72nd Legislative Day

October 19, 1989

- Speaker Breslin: "The hour of 9...9:30 having arrived, we invite Members to be in their seats. The chaplain for today is Reverend Herb Hubbard. He is from the Calvary Baptist Church in Taylorville. He is the guest of Representative Hasara. We invite our guests in the gallery to join us for the invocation. Reverend Hubbard."
- Reverend Hubbard: "Shall we pray. Heavenly Father, we thank You so very much for this, another day that You have given to us. I thank You, Lord, for the privilege I have of being here. I thank You for these Ladies and for these Gentlemen who give of themselves so diligently in their service to this country and this state. I pray, Lord, that Your wisdom, Your guidance and leadership may be upon their lives. I pray that You might bless them and their families, provide for them in every way. And we'll thank You for what You do. For it's in Christ's Name we pray. Amen."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Ropp, would you lead us in the Pledge please."
- Ropp et al: "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the Republic for which it stands, one Nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."
- Speaker Breslin: "Roll Call for Attendance. Is there any excused absences on the Democratic side of the aisle, Representative Mati..."
- Matijevich: "...We do have an excused absence of Representative

 Terry Steczo, due to passing away of his wife. And I'm not

 sure until Coach Lucco comes back who else is excused, but

 we'll report later."
- Speaker Breslin: "Very good. Are there any excused absences on the Republican side? Representative Cowlishaw."

72nd Legislative Day

- October 19, 1989
- Cowlishaw: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Would the record please show that Representative Piel has an excused absence today because of the death of his father. Thank you."
- Speaker Breslin: "That's too bad. Representative Piel and Representative Steczo both have deaths in their family.

 Take the record, Mr. Clerk. One hundred and sixteen people answering the Roll Call, a quorum is present. Agreed Resolutions."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 894, offered by Representative Curran. 983, DeJaegher. 984, DeJaegher. 992, Zickus. 993, Flinn. 994, Ropp. 995, Mautino. 996, Phelps. Cowlishaw. 998, Stephens. 999, Krska. 1000, Matijevich. 1001, Churchill. 1003, Parke. 1004, Santiago. 1005. McGann. 1008, Phelps. 1009, Black. 1010, Black. 1011, Leitch. 1012, Giglio. 1014, Richmond. 1018, Santiago. 1019, Ronan. Additional Agreed Resolutions. Resolution 1020, Wennlund. 1021, Wennlund. 1022, Wennlund. 1023, Curran. And House Joint Resolution 76, Weller."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Matijevich on the Agreed Resolutions."
- Matijevich: "Madam Speaker, Members of the House, both sides of the aisle have examined the Resolutions and they are agreed to. I move the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman moves the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'.

 In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Agreed Resolutions are adopted. Death Resolutions."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 1017, offered by Representative Johnson, with respect to the memory of Ivan Jansen. House Resolution 1016, offered by Representative Satterthwaite, with respect to the memory of Clarence Berdahl. House Resolution 1015, offered by Representative Johnson, with

72nd Legislative Day

October 19, 1989

respect to the memory of Clarence A. Berdahl. House Resolution 1007, offered by Representative Anthony Young, with respect to the memory of Johnetta Garnes Rakestraw. House Resolution 1002, offered by Representative Parke and Hensel, with respect to the memory of John W. Borris."

- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Matijevich moves the adoption of the Death Resolutions. All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Death Resolutions are adopted. General Resolutions."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 1024, offered by Representative Woolard et al. House Resolution 1013, offered by Representative Martinez. House Resolution 1006, offered by Representative Hoffman."
- Speaker Breslin: "Committee on Assignment. Committee Report."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Committee on Rules has met and pursuant to Rule 29(c)3, the following Bills have been ruled exempt on October 18, 1989: House Bill 1131. Signed, John Matijevich, Chairman."
- Speaker Breslin: "...Members to come to the floor and be prepared to debate these Motions, especially the Sponsors. The Sponsors are Bowman, LeFlore, Preston, Wyvetter Younge, White, Pullen and Keane. So please come to the floor and be prepared to present your Motions. ... Call one more time. We're waiting for Members to come to the floor to present their Motions on Total Veto Overrides. Representative Bowman. Representative Representative Preston. Representative Younge is in her chair. Representative White. Representative Pullen. Representative Keane. Representative Bowman, we'll begin with your Bill after we make a Supplemental Calendar Announcement. Proceed, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Supplemental Calendar #1 is being distributed."

72nd Legislative Day

October 19, 1989

- Speaker Breslin: "Total Veto Motions appearing on page five on your Calendar. The first Bill, House Bill 17, Representative Bowman."
- Bowman: "Madam Speaker, I normally don't do this, but neither am
 I so foolish as to call my Motion at this hour, so may I
 ask leave to take this Bill out of the record at the
 moment?"
- Speaker Breslin: "Surely. Surely. Ladies and Gentlemen, we are prepared to do business. We have to begin if we are going to leave at a decent hour and have daylight time to travel in, especially with bad weather. So the Chair would like to move expeditiously today, so that people can travel home safely this evening. So please come to the floor so we can begin to proceed with business. ...Representative Cullerton, for what reason do you seek recognition?"
- Cullerton: "Well, Madam Speaker, I...while we're waiting, I just was wondering why it is that it seems that the Republicans are always in their seat on time, the Democrats are always late? Do you have any ideas on the subject? I think it's commendable to the Republicans to always be in their seat."

 Speaker Breslin: "It's wonderful."
- Cullerton: "I think it's...the reason for it though, probably is because they're...they generally are just more boring people who don't have anything else to do and don't stay out that late. That's one idea. But in either case, they're always here on time and the Democrats are always straggle in."
- Speaker Breslin: "And they should be complimented for it. I'm surprised the board hasn't lit up with a retort here."
- Cullerton: "No, they know it."
- Speaker Breslin: "Let's go with Total...Representative Countryman, never at a loss for words. What is your retort, Representative Countryman?"

72nd Legislative Day

October 19, 1989

Countryman: "Well obviously, we weren't out late last night like all the Democrats were, so we were able to get up this morning, exercise and when we see you out at Washington Park, we think you're becoming a Republican, Representative Cullerton. You're...you're exercising. You're looking like a yuppy and, you know, you're living like one and you're here on time today."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Countryman, are you saying the Democrats have a better time?"

Countryman: "Oh, definitely."

Speaker Breslin: "Okay. Now that we're awake, Total Veto Motions, page five on the Calendar, House Bill 17. Representative Bowman. Out of the record. House Bill 83. Representative LeFlore. Representative LeFlore. Out of the record. House Bill 247, Representative Preston. Representative Lee Preston. Out of the record. On page six on your Calendar appears House Bill 1559, Representative Younge. Out of the record. House Bill 1848, Representative White. Out of the record. House Bill 1880, Representative Pullen. Representative Pullen. Out of the record. House Bill 2484, Representative Keane. Jim Keane. Out of the record. Ladies and Gentlemen, we are waiting to do the appropriation items that appear on page seven, eight and nine on our Calendar. We would ask all appropriation staff that are involved in these Bills to come to the floor. While we wait for them to do that, I would like to go to the Order of Amendatory Veto Motions, beginning on page ten on the Calendar. The Sponsors at the beginning are Ewing, Flinn, Ropp, Cullerton, Homer and Phelps. The first Bill is House Bill 98, Representative Ewing. Out of the record. House Bill 164, Representative Clerk...just...Representative Flinn."

Flinn: "Madam Speaker, I move that the...we adopt the Governor's

72nd Legislative Day

October 19, 1989

Amendatory Veto on House Bill 164. What this Bill deals with is the income tax checkoff for aid to the homeless. The original Bill was just like all the other checkoffs where there could only be ten dollars of your rebate money checked off. And what the Governor's done in another Bill is improve that, where you can contribute any amount of money, whether it's rebate money or whether you want to add money to your tax bill and let you donate any amount of money to the homeless. And he has made a good Bill better. And it required Amendatory Veto in this, and I move for the adoption of the Amendatory Veto."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved to accept the Governor's Amendatory Veto on House Bill 164. On that question, is there any discussion? Hearing none, question is, 'Shall the House...shall this Bill pass with the Governor's Veto...Governor's Amendatory Veto?' those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. This is final passage. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 111 voting 'aye', none voting 'no'. And this Bill having received the approval of the General Assembly with 71 votes is hereby declared passed. House Bill 224, Representative Flinn. Representative Flinn."

Flinn: "Yes, Madam Speaker, I would move that we adopt the Governor's Amendatory Veto. It changes the date from 19...January 1, 1990 to January 1, 1991. And it's done because the necessity of coming up for standards for certifying solid waste technicians is not available, because the National Waste Council has not come down with the guidelines and there's not enough time for the department to issue rules between now and the first of the year. And so we...we have agreed to postpone it until

72nd Legislative Day

October 19, 1989

9...January 1, 1991. And I move to accept the Governor's Amendatory Veto."

"The Gentleman has moved Speaker Breslin: to accept Governor's Amendatory Veto on House Bill 224. On that question, is there any discussion? There being none, question is, 'Shall this Bill pass with the specific recommendations of the Governor?' All those in favor 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. is final passage. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 113 voting 'aye', none voting 'no' and none voting 'present'. This Motion has received the required Constitutional Majority, so the Motion is adopted the House accepts the Governor's specific recommendations for change. House Bill 312, Representative Ropp, Proceed, Sir."

Ropp: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. The Governor made the change in House Bill 312, which was a codification of county law. And the change that he made merely reflects the current salaries for state's attorneys in the State of Illinois, and I want to accept his changes."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved to accept the Governor's Amendatory Veto of House Bill 312. On that question, is there any discussion? Anv discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall the House accept the specific recommendations for change with respect to House Bill 312?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. This is final passage. Seventy-one votes are required for adoption of this Motion. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 112 voting 'aye', none voting 'no' and none voting 'present'. This Motion has received the required Constitutional

72nd Legislative Day

October 19, 1989

Majority, so the Motion is adopted and the House accepts the Governor's specific recommendations for change. On page eleven appears House Bill 316, Representative Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Thank you, Madam Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the My Cosponsors are Representative Cowlishaw, Williamson and Doederlein, so that in and of itself cause some suspicion. So I perhaps should explain what the Bill does and what the Governor's Amendatory Veto did. Bill amends the Illinois Aeronautics Act, which is meant to prohibit the creation of hazards which obstruct restrictive landing areas, having at least twenty based aircraft, which are located within the Regional Transportation Authority. That was intended to protect three private airports. adjacent to these airports may be developed, since they're in the rich suburban areas of DuPage County, and therefore. restrictions are needed to...on the type of buildings which will be constructed in order to avoid obstruction of flight patterns and the...perhaps the necessity of closing the airport. But in the Bill, the term restricted landing area is used and apparently this does not correctly refer to one of the three airports involved, which is a 'residential airport'. So, Representative Cowlishaw sent a letter the Governor asking him for a technical change to amend this Bill to properly include within the scope of the the three airports, which was...it was designed to apply. So the Governor's technical change certainly compliance with our Rule 46.1 and I have no objection to it, and would move to accept the Governor's specific recommendations for change..."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman..."

Cullerton: "...Be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved to accept the

72nd Legislative Day

October 19, 1989

Governor's Amendatory Veto of House Bill 316. And on question, is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall the House accept the specific recommendations for change with respect to House Bill 316?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. This is final passage. Sixty votes are required for the adoption of this Motion. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 114 voting 'aye', votina 'no' and none voting 'present'. House...this Motion has received the required Constitutional Majority, so the Motion is adopted and the House accepts the Governor's specific recommendations House Bill 418, Representative Homer. Representative Homer. Out of the record. House Bill Representative Phelps. Proceed, Representative Phelps." Phelps: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of House. Ι move to accept the Governor's recommend...specific recommendations of House Bill 421 in the fact that. this...this Bill dealt with the

establishment of a rural health center and the only thing

twenty-eight through thirty-four on page three was to

to substitute in

So I accept

wanted

Governor

that."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved to accept the Governor's specific recommendations for change in House Bill 421. On that question, is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall the House accept the specific recommendations for change with respect to House Bill 421?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Seventy—one votes are required for this Motion to be adopted. Have all voted who

insert transportation, delete those lines.

72nd Legislative Day

October 19, 1989

wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 115 voting 'aye', none voting 'no' and none voting 'present'. This Motion has received the required Constitutional Majority, so the Motion is adopted and the House accepts the Governor's specific recommendations for change. House Bill 470, Representative McCracken. Proceed."

McCracken: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I move to accept the Governor's specific recommendations for change. This makes all effective dates in the Bill the same, January 1, 1990; except tendency by the entirety which was to be effective and still is to be effective October 1, 1990. I move that the House accept the Governor's specific recommendations for change."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved to accept the Amendatory Veto of the Governor on House Bill 470. On that is there any discussion? There being none, the question, question is, 'Shall the House accept the specific recommendations for change with respect to House Bill 470?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Seventy-one votes are required for the adoption of this Motion. Have all voted who wish? all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 113 voting 'aye', none voting and none voting 'present'. This Motion has received the required Constitutional Majority, so the Motion is adopted and the House accepts the Governor's specific recommendations for change. House Bill 548, Representative Brunsvold. Proceed."

Brunsvold: "Thank you, Madam Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 548 was the metropolitan compact. A provision in that Bill, Section 16, was inadvertently left there by the Reference Bureau, and I requested that the

72nd Legislative Day

October 19, 1989

Governor strike this Section. So I would move to accept the specific recommendations of the Governor."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved accept Governor's specific recommendations for change on House Bill 548. On the question, is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall the House accept spec...the specific recommendations for change with respect to House Bill 548?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Seventy-one votes are required for the acceptance of this Motion. Have voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 113...114 voting 'aye', none voting 'no' and none voting 'present'. Motion has received the required Constitutional Majority, so the Motion is adopted and the House accepts the Governor's specific recommendations for change. House Bill 642, Representative Flinn."

Flinn: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. On House Bill 642, it's the one dealing with the circuit clerk's processing fee. We changed the figure from thirty—six dollars a year to three dollars per payment. And we did not clarify the Bill well enough to keep the fee from being mixed up with the payments, and the Governor's people have done a good job of it. The fee will now have to be paid in a separate check or by cash to keep confusing it with the child support payments. And I move to accept the Governor's specific recommendations on the Amendatory Veto of House Bill 642."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved to accept the Governor's Amendatory Veto of House Bill 642. On that question, is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall the House accept the specific recommendations for change with respect to House Bill 642?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'.

72nd Legislative Day

October 19, 1989

Voting is open. Sixty votes are required for the acceptance of this Motion. Have all voted who wish? all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. this question there are 106 voting 'aye', 6 voting 'no' and voting 'present'. This Motion has received the required Constitutional Majority, so the Motion is adopted and House accepts the Governor's specific recommendations for change. House Bill 852, Representative Regan. Out of record. House Bill 1249, Representative Curran. Mr. Curran. Out of the record. House Bill 1257, Representative Balanoff. Representative Balanoff. Out...out of the record? You want this out of the record, Representative Balanoff? Representative Leverenz on the Motion."

Leverenz: "Yeah, it...it's really his Bill. My Amendment is contained in the Bill. We want to accept it because it delays the starting date. I would move that we accept the..."

Speaker Breslin: "Fine. The Gentleman moves to accept Amendatory Veto of House Bill 1257. On the question, is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall the House accept the specific recommendations change with respect to House Bill 1257?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting Sixty votes are required for the acceptance of this Motion. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 112 voting...there are one hundred and...115 voting 'aye', none voting 'no' and none voting 'present'. The Motion has received the required Constitutional Majority, so the Motion is adopted and the House accepts the Governor's specific recommendations for change. House Bill 1356, Representative Currie."

72nd Legislative Day

October 19, 1989

Currie: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Members of the House. was a Bill that created a pilot program to study disposal of waste...waste paint containers and pesticide containers. The department made a single change in that part of the Bill. He assigned lead responsibility to the Department of Agriculture rather than to the Department of Energy and Natural Resources. His change made sense, since other legislation we've put on his desk assigned comparable responsibilities in the area of pesticide containers to agriculture rather than to ENR. Secondly, the Bill provided a permitting exception exemption for certain kinds landscape waste composting operations. The Governor's second change in the Bill established the circumstances under which that exemption might be granted by the Illinois Environmental Protection Agency. I move adoption of the Governor's Amendatory changes in House Bill 1356."

Speaker Breslin: "The Lady has moved to accept the Governor's specific recommendations for change on House Bill 1356. the question, is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall the House accept the specific recommendations for change with respect to House Bill 1356?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Seventy-one votes are required for the acceptance of this Motion. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take record. On this question there are 114 voting 'aye', none voting 'no' and none voting 'present'. This Motion has received the required Constitutional Majority, so the Motion is adopted and the House accepts the Governor's specific recommendations for change. House Bill 1396, Representative Woolard."

Woolard: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. The Governor's Veto...Amendatory Veto corrected this Bill to allow those

72nd Legislative Day

October 19, 1989

volunteer fire departments who do not collect taxes to participate in this well thought out Bill. We move that we accept the Veto."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved to accept the Amendatory Veto of House Bill 1396. On the question, there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall the House accept the specific recommendations for change with respect to House Bill 1396?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Seventy-one votes are required for the adoption of this Motion. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who The Clerk will take the record. On this question wish? there are 114 voting 'aye', none voting 'no' and none voting 'present'. This Motion has received the required Constitutional Majority, so the Motion is adopted and the House accepts the Governor's specific recommendations for change. House Bill 1400, Representative Phelps."

Phelps: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 1400 established for school districts to create seniority lists for educational service personnel. The Governor recommended limiting these seniority lists to full-time educational support personnel. And I ac...move to accept those recommendations."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved to accept the Governor's Amendatory Veto of House Bill 1400. On the question, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative McNamara."

McNamara: "Will the Gentleman yield for a question?"

Speaker Breslin: "He will."

McNamara: "Thank you. I'm wondering for legislative intent, did the Governor define full-time in this?"

Phelps: "Representative McNamara, in your...as you know, the Governor signed your Bill off, which was Senate Bill 681,

72nd Legislative Day

October 19, 1989

and defined the full—time educational support personnel as those employees expected to work 600 hours or more in a calendar year. So this would be the same definition under the IMRF Fund Section to the Pension Code, so it's...it's the only Section that...of the Code that addresses your question."

McNamara: "Thank you. That clarifies it."

Speaker Breslin: "Any further discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall...I'm sorry, Representative Cowlishaw." Cowlishaw: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'm sorry, I didn't realize this was the Bill that we were discussing. I rise in opposition to this Motion because I am opposed to this Bill. We are at a time in this state's history when of all things we ought to be most cautious about causing our school districts any additional expenses that are not absolutely vital to the educational process. This Bill simply requires school districts to make additional lists for no particular purpose that has anything to do with education. Why should we be imposing still more mandates upon schools which costs them money and leave them with less money for teaching children to do things like read. I think we should oppose this Motion. Thank you."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Phelps to close."

Phelps: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I respect Representative Cowlishaw's remarks but, let me just read a little bit why I think this Bill does address the quality of education and its needs. The Governor's message said, 'These listings should be of benefit to the employee and employer, especially when reductions in force need to occur. School districts create such listings now for full-time teachers, but they're not required to do so for all personnel.' So, that's what this Bill is all about. I think it's a fair assessment. I'd appreciate your support."

