their credits for their master's degree in speech pathology."

Speaker Flowers: "The Gentleman move for the Amendment...adoption of Amendment #13. Representative Black."

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

141st Legislative Day

June 2, 1994

Speaker Flowers: "He indicates that he will."

Black: "Representative Novak, do you know of any opposition to this Amendment?"

Novak: "Not to my knowledge."

Black: "I don't know any opposition to this Amendment either. I think we ought to vote for it right now."

Novak: "Representative, that is a good idea."

Black: "I intend to vote 'aye'."

Novak: "I was anticipating...I was anticipating a tirade from you but apparently this is a good Amendment."

Black: "Every once in awhile you come up with a good Amendment."

Speaker Flowers: "Representative Hoeft on the Amendment."

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

Speaker Flowers: "He indicates that he will."

Novak: "Yes."

Hoeft: "It is not for the Type 10 or the 0-9 or 0-3, just for speech and language pathology?"

Novak: "Yes. Correct."

Hoeft: "No, not type 75 either. It is a brutally difficult certificate to get, a three year extension is very just."

Novak: "Thank you."

Speaker Flowers: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Amendment #13 to Senate Bill 1595. All those in favor say 'aye'; opposed, 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk McLennand: "Floor Amendment #14, offered by Representative von Bergen-Wessels."

Speaker Flowers: "Representative von Bergen-Wessels on Amendment #14."

von Bergen-Wessels: "Thank you, Speaker. What...and Ladies and

# 141st Legislative Day

June 2, 1994

Gentlemen of the House. What this Amendment does is to make some technical changes to a Bill that was passed last year which allowed special educational cooperatives which operate by contributing a purported share their equalized assessed evaluation to the co-op. To provide for a special education facilities by bonding. Current law allows for bonds to be paid by using current tax such as, education fund or operation, maintenance or special ed or bonds and interest. And that would not change under this Amendment. What this Amendment would do and what it would change, is to allow the co-op to provide different payment schedules, thereby, for helping the poorer districts. It would place a cap on the total project cost, thus helping and protecting the poorer It would allow for joint in several liability to enhance the market ability of the bonds used for special education facilities. So that the assets of the most financially prosperous districts would be considered by the bond sales person and finally it would put unit districts and dual districts on equal footing. Heretofore a dual district taxpayers would be taxed twice, once at the elementary level, then once at the high school level. And this Amendment would see that they are treated equally. And I would ask for your favorable consideration and answer any questions."

Speaker Flowers: "On that, Representative Wirsing, on the Amendment. Wirsing."

Wirsing: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Fellow Representatives. I rise in support of this Bill and would concur with the explanation that Representative von Bergen-Wessels has already given. I guess to me some of the important aspects of this Amendment is that it gives a county the opportunity

# 141st Legislative Day

June 2, 1994

to deal with the physical needs of school districts throughout the county. And that all districts come on board in the process of paying for...for that bonding issue, no matter which district it is. I think one of the important aspects of this is, that in Ogle County, which is the county in which this...we're talking about raised this issue. Is that Ogle County has a nuclear power in that county and that particular school district generates substantial taxes because it does have that power plant within its district. And what this Amendment allows, as an example, is that in Ogle County that particular school district payes the lions share of any capital or any bonding expenditure. And I know as a person who has served a school board for seven years and was constantly hearing people talking about taking those districts who had a high property tax income because of an example of a nuclear power plant, they ought to be dispersing those dollars to other more needed districts. This is a way to do that, it's within a county realm but this happens to be a county that had a school district by the name of Mt. Morris in it. And certainly because of that this Amendment allows a unified approach to either build or repair and replace physical needs throughout a county. As I stand in strong support of this issue, or this Amendment and would ask for your favorable vote."

Speaker Flowers: "Representative Skinner on the Amendment."

Skinner: "I haven't seen the words joint in several liability in anything except tort reform legislation and it is to repeal it not institute it. Can you tell me why you want to use those words here?"

von Bergen-Wessels: "Representative, the firm of Chapman and Cutler, which is an imminent bond firm, advised us that

141st Legislative Day

June 2, 1994

joint in several liability would make it easier to market the bonds."

Skinner: "All right, what this means is..."

von Bergen-Wessels: "So that, if you will let me continue..."

Skinner: "Certainly."

von Bergen-Wessels: "So that they might look at the assets of the most financially prosperous district and try to market those bonds, for example, Ogle County which brought this legislative idea to Representative Wirsing and myself, points out that they have Byron nuclear plant, which is a very prosperous school district. And they would be able to focus on the Byron's financial prosperity in marketing those bonds."

Skinner: "I do not see in here any limitation as to the size of the county that this would apply to. Does that mean it applies to all 102 counties?"

von Bergen-Wessels: "Representative, it only applies to those special education co-operatives that have a governing board and that are set up in such a way that a portion of each districts equalized assessed evaluation goes towards funding the co-op. There are approximately 12 or 14 co-ops in the state that this effects."

Skinner: "I assume one of them is McHenry County's?"

von Bergen-Wessels: "Give me a moment and I'll take a look."

Skinner: "Certainly."

von Bergen-Wessels: "Representative, I don't see McHenry on the list."

Skinner: "It would called by the initials CM, special education, District of McHenry County."

von Bergen Wessels: "I looking at the county side. Would you like me to read the different ones? I don't see Seedum."

Skinner: "Let me tell you're...my concern besides the joint in

# 141st Legislative Day

June 2, 1994

several liability which means that if three or four of the poorer districts cannot pay the bond issue, it means that the richest districts are going to have to pay for all of it. On page 7 in the lines 20 through 23 what is occurring here is the provision of a general obligation bond backup. And this, it seems to me, could result in necessity of tax increase without a referendum. Is that a correct interruption?"

von Bergen-Wessels: "No, Representative, I don't believe it is.

Because the only funds that would be allowed to be used are those that I had mentioned."

Skinner: "Would you mention them again?"

Skinner: "That's everything the school district has."

von Bergen-Wessels: "I'm sorry."

Skinner: "Isn't that everything the school district has except for life safety bonds?"

von Bergen-Wessels: "Not being a school finance expert I'm not sure if there are others but imagine there are most. But, for example, if there is...is there is still, for example, a dollar per hundred that is left in your education fund that you can tax without going to referendum. You could tap into that, that cushion that you have to pay for the bonds."

Skinner: "And conversely...and conversely, excuse me, not conversely but then this would be in direct competition with teachers salaries, janitors salaries, items like that.

And this would take precedence, correct? I mean, if there's not enough money to go around to meet the teachers contract and to pay off these bonds the bonds get paid off

141st Legislative Day

June 2, 1994

first, right?"

von Bergen-Wessels: "I'm sorry. I'm not sure that I can answer that particular question. If...if the governing board of the co-op, which is a school board person from each of the participating districts, decides to have a bond issue they have to use their...the money that exists in their tax authority presently. Now I would assume that if they did not have money to be able to pay their teachers and their janitors and so forth within their educational fund, without going to referendum, they also would not have money to commit themselves to bond payments and would therefore vote 'no' when that would become a discussion at the co-op."

"Well, I'm...you'll excuse me for being nervous, but my little village of Lakewood, before the tax cap went into effect, bought a golf course and they promised me it would never cost a dime because it was going to be paid for with revenue bonds. However, when the golf course fees did not bring in enough money to pay for the golf course payments. for the payments on the golf co se, my tax bill went up \$500. And so I am always very suspicious of anything that has a general obligation backup because I am afraid that there's going to be the possibility of a massive increase taxes without the taxpayers ever having...even knowing in about it. That would...and what you seem to be doing makes me think the same thing might happen as a result of this legislation. And I would sure like to be assured that that is not a remote possibility."

von Bergen-Wessels: "Representative, I share you concern, as a matter of fact I have a very similar park district situation in my district right now. Other than to tell you that the Bill says, 'that the general obligation of the

141st Legislative Day

June 2, 1994

district payable from any and all sources of revenue designated for that purpose by the Board of Education.' What they couldn't do...if they are maxed out on their education levee, for example, they would have to have a referendum to increase that. So there are protections, I would think, just simply built in the system as to when you have to go to the people to ask for more money."

Skinner: "Well, I hope you're right. But I would like to run this past some type of a bond lawyer and I will have time to do so before it gets to Third Reading, if you don't call...I mean, if the Sponsor doesn't call it today. You know, I don't have any objection to how you are splitting...splitting between grade school districts, high school districts and unit districts. That sounds like an improvement but I still have this nagging question about a tax...possible tax increase without a referendum. Thank you."

von Bergen-Wessels: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Flowers: "The Lady moves for the adoption of Amendment #14 to Senate Bill 1595. All those in favor say 'aye'; opposed, 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk, are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk McLennand: "Floor Amendment #15, offered by Representative Hicks."

Speaker Flowers: "Representative Hicks on Amendment #15."

Hicks: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Amendment #15 replace all references to handicap with a phase with disabilities. This is a Bill that we have had, I know...I believe this to be non-controversial by all means. This Bill has been around here, hasn't been successful in getting through because of other things being placed on it at times. But I know of no one who has any opposition to it. I would be

141st Legislative Day

- June 2, 1994
- happy to answer any questions with it."
- Speaker Flowers: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of
  Amendment #15 to Senate e Bill 1595. On that, is there any
  discussion? Representative Tenhouse. Representative
  Tenhouse. No discussion? Representative Cowlishaw on the
  Amendment."
- Cowlishaw: "Thank you very much, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I stand in support of Floor Amendment #15. Representative Hicks is absolutely accurate when he says that this is not controversial and it is really something that we need to do. So I stand in support of this Amendment and thank Representative Hicks for offering it."
- Speaker Flowers: "The Gentleman move for the adoption of Amendment #15 to Senate Bill 1595. All those in favor say 'aye'; opposed, 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk are there any further Amendments?"
- Clerk McLennand: "Floor Amendment #16, offered by Representative Wirsing."
- Speaker Flowers: "Representative Wirsing on Amendment #16.
  Withdraw the Amendment, Mr. Clerk. Are there any further
  Amendments?"
- Clerk McLennand: "Floor Amendment #17, offered by Representative Salvi."
- Speaker Flowers: "Representative Salvi on Amendment #17."
- Salvi: "Thank you, Madame Speaker. This Amendment very simply says, that no teacher or administrator in a public school shall be prohibited from using, reading from, or from posting in a public school building all, or any part of the following: Mayflower Compact, the National motto which is, In God We Trust, the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution of the United States, and the State of

141st Legislative Day

June 2, 1994

Illinois, and other historically significant, and important documents to the history of this country. I'd move for the passage of Amendment #17 to Senate Bill 1595."

Speaker Flowers: "The Gentleman moved for the passage of Amendment #17 to Senate Bill 1595. Are there any discussion? Representative Currie on the Amendment."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. Amendment's on its face looks like an Amendment we don't need. It seeks to solve a problem that as far as I doesn't exist. I'm not aware of any situations in which people are ripping out of historic text, any language that deals with religion, God, or what have you. I think this Amendment is not just what it looks like on its face. think there is a possibility that this Amendment intended to...to try to break down the traditional constitutional wall between religion and state in this It's hard for me to imagine how a teacher might interpret this passage. If a teacher wants to abridge documents for reasons of brevity, for reasons of access among the students of whatever age, and the teacher where do that and might in making that decision excise some response, some reference to a religion or to God. Would that teacher then find him or herself quilty of violating this new statute? I would hope that would not be Sponsor's intent, but as the language is drafted it seems to me it is possible a teacher might fear that Secondly, is this a way to get backhandly into classroom those items that have traditionally not been permitted? For example, if a Congressman wants in a congressional record to begin quoting the Bible, does the teacher in the classroom get away with, or in fact. required to present that information from this historic

141st Legislative Day

June 2, 1994

document, public document, the congressional record, and begin in fact reading Genesis. As I say, I think there is no problem, no problem, that I am aware of in the State of Illinois that this Amendment on its face could, would, or should solve. I think there is a real risk however, that this Amendment if adopted would begin to put the foot in the door, and break down the wall that constitutionally, traditionally, and appropriately separates religion and state in our country. I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Flowers: "Representative Brunsvold."

Brunsvold: "Thank you, Madame Speaker. Will the Gentleman yield for a question?"

Speaker Flowers: "Yes, he will."

Brunsvold: "Representative Salvi?"

Speaker Flowers: "Yes, he will."

Brunsvold: "Does...this Amendment is the same as the Bill that came from the Senate, Senate Bill 1144, Senator Petka's Bill?"

Salvi: "Yes, it is."

Brunsvold: "Which Representative Phelps is the Sponsor of that Senate Bill here in the House?"

Salvi: "Yes, Representative that's true but apparently there's been...some technical area that's taken...that inadvertently taken that out of the Bill and so Representative Phelps has submitted this as an Amendment to another Bill, and he and I had talked about this. It's necessary for us to submit it as an Amendment now."

Brunsvold: "Okay. Thank you, Madame Speaker. To the Bill. I
have looked at the Bill as it came through Education
Committee and display of these historic documents and
really see no problem with that and I would support the
Gentleman's Amendment, and I would also support

141st Legislative Day

June 2, 1994

Representative Phelps original Bill which the Education Committee inadvertently took out the original language of which we're going to put back into 1144. So I would urge the support of this Amendment and Representative Phelps Amendment on the original Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Flowers: "Representative Lang on the Amendment."

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

Speaker Flowers: "He indicates that he will."

Lang: "Representative, I would like to point you to page 2, lines
10 thru 12 of this Bill. Do you have that before you,
Sir?"

Salvi: "Yes, I do."

Lang: "What do you mean when you say the historically significant or venerated documents, writing, and records listed in subsection (a) shall not be construed to be exclusive."

Salvi: "Well in other words there are other such documents that should not be censored?"

Lang: "Well what other such documents?"

Salvi: "Historical documents."

Lang: "Name one other specific such document."

Salvi: "Well, I'm not...that...we named 10 of them."

Lang: "Well, who's going to interrupt what this means, Sir?"

Salvi: "Well like any law, Representative, I imagine that would be interrupted by the courts. My feeling is that..."

Lang: "By who, Sir?"

Salvi: "What we are trying to do is we are trying to prevent any kind of censorship, which I know that's a goal that you also support. We feel that there is a need for this, because in schools throughout the state there is an irrational fear that utilizing some of these documents, or teaching from some of these documents, such as the Declaration of Independence, the Mayflower Compact. That

141st Legislative Day

June 2, 1994

there's something wrong with it especially if there is some sort of indication...some sort of use of the word God, for example. What we're trying to do here is simply say, there's nothing wrong with that. This government does not censor such speech, and we want to make that very clear, and I think this Amendment does just that."

Representative, I don't think with Lanq: "I have no problem, items one thru 10. I might even sign off on them, I might even help you with them. But when you talk about these lines, when you talk about 10 thru 12, you're talking about the possibility of a professor, or a teacher in a public school reading a Bible in a classroom. I'm concerned about the separation about the church and state. That's constitutionally protected area. There should be and I'm sure you'll agree a separation between church and state. The question here is, where does that start and stop? If it stops with paragraph one thru 10, I might say to you, well I'm all for it, Representative. But here you have...here you have not only...Representative, here you have not only the possibility that someone could misconstrue this, you also have a constitutional problem, not only the matter of church and state, but the matter of vagueness. You know, Bills and statutes that we pass in this General Assembly are struck down by courts, because they are constitutionally vague. Don't you think the section is vague?"

Salvi: "I think if you give your interruption that you would be right, I think you raised a good point. So let me make it very clear, for the purpose of establishing a record for legislative intent, we do not intend to allow some teaching that would be unconstitutional. We're not putting any kind of stamp of approval on unconstitutional behavior. All

141st Legislative Day

June 2, 1994

we're doing here, and I think the language is very clear, is we're saying there is nothing unconstitutional about teaching part of any of these historical documents and if you...my point is that if you're interruption is correct, then you would be right that this would have constitutional problems. But for the purpose of legislative intent, let me make it very clear, we don't intend to do that. We're not including the Bible as part of this list. And that clause that you are referring to is not in anyway referring to the Bible."

Lang: "What about paragraph 10? What about the possibility that some Congressman that reads the Bible into the congressional record will lead a teacher in a public school in Illinois to read out of context. That clause in the congressional record to a classroom, should that be protected here?"

Salvi: "I think it should be. If a teacher says, hey listen this is what this Congressman argued, this is congressional record, class look at what Congressman so and so says on this important issue. There is a difference of opinion there's these other positions on that issue. There is nothing wrong with that, Representative. We're trying to get rid of some of the irrational fear of violating the constitution that a lot of teachers have. when there is no such violation to the Constitution. Nothing that we are doing here is...the courts will not allow us to violate the Constitution of the United States. Were...if something in here can be interrupted as saying we could teach the Bible, that is a misinterruption of this Amendment."

Lang: "Well, I don't know what you mean by misinterruption, it's right in here, that first. Second, second, when you talk

141st Legislative Day

June 2, 1994

about what a teacher will read out of the congressional record, I would submit to you that if a teacher read the whole congressional record it might be one thing. But if they say Congressman so and so said this, and they keep it out of context, and they simply say certain Bible quotes, and they're trying to indoctrinate children in a certain direction, I think there is a definite violation between the separation of church and state, don't you?"

Salvi: "No, I don't, I think if a teacher says this is part of a congressional debate, and this is what Congressman so and so said. I don't personally think that is a violation of separation of church and state."

Lang: "Thank you. Madame Speaker, to the Amendment. We should all be opposed strongly to this Amendment on several grounds. Firstly, the Amendment itself is vague, we have a responsibility to pass legislation here that makes sense. Not to pass legislation that at the beginning we be interrupted by a court. We want to pass laws that don't have be interrupted by a court. We would like to pass laws that have meaning on their face, so that the plain meaning of the language of the legislation is known everyone. So legislation that says, that the foregoing 10 items is not meant to be an exclusive, says that everything else is also fair game, and we're going to allow school board or we're going to allow a teacher, or we're going to allow an administrator, or a room mother, or any number of other people who can be in a classroom to determine what else can be read, or indoctrinated into students in a classroom. I would submit to you that this is unconstitutionally vague. I would also submit to you that there is no question that the purpose of legislation is to allow, in certain cases, indoctrination

141st Legislative Day

June 2, 1994

to take place between certain teachers and classrooms on the issue...on religious issues. Even if that were not the purpose, the fact that it's even possible, even possible under this legislation, is a direct violation of the Constitution of the United States. A direct violation of the Constitution of the State of Illinois. So this is vague on its face, and it's vague in terms of what can be taught, and what can't be taught. And if we believe in the constitution, and we believe in the separation of church and state, we must not vote for this Amendment. This is not good law, this is not good philosophy, this is not good education. It's a violation of our constitution, it demands a 'no' vote."

Speaker Flowers: "Representative Skinner on the Amendment."

Skinner: "I disagree. I'm reminded that the Sponsor of this Bill is Senator Ed Petka who served in this House, and who personally wrote the Criminal Transmission of HIV Law which opponents claimed was vague and couldn't possibly be understood. Amazingly enough this year it was upheld by the Illinois Supreme Court. I'm confident this will also be upheld by the Illinois Supreme Court. I would ask for a record roll call under Rule 55 (c) and I'm joined by at least four others. Thank you very much."

Speaker Flowers: "Representative Phelps on the Amendment."

Phelps: "Thank you, Madame Speaker. I hope we can clarify a couple of things, especially from one of the previous speakers. In regards to, this is not intended to bridge the gap between church and state. I believe it's very clear that all we are trying to do is preserve and solidify the right to free expression, that is already guaranteed under the U.S. Constitution. Someone that can refer to what is could be challenged constitutionally of course is a

141st Legislative Day

June 2, 1994

matter of wide gulf of opinion of legal minds that I'm, I quess, I'm not one of. But I do I think know the difference between teaching historical documents that's already a matter of establishing it as far as the record of our country. Such as the Mayflower Compact, if you want to take the Declaration of Independence, even look at the Pledge of Allegiance, it refers to under God. Now there are some folks that believe that infringes upon their religious freedom. If it's told or stated in a classroom by a teacher. And yes I believe that it is legal, and I think it's constitutional that you could teach the Bible, as a matter of literature. One of the greatest stories of love, if you will read the Book of Ruth. I taught that to my class of kids when I was teaching school, and gave no inference, or opinion of how they should believe, it is a historical document, it exists. And I believe that this legislation merely reinforces what's already exercised in the classroom, and only to protect the real impact of what could be interrupted as prohibition of censorship of the materials that we value as part of our history and part of our heritage. That's the intent of this Amendment and hopefully of an Amendment that will appear later. Thank you.

Speaker Flowers: "Representative Lawfer on the Amendment."

Lawfer: "Thank you, Madame Chairman. I rise in support of this Amendment. I think this is an Amendment that is been brought about and needed because of some court action. And I think that the public perception of what can be taught in schools and what is not, needs to be clarified and I think that this Bill does that. And I would urge your support on that."

Speaker Flowers: "Representative Pedersen. Representative

141st Legislative Day

June 2. 1994

Pedersen."

Pedersen: "Thank you, Madame Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Ιt is very curious to hear a great concern about some of our more politically correct colleagues. indoctrination in schools, and who carry on about what's constitutional, and what isn't, when we have interruptions of the constitution by our Supreme Court that the founders would be shocked to know about. So all I'm...all I'm commenting about is the fact that there are other...there's another side to the coin, and...plus the people on the other side of the coin have interests and concerns too. And talking about this thing being such a potential problem is just absurd."

Speaker Flowers: "Representative Maureen Murphy on the Amendment."

"Thank you, Madame Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of Murphy, M.: the General Assembly. An earlier speaker raised spector of some God awful indoctrination that could take place in the classroom. When fundamentally none of us would actually even be here if it wasn't about the various religious freedoms that were denied the founders of our country. We should not be worried about PC and teachers indoctrinating, when some of those same sponsors that have raised that spector talk about teaching about hate crimes, and the lack of tolerance by our student population. better than to accurately portray the documents from which this country was founded, and framed than to bring up The problems in our classroom today are because of too much God being in the classroom. The problem in the classroom is not because I'm saying, In We Trust, or one nation under God. There are those of us that do believe we need more God in the classroom. But

141st Legislative Day

June 2. 1994

fundamentally even if you do no believe that we need more God, to allow a teacher to accurately portray the documents from which this country sprung forth. It's PC at its very worst and the best quote I heard this year about PC was in January of 1994. Under deviousness PC is pashas, let's be let's be tolerant, and let's try to find out about one anothers differences, and perhaps then we can applaud some sense of sameness and insure a root to begin in our young children. Let's develop those roots for future tolerance. And unless we can examine differences, we cannot know tolerance and the fundamental belief is about God, and being founded because of religious differences. and the freedoms that we enjoy in 1994. I commend the Sponsor for bringing forward this Amendment, and I urge its serious consideration and its overdue approval. Thank you."

Speaker Flowers: "Representative Persico on the Amendment."

Persico: "Thank you, Madame Chairman. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Flowers: "He indicates that he will."

Persico: "Representative, maybe I missed the beginning of the debate, or something, but why is this...why do you feel that this Amendment is needed? For example, as a Social Studies teacher I teach the Mayflower Compact, I teach the Declaration, the Constitution, the speeches, the documents of our founding fathers, and so on and so on. I have never had any problem teaching this, I have never had anybody come to me and say, what are you doing teaching these documents to our school children. Why do you think that we need this piece of legislation? Have there been court cases that have ruled against this or what?"

Salvi: "No. No, court cases ruled against the teaching of any of these things. There is an overwhelming, and irrational

# 141st Legislative Day

June 2, 1994

fear on the part of a lot of teachers, not you obviously, that teaching...there is something wrong about teaching anything that has anything to do with God. The courts don't say that there is such a rule, or the courts don't say that's unconstitutional. And this makes it very clear that, in fact, it's okay to teach the Mayflower Compact. the Mayflower Compact is for some reason a very controversial thing now a days. It wasn't at the time, and it wasn't for hundreds of years, in the beginning of this country, but now it is because of the references to God. I'm just trying to make it very clear to everyone involved, particularly the teachers that are worried about this, that there's no reason to chill this speech, there is no reason to censor this, there is no reason to hide these great documents. This is part of our history, constitutional, it's okay and that's what this law...that's what this Amendment would do."