72nd Legislative Day

October 19, 1989

- Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall the House accept the specific recommendations for change with respect to House Bill 1400?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Sixty votes are required to accept this Motion. The Gentle...would you turn off Representative Steczo's light, please. Sixty votes are required to accept this Motion. Have all voted Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take who wish? the record. On this question there are 72 voting 'aye', 41 voting 'no' and 1 voting 'present'. Motion...Representative Deuchler wishes to be recorded as voting 'no'. So there are 42 voting 'no'. The Motion has received the required Constitutional Majority, Motion is adopted and the House accepts the Governor's specific recommendations for change. House Bill 1400, out of the record. House Bill 1496, Representative Homer. Representative Homer. Out of the record. House Bill 1567, Representative Harris."
- Harris: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. There are two Motions I filed to. I would like to take the override Motion out of the record."
- Speaker Breslin: "Out of the record for Motion #1. Proceed with Motion #2, Representative Harris."
- Harris: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The Governor's Amendatory Veto, which I move to accept, merely delays the implementation date on this Bill and I would ask for a positive vote."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved to accept the Governor's Amendatory Veto of House Bill 1567. On that question, is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall the House accept the specific recommendations for change with respect to House Bill 1567?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed

72nd Legislative Day

October 19, 1989

vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Sixty votes are required. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 114 voting 'aye', none voting 'no' and none voting 'present'. The Motion has received the required Constitutional Majority, so the Motion is adopted and the House accepts the Governor's specific recommendations for change. House Bill 1619, Representative Keane. Proceed, Sir. With Motion #1 or Motion #2? The Gentleman..."

Keane: "...Motion #2..."

Speaker Breslin: "...Takes...okay. The Gentleman takes Motion #1 out of the record. Proceed with #2, Mr. Keane."

Keane: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I move to accept the gubernatorial action on House Bill 1619. What the Governor did was he clarified that the... that the abatement projects undertaken by schools would be governed by the AHERA and the Asbestos Abatement Act. And I agree with his changes and I would ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved to accept the Governor's Amendatory Veto of House Bill 1619. On the question, is there any discussion? There being none, the question is. 'Shall the House accept the specific recommendations for change with respect to House All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Seventy-one votes are required for the acceptance of this Motion. Oh, excuse votes are all that are required for the acceptance of the Motion. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 113 voting 'aye', none voting 'no' and none The House does accept the Governor's specific recommendations for change on House Bill 1619, and this Motion has received the required Constitutional Majority,

72nd Legislative Day

October 19, 1989

so the Motion is adopted. House Bill 1666, Representative Ryder. Proceed, Sir."

Ryder: "On this Bill, just a moment please. This Bill originally amended the Banking Act by providing for various...in a sundry it was an administrative Bill for the Department of Revenue. And the Governor made an Amendment to it that pertained to the return of checks or money orders not made payable to the Department of Revenue. Therefore, I would ask that the Governor's Amendatory Veto be accepted and so move. Thank you."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Ryder, I'm sorry. What did you decide to do on this Bill? Did you move to accept?"

Ryder: "That's correct, Madam Speaker."

Speaker Breslin: "Okay. The Gentleman has moved to accept the Governor's specific recommendations for change on House Bill 1666. Is there any discussion on that Motion? being none, the question is, 'Shall the House accept the specific recommendations for change with respect to House Bill 1666?' All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote Seventy-one votes are required to accept this 'no'. Motion. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 113 voting 'aye', none voting 'no' and none voting This Motion has received the required 'present'. Constitutional Majority, so the Motion is adopted and the House accepts the Governor's specific recommendations for change. House Bill 1819, Representative Mautino."

Mautino: "Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. I move to accept the Governor's Amendatory Veto as it pertains to House Bill 1819. House Bill 1819 originally established the...the...it amended the State Employees Group Insurance Act to provide for local government to be included, including school districts. The Governor's message

72nd Legislative Day

October 19, 1989

basically did two things. It changed the effective date, which I agreed to, because there was no effective date in the Bill and therefore would be effectively immediately. He changed that to July 1st of 1990 and that's in agreement with CMS and with me as well. It also created a separate insurance pool for local government employees and employees of rehabilitative facilities, rather than allowing those employees to participate with the state employee group, which would affect the rates and the costs of that program. I agree in total with the Governor's Amendatory Veto. I know of no opposition. CMS has agreed to it as well and I move for the adoption."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved to accept the Governor's specific recommendations for change on House Bill 1819. On that question, is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Parke."

Parke: "Yes, Representative...Mautino, I have a question about it. Is this fairly acceptable to the municipal governments now?"

Speaker Breslin: "The question before you, Representative Mautino, is, is the Bill as amended accepted to municipal governments?"

Mautino: "Yes."

Parke: "Thank you."

Speaker Breslin: "There being no further discussion, the question is, 'Shall the House accept the specific recommendations for change with respect to House Bill 1819?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Sixty votes are required for the acceptance of this Motion. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are lll voting 'aye', none voting 'no' and none voting 'present'. This Motion has received the required

72nd Legislative Day

October 19, 1989

Constitutional Majority, so the Motion is adopted and the House accepts the Governor's specific recommendations for change. Proceeding on page twelve on the Calendar under Amendatory Veto Motions appears House Bill 1863, Representative Santiago."

- Santiago: "Madam Speaker, I move to accept the Governor's

 Amendatory Veto. The Governor just suggests a revision to

 clarify the...the sentence's provisions of the original

 Bill. So I move to accept the Amendatory Veto."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman moves to accept the Amendatory Veto of House Bill 1863. On that question, is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall the House accept the specific recommendations for change with respect to House Bill 1863?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Sixty votes are required to accept this Motion. Have all who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 108 voting 'aye', none voting 'no' and 2 voting 'present'. This Motion has received the required Constitutional Majority, so the Motion is adopted and the House accepts the Governor's specific recommendations for change. House Bill 1883. Representative Regan. Proceed, Representative Regan."
- Regan: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Members of the House. I move to accept the specific recommendations of the Governor on House Bill 1883. It's strictly technical changes and the Governor's wisdom made the Bill better. I move to accept."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved to accept the Governor's Amendatory Veto of House Bill 1883. On the question, is there any discussion? There being no discussion, the question is, 'Shall the House accept the specific recommendations for change with respect to House Bill 1883?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those

72nd Legislative Day

October 19, 1989

opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Sixty votes are required to accept this Motion. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 114 voting 'aye', none voting 'no' and none voting 'present'. This Motion has received the required Constitutional Majority, so the Motion is adopted and the House accepts the Governor's specific recommendations for change. House Bill 1899, Representative Didrickson."

Didrickson: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Members of the House. I move to accept the Governor's Amendatory Veto. I think clearly his placement in the statutes is much preferable to the original language."

Speaker Breslin: "The Lady has moved to accept the Governor's specific recommendations for change with regard to House Bill 1899. On the question, is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall the House accept the Governor's specific recommendations for change with respect to House Bill 1899?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Seventy-one votes are required for the acceptance of this Motion. all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 113 voting 'aye', none voting 'no' and none voting Motion has received the required Constitutional Majority, so the Motion is adopted and the House accepts the Governor's specific recommendations for change. House 2048, out of the record. House Bill 2130. Representative Didrickson."

Didrickson: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Members of the House. I move to concur with the Governor's Amendatory Veto with regards to the date change for collection purposes. It will make for ease of depositing of funds and

72nd Legislative Day

October 19, 1989

disbursement."

Speaker Breslin: "The Lady has moved to accept the Governor's Amendatory Veto of House Bill 2130. On that question, there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall the House accept the Governor's specific recommendations for change with regard to House Bill 2130?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Sixty votes are required for the acceptance of this Motion. Have all voted who wish? all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 110 voting 'aye', none voting 'no' and 2 voting 'present'. This Motion has received the required Constitutional Majority, so the Motion is adopted the House Governor's accepts the specific recommendations for change. House Bill 2334, Representative Kulas. Proceed, Representative Kulas."

Kulas: "Well, thank you, Madam Speaker. I move that the House do accept the Governor's Amendatory Veto to House Bill 2334. There was some inconsistencies in the Bill. The Governor's Amendment changed...made the Bill consistent throughout specifying that only forcible felonies, or greater, could result in revocation of bond. It's been approved by the state's attorneys and I would move for acceptance."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved to accept the Governor's Amendatory Veto of House Bill 2334. question, is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall the House accept the specific recommendations for change with respect to House Bill 2334?' All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Seventy-one votes are required for the adoption of this Motion. Have all voted who wish? all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 108 voting 'aye', none voting 'no'

72nd Legislative Day

October 19, 1989

and 3 voting 'present'. This Motion has received the required Constitutional Majority, so the Motion is adopted and the House accepts the Governor's specific recommendations for change. House Bill 2405, out of the record. Representative Cullerton in the Chair."

- Speaker Cullerton: "On the Calendar on page twelve appears House Bill 2687, Representative LeFlore. This is a Motion to override. House Bill 2687, do you wish to proceed with that, Sir? Representative LeFlore."
- LeFlore: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to override the Governor's Amendatory Veto of 2687. This Bill required the Illinois Board of Higher Education to budget and report and monitor programs on our public colleges and university campus to improve race and ethnic relation. I feel that this particular measure is needed and unfortunately, the Governor vetoed this particular measure and I would like to get a favorable vote on this Bill."
- Speaker Cullerton: "The Gentleman has moved to override the Amendatory Veto with specific recommendations for change of the Governor notwithstanding. On that, is there any discussion? The Lady from DuPage, Representative Cowlishaw."
- Cowlishaw: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise very reluctantly to oppose this Motion because of the tremendous amount of respect I have for the Sponsor. I would remind my colleagues however, that during an interview by the editors of Newsweek on October 1st, 1962, Charles de Gaulle asked a very interesting question. His question was, 'How can you be expected to govern a nation that has two hundred and forty—six kinds of cheese?' We are faced with even more than two hundred and forty—six kinds of cheese, if we are going to begin dictating the course content for getting a baccalaureate degree in a public university in Illinois.

72nd Legislative Day

October 19, 1989

There are so many different opinions about what ought constitute a corps of curriculum. And if you are really interested in that topic, I would suggest that you read this booklet, which is called 'Fifty Hours', which was written by the chairman of the National Endowment for the Because indeed, our college curriculum needs Humanities. improvement, but doing it piecemeal is no way to go about it. The Governor has only amendatorily vetoed this Bill to say that you don't have to have a whole course in the subject of interest to the Sponsor, you simply have to have some instruction. Which would give the universities flexibility of putting that instruction into an existing course and would not mean that this General Assembly dictating the course content and requirements for baccalaureate degrees, which I submit to you, Mr. we are not qualified to do. I think we should defeat this Motion and let the Sponsor submit another Motion to accept the Amendatory Veto, and that, I think, we could all rightfully support. Thank you."

Speaker Cullerton: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Levin."

Levin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of House. As one of the Co-chairmen of the Joint Committee on Minority Access to Higher Education from which this proposal came, you will recall that we had extensive hearings around the state on this issue. And this is a critical issue of the lack of minority access to higher education. And on most issues we come in with a proposal, we discuss it, we negotiate, we come to a compromise, maybe we further compromise, and everybody is satisfied. Unfortunately, the compromise that the Governor proposes here isn't very much of a compromise at all. point, you have to draw a line and say, nothing is better

72nd Legislative Day

October 19, 1989

than a so-called compromise that does not do anything. Unfortunately, that is the case here. The Governor's Amendatory Veto leaves really nothing in this legislation. It does not provide the protections for minority access to higher education. The course pattern requirements that many, many of those who testified in our committee around the state felt we needed. So, I rise in support of the Gentleman's Motion to override the Governor's Amendatory Veto. Suggesting that there will not be a Motion to accept if this Motion fails, because the Amendatory Veto so weakens the Bill, it is not worth proceeding with the Bill. I urge adoption of the override."

Speaker Cullerton: "Further discussion? Representative LeFlore to close."

LeFlore: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. During the Spring Session, this House passed a Bill that would give the rights to teach students about the Holocaust in high schools. And I see nothing wrong with the measure that we have sent to the Governor and the Governor has vetoed, that will identify and...to assist race...teaching of race relation in...in higher education. I'm sorry and I have respect for my colleagues, (sic - colleague) Representative Cowlishaw. and I will get that book, Representative, and read it. And I can appreciate what you said, but I think now we have a problem. And this problem needs to be dealt with. And I feel that this Bill, 2687, will offer, you know, some solution to the problem that we have in our higher education system. So therefore, I'm asking everyone on this House floor to give me a favorable vote on this particular Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Cullerton: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 2687 pass, the specific recommendations for change of the Governor notwithstanding?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those

72nd Legislative Day

October 19, 1989

opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? This is an override Motion, requires seventy—one votes. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question there are sixty—six voting 'yes', 39 voting 'no', and Representative LeFlore has asked for a Poll of the Absentees."

- Clerk O'Brien: "A poll of those not voting. Barger. Capparelli.

 DeLeo. Giglio. Krska. Pullen. And Terzich. No
 further."
- Speaker Cullerton: "Representative Terzich wishes to vote 'aye'.

 Representative Capparelli wishes to vote 'aye'.

 Representative McCracken wishes to change your vote, Sir?

 What purpose do you seek recognition, Mr. McCracken?"
- McCracken: "Just to a...request a verification if it appears to get enough votes."
- Speaker Cullerton: "...I'm sorry. For a verification if it receives 71 votes? Anyone else seeking recognition? On this question there are 68 voting 'aye', 39 voting 'no'.

 And the Motion to override fails. Representative Farley, for a Motion?"
- Farley: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would ask leave of the House to have a brief Labor and Commerce meeting in Representative McPike's Office. I checked with Representative Didrickson. She agrees that now would be timely. So with leave of the House, I would ask that we could conduct that meeting."
- Speaker Cullerton: "The Gentleman asks leave to conduct a meeting of the Labor and Commerce Committee while we are in Session. Is there leave? Leave is granted and the Gentleman's Motion prevails. On the Calendar, on page twelve...yes, that requires sixty...the previous Motion requires sixty votes, so we'll grant leave by the

72nd Legislative Day

October 19, 1989

Attendance Roll Call. On page twelve, House Bill...yes, Representative McCracken."

- McCracken: "Are you referring to the Motion for the committee hearing? Okay."
- Speaker Cullerton: "...Yes. Yes, the override Motion would require a recorded vote. Right. Representative Breslin on House Bill 2048."
- Breslin: "Thank...thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen, the Governor has amendatorily vetoed this Bill, I think to make it a much better Bill. It...the suggested language codifies the language inserted in House Bill 714 and recalculates the percentages set forth in the existing motor fuel tax...tax formula. My Bill, remember, was the Bill that...that codified the language and formula...the two formulas into one formula since we passed the gas tax this past Session, we then had three formulas. He's rewritten this Bill so that he has codified and merged the three formulas now into one single formula. the formula much more workable and it is supported by the Department of Transportation as well as, I think, the majority of the public, so...and the Illinois Taxpayers Federation. So I move to accept the Governor's specific recommendations for change on House Bill 2048."
- Speaker Cullerton: "The Lady has moved for the House to accept the Governor's specific recommendations for change with respect to House Bill 2048. On that, is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall the House accept the specific recommendations for change with respect to House Bill 2048?' All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question there are 115 voting 'yes', none voting 'no' and none voting 'present'. The Motion has

72nd Legislative Day

October 19, 1989

received the required Constitutional Majority, the Motion is adopted and the House accepts the Governor's specific recommendations for change. Now we'll go back and pick up any Bills that were taken out of the record on this Order Business. Representative Ewing, House Bill 98. Is the Gentleman in the chamber? Okay. Representative Homer, It's on page eleven of the Calendar. House Bill 418. There's a Motion filed to accept the Governor's recommendations for change."

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

Speaker Cullerton: "...Mr. Homer on House Bill 418."

"Thank you, Mr. Speak...Mr. Speaker. I don't have the file in front of me, but this...this Bill was a Bill dealt with the elements of an offense where there is an enhanced penalty because of a prior conviction for a...for a...let's see here. Okay, the...Alright, let me start over The Bill...the Bill as passed gave the defendant a right to notice that the state will seek an enhanced sentence applicable after а conviction, due to a defendant's prior criminal record. The Governor proposed a definition of the words 'enhanced sentence' to reflect the intent of the higher level classification of the offense. It's a reasonable change and helps the Bill and I would urge acceptance of the Amendatory Veto."

Speaker Cullerton: "The Gentleman has moved to accept the specific recommendations for change with respect to House Bill 418. On that, is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall the House accept the specific recommendations for change with respect to House Bill 418?' All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question there are 110 voting 'yes', one voting 'no' and

72nd Legislative Day

October 19, 1989

none voting 'present'. This Motion has received the required Constitutional Majority, the Motion is adopted and the House accepts the Governor's specific recommendations for change. Representative Ewing on House Bill 98."

Ewing: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have a Motion to accept the Amendatory Veto of the Governor on House Bill 98. His changes were mostly cosmetic or all cosmetic."

Speaker Cullerton: "Could you just briefly describe what the Bill does?"

Ewing: "Sure, if you'll give me just a moment, I'll briefly do it. He changed the word 'plaintiff' to 'petitioner' throughout to conform to the current terms of the Environmental Protection Act. Also eliminates provision requiring a plaintiff to pay the cost of preparing the record when a decision of the Pollution Control Board is appealed."

Speaker Cullerton: "The Gentleman has moved for the House to accept these specific recommendations for change with respect to House Bill 98. On that, is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Macon, Representative Dunn."

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

Speaker Cullerton: "He indicates he will."

Dunn: "I had a little trouble hearing. If there is an appeal taken from a county board decision, who pays for the transcript cost if this Bill becomes law and you accept the Governor's Amendatory Veto?"

Ewing: "The plaintiff, unless it's a citizen's group."

Dunn: "And how is that different from current law?"

Ewing: "Well, today just the...I think, the plaintiff alone pays for it. I'm sorry, the county board pays for it today."

Dunn: "That's what I thought. So this will require the plaintiff to pay...this is a..."

72nd Legislative Day

October 19, 1989

Ewing: "That's correct."

Dunn: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Cullerton: "Any further questions or further discussion?

There being none, the question is, 'Shall the House accept the specific recommendations for change with respect to House Bill 98?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question there are 112 voting 'yes', none voting 'no', none voting 'present'. This Motion has received the required Constitutional Majority, the Motion is adopted and the House accepts the Governor's specific recommendations for change. On the Calendar on page eleven, House Bill 1249, Representative Curran."

Curran: "Thank...thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move to accept the Governor's specific recommendations for change on House Bill 1249. All he did was change the effective date, made a good Bill better and I concur."

Speaker Cullerton: "Is there any discussion on the Gentleman's Motion to accept the Governor's specific recommendations for change with regard to House Bill 1249? Any discussion? This will require seventy-one votes. The question is. 'Shall the House accept the specific recommendations for change with respect to House Bill 1249?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question there are 112 voting 'yes', none voting 'no' and none voting 'present'. The Motion has received the required Extraordinary Constitutional Majority, the Motion is adopted and the House accepts the Governor's specific recommendations for change on House Bill 1249. House Bill 1480, Representative Breslin."

72nd Legislative Day

October 19, 1989

Breslin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen, I move to accept the Governor's Amendatory Veto on this Bill. It takes one Section dealing with the transfer of property by eminent domain and it authorizes previous...it...rather it no...the Governor took out the Section that authorized previous title holders of property to seek revestment of title upon a showing of nonsubstantive action on the part of the unit of local government. But he kept in the provision that allows prior owners the first opportunity to repurchase such property, should the local government decide to sell or lease the property. So, I know of no opposition to the Bill in this form and I accept the Governor's Amendatory Veto."

Speaker Cullerton: "You've heard the Lady's Motion, is there any discussion? There being none, the question is...I'm sorry, Representative Dunn."

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

Speaker Cullerton: "She indicates she will."

Dunn: "Does the application of this legislation apply only in eminent domain situations, so that if the governmental unit decides it no longer needs the property will offer the property back to the previous owner?"

Breslin: "Well, it also applies in...in..."

Dunn: "...I can't hear."