Persico: "Let me give you an example, let's say that teaching about the Pilgrims and the Mayflower Compact, okay? let's say that I'm talking...teaching about the Puritans, okay? One of the beliefs of the Puritan religion that time was the belief in predestination. If I use that as a spring board to talk about predestination, talking about the Puritan, and all the problems that they were having and so on and so on. And I bring out predestination, with the intent, let's say that I'm a believer in predestination. Could that then be used by me as a spring board to teach this. I mean is this what you're..."

Salvi: "No. That would...this Bill would not effect that at all.

If you can do it now under the present laws then you could
do it. If you can't do it under the present laws then you

141st Legislative Day

June 2, 1994

can't do it. This law does not address that situation."

Persico: "Well, I can talk about predestination, and the beliefs, and the historical context and to give some more meaning to what the Puritans were like at that particular time in our history. But if I use it to maybe glorify the values or the concept of predestination. Am I allowed...I don't think I'm allowed to do that right now. Would I be allowed to do that under this particular Bill?"

Salvi: "This Bill wouldn't effect that."

Persico: "How about cretinism?"

Salvi: "The Bill wouldn't effect it."

Persico: "I guess...I can see where you are saying it wouldn't effect it, and I don't think that I would be doing that under that context. Then I guess, why...then my original question then, why do we need it? I mean I'm not sure..."

Salvi: "Well again. Again, Representative, because there is a
 fear..."

Persico: "Because the word God is used in the Pledge of Allegiance?"

Salvi: "A lot of teachers don't teach a lot of these things because they think it is illegal to do so. This makes it clear that and again, sometimes we get so bogged down on these complicated side issues. Let me make this very clear, the Bill simply says, no teacher shall be prohibited from using, reading from, or posting in a public school building the following, and it lists Declaration of Independence, National Motto, Mayflower Compact, Constitution and so forth. It is a very simple Bill. You and I... I don't think there is a person on this Floor that disagrees with what's in this Bill. And to Representative Lang and to you Representative, I want to make it very clear, for legislative intent. That is all this Bill is,

141st Legislative Day

June 2, 1994

there is nothing hidden, there is nothing between the lines. It is a simple Bill, it just says it's okay to teach these things, it's okay to read from these things, it's okay to refer to these things, it's okay to post these things in public school buildings, that's all. Just because the word God is in there doesn't mean that it is unconstitutional. We're trying to eliminate that misconception."

Persico: "One last question then. Let's say that I taught the Mayflower Compact, and a irate parent sued me, would I not be covered already according to our constitution without this particular language in there?"

Salvi: "I would imagine that in the case, in that case,
Representative that the lawsuit would be dismissed, and
your lawyer would refer to this law, in dismissing that
case."

Persico: "Well, let's say that this case does not become law.

Will my lawyer still be able to refer to the United States

Constitution to protect my rights to teach the Mayflower

Compact?"

Salvi: "I would hope so."

Persico: "I understand what you are trying to do, and I'm sure that there're teachers that are fearful of teaching some of these concepts. But if we're already protected, I guess my only question is, is it needed then?"

Salvi: "Yes. I think it's desperately needed."

Persico: "Thank you."

Speaker Flowers: "Representative Ostenburg."

Ostenburg: "Thank you, Madame Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in opposition to this Amendment, now let me just list a few of the reasons why. Let me start by pointing out that I am somewhat confused by the arguments

# 141st Legislative Day

June 2, 1994

that are made on the other side of the aisle. I hear from one speaker that it has nothing to do with trying to allow things to be taught that involve God, and things of that sort. But then I hear from another speaker that we more God in the classroom. Now somehow or another somebody is confused in terms of what this Amendment does. at least some people think that it's going to allow more teaching of religious related things in the classroom. more importantly, the school code has enough problems already without us adding interpretations we acknowledge no interpretation is necessary. Everyone is acknowledged that we know of no court cases or anything similar that has caused the problem with any teacher in the classroom, teaching any of this material. And let me tell you when people start to talk about teachers having problems, we have two very powerful teaching organizations in the State οf Illinois, the Illinois Education Association, and the Illinois Federation of Teachers. Those organizations look out for the rights of teachers. If there were an outburst of opinion among teachers, that they were being denied their rights, or that they were having a hard time teaching material because of current law, believe me both the IEA and the IFT would be in there negotiating with school boards to make sure that provisions were put in place to allow them to do their teaching without having any kind of constraints put on them. a measure that is thinly disguised, but it is disguised non the less to hide the opportunity to simply teach more material. Now when you start talking about historical documents, I can list a long list of historical documents that could fall under this provision, that could be taught in the classroom. And some of those quote 'historical

141st Legislative Day

June 2, 1994

documents' don't necessarily have the same impact on the average student that the Constitution or the Mayflower Compact or things of that sort. We've picked 10 very patriotic items but the flood gates are open with particular piece of Amendment. This opens the door for a lot of things to be posted in classrooms, that I'm not sure all of us want all students to be subjected to all time. Things are working pretty well now, we've got problems in the School Code but by everyone's acknowledgement, including the proponents. This is not one of the areas where we have problems. We have no court cases that have been ruled against what is in the code right now, so why are we tampering with it? We're creating situation that will, in fact, cause confusion for teachers, for parents, for school administrators, and ultimately it's going to come back to us, then we're going have to correct the code for having messed it up. is not a good measure, it creates confusion, and it should be defeated."

Speaker Flowers: "Representative Parke on the Amendment."

Parke: "Thank you, Madame Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Have you been listening to this debate? Have you heard what the liberals are trying to tell us? That it cannot codify in writing, in the classroom the teaching of basic American tenants, like the Constitution, the Bill of Rights. Can you believe this dialogue has been going on for a half an hour? What is wrong with us? This is very simple, it says that it's okay, for teachers to teach in the classroom what is basic to American values in history. What's wrong with us? This ought to be passed, there shouldn't be a question on it. And I can hardly wait to see you liberals vote 'no' on this, and see the articles

141st Legislative Day

June 2, 1994

written up about you not voting for this, basic to what is America."

Speaker Flowers: "Representative Black, on the Amendment."

Black: "Thank you very much, Madame Speaker. I pray you will grant my request to move the previous question."

Speaker Flowers: "The Gentlemen moves to the previous question.

The question is, 'Whether the main question shall be put?'

All those in favor say 'aye'; opposed, 'nay'. The 'ayes'
have it. Representative Salvi, to close."

Salvi: "Thank you, Madame Speaker. You know I'm really flabbergasted, I'm shocked that there's any opposition to this. The Chairman οf the Education Committee, Representative Brunsvold, Representative Phelps, strongly behind this. All we're trying to do and it's amazing to me that there is opposition. All we're trying to do is make it very clear that it's okay for teachers to teach Declaration of Independence or any part of it. The Constitution of the United States, the writing, the speech, the documents, the proclamation of the founding fathers and Presidents of the United States. Why is there opposition to this? The fact that there's such confusion especially over on that side of the aisle, with regards to this. seems to me that I...I'm more right than I knew. really is a need for this, there really is a need to clarify this. It's okay to teach this, it's okay, are...these are our history, this is our heritage. And it' okay, there is nothing wrong with it. No, nothing in the United States prohibits a teacher from teaching these great documents. I urge a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Flowers: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Amendment #17 to Senate Bill 1595. All those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed, 'no'. The voting is now open.

141st Legislative Day

June 2, 1994

Representative Balthis to explain his vote."

- Balthis: "Thank you, Madame Speaker. I would like to ask the Members to take a moment to join with me in welcoming the Trinity Lutheran School students and teachers, they're back in the back end of the floor here. Thank you."
- Speaker Flowers: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk, shall take the record. 98 voting 'yes', 14 voting 'no'. This Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk, are there any further Amendments?"
- Clerk McLennand: "Floor Amendment #18, offered by Representative Davis."
- Speaker Flowers: "Representative Monique Davis on Amendment #18 to Senate Bill 1595. Representative Davis on the Amendment."
- Davis: "Thank you very much, Ladies and Gentlemen. Amendment #18 is a Bill that passed out of here with 92 votes or more. And what it does is, it gives the Mayor of Chicago 30 additional days in which to hire, I'm sorry, to appoint board members from the list given to him by the nominating commission. The Bill passed out with about 90 votes and it's over in the Senate. So we're just asking that we include it in this package."
- Speaker Flowers: "The Lady moves for the adoption of Amendment #18 to Senate Bill 1595. On that, is there any discussion? Representative Krause on the Amendment."

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

Speaker Flowers: "She indicates that she will."

Krause: "Representative, as I look at your Amendment #18 it provides that the vacancy shall be filled through appointment by the school board nominating commission and the mayor was deleted, is that correct?"

Davis: "I'm sorry I can't hear you."

141st Legislative Day

June 2, 1994

Krause: "The Amendment #18 provides that any vacancy in the membership of the board shall be filled through appointment by the school board nominating commission."

Davis: "That's correct."

Krause: "Okay. And the mayor has been deleted with the approval of the city council."

Davis: "Well, that's if she hasn't appointed in 60 days. That's correct."

Krause: "It doesn't say. With the selection by...the appointment by the school board commission. Is that to be by a majority of those at a meeting or by a majority of the 15 of the total commission?"

Davis: "The majority of those at the meeting."

Krause: "Those at the meeting?"

Davis: "Yes. It was on the...the majority that sit on the board."

Krause: "Okay. So it would be a majority of the 15 regardless of those at the meeting. Furthermore, the Amendment provides that if the mayor takes no action within 60 days, then the commission shall fill the vacancy or the new board position. By providing for those though, have you now deleted the requirement that the city council must approve?"

Davis: "No. The city council still has their approval rights."

Krause: "Well, the following paragraph reads that the city council takes no action to approve or disapprove the mayor's selection. But we now change..."

Davis: "Excuse me. No, no. The...currently the city council approves the selection of the mayor after they have been appointed or submitted by the school dominating commission."

Krause: "Well, I don't see a provision in here now..."

141st Legislative Day

June 2, 1994

Davis: "We're not changing that section. That section is not being changed."

Krause: "But it reads, that if the city council takes no action to approve or disapprove the mayors selection within 30 days. The appointment shall be deemed to be approved but the prior paragraph says, if the mayor takes no action within 60 days, then the commission shall fill the vacancy.

My question is, has now the city council power on that been deleted."

Davis: "No, it has not."

Krause: "Is that interrputed in there then that the city council..."

Davis: "What it says, Representative, is that the nominated commission will appoint the board member. The board member continues to go through what it now does. Goes through the approval of the city council."

Krause: "The concern that I have is, that by the changes that are occurring here by removing some of the powers that mayor...concern is equal that powers of the city council has been removed and that more of the power lies in the appointed..."

Davis: "That just is not true, Representative. It does not remove the requirement of the city council. It is not true what you are saying."

Krause: "Well, I'm against stating that the language that appears after the new language about it being on the commission does not now pick up that the city council has that authority and I repeat that and that is of a major concern in this legislation. Thank you."

Speaker Flowers: "Representative Lang on the Amendment."

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

Speaker Flowers: "She indicates that she will."

141st Legislative Day

June 2, 1994

Lang: "Representative, let me see if I understand what this, you said in your explanation. That all this does is expand the time to 60 days for the Mayor to appoint the board members.

Is that all the Bill does?"

Davis: "Representative, excuse me representative, this Bill, this very same Bill passed out of this House with over 90 votes."

Lang: "That is not the question I asked you unfortunately."

Davis: "No, I am going to complete my answer, if I may."

Lang: "Sure."

Davis: "The Bill does two things. It says that the Mayor has, instead 30 days it gives him an additional 30 days to appoint school board members when their terms have been up, when their terms are up. I mean currently, the Board of Education has members sitting on the Board, who have not been, who's terms have expired. And new members have not been appointed, and this Bill says, that after 60 days instead of 30 the nominating commission will appoint, continuing with the very same mandate, that the city council approves those nominations."

Lang: "Well, why would we want to turn over to the commission the mayors powers?"

Davis: "Why would we want to turn over the nominating commission, the Mayors powers? Well, Representative this Body, including you passed a school reform Bill in 1988. And part of that school reform Bill, requires that board members are selected from a pool that is presented by the nominating commission. The Mayor is given a slate of three candidates, and he can select any those of people that he chooses from that slate. Currently, there are people sitting on the board, who's terms have expired nominating commission in place have submitted names and yet, there are

141st Legislative Day

June 2, 1994

no names being chosen. We believe the Mayor needs additional time. Therefore, we're extending that time from 30 days to 60 days."