Breslin: "Okay. I...I think it applies exclusively in quick take situations of eminent domain. Don't hold me to that, but that's my memory. It's been a few months."

Dunn: "... Alright...Okay. That's fine. Thank you."

Speaker Cullerton: "Any further discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall the House accept the specific recommendations for change with respect to House Bill 1480?' All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'no'. The voting's open. Have all voted who wish? Have all

72nd Legislative Day

October 19, 1989

voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question there are 112 voting 'yes', none voting 'no', none voting 'present'. The Motion has received the required Constitutional Majority, the Motion is adopted and the House accepts the Governor's specific recommendations for change. On the Calendar on page eleven, House Bill 1496, Representative Homer."

Homer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would move to accept the Governor's Amendatory Veto on House Bill 1496, the Bill that provides for limited tort immunity for standing order physicians for public health clinics. The Governor accelerated the effective date to make it an immediate effective date. All parties of interest are in agreement with the Governor's decision and I would support his Motion."

Speaker Cullerton: "You've heard the Gentleman's Motion, is there any discussion? The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative McCracken."

McCracken: "At one time, there was a controversial Amendment on this, wasn't there? Or am I thinking of the wrong Bill?"

Homer: "I think you're thinking of House Bill 168, which is in a Conference Committee..."

McCracken: "...Yeah...alright, you're right...Okay, thank you." Speaker Cullerton: "Any further discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall the House accept the specific recommendations for change with respect to House Bill 1496?' This Motion requires seventy-one votes. All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question there are 114 voting 'yes', none voting 'no', none voting 'present'. The Motion has received the required Constitutional Majority, the Motion is adopted and the

72nd Legislative Day

October 19, 1989

House accepts the Governor's specific recommendations for change. Representative Harris, House Bill 1567. Out of the record. Representative Keane, House Bill 1619. This was taken out of the record previously. House Bill 1619."

Keane: "Mr. Speaker, I believe that one has been passed."

Speaker Cullerton: "Representative Wennlund, for what purpose do you rise?"

Wennlund: "Yeah, Mr. Speaker, point of personal privilege. I received the memorandum from the Speaker, dated October 17th with respect to Amendatory Vetoes, in which it was cited an Illinois Supreme Court decision in the case of Mulligan versus the Joliet Regional Port District, and explains what the law is with respect to Amendatory Vetoes and their effective dates. It's just that the memorandum failed to give proper credit to the attorney for the plaintiff who did an excellent job in that Supreme Court case. So, I just wanted to point that out."

Speaker Cullerton: "Who was the attorney for the plaintiff, Sir?" Wennlund: "That was me."

Speaker Cullerton: "I see. Well, my suggestion would be that next time you have someone else stand up and make that...that commending language."

Wennlund: "I helped the Speaker out. I just, you know, I thought that a nice thank you would be nice in the memorandum."

Speaker Cullerton: "I'll pass that along to him."

Wennlund: "Thank you."

Speaker Cullerton: "On the Calendar on page six, we'll go to the Order of Item Veto Motions. Representative Didrickson. Is the Lady in the chamber? Representative Didrickson. Or Didrickson? Representative Hartke. Representative Hartke, we're on the Calendar on page seven, Item Veto Motions. You have House Bill 845? Out of the record. Representative Leverenz. Item Veto Motions, House Bill

72nd Legislative Day

October 19, 1989

994, on page seven of the Calendar."

Leverenz: "I'd like to withdraw that."

Speaker Cullerton: "Out of the record. Representative, you have Motions 1 and 2 on that House Bill. Do you wish to withdraw #2 as well?"

Leverenz: "Withdraw that also. Thank you."

Speaker Cullerton: "Alright, thank you. Out of the record then.

On the Calendar on page seven appears on the Order of
Business of Reduction Veto Motions, House Bill 859,
Representative Regan. Representative Regan on House Bill
859."

Regan: "This is Motion #2. Motion #1 has been withdrawn?"

Regan: "Alright. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I move to override the Governor's Veto on House Bill 859. Motion #2 is domestic violence. We've had personal situations with the domestic violence people. They do a great job for the state. They're overwhelmingly been inundated with new clients. By now, there's twelve hundred people waiting. I would please hope that we have support to insulate the one million, five hundred thousand dollars back into their budget, so that they don't have to leave two thousand people a month waiting for services. And I urge its override."

Speaker Cullerton: "Yes, for the record so that the chamber knows, this will require sixty votes to pass the Reduction Veto. The Gentleman has made his Motion. You've heard it. Is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I believe the record should also reflect that I am a Sponsor of this Motion along with Representatives Regan

72nd Legislative Day

October 19, 1989

and Representative McPike. This Motion has strong bipartisan support for several reasons. First of all. domestic violence is one of the most truly disgusting and revolting and tragic plagues upon our society. It is one that we are just beginning to deal with, just beginning to deal with. So it should be no surprise appropriation for this program should grow during the early stages, and that's exactly where we're at here with...in the early stages of development of a statewide program. The amount of money that was appropriated was...is not sufficient to solve the whole problem, but it takes us a long way there. The centers of this state that serve battered women are turning away a thousand persons a month because they don't have the space. The centers need this money to restore funding equity that has been sacrificed as a result of program expansion and undue reliance on local sources and overcrowding in some of the centers. money is very desperately needed. This Motion has strong bipartisan support. There is no reason that there should be a single 'no' vote on this Motion. I stand in support. Thank you."

Speaker Cullerton: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Morgan, Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. There's some facts that we ought to bring to the attention of the House on this matter before we actually call for it on a vote. It's my understanding that the Department of Public Aid and their budget called for the same amount as was previously in fiscal 1988 and fiscal 1989, which is 2.9 million. The Legislature obviously deemed that to be inadequate, and in fact, we added a significant amount, a hundred and seventy—two percent increase by adding five million more for a total of 7.9. The Governor reduced the appropriation

72nd Legislative Day

October 19, 1989

by one and a half million. That means that of the 2.9 million that was originally in the budget, the Governor approved 6.5. That totals a hundred and eighteen percent increase. That increase is in comparison we have indicated a phenomenal increase. increases that It's not to say that it completely solves the problem, there are a lot of problems that are not completely solved by the Legislature during this last Session. consequence, all of these funds plus additional funds are then available. It seems to me that the kind of precedent, although the need may be great, I don't deny that; the kind of precedent that we're setting and the money that we're spending is not appropriate and I would ask the Members to be very cautious in that which they're doing at this point. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Cullerton: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Macon, Representative Dunn."

Dunn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. With all due respect for the comments of the previous speaker, I rise in support of this Motion. Domestic violence and domestic violence shelters have been grossly, inadequately funded in the State of Illinois. We can talk about large percentage increases, but percentages can be misleading. If you last year used one band-aid for a band-aid approach, and this year you used two band-aids and you have a two band-aid approach, you've increased the number of band-aids by one hundred percent. You have to keep in perspective where you begin and where you're going. Seven and a half million dollars for domestic violence across the State of Illinois is a drop in the bucket. isn't even walking around money in this place. This is a very serious problem and some of the previous speakers have indicated and it gives every indication that it is going to

72nd Legislative Day

October 19, 1989

continue to be a very serious problem. We should address our serious problems. We should meet our social and moral commitments and fund those programs which themselves to the serious needs of our state at an adequate level. This one and a half million dollars should be restored. Don't forget we passed a billion dollars worth tax increases last year on top of nine hundred million dollars new money for the State of Illinois. If we cannot among all those dollars, find another million and a half for domestic violence shelters, then we are not meeting our obligations to represent the people of the State of Illinois on a responsible basis. We need to restore this million and a half dollars and I urge your 'aye' support of this Motion."

Speaker Cullerton: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Vermont, Representative Mays."

Mays: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I think we need to take a longer view than just the view of the moment on particular Motion. When we ended the fiscal year, June 30th, everybody agrees that we had about five hundred and fourty-one million dollars in the bank. Wow, that's a record. It's never been done before. The spending plan that the director of the Bureau of the Budget adopted after passed the budget to him, would draw down that balance to three hundred and fifty million roughly. agrees on that. So what we've done is we've taken a hundred and ninety-one million dollars away from next year's revenues to fund the budget we pass this year. will take another million and a half away from that. Now if you want to keep on going that way, we can keep drawing down that balance and we'll be at a real fiscal cliff in a real quick time. This particular interest got a heck of a boost in this budget year. It's not everything

72nd Legislative Day

October 19, 1989

they wanted, but I don't know of any interest group that got everything they wanted. We're going to have to hold the line, if not now, we're going to pay the piper sure as shooting next June. So I ask that we sustain the Governor's Veto on this particular Motion and on many others."

Speaker Cullerton: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I surely want to compliment the immediate previous speaker's outstanding speech. And for this weekend, two weeks from now, we'd like to number that speech number one. And in spite of that, I think the ending balance might reflect the same ending balance action that we had this last June and it was really kind of fat. So that I think this is the perfect place to tuck an additional amount of money, and if it doesn't get used, it will still be available and support the Motion that we have here to consider and ask you all to vote 'aye'."

Speaker Cullerton: "Further discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall this...I'm sorry. Representative Regan to close."

Regan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I, of all people in the House, understand fiscal responsibility. this is a particular issue of importance to me. personal situation. have witnessed Ι what violence can do to family, the children and the wife а involved. At this particular point, there's two hundred and fifty-three thousand women, at least, that needs to reach some kind of counseling and help and the budget only allows for eight percent of those women to be taken care of. Again I repeat, eleven hundred a month are turned In the long run I anticipate this saving money. particularly with the abused children. I think that DCFS

72nd Legislative Day

October 19, 1989

won't have to work with them later. Special education won't have to work with them later. The work that these people do in the clinics and counseling, particularly the children that are upset mentally with the violence in their homes, in the long run I think it will be a savings to the state. And I certainly would hope that you would override this Veto."

Speaker Cullerton: "The question is, 'Shall this Item be restored to its original amount, notwithstanding the reduction of the Governor on House Bill 859?' All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. This Bill requires sixty votes to prevail. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk, please take the record. On this question there are 104...On this question there are 105 voting 'yes', 7 voting 'no', 2 voting 'present'. This Motion having received the Constitutional Majority prevails, and the House restores the item on House Bill 859. Now we'll go to page eight of the Calendar, Reduction and Item Veto Motions. The first Motion is on House Bill 592. It is an Item Veto requiring seventy-one votes. And the maker of the Motion is Representative Matijevich. Representative Matijevich Motion #1 on House Bill 592."

Matijevich: "Mr...Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, within that Motion there are certain items and I would like leave of the House to divide the Motions according to how I state the Motions. Some of the items I am not going to call. So my first Motion will be that the Item Veto on page 26, line 35 and page 27, line 1 to 4; the Item Veto of one million in general revenue funds; and on page 27, lines 5 to 10, the Item Veto of two hundred thousand dollar in general revenue funds be restored. The first item has to do with the district report cards and the

72nd Legislative Day

October 19, 1989

second item has to do with criminal background investigations. On the matter of the district report cards, the appropriation would fund the cost to school districts for the preparing, printing and mailing of district report cards. One of the programs in the 1985 Educational Reform Act, all school districts would receive reimbursement under this grant. On the matter of the criminal background investigations, this appropriation would fund the cost to school districts for the criminal background investigations which must be done before school districts can hire employees. This...this program was established by the 1985 Education Reform Act. And all school districts would receive a reimbursement under this grant. It is important that the funding of the 1.2 million dollars be restored for the district report card and the criminal background investigations to avoid a challenge regarding their enforceability as unfunded under the State Mandates Act. There was a lawsuit that was initiated by the State's Mandate Act's Right Task Force, called SMART. It is a coalition of nearly three hundred and fifty school districts. All of you have received a letter from Senator Art Berman, who indicates in his letter that although this 1.2 million dollars was not at first included in the appropriation of the State Board of Education. this appropriation was included supplemental appropriation as a response to the court by the State Mandates Act Right Task Force. Funding for these two programs was provided last year, as I said, supplemental are very important to all of the school districts in the State of Illinois. And I feel that all of us here know that it is our responsibility under the State's Mandates Act to fund those programs. They were both highly touted and I think the Governor made a mistake

72nd Legislative Day

October 19, 1989

in not realizing that this was our responsibility. I urge the Members of this Assembly to provide, not only the seventy—one votes, but all of your votes on the restoration of these funds. Thank you."

Speaker Cullerton: "To clarify the Gentleman's Motion, if you look on page eight of the Calendar under Reduction and Item Veto Motions, House Bill 592, the Gentleman's Motion is to...to override the Governor's Item Veto on page 26 and 27, line 35 and 1 and 4, for one million dollars; and on page 27, lines 5 to 10, for two hundred thousand dollars. On that, is there any discussion? Representative Ryder. There being no discussion the question is, 'Shall this item pass, the Veto of the Governor notwithstanding?' in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'no'. The voting's open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question there are 104 voting 'aye', 8 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. This Motion having received the required Three-Fifths Majority prevails, and this item is declared passed the Veto of the Governor notwithstanding. Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, on this Bill, my second Motion will be to...on page 20, line 29, (sic - page 29) lines 24 to 28, the Item Veto of \$828,000,000 in common school...\$28,000 in common school funds; and on page 28, lines 25 to 29, the Item Veto of one hundred thousand dollars in common school funds. The first item...the Motion is to restoration of those funds, the Item Veto of the Governor notwithstanding. The first item is the Farmland Assessment Hold Harmless Law that we passed. The second is the Farmland Assessment Hold Harmless clause as it relates to Adam's County. In 1986, a change in the formula for the farmland assessment was cr...enacted with a provision that if there was more than a

72nd Legislative Day

October 19, 1989

decrease in the 1986 agrid...aggregate equalized assessed valuation of property in any school district from the aggregate assessed...equalized assessed value of property for the 1985 assessment year, due to loss in the aggregate equalized assessed value of farmland, a sum equal to the amount of taxes not received by the school district shall be paid to the district by the Illinois State Board of Education. Partial funding for the hold harmless grants was paid in FY89. The eight hundred and twenty-eight thousand would pay for the outstanding balance for the grants statewide. The one hundred thousand dollars in the other item will pay for the hold harmless grants for school districts in Adam's County. Implementation of new formula in that county was delayed while officials debated the proper method for calculating the farmland assessment. That dispute has been resolved and Senate Bill 960, now on the Amendatory Veto Calendar, contains language to establish the 1988 as the base year. Given that this one hundred thousand dollars is needed to hold school districts in Adam's County is hold harmless. I urge the Members of the Assembly to provide the necessary votes to my Motion for an Item Veto, the Governor's reduction notwithstanding and appreciate your support."

Speaker Cullerton: "Representative Matijevich, is your Motion cover the one hundred thousand dollars on page 28, line 25 through 29?"

Matijevich: "Yes."

Speaker Cullerton: "And the second part of the same Motion is page 29, line 24 through 28, eight hundred and twenty-eight thousand?"

Matijevich: "Correct."

Speaker Cullerton: "You've heard the Gentleman's Motion. Is there any discussion? There being none, the question is,

72nd Legislative Day

October 19, 1989

'Shall this item pass, the Veto of the Governor notwithstanding?' All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed The voting's open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question there are 106 voting...I'm sorry, 107...Mr. Clerk, take the record. One hundred and eight voting 'yes', 7 voting 'no', none voting 'present'. Motion having received the required Three-Fifths Majority prevails, and the item is declared passed, the Veto of the Governor notwithstanding. Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Speaker, the only other Motion I have on 592 is on a Reduction Motion..."

Speaker Cullerton: "...Is that Motion #2?"

Matijevich: "The Motion...and I want to divide that because there's only one item I'm calling. My Motion will be on line 6, that the one hundred thousand dollars be restored from two hundred and eighty-four to three hundred and eighty-four thousand dollars. That will be my only Motion on the restoration on that Reduction Veto. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this one hundred thousand dollars is for the transition funds, whereby minority sti...students in the inner city, there are funds available for college programs. Senator Emil Jones, who I've discussed this matter with very closely, has shown to me the importance of these funds transition, those students into college, and I urge the Members because of this fine program, that this reduction be restored. So I urge your vote on this issue."

Speaker Cullerton: "The Motion is divided. It's found on page 8.

It's Motion #2 to House Bill 592 with respect to page 11,
line 6, to restore to three hundred eighty-four thousand
from two hundred and eighty-four thousand. You've heard
the Gentleman's Motion. Is there any discussion? There

72nd Legislative Day

October 19, 1989

being none, the question is, 'Shall this item be restored to its original amount, notwithstanding the reduction of the Governor?' This will require sixty votes. All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting's open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question there are 115 voting 'yes', none voting 'no' and none voting 'present'. The Motion having received the required Constitutional Majority prevails, and the House restores the item. On the Calendar on page eight, House Bill 592, Representative Ryder, Motion #3."

- Ryder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I understand an accommodation's been reached on that Motion as a result. I would withdraw it. Thank you."
- Speaker Cullerton: "The Gentleman withdraws the Motion #3 on
 House Bill 592. House Bill 850, Representative Hallock on
 Motion #1. Out of the record. Also on House Bill 850,
 Representative Hultgren, Motion #2. Representative
 Hultgren. Is the Gentleman in the chamber? Yes.
 Representative Hultgren."
- Hultgren: "Would you withdraw the Motion, please, for override."

 Speaker Cullerton: "The Gentleman withdraws Motion #2. Also on
 House Bill 850, Representative Didrickson, Motion #3. You
 wish to take that out of the record? Representative
 Matijevich on House Bill 850, Motion #4. An Item Veto?
 Representative Matijevich."
- Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, on House Bill 850, on page...line (sic page) 49, line 18 through 25 in the amount of 450,000 a line item vetoed by the Governor. And on page 49, line 26 through 28, \$300,000 line item vetoed by the Governor. I move that those items be restored despite the Governor's Veto of those funds. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, these funds are adult

72nd Legislative Day

October 19, 1989

education funds. Before we passed the necessary taxes for education, we didn't know how much was available revenue. Ιn my estimation the adult education did not see...receive the proper allocation because of the added revenue that we provided. I am and I believe that all of the Members here are strong supporters of adult don't think that any of us believe that adult...adult education, for example. The facts are, the last fiscal that we have reports on, in fiscal year '88, there 5,000 applications pending, pending to included in adult education programs that could not be part those programs because of lack of funds. Adult education is one program in all of Illinois that is cost effective. We hear much about Project Chance, for example. hear much about literacy programs, but do we hear much the fact that the reason that Project Chance effective, and the reason that the literacy programs are effective, is because of the funds available through adult education courses. That's what makes those programs good programs. We cannot shortchange adult education. We not...we cannot, when we provide sufficient revenues as we did this year in education, say that the one category education that we don't provide the sufficient funds is adult education. We should not say that three percent one percent of the funds that we gave adult education of that total amount is enough. It is not near enough. fact is that adult education came in very late with this...with these funds, 750,000 after we were aware of the increases in revenue. We now as a Legislature should to be responsible, we are going to provide these additional funds for programs that are cost effective. I know that on both sides of the aisle, adult education has friends here. You can show the people in adult education that you

72nd Legislative Day

October 19, 1989

their friend by supporting and restoring this Item Veto.

The Governor just made a mistake. I appreciate your support."

Speaker Cullerton: "You heard the Gentleman's Motion. Is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Coles, Representative Weaver."

Weaver: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of the Gentleman's Motion. And I think all of you would support it as well. All you have to do is check with your...your local adult education systems and find out the kind of job that they're doing. Insofar as our expenditures on education, we probably get the biggest bang for the buck in this area, and it addresses the needs people who have really little other options in terms of completing their education and getting employed. look at your local effort. It really works and we get a lot of value for our dollar. And I hope you will support this Gentleman's Motion."

Speaker Cullerton: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Morgan, Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I stand...in opposition to the Motion, but I wish to agree with a couple of things that the previous speaker's indicated. Representative Weaver indicates that this is a good program and I agree. funded it. We funded it at levels that adequate...given the revenues that we've had. If you take a look at where education is over the past two days and what it is that we've done, I think that you'll find that the amount of dollars there is not...not adequate. And the previous speaker had indicated the Governor may have made a mistake on this. I'm sure it won't be the first one and it would certainly not the first mistake that overridden. But this...we've got to start holding the

72nd Legislative Day

October 19, 1989

line. We've got to start saying no on some of these, and this is a place to start."

- Speaker Cullerton: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black."
- Black: "Well, thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I simply rise in support of the Gentleman's Motion. I'll not belabor We talk in this Body about life long learning. point. talk about the necessity, and we've all seen it back home in our districts for retraining. How in the world you can vote against this defies...any logic or common sense. You can go back into your districts and you can see Adult Ed. work. They are going to have to go back. We're all to have to go back and have retraining. We've lost many of the jobs that we've relied on over the years. technology is coming in, and we must retrain our work force. This simply is a good investment. If this is a lot of money, think what we'll spend if all of these people are forced because of a lack of training, a lack of...access to adult education, if you will, and if these people end up on public aid. This is a good investment, a good Motion and I rise in support of the Gentleman's Motion and urge 'green' votes."
- Speaker Cullerton: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from McLean, Representative Ropp."
- Ropp: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would only like to add one thing to the Sponsor of this Motion is that the primary concern that we have for funding of education is not only adults but maybe preschool that we need to put additional dollars. This is a good program, ought to be supported because these people want to learn. They don't come because they have to."
- Speaker Cullerton: "Further discussion? There being none,

 Representative Matijevich, do you wish to close?

72nd Legislative Day

October 19, 1989

Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "No, I just appreciate that genuine support that I have received, and I also...appreciate everybody's support on the board. Thank you."

Speaker Cullerton: "The Motion is Motion #4 on House Bill 850. The question is, 'Shall this item pass, the Veto of Governor notwithstanding?' All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'no'. The Bill requires 71 votes to override. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? all voted who wish. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question there are 104 voting 'yes', 9 voting 'no', 1 voting...Mr. Clerk, could you please record Representative Deuchler as voting 'aye'. On this question there's 105 voting 'yes', 9 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. The Motion having received the required Three-Fifths Majority prevails and is declared passed and the Veto of the Governor notwithstanding. On page 2 of the Calendar, House Bills - Third Reading. House Bills - Third Reading. House Bill 1487, Representative Homer."

Homer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen."

Speaker Cullerton: "Excuse me, Mr. Homer. This is Third Reading.

I'm going to ask the Clerk to read the Bill, please."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1487, a Bill for Act in relation to Statewide Grand Jury. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Cullerton: "Representative Homer on House Bill 1487."

Homer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 1487 creates a statewide grand jury in the State of Illinois under the direction of the Office of the Attorney General for the sole and limited purpose of prosecuting investigating drug offenses, specifically the cannabis and controlled substance trafficking, narcotics, racketeering, money laundering, Cannabis and Controlled Substances Act and the Drug Paraphernalia Control Act. The illegal drug business

72nd Legislative Day

October 19, 1989

Illin...in this country has reached epidemic proportions. It's become a \$90,000,000.000 year business. Ladies and Gentlemen, that's bigger than General Motors. That's bigger than Mobil Oil. Drug enforcement officials consider Illinois to be one of the primary illicit drug distribution centers in the country. than 5,000 Illinois residents lose their lives each year as a consequence of substance abuse. Of the nearly 12,000,000 residents of this state, approximately 10 percent of the adult population. 900,000 people have some chemical dependency problem. At least 80,000 of these are adult drug addicts or abusers. Adolescents are even more prone to subject (sic - substance) abuse. Approximately 300,000 Illinois children between the age of 10 and 17 suffer from chemical dependency. The time has come to declare all out war on major drug dealers and kingpins that operate in the State of Illinois. Under this proposal, county state's attorneys will continue to have the primary responsibility for investigating and prosecuting criminal offenders. But because persons who traffic in illicit narcotics frequently operate across county jurisdictional lines, investigation and prosecution by county authorities alone is often hampered and impeded. These drug criminal enterprises are particularly mobile and are often able to shift their location whenever the county authorities become aware of their activities. Furthermore, prosecution οf criminal enterprises frequently require investigative personnel with specialized training and equipment that not always available to local prosecutors. The Bill has been carefully drafted. It has a variation of Bills that have been proposed in the past. Back in the 1970's Attorney General Bill Scott advanced the idea of Statewide Grand Jury. The idea was further advanced in

72nd Legislative Day

October 19, 1989

1982 by then Attorney General Tyrone Fahner. This Bill takes the best of those ideas, limits its application strictly to drug prosecutions and is designed to take the profits out of drug trafficking by utilizing a tool we provided last year, in the spring actually, the Narcotics Forfeiture Profit Act, which provides a valuable tool to prosecutors to take the profits out of drug dealing, take assets away from the drug kingpins and the drug lords of this state. Just stop them where they hurt - in pocketbook. This Bill would vest the authority to pursue that Narcotic Forfeiture Act through the auspices of statewide grand jury. The profits that would inure to the state through the prosecution of these cases would channeled to local law enforcement officials in the formula that we had previously distributed for the Narcotics Forfeiture Act. It's anticipated that through enforcement of this Act, through the implementation of a statewide grand jury that will bring into Illinois \$20,000,000 a year, conservatively estimated that can be taken from drug lords and drug kingpins and drug dealers to help in the war against drugs. Wouldn't it be great to have drug dealers put in jail and prosecuted by using resources that have been confiscated from them, their...through their unseemly business of selling and peddling drugs in our neighborhoods and in our schools? The Bill provides that the Attorney General may petition the Supreme Court. The Supreme Court may grant authority for one statewide grand jury to operate at any one time in a county were the State's Attorney of that county has acquiesced in that grand jury coming to that county. Another part of the Bill is a part of the Bill that was drafted in response to the efforts and the crusade of Father George Clements, a Chicago Priest who has crusaded

72nd Legislative Day

October 19, 1989

the neighborhoods of the streets of Chicago, trying to take away the opportunists who would sell drug paraphernalia, the water pipes, the bongs and all of the related materials to our children, those items having no purpose other than serve illicit purposes and in order to further the drug conspiracy and transactions of drug dealers. Clements has crusaded valiantly in behalf of that cause, and this Bill has a provision which would strengthen the Drug Paraphernalia Law to provide that a Class IV felony is committed whenever someone sells or delivers paraphernalia for commercial consideration. And when that delivery is by a person over the...18 to someone under the age of 18, the offense would become a Class III The Bill has been examined by many, many diverse groups. It has won widespread support. It has been endorsed supported by such diverse agencies as the Illinois Police Association, Fraternal Order of Police, Illinois Community College Board, Illinois Police Association. Illinois Association of School Boards, Illinois Sheriffs Association, the Illinois State Prosecutors Association. Nearly every school group or law enforcement group that has looked at this Bill is supporting the Bill. It's well known that the greatest concern that parents have today, in addition to how their children are going to be educated, is whether their children are going to be subjected to drugs and be exposed to these drug lords and drug pushers have total disregard for the welfare and the fabric of our society that come in and cause chaos and destruction, times result in the death, devastation of our youth. It's time to say no to drug dealers. It's time to put a stop to drugs where they come into this state. It's time to tell the drug lords and the drug kingpins that we will no longer this General Assembly tolerate their acts perpetrated

72nd Legislative Day

October 19, 1989

upon our families and our children. We're going to focus the energy of this state and the resources in the office of the top law enforcement official of this state, the Office of the Attorney General, who will work in conjunction and coordination with the state's attorneys and local law enforcement officials to pool their resources, to bring together the expertise, the time and energy and the staffs to put into place an effective drug deterrent policy in this state, and to say no to drugs, no to drug dealers and this Bill will accomplish that. Mr. Speaker, I would answer questions, and I would urge a resounding message be sent to all throughout the State of Illinois and that be in the form of a resounding 'yes' vote on this Bill."

Speaker Cullerton: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage of House Bill 1487. Is there any discussion? The Gentleman from McLean, Representative Ropp."

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

Speaker Cullerton: "He indicates he will."

Ropp: "Representative, if this was such an outstanding program as you indicate now, why, when Attorney General Ty Fahner had the proposal, was it not endorsed then?"

Homer: "I was, Representative Ropp, I only heard part of that question, but your question is why...Repeat your question."

Ropp: "If...If this is such a good proposal now and you mentioned that we've had other similar proposals down through the years, one in particular Attorney General Ty Fahner when he proposed it. Why wasn't it accepted by this Body at that point in time?"

Homer: "Perhaps you could tell me better, Representative Ropp. I was the Fulton County State's Attorney at that time, and I'm not privy to the discussions that...or the debate that took place on the Bill at that time."

Ropp: "Well, it was used as one of your reference points during

72nd Legislative Day

October 19, 1989

your opening statement. I guess to the Bill, Mr. Speaker." Speaker Cullerton: "Proceed."

Ropp: "We, in my district, I've received comments both from the State's Attorney and from the Sheriff and both are of different political persuasions. Both have indicated to me that even though we're all very much committed to dealing with drugs that this proposal at this particular time is not well taken. It is a proposal that attempts to get totally involved in a situation that in dealing with drugs locally, the two parties are doing quite well. That they feel this attempts to somewhat muddy the waters, it is ill conceived and not really clearly thought out, and both parties even admit it might have a touch of political involvement since people are running for higher office. Thank you."

Speaker Cullerton: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Morgan, Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in great admiration of the Sponsor of this Bill. He has labored long and hard on behalf of this issue. And I think it's very unfortunate that we now have this politicization of this drug issue. Suddenly, because the Attorney General has discovered that as a top law enforcement agent for this state that his deficiency in the area of drugs becomes a campaign issue, he belatedly decides, who I got to do something here. can I do? He decides that he wants to jump on an issue that's been used by Republicans for years. To the credit of the Sponsor of this Bill, Tom Homer, he's labored long and hard trying to produce this Bill. I've talked to the folks back home. They said that they can cooperate with the Attorney General now if he wanted to. I've talked to the folks back home, and they've indicated that he has all the power in the world to come down there and assist with

72nd Legislative Day

October 19, 1989

his Assistant Attorney Generals in attempting to provide the kind of help that they need. But now one year from his election campaign for Governor, finally belatedly, we decide that this issue now has to be ramrodded through the General Assembly. It's a real disgrace to Tom Homer and to the folks that are sponsoring this Bill that the current Attorney General has to steal it because his extraordinarily poor record in drug enforcement laws. I think the question that you ask Where has he been for the last seven years? Where's Neil been when these issues in drugs have been terrorizing our country? What's the record there? And I think the fact that he has now decided to jump on a bandwagon that Tom Homer's been working on long and hard indicates that he's been nowhere. Thank you."

Speaker Cullerton: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Preston."

Preston: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of House. Just in response to the previous speaker, I can tell you that Attorney General Hartigan during the last 20 years of his career has been fighting for senior citizens, the rights of consumers, the rights of the handicapped and the rights of all of Illinoisans to a fair share of what government has to offer those in need. And in regards to this Bill that Representative Homer has worked so very long and hard on, this is not an issue on who a candidate for Governor is. This is an issue...Attorney General Hartigan will not be the Attorney General when this Bill is being used by the people of Illinois to go after drug pushers throughout this...throughout this state. We're going to have another Attorney General. Where he is running for another office, and I'm among those who hope he's successful at it, but whoever the next Governor is or

72nd Legislative Day

October 19, 1989

whoever the next Attorney General is that next Attorney General will be able to use statewide grand juries for the specific purpose of going after drug pushers. These are the people who sell drugs to children in our school yards and on the street corners of our communities. That's what this Bill's designed to attack. This isn't some political Representative Homer has been involved in this movement. issue for many, many years. He's taken a leadership position on it. And we ought to think of the people it affects, not who else is sponsoring it, but who is affected by it, and the people affected by it are our children. And we ought to all of us, regardless of political party or partisanship, be behind putting drug pushers in jail and enabling government to be able to do that in a better manner than it does today. This Bill will do that, and I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Cullerton: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Will, Representative Petka."

Petka: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House.

I believe that the Sponsor has very correctly pointed out that there is great concern in our society about the debilitating effects of drugs throughout all levels of society. And I believe that it is correct to characterize that we should have an all out war. Unfortunately, this all out war by virtue of House Bill 1487 would be an all out war against prosecutors, because I believe it makes an unwarranted assumption that local prosecutors simply do not know how to do their job. During the committee hearing on this Bill, I asked the Attorney General of this state straight out to name those prosecutors who had contacted him, who had made the statement that they were incapable of carrying out their own constitutional responsibilities as far as drug prosecutions. The question was never answered,

72nd Legislative Day

October 19, 1989

because really there was no answer to that. There has been no outcry from the State's Attorneys of any county in this state who would publicly state that they're having problems with the prosecution, because very simply those prosecutors know what I know, that prosecution is the end product. Cases that are made are against drug dealers are made not by prosecutors, they're made by police and especially undercover agents, so called 'meg agents'. Now these police who make these cases have to work with what we call informants, individuals who rat upon their friends. do this mostly because they, themselves, are on a hot spot, looking at a quick journey to the Department of Corrections and are very willing to turn in people up the ladder during the prosecution chain. What this Bill will do, in my opinion, will create overlapping informant networks which would be to the detriment of prosecution. Grand juries will simply indict. In other words, they will simply charge people. What we really need in this state are more petit jurors, that's people who are actually trying the cases and making decisions about whether or not a drug kingpin is guilty or innocent. And what we need are more street agents going out and dealing with the vermin of society, the drug kingpins. And what we really need are more prosecutors at the local level who have contact and who know their communities and who know exactly, exactly what needs to be done. They don't need a bureaucracy imposed upon them from Springfield to tell them where the drug problems are in their local communities. Unfortunately, and I do use the word advisedly, once again this issue is politicized. I argued against this Bill as the State's Attorney in the 1970's and again in 1982 as an ill-advised, ill-conceived idea. And the idea has not gotten any better over the last seven years. can

72nd Legislative Day

October 19, 1989

confidently predict and I'll put it in writing if someone wants, if, in fact, this Bill becomes law, we will be treated to a press conference of the week in metro areas selected throughout the state in a very timely fashion, right before the election, doing quote, 'legitimate work', unquote. Drug kingpins will be indicted, which is very commendable. They will unfortunately not be tried until sometime after the election, when by that time there will in fact be a new Attorney General in the office. Ladies and Gentlemen, let's not confuse politics with what are realities. Let's not confuse what really is not in the best interest of law enforcement in this state with political expediency. I ask you as strong as I can urge to beat this legislation. A vote against this legislation is not a vote which indicates a softness on crime, but in fact, indicates a simple statement that local prosecutors, if they run into a jam, can exercise the authority which is now available to them under Illinois law, and that is to ask the Attorney General to use the powers of his office to assist them. But to simply impose this bureaucracy on the State's Attorneys Office, in my opinion, is unwarranted, untimely and not in the best interest of anyone in the state and certainly not in the best interest of effective drug enforcement. Please vote 'no' on this bad Bill."

Speaker Cullerton: "Mr. Clerk, do you have an announcement?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Supplemental Calendar #2 is being distributed."

Speaker Cullerton: "Further discussion? The Lady from Sangamon,

Representative Hasara."

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

Speaker Cullerton: "He indicates he will."

Hasara: "Representative, sometimes I have a concern because we pass laws without giving too much thought to those who are

72nd Legislative Day

October 19, 1989

going to be implementing them. And my question relates to the selection of the jurors. I'm not at all clear from reading Section 6 exactly how it would work. And I'm concerned that this will pass, and counties will be unable to understand how they are to implement this. Could you tell me exactly who will be selecting? For instance, when it says that the grand jury itself may draw jurors, how would that work? How will the selection be made? Who will handle it?"

Homer: "Representative Hasara, the procedure that would be utilized is that the Attorney General would file application with the Supreme Court. The Supreme Court would appoint a circuit judge to oversee the grand jury, and the Attorney General would make a specific request for a county in which to preside the grand jury. The...Before the grand jury can be summoned, the local County State's Attorney would have to first give their permission for the statewide grand jury to conduct proceedings in that particular county. Once the county has been determined, then the jurors that would make up the grand jury would be selected from that county or from any of the other juror lists from the adjoining counties of the county where the grand jury sits. So that you would draw 16...Sixteen jurors would be chosen from the county where the grand jury sits, together with the adjoining counties. And they would be selected in the same manner now that grand jurors or petit jurors are selected. They will be drawn at random from the voter registration list."

Homer: "Right. Well, the...the Bill contemplates that there would be a need for coordination among the jury commissions

72nd Legislative Day

October 19, 1989

from the counties which would be involved in the selection, and then it would be up to them to formulate and determine how those jurors would be pooled and selected."

Hasara: "Okay. I do see that as a problem. I think we're saying to counties, We're passing this law. We don't know exactly how you're suppose to implement it. You pay, every year we'll appropriate money. We've said that in a lot of cases. Counties, go ahead and pay and we'll reimburse you, and somehow the money never gets there. So, it may be a minor point to some in the overall picture, but I can tell you to the workers in the counties, it is a...quite a burden to place on them, a very vague part of the statute and that concerns me greatly."

Speaker Cullerton: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative McCracken."

McCracken: "You know what's most disturbing? The opponents to this Bill were so intimidated, they would not testify at the hearing. It isn't just Neil Hartigan who's involved. The entire Democrat Majority in both Houses is involved. The letters have gone out, 'Support this Bill. The time has come to pass this Bill.' But the implication is, and maybe in some cases the stated quid pro quo is, if you don't do it this way, you don't get what you want on other issues. That's what's going on right now. That's what this Bill is all about. This Bill isn't about law enforcement. That's not the issue. The Bill isn't about the war on drugs. That's not the issue. The Bill is about political intimidation. That's the issue. The opponents were literally scared to stay in that committee room after they filed their slips in opposition. They walked out before it even got going. They were scared. And they were scared because the fear of God had been put into them. All to pass this. All to pass this, so the Democratic

72nd Legislative Day

October 19, 1989

Governor's nominee can claim that he's earned his spurs in the war on drugs, and nothing could be further from the He's been there seven years. Has he been down to see us to tell us we need this? This Bill was considered in April of 1987. It failed miserably in committee. Homer couldn't get anyone to vote for the Bill. acting in good faith and has been for years. I find no fault with that. But why is it passing now? Ιs anything but politics, raw politics? Nothing more than raw politics. It's nothing to be proud of. It's not about the drugs. It's about hardball politics and a on politician that wants to be Governor. Period. All the pretext and pretense and protestations to the contrary, there's nothing here but politics. That's the whole story. And I respect the people who talk about it on the merits. I respect the people whose opposition or support is based on the merits, but they miss the point. I don't dignify this debate with a discussion of the merits. That's not what it's all about. It's hardball politics, pure and simple in its rawest form. The Chicago City Council has nothing on the Illinois General Assembly when it comes to hardball politics. It's right here today."

Speaker Cullerton: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Santiago."

Santiago: "Mr. Speakers (sic - Speaker), Members of the House. I rise in support of House Bill 1487, because it addresses one of the most serious problems that is destroying our society today. The drug problem in our state has reached and is reaching an epidemic stage. Drug criminals are in the business of drug sales to make money, to buy homes, buy cars and buy material goods. I say to these individuals that we should take their material goods away from them and send them all to jail where they deserve to be at. To my

72nd Legislative Day

October 19, 1989

colleagues on the other side of the aisle, I ask you to support and follow the leader of your President Bush, who has called on...upon America to fight drugs, neighborhood by neighborhood, block by block, trial by trial. He said there should be zero tolerance, and I think this House should also follow the lead and say...and send the message to these drug pushers, these drug dealers, we do not and we will not stand for your drug pushing. We shall have zero tolerance. So I ask for your support. Thank you very much."