Lang: "Further question. Page five of the Bill, lines 10-13, says 'if the Mayor takes no action within 60 days, et cetera...et cetera... et cetera.' What if the Mayor takes action but the city council sits on it?"

Davis: "That is not a part of the school reform legislation that was passed in 1988. The city council has to my knowledge been responsible in approving or not approving candidates when they were presented before them, but Representative do you deny that the legislation that is passed through this Body should be adhered to or should we some of us ignore the rules that are in this law. That is my question to you."

Lang: "I believe all elected officials should abide by the law, but Representative you didn't answer my question. The Bill says the Amendment says that if the Mayor takes no action. Now, conceivably under the language in your Amendment, the Mayor could take action but the city council might not take action, for 60 or 90 or 120 days. How would that fit in with the language of your proposal?"

Davis: "Representative just as it is not in the previous legislation, it is not in this legislation."

Lang: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. To the Amendment I have to stand opposed to this Amendment. I agree Representative Davis on a lot of her legislation. But unfortunately not this one. The Bill is vague. First the Mayor of the City of Chicago in takes the power of divest it into another body. He was elected to make those decisions. Secondly, and perhaps more importantly the language on page 5, talks about what the Mayor should do.

141st Legislative Day

June 2, 1994

It says if the Mayor takes no action, but the Mayor still has to give these names to the city council. purpose of the proposal by Representative Davis, is to insure that the names are submitted and passed and these people are sitting on the board doing there job, then the Amendment should properly say, that if the Mayor and city council take no action, because under this proposal the Mayor could appoint on the first day, but the city council may never act on it. It may get buried in committee, and surely we're familiar in this General Assembly with items getting buried in committee. Let me in addition add, that there is an Illinois Appellate Court Case entitled Pollich vs. Chicago School Finance Authority. Which interpret something called the corporate authority doctrine. case says very clearly and it's a case that appears to be right on point. It says, elected officials that appoint boards that have the right to authorize the levy, let me say this again so it makes sense in English. authorized by any board can only be approved if all the board members are appointed by an appropriate body. The current statute required that the Mayor of the City of Chicago appoint those members. The Supreme Court Case or this Appellate Court Case is very clear, that if we pass this legislation the members of the board appointed could not vote on the levy of the school board. Accordingly for all these reasons we should be voting 'no'."

Speaker Flowers: "Representative Black, on the Amendment."

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

Speaker Flowers: "She indicates she will."

Black: "Representative, who is, who sits on the school board

141st Legislative Day

June 2, 1994

nominating commission? People who are appointed?"

Davis: "People that, the people on the nominating commission are from the local school councils."

Black: "Okay"

Davis: "From each local school councils. The districts submits one person to sit on the nominating commission. And the Mayor has appointments. The Mayor has five appointees on the nominating commission."

Black: "Okay, now we spend about three and a half hours on this Bill, and the Amendments. So, I am a little confused. The people on the school board nominating commission do they have to have a type 75 certificate?"

Davis: "The people on nominating commission, are the people..."

Black: "Your right, that was an earlier Amendment."

Davis: "No, no just a minute."

Black: "Yes."

Davis: "They were placed on the commission because they're members of the local school council elect a Representative to sit on the nominating commission. Now this is the you all school reform Bill."

Black: "That is right, so they, but they do not have to have a type 75 certificate to be on the commission? That is right isn't it?"

Davis: "Well, the members of the nominating commission, don't have to have a type 75 similar to Legislators who don't have to have high school diplomas."

Black: "Well, I think that is outrageous. But anyway, let me ask you a question on page 2 of the Amendment. And if we could look at page 2, line 23 and 24 and it goes on to say any vacancy in the membership of the board shall be filled to appointment by the new language school board nominating commission, with the approval of the city council."

141st Legislative Day

June 2, 1994

Davis: "If the Mayor fails to act in 60 days."

Black: "No, it does not say that Representative."

Davis: "But, it does say that."

Black: "No, Representative look at line 23, now all right.

'Through appointment by the school board nominating commission, new language school board nominating commission'. Line 24, the word Mayor is crossed out."

Davis: "Representative, this Bill passed with 92 votes, I think you are one of those who voted on it..."

Black: "Well, you know what Representative..."

Davis: "However, if you have had a change of heart to make you happy Representative Black, Madam Speaker, withdraw this Amendment, please."

Black: "Thank you."

Speaker Flowers: "Mr. Clerk, please withdraw Amendment #18 to Senate Bill 1595, are there any further Amendments?"

Clerk McLennand: "Floor Amendment #19, offered by Representative Homer."

Speaker Flowers: "Representative Homer, Amendment #19, to Senate Bill 1595."

Homer: "Thank you, Madam Speaker and Ladies and Gentleman. House Amendment 19, is identical to House Bill 3459, which passed on Third Reading with 111 votes. It creates the credit card Infinity Act. It's a measure that was cosponsored by Representative Persico, and you may recall this was a Bill that would have the State Treasure serve as the collector of the funds that would be paid over by credit card issuers that would then be distributed to school districts designated by the card holders as recipients of the infinity card benefits. I would answer questions. As I indicated the Bill passed out of here rather overwhelmingly on Third Reading and I would

141st Legislative Day

- June 2, 1994
- appreciate your support of this Amendment."
- Speaker Flowers: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Amendment #19, to Senate Bill 1595. Seeing no discussion.

  All those in favor say 'aye'; opposed, 'nay'. The Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk, are there any further Amendments?"
- Clerk McLennand: "Floor Amendment #20, offered by Representative Levin."
- Speaker Flowers: "Representative Ellis Levin, on Floor Amendment #20."
- Levin: "Thank you, Madam Speaker and Ladies and Gentleman of the House. Amendment #20...."
- Speaker Flowers: "Excuse me, Representative Levin.

  Representative Black, for what reason are you seeking recognition?"
- Black: "Thank you, very much Madam Speaker. An inquiry of the Chair, has Amendment #20 been printed and distributed?"
- Speaker FLowers: "Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk McLennand: "Amendment #20, has not been printed and distributed."
- Speaker Flowers: "Representative Cowlishaw, what is your pleasure?"
- Cowlishaw: "Madam Speaker, I rise to make an inquiry if I may please? Representative Levin came over to me earlier this afternoon and told me the contents of this Amendment and he is I think, very disappointed that it has not yet been printed, so of course it can not be distributed. He has told me that he talked to his leadership, and that if I take this Bill out of the record right now, and leave it on Second Reading, that this Bill will be called among the very first Bills to be called tomorrow, so that his Amendment can then be considered. I am always glad to be

141st Legislative Day

June 2, 1994

cooperative with one of my colleagues. But an awful lot of people have Amendments on this Bill that are important to them too. So, if I have the assurance of the Chair, that this Bill would be called again tomorrow, fairly early on in the day, so that Representative Levin's Amendment can be considered. I will gladly take the Bill out of the record. But only if I have that assurance."

Speaker Flowers: "Representative Cowlishaw. I have been assured that if you were to take this Bill out of the record. We will hear it tomorrow, but not first thing."

Cowlishaw: "I am sorry I couldn't hear you."

Speaker Flowers: "We will hear your Bill tomorrow."

Cowlishaw: "Very good. Thank you very much. Madam Speaker, I not only appreciate your assurances and your confidence and helpfulness, but I would respectfully request that when we do finally hear Amendment #20, and any that may have been filed overnight, or tomorrow morning or whatever beyond 20, that, please, don't you think Madam Speaker, I am entitled to a star to put on the top of the tree that has now become Senate Bill 1595. Thank you."

Speaker Flowers: "I agree with you, Representative Cowlishaw.

Mr. Clerk, take the Bill out of the record. Representative

Meyer, for what purpose do you rise?"

Meyer: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I would, if I could have the attention of the House I would appreciate it. I would like to give you all an update on the benefit that was held last night for Carolyn Chriswell for the fund that was established to help defray some of the medical cost, and so far we have raised \$3,467 and I would just like to thank all you who have participated so far and made donations and attended the event, in addition to last nights event, we still have 50/50 tickets on sale, that's where 50% of the

141st Legislative Day

June 2, 1994

raffle will go to prizes and 50% to the fund. And those tickets will remain on sale through July 13 at which time there will be a drawing, and if you wish to purchase those tickets or make a donation in addition to what you have all ready have done, you can do so either at the Clerk's office or else Representative McPike has consented to allow us to use his office for those donations also. So, those tickets will remain on sale through July 13, and thank you."

Speaker Flowers: "Representative Hannig, Representative Hannig for what reason do you rise?"

Hannig: "Yes, thank you, Madam Speaker and Members of the House.

Just for an announcement, I'd like to remind all the

Members of the Assembly that we will be continuing the mark

up of the Medicaid proposal tomorrow again at 9:00 in room

114, and you are all welcome to be there."

Speaker Flowers: "Representative Black."

Black: "Yes, I have an inquiry of the Chair, Madam Speaker. I sense perhaps, are we ready to adjourn?"

Speaker Flowers: "No, never."

Black: "Oh, that is good because I wanted to know how many Bills
we worked on today? Was it just one Bill."

Speaker Flowers: "One Bill, Representative Black."

Black: "But it did have a lot of Amendments as I recall."

Speaker Flowers: "Quite a few, 20 to be exact."

Black: "Well, you know, fine."

Speaker Flowers: "Representative Frias, for what reason do you rise?"

Frias: "Thank you, very much, Madam Speaker. I would like to take this opportunity to invite all the Members, staff and friends to the Legislative Day at the Roller Rink. We'll be conducting a roller derby, a bipartisan team. And it's going to be a good time, it will be from 7:30 - 10:00 at

141st Legislative Day

June 2, 1994

the Skateland South, next to Knights Action Park. Everybody should have received some information, if not you can call my office, and we will give you some information. So, let's all show and we'll have a good time and the women's caucus is invited to the Roller Derby against the bipartisan alliance of legislative leaders."

Speaker Flowers: "State Operations, House Bill 2542,
Representative Blagojevich. Representative Blagojevich.
House Bill 25...House Bill 2542. Representative
Blagojevich. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk McLennand: "House Bill 2542, a Bill for an Act in relation to firearms. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Flowers: "Representative Blagojevich on the Bill."

Blagojevich: "Thank you, Madame Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 2542, is a Bill we discussed two weeks ago regarding Amendments. What the Bill does is very simply is, it says that anybody convicted of an act of domestic battery or convicted of a crime of violation of order of protection would lose his or her firearm. This Bill is based on the very simple premise that people who are dangerous, who have exhibited dangerous propensities that in the sanctity of the most important relationship in their lives, ought not to have firearms because they can very well take that kind of violence to the next level. According to the FBI last year 4,000 women were killed as a result of domestic violence. Of those 4,000, the FBI reports, that 70% of them died at the hands firearm. The premise, or the rational for this legislation is very similar to what we do with people who are convicted of drunk driving. If someone is convicted of drunk driving, we revoke their driving privileges because we say to them they are dangerous and the next time they

# 141st Legislative Day

June 2, 1994

might kill somebody. This rational is similar, if someone is convicted of an act of domestic battery, for example, we are then saying to that person that you are dangerous and next time if you have a gun, you might kill somebody and so we're saying take that gun away. This legislation is also very consistent with the present law, in that, anybody convicted of any felony in the State of Illinois, regardless of the severity of the felony, loses his or her firearm. And let me say this, we have people convicted of felonies that are non-violent felonies, felonies that might include a theft of over 5 or \$600, those people lose their firearm. But how are we to then explain, to women in our society in particular, but also to men, that we will not take their guns away if they commit an act of Let me say this also, this is an issue that has the moniker of being a woman's issue. But it really isn't woman's issue, it is a people's issue. In our society that is so polarized today when we consider race and consider economics. we are also now witness the polarization between genders. And one of the reasons we're witness that is because we who are men are maybe too insensitive of about some of the things that are important If we don't send a message that we take to women. seriously those who commit domestic violence and take their then we are neglecting to maintain our responsibility to all of our members in our society. Let say this last thing, I don't believe that the NRA opposes this legislation, I don't believe the Illinois State Rifle Association opposes this legislation because members of the NRA and the Illinois State Rifle Association believe, I'm sure, that you shouldn't beat your wife, shouldn't beat your spouse and you shouldn't beat your

# 141st Legislative Day

June 2, 1994

girlfriend. And those people are hunters and they're sportsmen and they believe in that, and they don't believe that any criminal ought to have a qun. And so we're extending that logic, as well, to this legislation. So anybody who fears the NRA, I don't believe there's anything to fear here. And let me say one last thing, for those people who believe that maybe the NRA might be angry, here's the chance to show some real political courage. for you fellows out there, on this particular issue, might want to show a little testicular virility and vote against the NRA, if it is even an issue because it isn't a thing to do. Here is a perfect issue to stand up for something that is fundamental and right. I ask for a 'yes' vote. Thank you."