Speaker Cullerton: "Further discussion? There being none, the Gentleman...Representative Homer to close."

Homer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I...I really...I guess I regret that the...that we've injected this partisan element into this debate. The...the fact of the matter is it is a Bill introduced last spring with the full help and assistance of the Attorney General, who assisted me drafting the Bill and provided his staff and resources to assist in presenting the Bill, and it's true that last spring, although we had a spirited debate in committee, we fell a few votes short at the committee level last spring. And we renewed our efforts. We revised the Bill. limited the Bill. We addressed many of the concerns were expressed at that time into the Bill over the summer, and we presented the Bill again to the House Judiciary Committee Monday of this week...Tuesday of this week. after hearing much of the same political harangue, I'm proud to report to you and to everyone that the Bill came out with a strong bipartisan support. Representative Countryman, Chief House Sponsor of the Bill, the Minority Spokesman of that committee, spoke on behalf of committee and lent his support, and I'm proud of that and I'm proud of the association with my brothers and sisters

72nd Legislative Day

October 19, 1989

both sides of this aisle who worked together on many issues. I know there's an election coming. And I that that means that we'll have to somehow talk politics from here on out. But when we're dealing with an I think about the testimony in that committee like drugs. of Father Clements. Father Clements, who's dedicated much his time and energies to trying to rid the scourge of drugs from the neighborhoods of the streets of Chicago, who talked about it in personal terms and about the funerals that he has presided over and officiated during the past few years, where an ever increasing number of young children are those who are being buried and those who are being eulogized before their short, young lives had a chance to be enriched, because they were subjected to the temptations and the techniques of these drug lords and drug kingpins and drug conspiracies who care only profiting, care nothing about destruction of life, care nothing about destroying families or social fabrics. the discussion in that committee and the debate...and the debate here on the floor by those who would want to be partisan about this didn't go to the merits of the Bill. There is no discussion here or there about weaknesses the Bill or any flaws in the Bill. We addressed those concerns. We heard those arguments. We addressed them and put a Bill together that met a very narrowed scope, had to require the concurrence of the State's Attorneys. And as a result, almost every group that has an interest in law enforcement or education support this Bill. They came to committee in flocks to testify for the Bill. We hear today that the opponents didn't testify and there was opposition in committee. We hear the novel argument today that they were intimidated to testify. I ask everyone here to think about that and think if that really sounds

72nd Legislative Day

October 19, 1989

plausible. Do you think that those people were intimidated not to testify or do you think perhaps, as I do, their opposition was perhaps token or not heartfelt? I believe that's the case. We've had many, many devisive issues that have come before us, much more controversial than this one that should unite us that have brought opponents out of the woodwork. To suggest that somehow the opponents have been intimidated by some mystical force is just absolutely absurd. You know it. You're too good. The people of this General Assembly are too good to put partisanship in the way of trying to help curb the flow of drugs into neighborhoods, into our schools, into our communities. We need your support. I reach out to you, and I there are many Members on the other side of the aisle who will put aside the partisan rhetoric and will be able to do the correct thing and vote to keep the drugs out of State of Illinois. And this is a significant step forward. I urge your support for House Bill 1487."

Speaker Cullerton: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 1487 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. This is final passage. Have all voted who wish? To explain his vote, Representative Young, from Cook."

Young, A.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I have traditionally opposed this measure, and I'm going to change my vote today and support it. The reason for that support...The reason for that support is there will be a genuine effort in the Senate to take some of the proceeds that this statewide grand jury will hopefully recover from the sale of drugs and send it back into the communities where the drugs' profit actually originate, back into the communities that suffer from people who actually support these drugs. And so some of the proceeds

72nd Legislative Day

- October 19, 1989
- will hopefully, finally be used for education and treatment as well as law enforcement. And for that reason, I vote 'yes'."
- Speaker Cullerton: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. Representative...On this question there are 67 voting 'yes', 38 voting 'no'...and 10 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order...and the Bill is declared passed. On the Order of Third Reading, House Bill 2511, Representative Giorgi. Representative Daniels."
- Daniels: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, normally I don't ask for a moment for an introduction, but we have a very special guest with us today, Senator Jan Fates is from the State of Alaska. She will be the incoming Chairman of the Energy Committee for the National Conference of State Legislatures, and I would ask that all of us from Illinois give her a very warm welcome to the State of Illinois from Alaska, Senator Jan Fates."
- Speaker Cullerton: "On the Calendar on page 2, House Bills —
 Third Reading. House Bill 2511, Representative Giorgi."
- Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, House Bill 2511 is the Act that amends the Court Reporters Act, increases the maximum salary for full time court reporters by 2,000..."
- Speaker Cullerton: "I'm sorry, Representative Giorgi. I'll ask the Clerk first to read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2511, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Court Reporters Act. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Cullerton: "Representative Giorgi."
- Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, House Bill 2511 amends the Court Reporters

 Act, increases the maximum salary for full time court
 reporters by \$2,000 to \$39,000 beginning July 1st, 1989.

72nd Legislative Day

October 19, 1989

That will be amended in the Senate if the Bill gets out of the House. We've...This Bill has been around all Session of the General Assembly. It was exempted by Rules. All the Members know what its contents. And I urge support of the House for House Bill 2511."

Speaker Cullerton: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage of House Bill 2511. On that, is there any discussion? The Lady from Cook, Representative Pullen."

Pullen: "I'd like to ask the Sponsor a question, please."

Speaker Cullerton: "Indicates he'll yield."

Pullen: "Has this Bill been cleared as an emergency for this Session by the House Rules Committee?"

Giorgi: "Yes, Miss...Representative Pullen."

Pullen: "Just trying to see what our priorities are. Thank you."

Giorgi: "Thank you, Representative Pullen."

Speaker Cullerton: "Further discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 2511 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. This is final passage. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 72 voting 'yes'...74 voting 'yes', 33 voting 'no', 5 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed... by the extraordinary Constitutional Majority, three-fifths vote, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2833 on Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2833, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Young, A.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 2833 is the Bill that would restore the Chicago school districts to the same number of districts that existed at the time we passed the Educational Reform

72nd Legislative Day

October 19, 1989

The reason this is necessary, before the districts Act. were cut, every school district in the City of Chicago was larger than any other school district in the state. All 23 those districts had more students than any other school districts in the state. Under the Reform Bill that we passed, district superintendents have the responsibility of working with all the individual schools in their districts to write a school improvement plan and to help implement This is a very difficult task when you're that plan. talking about 20 to 25 schools for one superintendent. It's impossible when you make that number 50 or in one case, 78. For those reasons and the other important reason is that the nominating commission that will ultimately nominate a permanent board is based on membership of those school districts. When we passed the School Reform Bill. there were 23 districts. The Members of the General Assembly intended for 23 parents to be on the nominating commissions. As the district exists now, there will only be 11 parents and 5 mayoral appointees. That is not the intent of this Body at the time we passed the law, and that certainly is not improving the system from the bottom up. And finally, I'd like to say what we're talking about, we're talking about service to the students. We're talking about offices in the community that provide a much needed service. We're not talking about bureaucrats on Pershing Road, but service to the students and a commitment to the intent of the legislation we generally or...we originally passed. I move for its adoption and be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Cullerton: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage of House Bill 2833. On that, is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Levin."

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

72nd Legislative Day

October 19, 1989

House. Despite the excellent sponsorship on this Bill. I must rise in opposition to House Bill 2833. One of the major focuses of Chicago School Reform was the elimination of the top heavy bureaucracy and the waste. Many on both sides of the aisle said that before we could vote for an increase in the income tax that would send more money to the Chicago schools, had to be able to go back to constituents and say that the waste had been eliminated, the bloat had been eliminated from the Chicago public schools, so that the new tax money would be fairly and reasonably spent. The bureaucracy was capped in the school reform proposal and that bureaucracy unlike in other parts of the state is not just on Pershing Road. There is a subdistrict system in Chicago that was top heavy with really didn't do very much of anything. bureaucrats who What the interim board did was to take seriously mandate to cut the bureaucracy, and they cut not only on Pershing Road, but they cut in the districts. They eliminated unnecessary positions. And unfortunately, what we have is a reaction to the attempt of the interim board to save \$2,000,000 in unnecessary bureaucracy. When the Sponsors of this legislation initially came to me...in terms of their concerns about the reduction in the number of districts, I asked, 'What is your real concern?' If the is in the racial composition of the district superintendents, I pointed out the number ο£ district superintendents were nine minorities and only two whites. They said, 'No, that is not the concern.' I said, 'If the concern is with the composition of the permanent nominating committee, you have a concern. You have a legitimate concern, but we can deal with that through other legislation.' And we are, in fact, going to be hearing next week in Chicago, to increase the number of parents

72nd Legislative Day

October 19, 1989

from each district on the permanent nominating committee, so there will be a good ratio between parents and mayoral nominees. The bottom line, it seems to me unfortunately, is that there are some people that lost their bureaucrats who are earning \$70,000 a year, who didn't like the fact that by being downgraded to being a principal, they're only going to make \$55,000 a year. I'm opposed to this Bill, because I think it sends a bad message. We were serious about getting rid of the waste and the inefficiency, and we've seen from the results of the elections in Chicago a couple of weeks ago that the parents rallied to the cause of school reform. If we pass this legislation now, what we're saying is that \$2,000,000 that was going to go to the school children of Chicago, that was going to be diverted from the bureaucracy and go to the kids, would have to be diverted back to this unnecessary bureaucracy. Yes, there are local schools that need assistance. We've got many community groups that are assisting them. We've got foundations that are assisting them. In fact, the downtown bureaucracy is mandated to work with the local school councils to assist them. So, I would encourage reluctantly a 'no' vote on this Bill, because it sends the wrong message. It says, We really aren't serious about cutting the bureaucracy. It is hard to make any cuts, but I think that we need to leave in place the cuts that were made, were mandated by General Assembly and were followed through by the interim board. Otherwise, what we've got is a situation like, you fight in a suburban district to close the school, and the school district ultimately decides to close the school, and then a Member of the General Assembly comes down to Springfield, passes a Bill that says...mandates the school be open. This is a local decision. It ought to be

- 72nd Legislative Day October 19, 1989

 made locally. And I urge a 'no' vote."
- Speaker Cullerton: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Ronan."
- Ronan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Gentleman yield for a few questions?"
- Speaker Cullerton: "Representative Young indicates he will."
- Ronan: "Representative Young, as you know, I have tremendous respect for you as a Sponsor. I support your legislative initiatives almost 100 percent. But I think that we have some problems here that I'd like to discuss. How many individuals are affected by...by this action of the interim school board?"
- Young, A.: "I would say that the 400,000 school children in the City of Chicago are affected by this action."
- Ronan: "No...no, we're not talking about kids yet, Representative Young. We're going to get to the kids."
- Young, A.: "I beg your pardon, Representative. I'm talking about the kids."
- Ronan: "How many...How many bureaucrats...How many bureaucrats are affected by this legislation?"
- Young, A.: "I don't know how many people man those districts offices."
- Ronan: "That's one of our problems. You don't know how many people worked in those district offices. I didn't know how many people worked in those district offices, and the taxpayers of Chicago sure didn't know how may people worked in those district offices, and the kids in those schools did know who was working in those district offices. Let me ask another question. What was the average salary of those people working in those district offices?"
- Young, A.: "Very small."
- Ronan: "Sixty-seven thousand dollars a year is very small? You and I should put in a pay raise Bill, Representative,

72nd Legislative Day

October 19, 1989

because if they were worth \$67,000 a year, we're sure worth a lot more down here. What we've got is a situation where we acted. Representative Young, myself and every Member from Chicago worked diligently on the concept of school We crafted what I thought was a good piece of legislation, working with the Senate, working with the Governor, working with the other side of the aisle. legislation was sent to the interim school board that we mandated to be created. And they said, we can make some refinements. We gave them the authority. They said they could make some refinements. They acted to cut out high paid bureaucrats. They've now put a new superintendent Let's not come down here and start meddling when a new superintendent's brought in. The message that we should be delivering back to the people of the City of Chicago is, The Chicago Board of Education is going to be concerned with kids, number one; their parents, number two, the community at large and the educational forces that make a difference in the classroom. Bureaucrats in district offices getting paid \$67,000 a year only makes a difference in draining the budget. If we're interested in education, would hope that we would join together, soundly defeat this bad concept, and then let's all let the City of Chicago and the Chicago Board of Education proceed to hopefully improve the sorry state of our schools. I urge a 'no' vote on this Bill."

Speaker Cullerton: "Further discussion? The lady from Cook, Representative Davis."

Davis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the General Assembly. To the Sponsor of the Bill, I'm pleased to rise in support of improving the schools in the City of Chicago. I think it's significant that we remember that in the legislation that we passed, we mandated that the

72nd Legislative Day

October 19, 1989

district superintendents be responsible for monitoring the implementation of the reform. Now, I want you to get this good. The district superintendents have been charged in Senate Bill 1840 with the monitoring of the progress of school's improvement plan of monitoring the progress of those schools meeting the goals that have been set forth in their school improvement plan. Now, what did we do We cut 23 districts to 11, and then we decreased Chicago? the staff that those 11 have to work with. Let's look some other school districts across the State of Illinois. In Logan County there are nine school districts and they monitor 18 schools. That means the school district of Logan, each district superintendent monitors only two Let's look at another one. Let's take a look at Livingston County. There are 16 school districts and they monitor 25 schools. That is less than two...Yes, thank you, Lou Jones is yielding her time to me."

Speaker Cullerton: "Very gracious of her."

Davis: "Let's look at some others. There's Macon County and Macon County there are eight school districts and they monitor 55 schools. That's less than ten or eight schools per district superintendent. Now in the City of Chicago, you are asking 11 district superintendents to monitor 60 or 70 schools with a decreased staff. Now, if we're really serious about reforming those schools, we don't want to remove those who are charged with monitoring the progress, to helping write remediation plans, to sit down with local school councils to evaluate the principal. You're removing that very step that will allow us to succeed. When we talk about those dollars, Representative Ronan, you just voted to decrease the amount of real estate taxes that people will pay to support the schools. I believe that most people in this General Assembly are genuinely sincere about

72nd Legislative Day

October 19, 1989

improving schools. I just returned from Alaska. I welcome that Senator. She will attest to the fact that an average teacher in Alaska earns 42,000. A top teacher earns \$57,000 in Alaska. So, if we talk about a district superintendent who you think earns 67, it really Maybe, he might earn 55 or 60, but if he's going to monitor 60 or 70 schools, I think we better see that gets \$67,000 a year. I urge you, Ladies and Gentlemen, let's make that School Reform Bill that we voted on, let's work by making sure the level who monitors it is not cut. It has nothing to do with money, Ladies and Gentlemen. In this instance, what they're really trying to do is prove to you that the Chicago schools cannot succeed. I beg to differ with them. We must return at least to letting those district superintendents monitor 25 and They'll still have 25 or 30, if we put back the 23 districts, which is three and four times what the of this state is mandated to do. Please be fair on this. Thank you."

Speaker Cullerton: "Further discussion? The Lady from DuPage, Representative Cowlishaw."

Cowlishaw: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rose yesterday to speak in behalf of the Sponsor of this Bill having the opportunity to present his Bill. I think that is his right, and as a Member of the Minority Party in this chamber, I am very sensitive to each of us being given the opportunity to present our ideas and have those things judged on their merits, not whether the Sponsor is a Republican or a Democrat. Having had what are our essential rights denied to us frequently, we are certainly ready to stand and ask that those rights be granted to everyone, including those on the other side of the aisle. I would always stand for the right of every

72nd Legislative Day

October 19, 1989

elected Representative to have an opportunity to present his or her ideas and hope that those ideas would be regarded by all of us on the basis of their merits. On the basis of the merits, this Bill deserves to be defeated. But I am delighted that the Sponsor had an opportunity to present his views. Thank you."

- Speaker Cullerton: "The Chair would like to announce the presence of an Alderman from Chicago, Alderman Jesse Evans, from the 21st Ward. Welcome to Springfield, Alderman. Representative Monique Davis, what purpose do you rise?"
- Davis: "Thank you, thank you, John. Jesse Evans is here in support of that Bill from the 21st Ward, as well as those senior citizens up there in that balcony. Senior citizens from the 21st, right on. So you'd better pass this Bill, right?"
- Speaker Cullerton: "The Chair would also like to announce the presence of the Director of the Department of Corrections, Michael Lane, is here. Further discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Williams."
- Williams: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of this Body. First, I want to start by saying it's so good to see that Al Ronan is out for cutting patronage and it makes me feel good, is out for cutting jobs. But first of all, let's get to the real substance of what we're talking about. Over the past few days, I've talked to a lot of the colleagues about this Bill. What we talk about is school reform, but understand how it's been implemented and what's going on right now in the City of Chicago. Local school councils have been given the responsibility for running local schools in each and every school district in the City of Chicago. Our schools have different make-ups. The schools that Ellis Levin represent, the schools possibly Al Ronan represent and those councils have

72nd Legislative Day

October 19, 1989

about with a lot of professional people on those councils. They have lot of CPA's and other sort of people who the ability, knowledge and the experience in running these various schools. The schools from my district have school graduates on those councils. What we're talking about is a function within the particular school board that says, you will work to ensure that these local councils operate properly, that they have the support from the board. Understand this. We need that level of support. My community, and I'm one of those who both supported the Bill and defended the Bill in my neighborhood, but many people in our neighborhood feel that this particular level of support is the very level that's needed to make this whole thing work. This \$2,000,000,000 budget that's involved, and we're talking about a \$2,000,000 expense. And then let's go back to the original intent. When we were in the room negotiating over, would this Bill pass? A question was asked of all of those who were involved with school reform. The question would you reduce the local district superintendents, the subdistricts? The answer given was, No, we will cut the local district superintendent. So, all that we're doing is saying, 'Let us conform to the original language, the original intent and the understanding that we had when we passed this legislation.' Please give our local school councils an opportunity to work properly by giving them the proper support that they need to operate. I sincerely urge that you think about this. Don't do it partisan; don't do as a friend. Think about it. We want it to work; you want it to work. Please support us in this very serious..."

Speaker Cullerton: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from $\hbox{\tt DuPage, Representative McCracken."}$

McCracken: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in opposition to this

72nd Legislative Day

October 19, 1989

Bill. Isn't the whole point of reform to cut down the bureaucracy? Isn't the whole point of reform local control and choice? Isn't that the point? We're not talking about the bureaucrats anymore. The focus in reform is on the children, the parents and choice over their schools. Isn't that the whole point of the reform package in the first place? This just creates more jobs. It puts more of the bureaucrats back, and it is a step in the wrong direction. The reform hasn't even had time to take effect. How can we be tinkering with it already? Let's say 'no' to this Bill. Give reform a chance and say 'no' to the bureaucracy."

Speaker Cullerton: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative
Young, to close."