- Speaker Flowers: "The Gentleman moved for the passage of House Bill 2542. On that, is there any discussion? Representative Black."
- Black: "Thank you very much, Madame Speaker. I have an inquiry of the Chair. What order of business are we on now?"
- Speaker Flowers: "Mr. Clerk, would you please state the order of business this is?"
- Clerk McLennand: "We are on the Order of State Operations, Third Reading."
- Black: "Oh. State Operations, Third Reading? And we were on State and Local Government, Second Reading, is that correct? We were on Senate Bills and now we've gone back to House Bills?"
- Speaker Flowers: "That's correct, Representative."
- Black: "Oh, okay. And we are on this...we're on Third Reading
- Speaker Flowers: "That's correct, Representative Black."
- Black: "Okay. So you'll ring the bell at the appropriate time,

141st Legislative Day

June 2, 1994

right? There we go okay. Now will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Flowers: "Yes, he will, Representative Black."

Black: "Thank you. Representative, I just have one question and if you could answer it as simply as possible. Why are you calling this Bill now on the second of June, 1994?"

Blagojevich: "Representative, I don't have complete control over when the Bill is called, I mean, I take it as they come, you know you hit the pitch as it is pitched to you."

Black: "Well, okay."

Blagojevich: "The first chance I got and we're calling it now."

Black: "Okay. Thank you very much. Thank you very much. Madame Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Bill. Now that we have an opportunity, either we're all going to be followers down here or we can be Representative Pugh earlier in the day and move to adjourn and stop this charade. If we don't have any control over when these Bills are called, then we don't need to be here. the four leaders want to get together and punch everybody's switch, that's fine with me. If that's what they want to do, okay. This is an exercise in absolute idiocy. I've taken everyone of my House Bills, some of which got out of committee unanimously, and are good Bills and put them on Interim Study, and I don't intend to call any House Bills on the second of June or any other this June. Everyone of us in this chamber knows this Bill doesn't have anyplace to go and we're going to sit here and waste another 15 or 20 minutes so somebody can have a press release. Well I'll tell you what, if we had what you said earlier, Representative, everyone of us on both sides of the aisle, you talk about your virility, if you had any you'd take this Bill out of the record and send a message to your Leader, enough is enough."

141st Legislative Day

June 2, 1994

Speaker Flowers: "Representative Granberg on...House Bill 2542, Representative Granberg."

Granberg: "Thank you, Madame Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the The Sponsor of this Bill is trying to do the best he can, like we all are for the citizens we represent. Representative Black mentioned on previous occasions that he represents 97,000 people and that's what he is doing here. Well that's what this Representative is doing and as we all are...and that's what we all are doing. And we all know in this business that, especially I would say to the Freshman, all of them, if you have been around this business you will know that nothing is ever dead around There may be some, you think, exercises in futility but that is not necessarily the case. Things have come back, in fact, serving in this Body could be a very religious experience. Because you are going to...you will see miracles the longer you are here. Things will rise from the dead and they will come back to life. That could be the case with this Bill, this could be the case with any Bill, and I think the Representative is doing the best job he can and I know the people impacted by this legislation appreciate it."

Speaker Flowers: "Representative Rutherford on the Bill."

Rutherford: "Thank you, Madame Speaker. I am particularly hearten by Representative Granberg's comments such that now maybe some of the Bills that I've never even seen the light of day since we started this year's Session may have some opportunity before this thing is all over with. Would the Sponsor yield, please?"

Speaker Flowers: "He indicates that he will."

Rutherford: "Representative Blagojevich, in the...definition...this is a serious question now, not one

141st Legislative Day

June 2, 1994

of these trick political ones, is the terms domestic battery define statutorily so it is not an interpretative thing that a judge would be able to try to define or do we actually have the word in the law that say what domestic battery is?"

Blagojevich: "Yes, it is, it's presently in the statute right now. It is a Class A misdemeanor."

Rutherford: "And then we also talk as if there is a...that they could also lose this privilege for violation of an order of protection, of course that is obviously outlined statutory."

Blagojevich: "That's right."

Rutherford: "Now the part though, for a substantially similar offense of another jurisdiction, what does that mean? Is that statutory defined?"

Blagojevich: "No."

Rutherford: "Then what does that mean?"

Blagojevich: "That means that if a similar offense occurs in another jurisdiction and the facts of that offense could be defined under our present statute, that would satisfy the substantially similar requirement."

Rutherford: "I'm still confused, I'm sorry, say that again."

Blagojevich: "Okay. So for example, someone commits a domestic type of battery in another jurisdiction, if we...if that battery, the facts of that particular domestic battery, are similar to what our statute here in Illinois define as domestic battery that would be substantially similar and that would apply here."

Rutherford: "Help me understand, please and I'm not a lawyer, that when you say other jurisdiction meaning another state?"

Blagojevich: "Yes."

141st Legislative Day

June 2, 1994

Rutherford: "Another."

Blagojevich: "Yes."

Rutherford: "Okay. Thank you."

Blagojevich: "Thank you."

"To the Bill, Madame Speaker. Rutherford: I will not supporting this for other reasons, but beyond that I actually am some what chagrin that we are now looking at House Bills. When I've got good pieces of legislation that are still sitting in the dismal dungeons of some type of committee. And if we're going to be sitting here during the month of June doing some type of action for the people of Illinois I would hope that we could do something productive like putting on 18 Amendments to a Senate Bill, at least there is some redeeming value in spending time Bills Senate which dо have opportunity of consideration when they go to the other chambers. you very much, Madame Speaker."

Speaker Flowers: "Representative Meyer, on the Bill."

Meyer: "Thank you, Madame Chairman. Would the Representative or the Sponsor yield for a question? Representative, has this Bill been debated before the House previous to this?"

Blagojevich: "Yes. We discussed this Bill and the context of Amendments."

Meyer: "What Amendment and what Bill was that debated on?"

Blagojevich: "Amendments were attached to this particular Bill and there was a lengthy discussion about two weeks ago whether or not some of those Amendments would actually be tacked onto this Bill."

Meyer: "So the Amendments that this Bill was debated as an Amendment to this Bill? I don't understand that."

Blagojevich: "No. The substance of this particular Bill was never really debated. We discussed whether other

141st Legislative Day

June 2, 1994

Amendments should attach to this Bill, and we spent about 45 minutes doing that."

Meyer: "But it was on this Bill?"

Blagojevich: "It was regarding this Bill, correct."

Meyer: "Regarding this Bill or this Bill was called before?"

Blagojevich: "It was this Bill, yes, it was this Bill."

Meyer: "That's what I'm trying to get clear."

Blagojevich: "That is a fair question, yes that is a fair question. At a certain point, Representative Meyer, I'm dying to get in here and respond to Representative Black.

At some point I'll get acknowledge, I just want to throw that out."

Meyer: "I understand that but I still have additional questions.

Were Amendments passed to this Bill at the time that we spent the 45 minutes debating?"

Blagojevich: "Some were and some weren't."

Meyer: "Can you refresh my memory as to what Amendments were and how they changed the original Bill?"

Blagojevich: "To the best of my ability, I will. We passed an Amendment that would provide more funding for additional police and there was an Amendment that Andrea Moore, who was a Co-Sponsor of this Bill, had, that had already passed out of the House that is now in the Senate and that was domestic violence oriented but somewhat different and I contended it, there were constitutional issue about that and that Amendment did not pass."

Meyer: "Thank you, Representative, to the process here. You know here we are in June, we're dealing with House Bills that have really no effect on becoming law. I think that we better spend our time in dealing with the Senate Bills that are before us. If the Representative wants to see this Bill amended to a Senate Bill that does have some change of

141st Legislative Day

June 2, 1994

being passed, I think he should do that. Otherwise, we ought to open this process up entirely and allow us to go back to committee and spend some time in the mornings down here working on a committee, so that we can get some of the Bills that I've proposed here heard in committee finally, so that I have a chance to come out here on the Floor and talk about my Bill and represent the people of my district that sent me down here to represent them. Thank you."

Speaker Flowers: "Representative Biggins, on the Bill."

Biggins: "Thank you, Madame Speaker. Representative...will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Flowers: "He indicates that he will."

Biggins: "Representative, does this mean that persons convicted of domestic battery cannot get a FOID card?"

Blagojevich: "I'm sorry, what was the question?"

Biggins: "Does this Bill mean that a person convicted of domestic battery cannot get a FOID card?"

Blagojevich: "Yes, it does."

Biggins: "And you want it to be expanded to include those convicted of domestic battery. Do you think there is any other crime that should also be tie into to being precluded from getting a FOID card?"

Blagojevich: "The only two crimes that are enunciated in this legislation is a conviction for domestic battery, and a conviction for the Class A misdemeanor of violation of an order of protection, only those two."

Biggins: "Could you define domestic battery by my family, do you mean what is family?"

Blagojevich: "Family means a spouse, means a child, means anybody living in the household."

Biggins: "Does it include step children?"

Blagojevich: "Yes."

141st Legislative Day

June 2, 1994

Biggins: "Cousins?"

Blagojevich: "If they live in household, I believe it would, yes."

Biggins: "If they live within the household?"

Blagojevich: "Right."

Biggins: "How long would they be prohibited from having a FOID card?"

Blagojevich: "Forever."

Biggins: "Is that a bit extreme?"

Blagojevich: "No. Because the rational is the same as for a convicted felon. Consider these alternatives, on the one hand you have somebody who is convicted of felony theft for stealing something in excess value which might be they have shown no violent propensities, they have shown no dangerous tendencies. The other hand you've got convicted of ...convicted of domestic battery whether it be a man beating a woman or a Lorena Bobbitt situation if she were convicted, doing that to a man. then the question is, which one really is more likely to do violent harm with a firearm? I would submit to you that that Class A misdemeanor domestic battery gives us rise to think that person would be more prone to commit a violent act with a firearm, than that felon who commits an act of theft in excess of \$500 or \$600 whatever the law is. So  $\,$  I would say it's not extreme at all."

Biggins: "Would a hit and run driver who killed another person still be able to get a FOID card though?"

Blagojevich: "That's wreckless homicide, that's a felony, that person could not get a FOID card."

Biggins: "But the felony does not include just the use of firearms? It states that just firearms used in the felony."

141st Legislative Day

- June 2, 1994
- Blagojevich: "No. Any convicted felon...any convicted felon regardless of the felony cannot have a firearm, whether a firearm is used or not."
- Biggins: "To expand the use of unlawful use of weapons by felons to include persons convicted of domestic battery, or a violation of an order or protection that stems from the similar offense of another jurisdiction. That doesn't include hit and run drivers, they can still go get a FOID card."
- Blagojevich: "If a hit...if you're saying that a hit and run driver is somebody who is convicted of a felony of reckless homicide, then it is concluded already by the law. If it's a misdemeanor hit and run driver, then it does not include them and that person can still get a FOID card."
- Biggins: "Are there any other crimes you think should be expanded to include...preclude anyone from getting a FOID card?"
- Blagojevich: "No. I would say that these two pretty much cover the...the spectrum. And the rational again is, you look at the FBI statistics that say 4,000 women in the United States last year were killed by their domestic partners, their spouses, their lovers, their boyfriends and so forth. Seventy percent of them, 70% of those 4,000 were killed by somebody using a firearm and when I look at statistics like that it seems to me very reasonable to try and take those firearms away from those people."
- Biggins: "Now crime, misdemeanor of any sort are not included in this?"
- Blagojevich: "Right. The only two misdemeanor are these two domestic violence type misdemeanor."
- Biggins: "Are there any misdemeanor that you'd consider not serious? I mean a minor drug possession is a misdemeanor,
  I believe isn't it? A first time possession, is that a

141st Legislative Day

June 2, 1994

minor crime to you?"

- Blagojevich: "What was your question?"
- Biggins: "What's a misdemeanor...what crimes of misdemeanor do you think are not important enough to be included in this Bill? Like drug possession..."
- Blagojevich: "No I think there...I think they are all in varying degrees of seriousness and varying degrees of potential danger later. I for example, would not think that somebody who is convicted, necessarily of marijuana, whether they inhaled or not, should necessarily lose their firearm. But I do think that anybody who's convicted of domestic battery, that says to me that there is a violent person there who commits an act of violence, interestingly enough, on the person that he or she ought to be closest to, somebody who lives in their household. When they show those danger propensities, that to me is a red flag that says, we're looking at violence that person shouldn't have a qun."
- Biggins: "But if a person is in possession of marijuana, you're saying it's all right for them even though they were convicted of being in possession of marijuana to go get a FOID card."
- Blagojevich: "I'm not necessarily saying it's all right, but I'm necessarily saying they shouldn't get one either. I'm not making a judgment on that one way or the other."
- Biggins: "Thank you. To the Bill. I just think it's not tight enough in its drafting, it excludes too much, and includes perhaps too much and I'd urge a 'no' vote."
- Speaker Flowers: "Representative Wennlund, on the Bill."
- Wennlund: "Thank you, Madame Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. You know what's really scary, what is really scary is that there are some Members on this House Floor,

141st Legislative Day

June 2, 1994

including the Sponsor of this Bill, and as much respect as have for the Honorable Kurt Granberg that some Members. it's really scary that some Members actually believe that House Bill or any House Bill will actually get to the Governor's desk. Now that's what's scary about this whole and this whole procedures. Some Members actually believe that they're doing the work of the people when they know damn well that this Bill is dead, as are all other House Bills. Now the Senate sent over a budget, they sent over a Medicaid plan, that's what the people's business is and that's what we should be doing. If there is any doubt about those Senate Bills there is no doubt about this Bill is dead. And it is an insult to everybody's intelligence. including the 97,000 people in your district to be calling House Bills and debating House Bills that are totally dead, totally a waste of time. Let's get down to the business of the people, adopt a budget, solve the medicaid and go home,"

Speaker Flowers: "Representative Stephens, on the Bill."

Stephens: "Well, actually on a related matter. You know that...that appropriations notice that I got yesterday from May 14, 1976. We were suppose to meet Thursday morning, so I went there and the Republican Bills were still not printed. What do you have to say for yourself?"

Speaker Flowers: "Thank you, Representative Stephens. Representative Tom Johnson."

Johnson, Tom: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Flowers: "He indicates that he will."

Johnson, Tom: "I agree of course, with the rest of my colleagues on this side of the aisle. But this Bill is an absolute waste of our time at this point and as Representative Skinner so aptly put it last week these are Peter Pan Bills

141st Legislative Day

June 2, 1994

they're going somewhere, okay, they're just out there. But aside from the politics, Representative, I've got a couple question for you. This taking of the weapons, it's really two things, is it not? One is that if you are convicted you cannot be issued a FOID card and the other aspect of this, is that if you have a restraining order and if you have the weapons they can be taken from you, is that correct?"

Blagojevich: "Representative Johnson, let me just address all of what you said and I appreciate the opportunity you gave me to respond."

Johnson, Tom: "I thought you would, I gave you that opening."

Blagojevich: "Yes. Because I'm dying to respond."

Johnson, Tom: "I'd get it over with now, so we can respond, but go ahead."

Blagojevich: "The first part of your question was trying to get a piece of legislation out of the House that you guys, Representative Wennlund, Representative Black and yourself correctly assume may not go anywhere in the Senate. But I would submit to you and your colleagues on the Republican side of the aisle, that to paraphrase President Lincoln before the Civil War emerged, and he had an issue with the South and the North and he said, 'in your fellow...in your hands my fellow country...countrymen lies the issue of war and peace" not in mine.' I would submit that the issue really shouldn't be addressed to me but it ought to be addressed to the Senate President, Pate Philip, because we could pass this Bill in the Senate if the Senate President would simply call my Bill. Now there are no great competing interests in state government that would be against this legislation. This isn't between lawyers and doctors, insurance companies and lawyers, it's not about

141st Legislative Day

June 2, 1994

business and labor. It is a very simple thing it says: we extend what felonies...what the law is with felonies to two misdemeanor domestic violence type crimes because there's a need and an urgency to do it because the FBI says: 4.000 women last year died and 70% were killed by the use of firearms. If the present President of the Senate wants this Bill to be law he can pass it, and I would urge not only a 'yes' vote on this but I would also urge that we all call the Senate President or whoever runs the show there ask them to call this Bill and let's have a hearing on and it. And let's get it done in this Session. believe it's over, and I think we have a chance to do it. And what was it Bobby Kennedy used to say, 'some men see things as they are and ask why, I dream things that never were and never ask why not'."

Johnson, Tom: "All I wanted was an answer to the question, Representative. Representative."

Blagojevich: "Why not call that Bill in the Senate?"

Johnson, Tom: "I'm still waiting for an answer to the question, as it relates to the two issues, FOID cards and taking away of the guns."

Blagojevich: "No."

Johnson, Tom: "Are you running for Congress? Somebody just told me you were running for Congress."

Blagojevich: "No. I heard that rumor myself last week."

Johnson, Tom: "Oh. Okay."

Blagojevich: "No, I'm running to pass this Bill and I would like to see some real enacting of laws and of course it goes to the next chamber. In answer to your question."

Johnson, Tom: "Yes."

Blagojevich: "Order of protections are not at issue in this piece of legislation. It requires a conviction, it requires

# 141st Legislative Day

June 2, 1994

proof beyond a reasonable doubt. The issue of an order of protection was an issue that was raised on Andrea Moore's Bill which passed out of here, and it was an Amendment on my Bill. I support her concept, but there may be some constitutional problems with that. This one says, only after conviction."

Johnson, Tom: "Okay. And after conviction, what happens? When you...the person is to turn their guns in, is that correct?"

Blagojevich: "What was that, Representative Johnson?"

Johnson, Tom: "After a conviction, okay? Is it just the non issuance of a FOID card that would come into play on your Bill, not the actual taking of any weapons that might be in that person's possession?"

Blagojevich: "You would lose the FOID card, you could not apply for the FOID card, you would be encouraged like an felon to come in and turn your firearm in. You would also, if there was probable cause to think that you violated a law, be subject to an arrest or search warrant that would then allow law enforcement to enforce the law if the local law enforcement thought that was necessary."

Johnson, Tom: "Okay. So as I recall, the thrust of your Bill is limited strictly really to the FOID card and the losing of the FOID card and not being able to obtain a subsequent one, correct?"

Blagojevich: "As a practical matter, that's probably what will happen in most instances. However, those who are convicted of this, by law, are required to turn their weapons in, and if they don't do that, they are violating the law. And it is certainly possible that a local law enforcement agency would seek an...if they had probable cause to believe that that person had a weapon in their possession they would

141st Legislative Day

June 2, 1994

have a right to go out and be able to..."

Johnson, Tom: "Get a search warrant, correct?"

Blagojevich: "Right."

Johnson, Tom: "And go in and take it. But we have no way of knowing how many weapons that individual might have or anything else, right?"

Blagojevich: "Absent that, right."

Johnson, Tom: "Okay. Now is this a gender neutral Bill, does this relate to if my spouse..."

Blagojevich: "Absolutely. It's gender neutral."

Johnson, Tom: "All right. I just wanted to be sure of that."

Blagojevich: "It is gender, absolutely."

Johnson, Tom: "Okay. To the Bill. Again this Bill is about as I...the best I can calculate it is now some month late being called and being debated on this Floor. I believe that it's a good Bill, I believed it was a good Bill when I saw it in committee. I'm going to support this Bill as it takes off into the upper regions of this House and I will suggest to the Representative who has sponsored it that we have to be concerned about the time schedules in this House, not be concerned with the other House. It you're side of the aisle that controls this House and what is heard and what is not heard, whether it is timely or Obviously we had a number of Bills that we felt would merit at least some debate on this Floor, they never were debated and of course they are in never land, they have been in never land and now your Bill is going to never land and we have wasted another 20 minutes on this. So thank you, Representative."

Speaker Flowers: "Representative Laurino."

Laurino: "Well, thank you, Madame Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. As a Co-Sponsor in favor of this legislation

141st Legislative Day

June 2, 1994

I move the previous question."

Flowers: "The Gentleman has move Speaker for the previous question. The question is, 'Whether or not the main be put?' All those in favor say 'aye'; question shall 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Representative Blagojevich, to close."

Blagojevich: "Again I think the merits are very clear and the substance of the Bill is very clear, and the question is do we allow people who are convicted of domestic battery and violation of order of protection to have guns, or do we not? And the issue of whether or not we are actually going to enact a law is out of our hands to a certain extent. I don't believe legislating means only that we pass Bills out of one chamber and then just let them go. don't believe it's just enough to pass some more paper over that chamber. I also believe that we can do more than that and if we call our Senators, if we call our President, if we get people to call them, if we write editorials encouraging the Senate to act legislation now, these deadlines are not necessarily fixed in stone and the Senate can change deadlines for some legislation. And I just happen to think and frankly, I can't let myself think otherwise, that this process at this stage still might mean something. And so I'm not going to give up thinking that if we pass a Bill out of here that it dead in the Senate. I refuse to believe that, and so I am committed to work for the rest of this Session to Pate Philip tries to call this Bill and I would encourage everybody who is a 'yes' vote this to on likewise. And if enough of them, make enough noise, he might hear us and the people in the Senate might act this and we could have this Bill on the Governor's desk and

## 141st Legislative Day

June 2, 1994

I would like to see the Governor enact this in law. So I am not giving up, I think there is great hope, we got to take one step at a time, the old Chinese proverb, the journey of a thousand miles begins with one step, this is the first step, we go after that to the Senate and we should do our lobbying over there too. So I would appreciate two things, a 'yes' vote and then a lobbying of the Senate. Thank you."

Speaker Flowers: "The Gentleman move for the passage of House Bill 2542. All those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. The voting is now open. Representative Krause, you have one minute to explain your vote."

Krause: "Thank you, Speaker. First of all on the Amendment, I do support it. But I do want to use my time in order to register a strong objection to the insensitivity here of bringing up a House Bill which was dead in has been for a number of weeks. I do believe that it is an abuse of the process by the other side of the aisle to use this time when we ought to be addressing Senate Bills, the budget, and the medicaid manage care reform to bring back a Bill that could have been heard weeks ago and I think that it is a shame that it was used on this Bill. It is an abuse of the legal process, it steps on the rules of this General Assembly, on the procedure of the General Assembly, and it makes a mockery of everything that we are doing down here and I think that it is unfortunate to have used it on this Bill."

Speaker Flowers: "Representative Lindner you have one minute to explain your vote."

Lindner: "Thank you, Madame Chairman. I agree with the previous

Speaker that according to the rules we shouldn't be

considering this Bill, but I did have a very pertinent

141st Legislative Day

June 2, 1994

question. You have a violation of an order of protection that there would be the FOID card removed, and that troubles me because of violation could be hanging around the school, not going to counseling, being near the house, any number of things that we mark that you are not suppose to do when you have an order of protection. And I think those violations are to...are not serious enough to warrant taking the FOID card away and that's why I'm voting 'present'."

- Speaker Flowers: "Representative Hawkins, you have one minute to explain your vote."
- Hawkins: "Madame Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. One of the most serious problems we have in the United States today is domestic violence. If you don't think this legislation won't save lives all you have to do is look at the amount of murders that have been committed in the State of Illinois where the person that committed the murder had previously been convicted of a domestic dispute. This legislation will save lives."
- Speaker Flowers: "Representative Black, you have one minute to explain your vote."
- Black: "Thank you very much, Madame Speaker. My name was used in debate and I do agree with one thing the Sponsor said. I...the issue may be not the rules are written in stone, that is obvious, you guys have changed the rule six times since we've been here. The issue is very simple, there are four House Bills on Senate Concurrence Calendar, four House Bills, two of these Bills are Sponsored by Democrats, two of these Bills are Sponsored by Republicans. Now, you've got all the crime packages you would want in these four House Bills that the Senate has already passed and sent over. Why don't we get on with the items on the Calendar

# 141st Legislative Day

June 2, 1994

that can, and will, and may end up on the Governor's desk? Why do we have to go back to House Bills? We all agreed on the deadline, didn't we, May 27, you've changed it six times. We have the things on the Concurrence Calendar that would should be dealing with, two of them Sponsored by Democrats, two of them Sponsored by Republicans. Let's get on with the business at hand."