Young, A.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of find it amazing that the opponents of this Bill do so in the name of reform. Anyone who really wants to give reform in Chicago a chance should support this Bill. We talk about local reform and the children, I just remind this General Assembly, when we passed the original Bill, we did away with some districts, some high school districts. The parents came to Springfield in overwhelming numbers in testimony both here and the City of Chicago and testified to the importance of those districts. They testified much that in the Governor's Amendatory Veto, that was worked out by both sides of the aisle. We put the districts back in, because it was the will of the parents who testified loud and clearly. So, I would just urge you that if you're thinking about the parents, if you're thinking about the children, if you're thinking about the bottom up, these are not bureaucrats. They don't work in Pershing Roads. They're there where they are accessible and available to the parents and the children. This is not about money. This is about whether or not the people in

72nd Legislative Day

October 19, 1989

the City of Chicago, whose children go to those schools, will be able to function in a reasonable atmosphere. As it stands right now, the school councils will have 50 and 60 parents on them. It's just too large a number; it's not workable. We're not talking about jobs, bureaucrats or money. We're talking about reform that's supposedly from the bottom up. The parents have made their wishes clear. They need the support provided by the districts. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Cullerton: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. This is final Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? all voted wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. this question there are 40 voting 'yes', 65 voting 'no', 6 voting 'present'. This Bill, having failed to receive required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared failed. On House Calendar Supplemental #1 appears a Motion on House Bill 1131 - Representative Levin. I believe that this is an agreed Motion. The Gentleman asks leave to adopt his Motion on House Bill 1131, to take from the Table and suspend Rule 79(e) and place on the Order Concurrence on Conference Committee Reports. The Gentleman leave by the Attendance Roll Call. Leave is granted. The...There's an objection to this Bill being granted So the Gentleman moves that we take from the Table and suspend Rule 79(e) and place on the Order of Conference Committee Reports - House Bill 1131. All those in favor 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is vote open. This is Representative Levin's Bill, House Bill Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the 1131. record. On this question there are 76 voting 'yes', voting 'no', 3 voting 'present' and the Motion is adopted.

72nd Legislative Day

October 19, 1989

Senate Bill 47 - out of the record. Senate Bill 472 - out the record. Senate Bill 801 - out of the record. Senate Bill 1075 - Representative Ronan. Representative Ronan moves to suspend Rule 79(e) and return Calendar Order of Conference Committee Reports -Bill 1075. The Gentleman asks leave by the Attendance Roll Call. Is leave granted? Leave is granted. The Motion prevails by the Attendance Roll Call. Senate Bill 1136 -Representative Giorgi. The Gentleman moves to take from the Table and place on the Order of the Calendar - Second Reading - Senate Bill 1136. The Gentleman asks leave by the Attendance Roll Call. Leave is granted. prevails by the Attendance Roll Call. Senate Bill 1276 -Representative Wolf moves to discharge the Personnel and Pensions Committee on Interim Study Calendar and place on the Order of Second Reading - Senate Bill 1276. Gentleman asks leave by the Attendance Roll Call to pass this Motion. Leave is granted. The Motion is Senate Bill 1322 - Representative Kubik - Motion to suspend Rule 79(e) and place on the Calendar Order of Conference Committee Reports - Senate Bill 1322. The Gentleman asks leave by the Attendance Roll Call to adopt the Motion. Leave is granted. The Motion prevails. Senate Bill 1379 -Representative Balanoff moves to take from the Table and return to the Order of Calendar - Order of Third Reading -Senate Bill 1379. The Gentleman asks leave by Attendance Roll Call to adopt the Motion. Leave is granted. The Motion is adopted. Senate Bill 1403 -Representative Stern moves to take from the Table and place on the Order of Third Reading - Senate Bill 1403. The Lady asks leave by the Attendance Roll Call to adopt the Motion. Leave is granted. The Motion is adopted. Senate Bill 1451 - Representative Bugielski moves to suspend Rule 79(e) and

72nd Legislative Day

October 19, 1989

place on the Calendar on the Order of Conference Committee Reports - Senate Bill 1451. The Gentleman asks leave the Attendance Roll Call. Leave is granted. The Motion prevails. House Resolution 35 - Representative Curran moves to take from the Table and place on the Order of Speaker's Table for immediate consideration Resolution 35. The Gentleman asks leave by the Attendance Roll Call to adopt the Motion. Leave is granted. The Motion is adopted. Now on the Calendar on page...Representative McCracken. On the Calendar on page 6 Item Veto Motions. We had called House Bill Representative Didrickson. She had asked that this be taken out of the record and passed. Representative Didrickson, do you wish for us to call...Representative, am mispronouncing your name? Is it Didrickson or Didrickson?"

Didrickson: "You did. Wonderful job, wonderful job."

Speaker Cullerton: "Okay. This is on page 6 - House Bill 830.

You have a Motion #1 on an Item Reduction Veto."

Didrickson: "Yes. The Governor's Veto of \$150,000 for a Division of Labor within the Department of Labor to monitor hiring practices of women and minorities in the public and private sector was based on the fact that this data base is already being collected. That is not correct; it is not true. The Department of Employment Security does not have this data base. There are a number of departments and commissions, particularly the Commission on Women, who would like to have this kind of information. It would certainly be most useful to all of us when we are considering pieces of legislation within this purview. I would ask for your favorable consideration to override and establish this new division."

Speaker Cullerton: "You heard the Lady's Motion. The Gentleman

72nd Legislative Day

October 19, 1989

from Cook, Representative Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Department of Labor is always tight or underfunded. We keep banging on this agency and others and ask deep questions on minority and female hiring. Also, we, in the Supplemental two weeks from now, we are going to take care of the hiring problems with veterans. And I think we should override the Veto of the Governor here and take care of the minority and the female. Two weeks from now, we'll take care of the veterans. We'll do them all at once. I would ask for all of us to join unanimously in voting 'green'."

Speaker Cullerton: "Further discussion? You've heard the Lady's Motion. The question is, 'Shall this Item pass, the Veto of the Governor notwithstanding?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question there are 108 voting 'aye', 4 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. The Motion, having received the required Three—Fifths Majority, prevails and this Item is declared passed, the Veto of the Governor notwithstanding. Now on page 8 of the Calendar under Reduction and Item Veto Motions appears House Bill 850, Representative Turner, on Motion #5."

Turner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Assembly. A Motion...Amendm...Motion #5 deals with the \$5,000,000 appropriation to the Affordable Housing Trust Fund Legislation. As you know, we set up the commission this past spring. This \$5,000,000 would start up funds to help get the commission up and going. It was anticipated that the commission...that the program would generate \$13,000,000 for affordable housing in the State of Illinois. We all know that \$13,000,000 is only a drop in the bucket. I move and urge this Body to help me support

72nd Legislative Day

October 19, 1989

the override of the Governor's Veto of this \$5,000,000. It's a small drop in the bucket in terms of getting this program off the ground. We know the importance of housing, and I just move for favorable support of this particular override."

Speaker Cullerton: "The Gentleman from Vermont, Representative Mays."

"Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I reluctantly rise in Mays: opposition to the Gentleman's Motion. The idea originally was that we were going to have to have these dollars to, so to speak, jump start this program while the dollars roll in from the Real Estate Transfer Tax that funded in total in the out years. It's my understanding that the Advisory Board has not even been appointed to this. It is also my understanding that the rules have not even been promulgated at this point. And as we speak, dollars are coming this fund from the Real Estate Transfer Tax that passed, that we all voted for last June. As a result, I don't believe it would be appropriate for us to spend down \$5,000,000 in General Revenue Funds, which are going to be tight in the out years, and everybody knows it. And they're getting there real fast right now. Αt time, we are already accruing these funds as they are supposed to accrue from the Real Estate Transfer Tax that passed last year. As I said, we've already got a million three in that fund. It is going to be available spending once the board does get going. By the time the board does get going, it is now...undoubtedly will have a lot more money in that fund. So the rationale for a jump start, I don't think exists as it did previously. And certainly the General Revenue dollars and the depletion that this would cause should be of equal concern to everyone. So I would rise in opposition to the Gentleman's

72nd Legislative Day

October 19, 1989

Motion to restore the Reduction Veto."

Speaker Cullerton: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I supported the Gentleman's Bill last year on the Affordable Housing Program. I also supported him in finding a funding And so it is with a great deal of reluctance that I join the previous speaker and must rise to oppose his Motion before us at this point to transfer funds...transfer dollars from the General Revenue Fund. We simply cannot continue to make hits from the General Revenue Fund and do the things, the many things, that we are asked to do down here. I think the legislation the Gentleman passed last year is a step forward. It will work. The monies will accrue from the dedicated source that he worked so hard to pass. I would simply ask Members on both sides of the aisle to resist spending very, very scarce General Revenue Fund dollars for the program at this time. And it is with a great deal of reluctance that I must oppose the Gentleman's Motion."

Speaker Cullerton: "The Gentleman from Morgan, Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The attempt may be well founded, but the fact of the matter is that this organization is not ready to do business. We don't have rules; we don't have people appointed and yet, each month the fund is accumulating a million point two, a million point three dollars in order to do business when they're organized and ready to. In actuality, the 5,000,000 is being sought will be there within the next four months, at which time they will then start doing business. So why are we spending money now to do what the regular source of those funds, the Revenue Stamp Tax, would do in the first place? It's

72nd Legislative Day

October 19, 1989

additional. It is trying to do something that is not appropriate. I stand in opposition."

Speaker Cullerton: "The Gentleman from Adams, Representative Mays, for what purpose do you rise, Representative?"

Mays: "Parliamentary inquiry. You had a restoring a Reduction Veto and I have it down as an Item Veto."

Speaker Cullerton: "Yea, this is an Item Veto."

Mays: "Okay. Thank you. So that will take 71 votes then to..."

Speaker Cullerton: "Yes, it will."

Mays: "Thank you."

Speaker Cullerton: "Yes, Representative Bowman, on the issue."

Bowman: "Thank you. I rise in support of the Gentleman's Motion. Number one, as to the points made by the last speaker, I think passing this Motion would send a very strong message to those people who are in charge of promulgating rules and regulations that the General Assembly is really serious about this program, and we want it to get up and running as fast as possible. With regard to whether the money is there or not, let me simply point out that the Economic and Fiscal Commission is revising its revenue estimates upward. The original estimates appear to be too pessimistic, and so in my opinion there is absolutely nothing that we have seen that would argue against this particular Motion, so I'm pleased to support the Gentleman in it."

Speaker Cullerton: "Further discussion? Representative Turner to close."

Turner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Assembly. The previous speakers referred to this as a jump start. They refer to it as a hit against the General Revenue Fund. I only say that the \$13,000,000 that we anticipated would be raised by the Transfer Tax, we all agree was not enough money to satisfy the lack of affordable housing in this state. The reason that the

72nd Legislative Day

October 19, 1989

commission has not been formulated and the rules have not together, is being held up by that administration. We have urged and called the Governor's and requested that the commission members appointed and that the program be put in place. The General Assembly has...did all we could do when we passed out this legislation. There appears to be some delay on the part of the other side of the aisle in terms of making this thing go. I think that if we're serious about dealing with housing in the State of Illinois, if we understand that housing, that there's a direct correlation between housing and economic development, we understand the need for the...satisfying the homeless situation in this state, when you look at cold weather approaching and we saw the outside this morning, you understand there's...this is a very important issue. That \$5,000,000 is a very small step. It does not nearly cover the need, and I urge the Members to support the Governor's override of this particular Bill."

Speaker Cullerton: "The question is, 'Shall this Item pass, the Veto of the Governor notwithstanding?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. This requires 71 votes for passage. The voting's open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question there are 66...On this question there are 66 voting 'yes', 45 voting 'no', 2 voting 'present'. Representative Saltsman wishes to vote 'aye'."

Saltsman: "Yes."

- Speaker Cullerton: "Representative Turner, do you wish to poll the absentees? Poll of those not voting, please, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "Poll of those not voting. Didrickson. Harris and Hoffman. No further."

72nd Legislative Day

October 19, 1989

Speaker Cullerton: "So on this question there are 68 voting 'aye', 43 voting 'no', 2 voting 'present'. The Motion, having failed to receive the required three-fifths majority, fails. I understand Representative Didrickson or Didrickson wishes to hear on House Bill 850 on Motion #3. Is the Lady in the chamber? We had taken it out Representative Didrickson, am I mispronouncing record. your name again? Is it Didrickson or Didrickson? Didrickson, do you wish call to call on page 8 of the Calendar House Bill 850 - your Motion #3."

Didrickson: "Yes. Thank you very much, Representative Cullerton.

This Override Motion has to do with direction services which provides for a statewide network of special ed. services, the hot line number. It's a \$110,000 that was struck from the Governor's...the Governor's action. And what it will do is actually shut down Direction Services for the Alliance of Exceptional Children and Adults in the State of Illinois. This is legislation that we passed three years ago. It is working very competently and is providing services in a network across the state. I would ask for a favorable Motion on this."

Speaker Cullerton: "You've heard the Lady's Motion on an Item

Veto. Is there any discussion? Representative Leverenz."

Leverenz: "I would ask that you consider this and that you would

vote 'yes'. This is a service that will stop if we don't

give it 110,000. It's very vital for special needs of

children in educational placement. I'd ask that you vote

'aye'."

Speaker Cullerton: "Further discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall this Item pass, the Veto of the Governor notwithstanding on House Bill 850?' Those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the

72nd Legislative Day

October 19, 1989

record. On this question there are 103 voting 'yes'...On this question there are 107 voting 'yes', 3 voting 'no', 10 voting 'present'. This Motion, having received the required Three-Fifths Majority prevails and this Item is declared passed, the Veto of the Governor notwithstanding. On page 8 of the Calendar - House Bill 850 - Motion #8 - Representative Bugielski. I'm sorry, Representative Preston - Motion #6. It's before Representative Bugielski. Representative Preston."

Preston: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Motion #6 has to do with reinstating the sum of \$73,000 into the budget that was appropriated for the purpose of lakefront...fighting lakefront erosion from the wave effects of Lake Michigan. This appropriation to the Department of Transportation will provide for lakefront revetments to be built to protect a synagogue and some residential property that the wave action today is not just flooding, but drawing this property into Lake Michigan. It's a very small amount of money. It is needed to protect this property. And I'd be glad to answer any questions, and I really do urge and hope you will vote 'aye' on this Override Motion."

Speaker Cullerton: "The Gentleman moves for the passage of Motion #6, an Override Motion on an Item Veto on House Bill 850.

Any discussion? The Lady from Cook, Representative Parcells."

Parcells: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in opposition to this add on. Seventy—three thousand dollars isn't a great deal of money, but there's already a million...one million seven...one point seven million dollars in this appropriation already. There was some rumor that this was for a particular condominium which may or may not be the case. This condominium chose not to be part of the program

72nd Legislative Day

October 19, 1989

and then later botched up their own work and then came running back to the state saying we need the help. They could, in fact, go through the regular process that everybody else along there has gone through. They, if they want to improve their shoreline erosion, there's a way to line up with the state and collect this money. There's plenty of money in the program already. And it appears that this 73,000 is somebody who is trying to shortcut the procedure, and I don't think it should be allowed. And I would ask for your 'no' vote."

- Speaker Cullerton: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Adams, Representative Mays."
- Mays: "Thank you very much. Would the Gentleman yield for a question? Are these Capital Development Funds or General Revenue Funds?"
- Preston: "Representative, to answer your question, I'd be guessing. I believe they're Capital Development Funds, but that's a guess and I certainly wouldn't expect you to run on it."
- Mays: "Okay. I believe they are also, and I guess ordinarily in the scheme of things, you could say, well, they are not GRF so we don't have to worry about it. If they are GRF, you know we're always raising the fiscal flag on that stuff. That's ordinarily. But I want you to keep in mind that this particular year, we passed a capital budget pretty heavy. And then we added on top of that about \$97,000,000 for Corrections and a number of other things which means we've appropriated more capital projects then we've got the bond authorization...well, no, the bond authorization matches, but we have...more than we're going to be able to afford to do. Adding more to that will simply delay those other projects that have been worked up through that process. And as a result, I don't think

72nd Legislative Day

October 19, 1989

that's a good precedent we ought to be setting at this point. I would therefore urge the Members of the General Assembly to sustain the Governor and his action on this particular item."

- Speaker Cullerton: "Further discussion? There being none, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Preston, to close."
- Preston: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I understand the concerns of principle that some Members may have. I have on very rare occasions ever asked for an appropriation of any sums of money to help my district specifically. This is one of those occasions. I think it's probably the second time in the eleven years I've been here. This lakefront erosion is destroying residential property. Ιt is destrovina synagogue property. This will assist in protecting that, which is our obligation, I think to do. I 'm asking for it for my district. They need it. If you saw the photographs that I saw of what the wave action is doing to this property, you'd be amazed and abhorred and I hope you will. If the Governor understood it, he'd be all for this. And I hope you'll vote to override his Veto."
- Speaker Cullerton: "The question is, 'Shall the this Item pass, the Veto of the Governor notwithstanding on House Bill 850?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. This Item Veto would require 71 votes for passage. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. Representative Preston, would you care for a poll of those not voting? Mr. Clerk, could you please poll those not voting."
- Clerk Leone: "Poll of those not voting. Barger. Harris.

 Martinez. Myron Olson and Pullen. No further."
- Speaker Cullerton: "Representative Martinez wishes to be recorded as voting 'aye'. Representative Johnson, what purpose do

72nd Legislative Day

October 19, 1989

you rise?"

page 8."

Johnson: "Would you please change my vote from 'yes' to 'no'."

Speaker Cullerton: "Representative Johnson pushed the wrong button... wishes to vote 'no'. Representative Hallock wishes to vote 'no'. And Representative Olson wishes to vote 'no'. I'm sorry, that's Myron Olson. So, on this question there are 68 voting 'yes', 45 voting 'no', none voting 'present' and the Motion, having failed to receive the required Three-Fifths Majority, fails. On the Calendar — Motion #8. Representative Bugielski on House Bill 850 on

Bugielski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the This Motion seeks to restore a five hundred House. thousand dollar appropriation from the Tourism Promotion Fund to the Department of Commerce and Community Affairs for a grant to the Chicago Convention and Visitors Bureau. The appropriation will fund an ongoing and previously funded distress period marketing program designed to increase the number of conventions and business meetings in Illinois during the winter months, December through March. This is when the state experiences high hotel/motel vacancy rates. The five hundred dollar...the five hundred thousand appropriation is needed to complete the distress period marketing program started in 1989, and is expected to generate new Illinois convention business sufficient to first create more than five hundred thousand dollars in new hotel/motel sales, income, gas, liquor and cigarette taxes; and second, to create 350 new jobs. This Override Motion is supported by the Illinois Restaurant Association, the Hotel/Motel Association of Illinois, the Hotel and Restaurant Employees' Union, the Chicago Federation of Labor, Illinois Retail Merchants Association, Convention and Visitors Bureau, Chicago Association of

72nd Legislative Day

October 19, 1989

Commerce and Industry and the Chicago Society of Association Executives. I know that many of you are aware of this Motion and I solicit your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Cullerton: "The Gentleman moves for the passage of the
Item Veto Override. Are there any...Is there any
discussion? The Gentleman from Bureau, Representative
Mautino."

Mautino: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, will the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Cullerton: "He indicates he will."

Mautino: "Bob, if I remember correctly, we provided in that line item originally about a million dollars for the tourism provision in the City of Chicago and about seven hundred thousand under the Tourism Council. Is that correct?"

Bugielski: "I believe so."

Mautino: "Now, the five hundred thousand dollars you're asking for is in addition to those two, and where do those funds come from, because the rest of the...Does it come from the rest of the pool which is the downstate tourism councils?"

Bugielski: "I was under the impression that it was coming from GRF, but I'm not sure on that."

Mautino: "Well, we have basically about a three million dollar total of which is split pretty equally between upstate and downstate. This is the problem we sometime run into with Overrides and Supplemental Appropriations. Does that mean that the budget next year that they will be seeking will be 1.5 million dollars instead of one million dollars, or is it going to be five hundred thousand less and you're moving to use next year's funds? This...this..."

Bugielski: "This five hundred thousand dollars was just for a one year grant. I don't see, you know, in the following...you know, years to come."

Mautino: "Well, is there a corresponding addition for five hundred thousand for the balance of the state, or is this

72nd Legislative Day

October 19, 1989

just five hundred thousand for one area?"