- Speaker Flowers: "Representative Tenhouse you have one minute to explain your vote."
- Tenhouse: "Thank you, Madame Speaker. It comes back to the same thing this Bill had to say here that the whole problem is, we've been over a month. As we look this...these Bills are dead. We might as well call these the coroner's Bills, we might as well call someone in to do an inspection. I mean all we're doing is rehashing something that is absolutely going nowhere, and in fairness to this Sponsor I understand his well meaning as far as this legislation is concerned. But it is absolutely asinine for us to be wasting time of the taxpayers of the State of Illinois at this particular juncture."
- Speaker Flowers: "Representative Hawkins you have 30 seconds to complete your one minute comment."
- Hawkins: "Thank you, Madame Speaker. I would just like to tell the other side of the aisle that I am tired of them crying about not being able to get their Bills called. I have been elected, just like anybody else here, every single piece of my legislation that is passed by unanimous vote in the House has been killed in the Senate."
- Speaker Flowers: "Excuse me, Representative Hawkins.

  Representative Skinner, for what reason do you rise?"
- Skinner: "I rise to an Animal Farm point of order, Madame Chairman. You've read Animal Farm by George Orwell? In

141st Legislative Day

June 2, 1994

which some animals had...most animals had to walk on four legs but some got to walk on two legs. Hasn't the Gentleman spoken in debate already?"

Speaker Flowers: "Representative Skinner, I specially said that he had 30 seconds because when he was given his one minute he was cut short."

Skinner: "Oh."

Speaker Flowers: "So I was giving him his other 30 seconds."

Skinner: "Well, I apologize then. Withdraw my animal farm and..."

Speaker Flowers: "Thank you very much, Representative Skinner.

Representative Hawkins, will you please, you have five more seconds, Representative Hawkins."

Hawkins: "I would like a point of personal privilege. He responded...he Representative Skinner...Representative Skinner addressed me so get a chance to respond. I simply want to say that we heard on this issue right here, we've been talking about this Bill not being able to be passed."

Speaker Flowers: "Representative Hawkins, would you please bring your remarks to a close?"

Hawkins: "I just simply..."

Speaker Flowers: "Thank you, Representative Hawkins.

Representative Mulligan...Representative Mulligan, one minute to explain your vote."

Mulligan: "Thank you, Madame Speaker. I rise to support the concept of the Bill. I think it is a very good Bill, it's too bad that it wasn't called sooner. I think now, what is left is to call a Bill that has a good concept that leaves a lot of people with political posturing which is unfortunate. I do think that it was a good concept, there were many good things on this Bill. I'm sorry it wasn't called earlier many of us have had our Bills fall by the

141st Legislative Day

June 2, 1994

wayside, but where the Sponsor did lose me on this, is I will not go to Pate Philip and beg for him to hear this Bill. I think that's wrong, I think we should of had the Bill out of here and there probably similar Bills that have many things and many good concepts that will get out, and perhaps Representative Blagojevich will be back next year to Sponsor this similar Bill and I will be more than happy to Co-Sponsor it with him."

Speaker Flowers: "Representative Olson, you have one minute to explain your vote."

Olson: "Thank you, Madame Speaker. Madame Speaker, I have counted the pages in the Calendar of House Bills on Second Reading, there are 33 pages, roughly 500 Bills. That. we're going to go back and dig them out of the woodwork when they're dead, why don't you just start on page number on the Calendar and go through those 500 Bills. This is ridiculous, the Floor Leader on the other side said Representative had the right to have his Bill called, he represented 97,000 people. There are 51 of us over here that each represent that many people, and we went according to the media 14 days and couldn't get a Bill called. Let's just put a little honesty and fairness into the system. that is very simple, very simple. Just a little fair in the system, this is bordering on ridiculous. I don't know how you can stand up there or sit up there and be a of a program that is just...good God if you want to dictator move over into Sedam Husseim's territory."

Speaker Flowers: "Point well taken, Representative Olson.

Representative Andrea Moore, you have one minute to explain
your vote."

Moore, A.: "Thank you, Madame Speaker. I wanted to talk just for a minute about this dead Bill because it does have my name

# 141st Legislative Day

June 2, 1994

on it and I wanted to point out and clarify that it's not the same dead Bill as my dead Bill that passed. And my dead Bill that passed was put on Giglio's Bill which I hear is also dead over in the Senate. So we have three dead Bills about this subject. Nevertheless, the subject is an important one, and for those that like to go on record, even if they are dead Bills, my dead Bill was a little better than your dead Bill, but what you've got is a good dead Bill and I was happy to put a green vote on that good dead Bill."

Speaker Flowers: "Representative Biggins, you have one minute to explain your vote."

Biggins: "Thank you, Madame Speaker. I don't really have to explain my vote but I have noticed that the Speaker has not voted yet on...Mr. Speaker has not voted on this measure yet. Is there a mistake here or is the Speaker absent from the Capitol? He knows...he knows it's a worthless piece of legislation, he's decided to leave town apparently or he's not voting. Could you explain where Mr. Speaker is?"

Speaker Flowers: "Representative Biggins your point is well taken. Thank you very much. Have all voted? Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk, shall take the record. On this question, there are 87 voting 'aye', voting 'no'. This Bill, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of Third Reading, State and Local Government, we have Representative Schoenberg, on Senate Bill 1159. Mr. Clerk, Representative Schoenberg would like to have leave to bring this Bill back to second for the purpose...Does Gentleman have leave? The Gentleman move to have the Bill brought back to second for the purpose of an Amendment. Does the Gentleman...All those in favor say 'aye'; opposed,

141st Legislative Day

- June 2, 1994
- 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. All those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Representative Kaszak would like to be recorded as voting 'aye'. Representative Schoenberg."
- Schoenberg: "Thank you, Madam Speaker and Ladies and Gentleman of the House. As you can see by looking at the board. This has to do with HAM and radios and licenses. And since I find HAM to be un kosher I think we need to make some changes in this, and that is why I am asking the indulgence of all the Members to turn this back to Second, and I hope you will oblige me."
- Speaker Flowers: "Representative Turner, for what reason do you rise?"
- Turner: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Since we were talking about cows earlier. I thought it was appropriate for the pork producers that we at least allow this younge man a chance to do something for HAMS, and so I rise in support of bringing this back to second."
- Speaker Flowers: "Representative Skinner, for what reason do you rise?"
- Skinner: "The Sponsor of the Bill is clearly out of order, he used a religious reference in debate."
- Speaker Flowers: "Representative Black."
- Black: "Yes, an inquiry of the Chair, Madam Speaker. How many votes does the Gentleman need to get his Bill recalled for Second Reading?"
- Speaker Flowers: "60 votes."
- Black: "Oh, thank you. Should it get 60 votes, I'll request a
   verification of the affirmative."
- Speaker Flowers: "Thank you. Clerk take the record. This Bill, 62 voting 'ayes', 52 voting 'no'. This Bill having received the...the Motion is adopted, and the Bill is brought back to second. Mr. Clerk. Mr. Clerk what is the

141st Legislative Day

- June 2, 1994
- status of this Bill? Representative Black, would you still like to have your verification?"
- Black: "Yes, I would Madam Speaker."
- Speaker Flowers: "Mr. Clerk, would you please poll those not
   voting."
- Clerk McLEnnand: "There are no Members not voting."
- Speaker Flowers: "Mr. Clerk would you please poll the affirmative."
- Clerk McLennand: "Those voting in the affirmative, Representatives Balanoff. Blagojevich. Brunsvold. Bugielski. Burke. Capparelli. Curran. Currie. Davis. Deering. DeJaegher. Dunn. Edley. Erwin. Flinn. Flowers. Frias. Gash. Gialio. Giles. Giolitto. Granberg. Hanniq. Hartke. Hawkins. Hicks. Hoffman. Homer. Lou Jones. Kaszak. Kotlarz. Lang. Levin. Martinez. Mautino. McAfee. McGuire. McPike. Moore. Moselev. Harold Murphy. Novak. Ostenburg. Phelan. Phelps. Prussing. Pugh. Ronen. Rotello. Santiago. Schakowsky. Saltsman. Schoenberg. Sheehy. Stroger. Turner. von Bergen-Wessels. Woolard Steczo. and Representative Younge."
- Speaker Flowers: "Mr. Black, questions of the affirmative please?"
- Black: "Yes, thank you very much, Madam Speaker. Representative Flinn?"
- Speaker Flowers: "Pardon me Mr. Clerk. Representative Flinn.

  Representative Flinn, Monroe Flinn. How is the Gentleman voting Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk McLennand: "He is voting in the affirmative."
- Speaker Flowers: "Remove him. Representative Wyvetter Younge would like to have leave to be verified, does she had leave Representative Black. No, she does not have leave?"

141st Legislative Day

June 2, 1994

Black: "No, that's all right."

Speaker Flowers: "She does have leave, thank you Representative Black."

Black: "Representative Dunn?"

Speaker Flowers: "Representatiave Dunn. Representative Dunn.

Mr. Clerk how is the Gentleman voting?"

Clerk McLennand: "He is voting in the affirmative."

Speaker Flowers: "Remove him, Mr. Clerk. Representative Novak for what reason

do you rise?"

Novak: "Yes, Madam Speaker. I would like to welcome
Representative Kurt Granberg, to the Illinois House of
Representative. Representative Granberg do you want to
stand up please..."

Black: "Representative Granberg?"

Speaker Flowers: "Representative Granberg."

Black: "I don't think that he is in the chamber?"

Speaker Flowers: "Representative Black, Representative Dunn has returned and we would like to restore him back to the roll, as voting 'aye'."

Black: "Madam Speaker, is Representative Granberg..."

Speaker Flowers: "He is in the chamber, Sir, yes."

Black: "Is he in the gallery on official business?"

Speaker Flowers: "Mr. Clerk, remove Representative Granberg."

Black: "Oh, I would never do that. I see him up there, I am not sure what he is doing up there. Representative, there is a phone call for you in the Speakers Office, it's from Mary."

Speaker Flowers: "Representative Black, are you withdrawing your verification?"

Black: "I will withdraw Representative Granberg, I am sure he is
 on official business. Is Representative...."

141st Legislative Day

- June 2, 1994
- Speaker Flowers: "Mr. Clerk, please restore Representative Granberg. Thank you."
- Black: "Yes, thank you Madam Speaker. Representative Phelps?"
- Speaker Flowers: "Representative Phelps, he is in the center aisle."
- Black: "Oh, there he is. If he would just get in his seat it
   would be so much easier. Representative, DeJaegher?"
- Speaker Flowers: "Representative DeJaegher is sitting in his seat."
- Black: "I couldn't see, Representative Schakowsky's hairdo was in the road. Representative Phelan? Representative Phelan?"
- Speaker Flowers: "Representative Phelan is also in his seat."
- Black: "Where? Oh, there he is. I get him confused with Burke all the time."
- Speaker Flowers: "Representative Davis, would like to have leave, to be verified, does she have leave?"
- Black: "Well, since she was voting 'no', for a while, until somebody twisted her arm, and I see now she is voting yes.

  Yes, I suppose. That's okay."
- Speaker Flowers: "Representative Davis, you have leave."
- Black: "Representative Mautino?"
- Speaker Flowers: "Representative Mautino. The Gentleman is in the rear of the chamber, he is on the Republican side of the chamber, to be exact."
- Black: "And a welcome addition he is I might add. Is...I see him over there, he's his chair turned around. Is Representative Santiago in his chair or his he just turned around?"
- Flowers: "Representative Santiago is in his chair, Representative Black."
- Black: "Representative...it is very hard to see over there, is

  Rotello, is Representative Rotello over there?"

141st Legislative Day

June 2, 1994

Speaker Flowers: "Representative Rotello is in the center aisle."

Black: "He isn't in his seat either. Representative Lopez?"

Speaker Flowers: "Representative Lopez. Representative Lopez.

Mr. Clerk how is the Gentleman voting?"

Clerk McLennand: "Voting in the affirmative."

Speaker Flowers: "Please remove him."

Black: "Thank you, Representative Capparelli?"