Bugielski: "Five hundred thousand dollars for the Chicago Convention and Tourism."

Mautino: "The...the concern I have is if there's...we put about three million dollars into the fund and I would hope that you're not taking it from the balance of state fund to increase the portion that already gets 1.6 million to an area. Is there any way you can tell me exactly, or somebody can tell me exactly if that's the case or not?"

Bugielski: "Well, the one thing is that the five hundred thousand dollars is going to be spent right now. But estimated right in the first three months, we'll be getting back...or four months, four hundred thousand dollars back into the Hotel and Motel Tax Fund, just by the occupancy rate going up. So, the money is being spent out, but it will be coming right back into the fund also."

Speaker Cullerton: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Saline, Representative Phelps."

Phelps: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Gentleman yield?" Speaker Cullerton: "He indicates he will."

Phelps: "Bugs, I hate to do this, but it's my understanding now the tourism fund, and Representative Mautino touched upon this, right now that it's one—third Chicago, two—thirds downstate allocation, and you're to get a million and whatever Mautino discussed in addition. This five hundred thousand, and downstaters need to take notice of what we're trying to do here, although Bugs' intentions I know are respectful for his district, the Tourism Promotion Fund right now realizes from the Hotel/Motel Tax ten percent. And the number of dollars that, if you get this five hundred thousand it would generate back into the economy, we could only recoup ten percent of that. In other words, if you generated four hundred thousand, ten percent would

72nd Legislative Day

October 19, 1989

be forty thousand back in TPF Fund. Whereas right now, 1.3 million of this fund that you're tapping into for downstaters' purposes goes to welcome centers and matching grant promotion funds for festivals, brochures and all those events. Now we've had a long struggle trying to capture what little money we have and in all due respect to Bugs, this particular fund will lose its flexibility and we'll be back here screaming for more money for downstate. And it's a shifting game and I just want to caution you against it, although I'd be willing to work with Representative Bugielski on trying to provide new money for all of us next year. Thank you."

Speaker Cullerton: "The Gentleman from Ryder,

Representative...the Gentleman from Morgan, Representative

Ryder."

Ryder: "Was that 'Collerton' or Cullerton, I didn't recall?"

Speaker Cullerton: "Representative...Speaker pro tem would be fine."

Ryder: "Thanks for the extra stipend, I appreciate it. As a downstater I rise in support of this Motion. I understand the concerns that have been raised by the two previous speakers indicating that it may cause some concerns in I'm not here to debate that issue. What I am here suggest to you, is that this...funds would be appropriately spent and then would return dollars back into the fund with the kinds of Motel/Hotel Tax that's required in the City of Chicago. Now it may very well be that the City of Chicago needs extra money to get tourists there, because the downstate organizations have been taking them away from the city, so it might be that we have to repay them for that purpose. But as a consequence, it does seem to me that it, in this particular situation, that we're talking about a five percent portion of the budget.

72nd Legislative Day

October 19, 1989

would be in support of the Gentleman's Motion."

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

Black: "Well, thank you very much, Mr. Speaker pro tem. Will the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Cullerton: "I don't know, let's ask him."

Black: "Thank you."

Speaker Cullerton: "He indicates he will."

Black: "Thank you very much. Representative, can you perhaps shed some light on the situation in that it's my understanding that this transfer will not alter the current formula to the downstate convention and visitors bureaus, tourism agencies etc. Is that your understanding?"

Bugielski: "To my knowledge, it is."

Black: "And isn't what you're asking here is for this transfer to concentrate particularly on what we call the distressed season; tourism promotion in Chicago, i.e. December, January, February?"

Bugielski: "And March. Correct."

Black: "Thank you very much. Mr. Speaker pro tem, to the Bill.

I think the Gentleman's Motion is quite frankly a reasonable attempt. And I guess as a downstater, maybe you can come over here and make a career out of bashing Chicago, and I suppose on occasion I don't always vote the way Chicago would want me to vote, but in this case I think we have to look at some of the dollars from downstate taxpayers we have already sent to Chicago. Particularly, and no matter how we feel about it, McCormick Place and other such centers in Chicago. It would be, I think, penny wise and dollar foolish at this point, if we neglect to market Chicago, the magnet of Illinois, whether we like that are not, to the very best of our ability. Because quite frankly, what you can attract to the City of Chicago

72nd Legislative Day

October 19, 1989

I would hope we then our bureaus and agencies could attract to stay an extra day or two and visit central or southern Illinois. So, while we may not always be in agreement, Representative, I think your request is reasonable. I think we all in the State of Illinois have to realize that on occasion, Chicago is indeed a part of Illinois and can be on those occasions, I think, beneficial to all of Illinois. And in this case, I would simply rise to support your Motion."

Speaker Cullerton: "Further discussion? There being none, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Bugielski, to close." "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Again, this will take care Bugielski: of the distress period marketing programs. Ιt will increase the number of hotel room nights in northeastern Illinois by five thousand rooms per month, with average room rates of a hundred dollars and average visits of 2.1 days. The program will generate an estimated 3.million...3.5 million dollars in hotel/motel revenue, producing an estimated four hundred thousand dollars in state hotel/motel tax receipts. Failure to implement the distress period marketing program can be expected to result in layoffs of three thousand hotel workers during the December-March period. So we see the importance of this. I ask for your 'aye' votes in this Motion. Thank you very much."

Speaker Cullerton: "Question is, 'Shall this item pass, the Veto of the Governor notwithstanding?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting's open. This is...This Bill will require 71 votes. Have all voted who wish? Representative Hicks. One minute to explain his vote."

Hicks: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I just find it somewhat ironic that

Representative Black and Representative Ryder get up in

72nd Legislative Day

October 19, 1989

support of this Motion, when we've seen several times there has been a little bit of Chicago bashing. And whoever talked to you, I wish they would come and talk to me and convince me why it's good that we do that. Come over, Bill. Thank you."

- Speaker Cullerton: "Mr. Clerk...Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question there are 70...Representative Shaw."
- Shaw: "I'd like a verification of the Roll Call, please."
- Speaker Cullerton: "Representative Davis. Okay. Well, Representative Shaw asked first. So, on this question there are 75 voting 'yes', 33 voting 'no' and 6 voting 'present', and the...Representative Bugielski asks for a poll of those not voting. Representative Shaw asks for a verification of the affirmative. So, Mr. Clerk, if you'll do the poll of those not voting."
- Clerk Leone: "Poll of those not voting. Representative Harris and Williams. No further."
- Speaker Cullerton: "Could you proceed with the verification of the affirmative votes?"
- Clerk Leone: "Poll of the affirmative. Barger. Barnes. Black. Bowman. Breslin. Brunsvold. Bugielski. Capparelli. Churchill. Countryman. Cowlishaw. Cullerton. DeJaegher. DeLeo. Didrickson. Doederlein. Edley. Farley. Virginia Frederick. Goforth. Giorgi. Granberg. Hallock. Hannig. Harris. Hartke. Hasara. Hensel. Hicks. Hoffman. Homer."
- Speaker Cullerton: "Representative Young wishes to change his vote to 'no'. Representative Balanoff wishes to change his vote to 'aye'. Representative Mulcahey. For what purpose do you rise, Representative Mulcahey? Yes, I'm sorry, that's Anthony Young wishes to vote 'no'."

Mulcahey: "Learn to be verified now?"

72nd Legislative Day

October 19, 1989

Speaker Cullerton: "Well...Representative Shaw will you give leave for Representative Mulcahey to be verified? And Representative Robert Olson wishes to vote 'no'. Representative Paul Williams wishes to vote Representative Leverenz asks leave to be verified. Representative Shaw, Representative Leverenz asks leave to be verified. Representative Rice wishes to vote 'no'. Any further changes? While the Clerk...It takes a little time for the Clerk to catch up on these...on these changes, so as soon as he's finished, we'll proceed. Okay. Now, any further changes? Representative Shaw, Okay. do you question any of the affirmative votes? Representative Balanoff, do you wish to be recorded as voting...Well, Representative Balanoff, I believe I announced on the record that you wished to vote 'aye'. Okay, so you wish to vote 'no' at this time? Okay, and that's the way recorded. That's fine. Representative Shaw."

Shaw: "Representative Morrow?"

Speaker Cullerton: "Representative Morrow? How is the Gentleman
 recorded?"

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

Speaker Cullerton: "Is the Gentleman in the chamber?

Representative Morrow. Remove him."

Shaw: "Representative Wyvetter Younge?"

Speaker Cullerton: "Representative Wyvetter Younge? She's in the rear of the chamber."

Shaw: "Representative Parcells?"

Speaker Cullerton: "Representative Parcells? How is the Lady recorded?"

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

Speaker Cullerton: "Representative Parcells is way at the rear of the chamber, right outside the women's washroom."

Shaw: "Representative Dunn?"

72nd Legislative Day

October 19. 1989

Speaker Cullerton: "Representative John Dunn? How is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Cullerton: "Representative John Dunn is in the center aisle."

Shaw: "Representative..."

Speaker Cullerton: "Representative Black asks leave to be verified."

Shaw: "Okav."

Speaker Cullerton: "Alright. That's okay."

Shaw: "Representative DeLeo?"

Speaker Cullerton: "Representative DeLeo? How's the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Cullerton: "Is the Gentleman in the chamber?

Representative DeLeo? Remove him."

Shaw: "Representative Keane?"

Speaker Cullerton: "Representative Keane? Is the Gentleman in the chamber? How's the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Cullerton: "Is Representative Keane in the chamber? Remove him."

Shaw: "Representative Stange?"

Speaker Cullerton: "Representative Shaw, Representative Sieben asks leave to be verified. You know..."

Shaw: "Okay."

Speaker Cullerton: "...who he is? Right. He's in the center aisle."

Shaw: "Representative Stange?"

Speaker Cullerton: "I'm sorry."

Shaw: "Representative Stange?"

Speaker Cullerton: "Representative Stange? How's the Gentleman recorded?"

72nd Legislative Day

October 19, 1989

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

Speaker Cullerton: "Is the Gentleman in the chamber? Remove him.

Now Representative Williamson and Ryder ask leave to be verified."

Shaw: "Okay."

Speaker Cullerton: "You have leave. Okay."

Shaw: "Representative...Representative Wennlund?"

Speaker Cullerton: "Representative Wennlund? How's the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Cullerton: "Representative Wennlund is in the chamber."

Shaw: "Representative...Representative Farley?"

Speaker Cullerton: "Representative Farley? How's the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Cullerton: "Is the Gentleman in the chamber? Yes, he is.

He's in the rear of the chamber."

Shaw: "Representative Laurino?"

Speaker Cullerton: "Representative Laurino? How's the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Cullerton: "Is Representative Laurino in the chamber?

Remove him. Further questions?"

Shaw: "Representative Leitch?"

Speaker Cullerton: "Representative Leitch? How's the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Cullerton: "Is the Gentleman in the chamber? Remove him."

Shaw: "Representative...Representative Krska?"

Speaker Cullerton: "I'm sorry. Could you repeat that name,
 please?"

Shaw: "Representative Krska."

72nd Legislative Day

October 19, 1989

Speaker Cullerton: "Oh, Representative Krska. Yes, how is the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Cullerton: "Is Representative Krska in the chamber?

Remove him. Representative Keane has returned to the chamber. Please add Representative Keane to the Roll Call as an 'aye' vote."

Shaw: "Representative Novak?"

Speaker Cullerton: "Representative Novak is in the chamber."

Shaw: "Okay."

Speaker Cullerton: "Representative Woolard, for what purpose do you rise? Representative Woolard wishes to change his vote to 'aye'. Representative Krska has returned to the chamber. Please return Representative Krska to the Roll Call as an 'aye' vote. Are there any further changes? Representative Novak wishes to vote 'aye'. Representative Novak wishes to change his vote to 'aye' and Representative Curran wishes to change his vote to 'aye'. Representative Petka wishes to change his vote to 'aye'. On this question there are 71 voting 'aye', 34 voting 'no', 5 voting...Who is seeking recognition? Representative Jones, Shirley Jones."

Jones, Shirley: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I think Representative Wyvetter Younge was seeking recognition."

Speaker Cullerton: "Well, she's in her chair and she's not pushed her button, so...Representative Granberg wishes to be recorded as voting 'aye'. Are there any further changes? On this question there are 72 voting 'aye', 33 voting 'no' and 5 voting 'present'. This...the Motion having received the Constitutional Majority prevails and the House...the Motion having received the required Three-Fifths Majority prevails, and the item is declared passed, the Veto of the Governor notwithstanding. On page 9 of the Calendar,

72nd Legislative Day

October 19, 1989

Motion #11, Representative Mulcahey. An Item Veto on page 9 of the Calendar."

Mulcahey: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Motion #11 seeks to restore one hundred thousand dollars to the budget for the...for grants to be administered by the EPA in the creation of the Illinois Lake Management Program. And I would move for the adoption of the Amendment...or the Motion."

Speaker Cullerton: "Okay, this is an Item Veto. The Gentleman's made his Motion. Is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall this item pass, the Veto of the Governor notwithstanding?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting's open. This is final passage. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question there are 87 voting 'yes', 22 voting 'no', 3 voting 'present'. This Motion having received the required Three—Fifths Majority prevails, and this item is declared passed, the Veto of the Governor notwithstanding. On page 8 of the Calendar appears Motion #9 on House Bill 850. Representative Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On Motion #9 this is a Reduction Veto. We are restoring fifty thousand dollars to what is known as the Clean and Beautiful Program, which really means the recycling and composting projects that go to our communities. We had eleven communities in the program in 1986, it's now grown to thirty and there's no way that the hundred and fifty thousand left, I think, could satisfy the demand on the program. Therefore, I'm asking for the additional fifty thousand to be restored for a total of two hundred thousand. I solicit your 'aye' vote, so we can take care of this project that is very dear to our communities."

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

72nd Legislative Day

October 19, 1989

there any discussion? The Lady from Cook, Representative Didrickson."

Didrickson: "I'm not going to touch that. I rise in support of the Gentleman's Motion. As a Cook County Legislator, I know the benefit having run out of landfills in our region, for such a recycling, composting program. And the grants that are generated to local villages, particularly in my district, the Village of Orland Park, is a recipient and others working on this. So, I think it's a good Motion and I support the Gentleman's request."

Speaker Cullerton: "Any further discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall this item pass, the Veto of the Governor notwithstanding?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting's open. The Chair apologizes. This is a Reduction Veto. The question is, 'Shall...the question is, 'Shall this item be restored to its original amount, notwithstanding the reduction of the Governor?' And requires 60 votes. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question there are 99 voting 'aye', 13 voting 'no' and none voting 'present'. This Motion having received the Constitutional Majority prevails, and the House restores the item. Representative Myron Olson."

Olson, M.: "Thank you...Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The Republicans are calling a caucus in Room 118 for 30 minutes. Excuse me, the Republicans aren't calling a caucus in Room 118 for an hour and thirty minutes."

Speaker Cullerton: "Representative Olson..."

Olson, M.: "For thirty minutes."

Speaker Cullerton: "The Members on your side of the aisle have asked for a Roll Call on this."

Olson, M.: "Please deny them that Motion. We're going."

72nd Legislative Day

October 19, 1989

- Speaker Cullerton: "Fine. So, you've asked for one half hour.

 If you look at the clock it's 1:21, so the House will stand adjourned. The Republicans have requested a caucus...conference and that'll be in...Yes, we'll adjourn, you have your conference. No, we're just going to go into recess while you have your conference. We'll be back in one half hour. There's a Republican Conference in Room 118. You're to be back in 27 minutes."
- Speaker Breslin: "...distributed. The first Order of Business is
 Total Veto Motions. House Bill 789, Representative Giglio.
 Would Representative Giglio come to the chamber, please.
 We'll go on to Amendatory Veto Motions, Gubernatorial
 Compliance. The Sponsors are Satterthwaite, Munizzi and
 Krska. The first Bill is House Bill 559, Representative
 Satterthwaite."
- Satterthwaite: "Madam Speaker and Members of the House, I move to accept the specific recommendations of the Governor as to House Bill 555 (sic - 559). The Governor's Amendatory Veto puts in a July 1, 1990 date for the implementation of the Bill, because it would otherwise change the estimated amounts that school districts would get this year. I to accept that Amendatory Veto and have the Bill go into effect next year. I'll be happy to respond to questions, otherwise. ask for acceptance of the Governor's recommendations."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Lady has moved to accept the Governor's Amendatory Veto. On this question, the Lady from DuPage, Representative Cowlishaw."
- Cowlishaw: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I urge a 'yes' vote on the acceptance Motion. Thank you."
- Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall the House accept the specific recommendations for change with respect to House Bill 559?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those

72nd Legislative Day

October 19, 1989

opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. 71 votes...excuse me, 60 votes are required for the acceptance of this Motion. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 109 voting 'aye', none voting 'no' and none voting 'present'. This Motion has received the required Constitutional Majority, so the Motion is adopted and the House accepts the Governor's specific recommendations for change. House Bill 2059, Representative Munizzi."

Munizzi: "Thank you, Madam Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen. I move to accept the Governor's Amendatory Veto for this Bill. He changes the effective date of the Bill to January 1 of 1991 to comply with the Secretary of State's request, and he also clears up some of the language with regard to the DUI Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "The Lady has moved to accept the Governor's specific recommendations for change in House Bill 2059. Is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall the House accept the Governor's specific recommendations for change with respect to House Bill All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Seventy-one votes are required for the acceptance of this Motion. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the On this question there are 108 voting 'aye', none voting 'no' and none voting 'present'. This Motion received the required Constitutional Majority, so the Motion is adopted and the House accepts the Governor's specific recommendations for change. House Bill 2405, Representative Krska."

Krska: "Amendatory Veto on House 2405. The present Act sunsets on December 31st of 1989. With the Governor's Amendatory Veto, the new Act would not take effect until July 1st of

72nd Legislative Day

October 19, 1989

1990. I would override...I would appreciate a vote on the override for the Amendatory Governor's Veto. It's been agreed upon with Leadership on both sides."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved to accept the Amendatory Veto on House Bill 2405. On the question the Gentleman from DuPage, Representative McCracken. This is a Motion..."

McCracken: "Yes, the Motion's to override. I just wanted to confirm what Representative Krska discussed. Apparently, because of the time of year in which we are considering this Veto, with no date specified in the Act making it effective, it won't be effective until July 1, 1990, regardless of the margin by which it passes. The Bill itself repeals the current law effective January 1, 1990. So, that six month gap cannot be allowed to occur and that's the reason for this override. There are some changes, they're generally technical but they are important however, that are made in the Amendatory Veto. And I want to confirm that it's the Sponsor's intention to support that legislation to affect those changes in the spring. Is that right, Sir?"

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman indicates that that is correct.

The Sponsor indicates that that is correct."

McCracken: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Breslin: "The Chair has misstated the question. there's no further discussion, please remember that the question is, 'Shall House Bill 2405 pass, the specific recommendations for change οf the Governor notwithstanding?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. 60 votes are required to accept this Motion. The Chair is incorrect, 71 votes are required. As usual the Members are right. Seventy-one votes are required there are...take the record, Mr. Clerk.

72nd Legislative Day

October 19, 1989

There are 109 voting 'aye', 1 voting 'no' and 1 voting 'present'. This Motion having received the required Three-Fifths Majority, the Motion to override prevails and House Bill 2405 is declared passed, the specific recommendations for change of the Governor notwithstanding. On Amendatory Veto Motions, Gubernatorial Noncompliance, appears House Bill 1571, Representative McGann. Excuse me. Representative McCracken, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

McCracken: "On the Supplemental Calendar #2 you identify a third

Motion relative to the Bill. There are two previous

Motions which I want recognized in order of their being

made or filed."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative McCracken, we're on the Order of Amendatory Veto Motions, Gubernatorial Noncompliance.