Speaker Flowers: "Representative Capparelli. Mr. Clerk how is the Gentleman voting?"

Clerk McLennand: "Voting in the affirmative."

Speaker Flowers: "Please remove him."

- Black: "The Gentleman that represents a town south of here,
  Alton, is he, oh, there he is. I see him, okay.

  Representative Kaszak, on our side of the aisle. Nothing
  further, you can take the Roll, now."
- Speaker Flowers: "Mr. Clerk, please return Representative Lopez back to the Roll. Take the record Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 60 voting 'aye', 52 voting 'no'. The Motions carried, is adopted. Mr. Clerk, would you please bring the Bill back to Second Reading. And what is the status of the Bill?"
- Clerk McLennand: "House Bill, Senate Bill 1159 has been read a second time previously. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee. Floor Amendments #2 and 3 have been adopted."
- Speaker Flowers: "Mr. Clerk, please leave the Bill on Second Reading. On the Order of Motions, we have House Resolution 2831, Representative Turner. Read the Motion, Mr. Clerk. Representative Turner."
- Turner: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Pursuant to Rule 77(a) I move to discharge the committee on Health Care and Human Services, from further consideration advanced to the Speakers Table House Resolution 2831."

141st Legislative Day

June 2, 1994

Speaker Flowers: "The Gentleman has moved to discharge House Resolution 2831. On that is there any discussion? Representative Skinner, on the Motion."

Skinner: "Yes, has the Resolution been printed and distributed?

I cann't seem to find it."

Speaker Flowers: "Mr. Clerk, what is status of this Resolution?

Representative Skinner, the Motion is on the Calendar."

Skinner: "Well, it's traditional to be able to read a Resolution if we're going to be considering it. I mean perhaps the Sponsor would explain the content in detail."

Speaker Flowers: "Representative Turner, on the Motion."

Turner: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Do I have leave to bring it back to the Body?"

Speaker Flowers: "The Gentleman has leave."

Turner: "On the Resolution. House Resolution 2831, creates an Early Childhood Education and Care Program here in the state. It would be a work group, that would..."

Speaker Flowers: "Excuse me. Excuse me. Representative Black, for what reason do you rise? Representative Black."

Black: "Yes, I have an inquiry of the Chair. How many votes does
 it take to discharge committee?"

Speaker Flowers: "Sixty."

Black: "Your right, it is on the Calendar."

Speaker Flowers: "That is correct."

Black: "What order of business are we on right now? Asking questions about the Motion to discharge or asking questions about Resolutions?"

Speaker Flowers: "We are on the Motion to discharge."

Black: "Okay, could I ask the Sponsor of the Motion a question,
 if he would yield?"

Speaker Flowers: "He indicates that he will yield."

Black: "Okay, thank you. Representative, is there a reason the

141st Legislative Day

June 2, 1994

Resolution was not reported out of committee. I guess what I am asking you, was it voted on and failed, or was it never called?"

Turner: "No, Representative it was never called."

Black: "Okay, thank you."

Speaker Flowers: "Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Could the Gentleman direct to the page in the digest where this House Resolution is listed. My digest only goes up 2658."

Speaker Flowers: "Representative Turner."

Turner: "What is the date of your digest?"

Skinner: "This one is May 13th."

Turner: "That may explain it. Today is June 2nd."

Skinner: "Well, I am still looking as to a clue as to the content."

Turner: "Representative I can share with you a copy of the Resolution. If we could just get leave to consider it.

You can vote 'yea' or 'nay' on the Resolution."

Skinner: "Well, Representative we have just brought a Bill back from Third Reading to Second Reading, not even having a clue as to what Amendments going to be put on it. And this is that stage in the Session where it is good to know, what is going to happen to Resolutions and Bills, before they come back."

Turner: "You don't have a copy of the Resolution?"

Skinner: "No."

Turner: "If I could, I will get a page to bring this over to you.

Take a quick look. One of our tech review specialists..."

Skinner: "Oh, finally a use for them."

Turner: "To enlighten you on this Resolution. It's an Early Childhood Education Resolution, Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "I am glad to know that your page's have gone through

141st Legislative Day

June 2, 1994

law school, it seems an appropriate use of law school."

Turner: "I correct that, he is our technician, our tech review specialist."

Skinner: "Yes, one of the nomes in the basement."

Turner: "Paiges were busy getting lunch for you. Do you want him to explain it to you Representative."

Skinner: "Well, it would give him a use in the process."

Turner: "It is a bipartisan Resolution..."

Skinner: "This says a work group should be created. Is that, is work group a word that means committee?"

Turner: "Representative, it's defined later in the Resolution, on page..."

Skinner: "It says it's going to have culturally diverse representation, I guess that means there will be some conservative Afro-American on it."

Turner: "That is right. On page three, lines one through lines 20, or 24 pretty much explains the work group. That work group would include Members of the General Assembly."

Skinner: "Four Members of the General Assembly."

Turner: "Four Members of the General Assembly, one appointed by each of the four Legislative Leaders, one Representative from the Governors office, a Representative from each of the following departments: the Department of Children and Family Services, the Department of Public Aid, the Department of Commerce and Community Affairs, the State Board of Education, Illinois Department of Public Health, the Department of Mental Health and Disabilities, the Department of Alcohol and Substance Abuse, the Department of Rehab Services, 15 people appointed by the Governor, two of them..."

Skinner: "If I could interrupt just a moment, for a moment."

Speaker Flowers: "Excuse me, Representative Skinner, excuse me,

141st Legislative Day

June 2, 1994

Representative Skinner, Representative Skinner we are on the Motion, not the Resolution. Just for clarity, we are on the Motion, for discharge."

Skinner: "Well, the Motion is defective on page three, there's no, C, it goes A, B, D. Now perhaps the technical staff didn't catch that."

Speaker Flowers: "Representative Turner."

Turner: "On line four Representative, I believe I see a C, right after the Governors Office."

Skinner: "Oh, thank you. Thank you, it must be these glasses that I am having replaced."

Turner: "Yes, do you need a little more time, Representative?"

Skinner: "I sure would like some."

Turner: "Well, if you care to leave. We'll go ahead and debate this, and you can take a look at it."

Skinner: "Well, this looks very much like the Healthy Families

Legislation. When was this introduced? What date was it

introduced? It's not indicated on the Resolution."

Turner: "Mr. Clerk, could you inform Mr. Skinner, as to what date this Resolution was introduced?"

Clerk McLennand: "It was filed on May 4th."

Turner: "May 4th, Representative."

Skinner: "Well, LIS, according to our staff, LIS has it introduced on the 26th and if it indeed introduced on May 5th, it would then indeed be in my May 13th digest. What this appears to be, is a committee of...dominated by social workers and other liberals who are going to sit down and determine what we should do with our kids, and I don't think that's very balanced. I think that social workers are probably...well, look at the Departments that are, that are dominated by social work types. Are they working? The answer is, no they're not working? DCFS comes to mind. I

141st Legislative Day

June 2, 1994

think this is an extremely important Resolution I think it's one in which reasonable people could agree that there is a problem but I think it's one in which, with which, on which reasonable people could suggest that it should be a legislative dominated committee, not a bureaucracy and not-for-profit organization, dominated committee. Where the not-for-profit corporations can be controlled by the departments, from whom they get grants. I have a great deal of respect for the Sponsor, but this Resolution looks to me like it deserves committee consideration, so I would urge a 'no' vote and I would ask for a record roll call, and I am joined by at least four of my others, I believe, and I yield to Floor."

Speaker Flowers: "Representative Moffitt, on the question."

Moffitt: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I just rise in support of Representative Turner. We have the opportunity to get this on the Floor, so that we can have some debate the intent, I think, is very well meaning and it's...we have been symposium on success starts young on early childhood intervention, and I think it deserves consideration before this Body. So, I support Representative Turner, in having this considered before the House."

Speaker Flowers: "Representative Turner."

Turner: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I want to make, this Resolution has its bipartisan support and I would really would like to have the vote of Representative Skinner on that, and with that in mind. I'm going to give him another copy of this Resolution to take home with him tonight. And I would ask that we pull it out and that we consider this again, if I could get a commitment from the Speaker that this Resolution will be called tomorrow. Similar to the bipartisan nature that you have shown today, in your

141st Legislative Day

June 2, 1994

commitment to others Members of this Assembly, I'd ask that we pull this out of the record, and give Representative Skinner a chance to review this Amendment tonight, review this Resolution tonight, and let us consider this tomorrow, because I want him on board. I think he is a strong supporter of Early Childhood Education, he know how important it is, he was a child himself at one time, believe or not and I would like to just pull it out of the record with a commitment that you will call this Resolution tomorrow."

- Speaker Flowers: "Representative Turner, I tell you what. I think I will give you the same consideration, that we gave Representative Cowlishaw. Cann't promise you that it will be first thing. But we will consider your Motion, tomorrow. Is that fair enough. Representative Skinner?"
- Skinner: "I would like to thank the Representative, and indicate to him that he may be closer the mark than he could possibly know. Because I wasn't allowed to go to kindergarten, it wasn't required then and my parents didn't pay for it for me."
- Speaker Flowers: "Out of the record, Mr. Clerk. Representative Turner, now what?"
- Turner: "Madam Speaker I am just saying that maybe ought to let
  Representative Skinner go home, he needs a little time
  tonight, he has been working hard today."
- Speaker Flowers: "Mr. Clerk, agreed Resolutions, please."
- Clerk McLennand: "House Resolution 2860, offered by Representative Park; House Resolution 2862, offered by Representative Speaker Madigan; House Resolution 2863, offered by Representative Schoenberg; House Resolution 2864, offered by Representative Kotlarz; House Resolution 2865, offered by Representative Ackerman; House Resolution

# 141st Legislative Day

June 2, 1994

2866, offered by Representative Ackerman; House Resolution 2867, offered by Representatiave Ackerman; House Resolution 2868, offered by Representative Ackerman; House Resolution 2869, offered by Representative Weller. House Resolution 2870, offered by Representative Zickus; House 2871, offered by Representative Cowlishaw; House Resolution 2872, offered by Representative Cowlishaw; House Resolution 2873, offered by Representative Noland; House Resolution 2874. offered by Representative Maureen Murphy; House Resolution 2876, offered by Representative Maureen Murphy: House Resolution 2877, offered by Representative Granberg; Senate Joint Resolution 167, offered by Representative and Senate Joint Resolution 168, offered by Representative Hughes; Senate Joint Resolution 172, offered by Representative Tom Johnson."

- Speaker Flowers: "Representative Granberg moves for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. All those in favor 'aye'; opposed, 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. The Resolutions are adopted. Death Resolutions. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk McLennand: "House Resolution 2875, offered by Representative Daniels. With to the respect to the Memory of Anna Marie Zorger."
- Speaker Flowers: "Representative McPike, moves for the adoption of the Death Resolution. All those in favor say 'aye'; opposed, 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. The Resolution is adopted. Representative Coy Pugh, now moves that the House stands adjourned, until 11:00 a.m. tomorrow. All those in favor say, 'aye'; opposed... At ease, at ease. House now stand adjourned, until 11:00 a.m. tomorrow morning. All those in favor say, 'aye'; opposed, 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. This House has adjourned."

REPORT: TIFLDAY PAGE: 001

HOUSE ADJOURNED

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

94/10/27

13:16:37

143

PAGE

JUNE 02, 1994

HB-2542 THIRD READING	PAGE	108
SB-1159 SECOND READING	PAGE	136
SB-1159 HELD ON SECOND	PAGE	136
SB-1159 RECALLED	PAGE	131
SB-1595 SECOND READING	PAGE	8
SB-1595 OUT OF RECORD	PAGE	105
SB-1726 SECOND READING	PAGE	2
HR-2831 MOTION	PAGE	
HR-2831 OUT OF RECORD	PAGE	141
SUBJECT MATTER		
HOUSE TO ORDER - SPEAKER GIGLIO	DAGE	
	PAGE	1
PRAYER - MINISTER TODD MAGRUDER	PAGE	1
PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE	PAGE	1
ROLL CALL ATTENDANCE	PAGE	2
REPRESENTATIVE FLOWERS IN THE CHAIR	PAGE	8
MEYERS - CAROLYN CHRISWELL'S FUND	PAGE	106
AGREED RESOLUTIONS	PAGE	142
DEATH RESOLUTION	PAGE	143
HOUGE AD TOURNED	2402	