There's only...the first Bill is House Bill 1571."

McCracken: "Motion #3."

Speaker Breslin: "Motion #3."

McCracken: "Right. On the Supplemental it's Motion #3. There were two previous Motions filed. I don't know why your Calendar makes reference only to Motion #3, but there were two previous Motions filed. They're on the Regular Calendar, page 14."

Speaker Breslin: "That...I think it's the Sponsor's wish to proceed with Motion #3. We have previously allowed that."

McCracken: "Yeah, I don't...I don't...Oh, no we haven't. We have taken them in order."

Speaker Breslin: "No."

McCracken: "By order of filing. Alright. Well, then, you want to override the Calendar that we're suppose to rely on and you want to go with the Supplemental, something just made up in the back office? You want to go to Motion #3 and avoid 1 and 2?"

72nd Legislative Day

October 19, 1989

Speaker Breslin: "Regardless, Representative McCracken, all day we have been allowing the maker of the Motion when they have..."

McCracken: "We haven't been allowing the maker of the Motion, if

he isn't the maker of all Motions. And he is not the maker

of all Motions."

Speaker Breslin: "I'm sorry, I don't have that Calendar in front of me, so I didn't realize that..."

McCracken: "That's right, because it's not important to you."

Speaker Breslin: "Okay. I didn't realize he wasn't the maker of the Motion. However, it should be understood that Representative McGann has the rights to make this Motion as the Sponsor of the Bill. You're the Sponsor of the Bill, is that correct, Representative McGann? Representative McGann."

McGann: "This is a committee structured Bill, House Bill 1571..."

Speaker Breslin: "And you're the Chair of the Committee?"

McGann: "...and I was the floor manager."

Speaker Breslin: "Okay."

McCracken: "Well, on the assumption my friends stay with me, I think this is not going to be something you will be successful at, Sir. And I want the Chair to know that I disapprove of this, using the Supplemental..."

McGann: "Madam Speaker...Madam Speaker."

McCracken: "...Calendars like this. See the Supplemental Calendar, Mr. Speaker? I threw it on the ground. See the Calendar that's published everyday? The two Motions are on the Regular Calendar. You go to these Supplementals, because there's no way to stop you because of the way you've drawn the rules. And then you want us to sit back and just take it and we will not take it. We want the Motions that are on the Regular Calendar. I want the Motions considered in the form and in the time they were

72nd Legislative Day

October 19, 1989

filed, period."

McGann: "Madam...Madam Speaker."

Speaker Breslin: "Excuse me, Representative McGann. Your point has been made, Representative McCracken. The Chair is going to follow the Supplemental Calendar, and Representative McGann is recognized to present his Motion."

McGann: "In the important...Madam Speaker, if I may and Members of the Assembly, in the importance of this total...this override of this Amendatory Veto, I would have to have the cooperation of both sides of the aisle. And inasmuch as that is very, very important for the mentally handicapped of this state in regards to abuse and neglect in our centers, I would like the Chair to follow the recommendation of Representative McCracken and address the first two Motions that are on and then come to my Motion if it's necessary."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative McGann...Representative Matijevich, you made a Motion to Override, is that correct, Sir?"

Matijevich: "Yeah. That's got..."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative...excuse me. Representative McGann, what was your Motion?"

McGann: "First of all...before I answer your question, Madam Speaker, I know you were taken away from the Chair for a moment there while I was speaking, I'd ask the indulgence of the chamber to listen to me once again. The importance of the override of this Amendatory Message from the Governor is very, very important to the abuse and neglect of our people in the state centers for the mentally handicapped. This Bill is very, very important that it's intact and I need the cooperation of both sides of the aisle to proceed. Therefore, I would ask the Chair to reconsider and consider the Motion 1 and 2, and if

72nd Legislative Day

October 19, 1989

necessary, come back to me on Motion 3."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Matijevich, for what reason do you seek...what is the point that you make?"

Matijevich: "Well, the point I make is that there's two...well, there's three Motions, but one...two of the three are Motions to override, one is a Motion to accept. We have always had preference where there is that...those types of Motions, to the Motion for a full override, because if we go to accept then we don't have the Motion to override. You know, if the override...well, it doesn't work both ways. That's not the way we've been operating, though, for all the years I've been here. Maybe you've been here longer...less and learned more, I guess, but that's the way I learned the game."

Speaker Breslin: "Excuse me. I understand that there is some concern because this is an Amendatory Veto Motion for...that it has been found in Noncompliance, that there is some concern that the other Bills on Noncompliance will not be heard. That is not correct. All Motions filed will be heard. So, if that is the issue then at least you know what that...Representative McGann and Representative the rules provide under Rule 35.1, that when a Resolution or a Bill, other than an Appropriation Bill, called on any order of business, the Chief Sponsor may request that consideration of the Bill or Resolution deferred. So, this is the new rule that allows the Sponsor to control the Bill. If you are correct, that in numerical order we take those Motions, that can be done, Representative McGann...Where is Representative McGann? Representative McGann has the right if he wishes, when we go to #1, to take it out of the record and #2 to take it out of the record, so he gets to #3 anyway. He can take...while you...we have...go to your Motion, he can take

72nd Legislative Day

October 19, 1989

his Bill out of the record, so we then move on to the next one. So, I think your point is not well taken. The Gentleman, however, has indicated that he will defer to your Motion first. I just want to make it very clear that under the new rules the Sponsors control the Bill, and we have to remember that in making future considerations. So, if we want to go directly to Representative Ryder's Motion, Representative McGann has agreed to do that. Representative Ryder on Motion #1."

Ryder: "Thank you, Madam Speaker."

Speaker Breslin: "Excuse me. Representative McCracken."

McCracken: "I realize there's been a compromise of the precipitating issue, however, for the sake of the value of the precedent I just cannot agree with you. That change in the rules was made for the purpose of allowing Conference Committees to be taken out of the record. Amendatory Veto and a Motion made relative thereto. don't believe the control rule still applies, and even if it does apply, your interpretation of it to these facts in effect gives control not over only the Bill, but over the Motion, over the action relative thereto. So, I just don't agree with you and I do not accept...and I don't want cited as precedence that we have acquiesced in decision of the Chair."

Speaker Breslin: "Just so you know that it's any order of business and we are on a Bill, House Bill 2405, and that will be the ruling of the Chair. Can we go to Representative Ryder now? Okay. Representative Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Well, I just wanted to indicate that I think it's ludicrous that we're taking a Motion to accept before we take a Motion to Override. I think Representative Matijevich's point was well taken and if this is any kind

72nd Legislative Day

- October 19, 1989
- of precedence, as I think was the word Representative McCracken used, it's improper. It's...you should take the Motion that requires the extraordinary majority first. If it doesn't pass, then you go to the Motion to accept. It's absurd to do it this way."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Chair agrees with you, Representative Cullerton. Representative Hultgren, for what reason do you rise?"
- Hultgren: "Point of parliamentary inquiry. I heard the ruling that you gave in response to Representative McCracken's question. In this particular instance the Chief Sponsor is not Representative McGann, but the Chief Sponsor is the Select Committee on Mental Health."
- Speaker Breslin: "We've gone...we've been through that already,
 Representative Hultgren, and the rules provide that the
 Chair of the Committee, the spokesman of the committee
 presents those Bills and so he makes the call on the
 proposal."
- Hultgren: "Presents the Bill, but he's not the Chief Sponsor. Is that correct?"
- Speaker Breslin: "We'll refer you to the appropriate rule, meanwhile we are accommodating Representative Ryder.

 Proceed, Representative Ryder. Excuse me. Excuse me. Representative Ryder is recognized on Motion #1.

 Representative McGann, for what reason do you rise?"
- McGann: "I ask you to take it out of the record at this time."
- Speaker Breslin: "Take the Bill out of the record, Mr. Clerk.

 Now we're on House Bill 1571, Motion #2. Representative

 Bowman is the Sponsor of that Motion. Representative

 Bowman."
- Bowman: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I am prepared to proceed with my Motion."
- Speaker Breslin: "Excuse me. Representative Ryder."

72nd Legislative Day

October 19, 1989

Ryder: "Thank you for recognizing me. Am I to now understand after all of the legal jargon that you've given us, that have no opportunity to present my Motion? Is that what I'm to understand, that you are denying me the opportunity? I had indicated, Madam Chair, I had indicated to the other makers of these Motions that I was not going to speak on this issue as a courtesy to them. But, if the kind of chicanery that we're seeing now to deny that is the case, then I feel completely removed from any obligation in that regard and intend to strongly disagree with all, not only the procedure, but the effect of their Motions. Is it, and I'm inquiring of the Chair, Madam Speaker, is it intention that I do not have the opportunity to present Motion #1 first in order. Is that the indication of the Chair?"

Speaker Breslin: "The indication of the Chair is that the proper procedural Motion is to call Motions to override before acceptance. That has always been the history in this state...in this House and it is also the logical Chair believes that that progression. The is the appropriate method to go by and that is what I have done. I don't know what went on between the two of you, so the Gentleman has obviously...acting within his rights. made his Motion. We are now on Motion #2..."

Ryder: "So..."

Speaker Breslin: "...and Representative McGann is recognized as well. Representative McGann."

McGann: "I..."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative McGann, are you taking the Bill
 out of the record?"

McGann: "I'm taking..."

Speaker Breslin: "This is a Motion to override again."

McGann: "I'm taking the Bill out of the record period, for this

72nd Legislative Day

October 19, 1989

time."

- Speaker Breslin: "Okay. Take the Bill out of the record, Mr.

 Clerk. On the Supplemental Calendar #2 under the Order of

 Motions, appears Senate Bill 1096, Representative Ewing.

 This is a Motion to discharge the Appropriations I

 Committee."
- Ewing: "Yes. Yes. Madam Speaker, could I have some order on your side of the aisle?"
- Speaker Breslin: "Yes. Let the...Representative Cullerton, come to order. Give your attention to Representative Ewing. Proceed, Sir."
- Ewing: "I...At least I would ask that Representative Cullerton use a current Calendar if he's going to wad one up. Yes, Madam Speaker, we would like to discharge committee on this Bill. We plan to amend a Bill that...a Chamber of Commerce Bill dealing with accountability to this. You are my Co-sponsor on that Bill and it's a Bill that has...I think there's agreement on both sides of the aisle to move this Bill in this way. And it was an Amendatory Veto which won't be approved."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved to discharge the Approp. I Interim Study Committee from further consideration and advance Senate Bill 1096 to the Order of Second Reading. Is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall the House discharge the Approp. Committee and advance this Bill to the Order of Second Reading?' Does he have leave? Hearing no objection and by use of the Attendance Roll Call, leave is granted. House Resolution 13...excuse me. House Resolution 1013, Representative Martinez. Where is Representative Martinez? We'll come back to that. Going to the Order of Total Veto Representative Giglio, we're waiting for you to present House Bill 789. It's a Motion to override a Total

72nd Legislative Day

October 19, 1989

Veto. Out of the record. Under Amendatory Veto Motions.
On the Order of Amendatory Veto Motions, Gubernatorial
Noncompliance, appears House Bill 1571, Representative
McGann."

McGann: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Members of the Assembly. sorry to take up such valuable time here in this last afternoon, but I think that the time that we are going to spend on this Total Veto of House Bill 1571...Amendatory Veto, excuse me, is very, very important for misfortunate in our institutions. I don't want to completely take your time up in going back in history, but this all started as a result of some problems at Read Medical Center...Read Mental Center and also a center Evanston, a year long committee did a lot of work on and came up with an agreed Conference Committee Report which was adopted in the House and Senate by near unanimous votes. It was understood by the Sponsors that objections of the Department of Mental Health and Developmental Disabilities had been resolved at that time. In fact, language relating to the staff training requirements, including the establishment of two training offices, was specifically amended pursuant to negotiations with The Governor's recommendations for change are in conflict with those prior agreements. It is for this reason that I am moving for...to override this Amendatory Veto, because what we have seen here is that the Governor either ill-advised or whatever, has decided to write legislation for us in this chamber. This we know cannot be accepted, because we must keep the two divisions of government separate. He wrote in in a few areas here that we believe is wrong, we also believe that we must have this piece of legislation before any more debts occur in our centers, before any more abuse continues on, we must put a

72nd Legislative Day

October 19, 1989

stop to it. It's mind boggling to me to wonder why this department that we have...a part of state government is constantly knocking heads against any change, any betterment for our handicapped. I'm going to ask you this afternoon to support our committee, to support those handicapped in this state and give us a 'green' vote on this override...Amendatory Veto."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved to override the Governor's Veto of House Bill 15...this Amendatory Veto of House Bill 1571. On the question, the Gentleman from Morgan, Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Would the Gentleman yield, please?"

Speaker Breslin: "He will."

Ryder: "Representative, apparently through the actions of the Chair we have been denied an orderly opportunity on Motions 1 and 2. I'm wanting to ask you, since the Bill as it exists does have some meritorious items, in the event that your Motion to override fails, would you then agree to allow me to have Motion #1 heard, and would you then support Motion #1?"

McGann: "Representative Ryder, it is very difficult for us to have a dialogue that isn't just a total agreement because I've worked with you for a long, long time. But, I feel strongly in this matter and maybe it's the Irish bullhead surfacing, I don't know, but I...at this moment I don't feel as though that I would entertain any other Motions if we were to lose override. I have the faith and enough...to further answer your question, I have faith in the chamber, that despite what our party dictates to us from time to time, that we must act as individual Representatives of the people. And a lot of Representatives on your side of the aisle as ours have institutions in their communities, their

72nd Legislative Day

October 19, 1989

districts, and they have to look at that, whether they want to continue to allow abuse and so forth or to put safequards. That's going to have to be an individual, shall we say decision, and an individual vote cannot come on parties. I hope I'm answering your question properly." Ryder: "I understand the answer that you've given and I don't care to categorize it as being Irish stubborn, I think it's more Irish integrity. Unfortunately, Representative, since you are...since you have indicated that you will deny an opportunity for us to accept this Bill, what you are saying is, either we override it or it's dead. And I can't agree with that option. Very reluctantly, I have to oppose your Motion to override. The Governor has made some changes, some changes that in some ways dilute the Bill and other ways improve it. But, unless I am indicated that we have an opportunity to accept those changes of the Governor, then I must ask those, at least on our side of the aisle and those others who are concerned about this, to move to vote 'no' on this Motion to override. Thank you, Madam Speaker."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative McCracken on the question."

"Thank you. I'd ask you to reconsider, Representative McGann. I understand the Chair's ruling, and with all respect I think it was a...in effect, never contemplated in the change of the rules. The entire purpose of the change of the rules was to allow people to control their Bills. It was never contemplated that that would extend to in effect controlling Motions. Now, there was a discussion before we moved onto the merits of this Motion and every Democratic speaker talked about the importance of doing the acceptance...or the Override Motion first, and then if that fails, going to the Acceptance Motion. But, the effect of the Chair's ruling is to essentially dictate

72nd Legislative Day

October 19, 1989

the terms to the Minority, and by that I mean this. It isn't a question of considering both merits of both Motions, it's a question of doing it your way or no way. Now Representative McGann, Representative Ryder has asked to have the consideration of the Acceptance Motion."

- Speaker Breslin: "Excuse me. Excuse me, Representative McCracken. Excuse me, Representative McCracken. Representative Currie, for what reason do you interrupt?"
- Currie: "Point of parliamentary inquiry. Should the Gentleman not be confining his remarks to the Motion that has been put by Representative McGann, rather than Motions that are not presently before this Body?"
- Speaker Breslin: "Yes, of course."
- Currie: "Would the Chair ask him to confine his remarks, then, to this Motion?"
- Speaker Breslin: "Yes. Make your remarks to the Motion. You'll have another opportunity, I'm sure, to make other points, Representative McCracken."
- McCracken: "We have rules to liberate us from the tyranny of the Majority, Madam. I find it ironic that you cite rules in support of that. I think your Motion will not prevail, Sir. And in the interest of state public policy and the people who need these services, I ask you to reconsider your decision."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative McGann is recognized to close."

 McGann: "The previous speaker certainly makes a good point, but
 for all the items and decisions that he tries to make on
 behalf of his party, he is already saying that all 51 on
 the other side of the aisle are going to vote against this
 Motion. That's unfortunate. We talk about our democratic
 society, we have to open up their minds. He's say that
 according to policy that we could do A, B, C. I'm saying

72nd Legislative Day

October 19, 1989

that the Governor did not have to use this policy that he used in his Amendatory Veto to write legislation for this chamber. There are other ways he could approach, by either new legislation recommended by the Department or whatever, on down the road. He did not have to write legislation for us. We are the ones that are suppose to present the legislation, he is suppose to approve or disapprove. Ι think he has extended himself. Unfortunately, I have a lot of respect for the Governor, I have a lot of respect for my Republican colleagues across the aisle, and I'm sorry that we are into this juncture at this time that's going to suffer for those that cannot speak for themselves or defend themselves in our institutions. But, there is principle that has to be maintained. That principle is that we have to do what we believe is totally right and beneficial for all, whether it be in this Bill or any other Bill. I'm going to ask that everyone, Democrats and Republicans, please vote your conscience and override the Amendatory Veto on House Bill 1571. Thank you."

- Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 1571 pass, the specific recommendation for change of the Governor notwithstanding?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Seventy—one votes are required to override. Representative Stephens, one minute to explain your vote."
- Stephens: "Well, on behalf of those of us that are... really regret having to do this, this is an issue that we don't want to put 'no' votes on, but we are...we're being trampled upon and we have to vote 'no'. And Andy, I'm sorry."
- Speaker Breslin: "Have all voted who wish? Only vote your own switches. Have all voted who wish? Representative Bowman, one minute to explain your vote."

72nd Legislative Day

October 19, 1989

Bowman: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would just remind everybody here that the original Bill passed almost unanimously. This was the work of a committee that was truly bipartisan, equal numbers of Democrats and Republicans. We did not have a dissenting vote on any Motion in that committee. totally unanimous in the committee. The recommendations of the Committee were embodied in this Bill, and then the result, it passed almost unanimously on the floor in both chambers after negotiations. A lot of the issues in this debate are over procedure, and while I understand that people's emotions can run high on such matters because procedural matters are very important, nevertheless I would hope that that would not blind people to the real need for this legislation. If this legislation fails...or this Motion fails, I could not in good conscience support a Motion to accept the Governor's Amendatory change, one of the particular provisions of this Bill..."

Speaker Breslin: "Bring your remarks to a close, Sir, your one
 minute is up."

Bowman: "I was just going to say the whole committee agreed the training was the essential missing piece in the present picture, and the Governor's Amendatory Veto just guts that part of the Bill, totally guts the Bill. So, without that I'm afraid our work was for naught and so that's why I would urge everyone to support this Motion to override."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative McCracken has already requested a verification. Vote your own switches. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On the question there are 65 voting 'aye', 7 voting 'no' and 43 voting 'present', so the Motion does not carry. On Supplemental #2 is Total Veto Motions, House Bill 789, Representative Giglio. Present your Motion, Sir, Motion #2."

72nd Legislative Day

October 19, 1989

Giglio: "Thank you, Mr...Madam Speaker. This is Senate Bill 7 or House Bill 789. It is the one we talked about the other day and it amends the Environmental Protection Act to provide that the Department of Natural Resources shall prepare and present to the Governor and General Assembly a study of the Lake Calumet ground water situation by The Amendment...I think Amendment #1 increased the 1991. time date to '93, so there's plenty of time. I'm not going to elaborate on how important we feel this Bill really is. think Representative Balanoff and myself put out some letters, we also put out a editorial with regard to how bad Lake Michigan is getting with the pollution. And in our area where we have the landfills and we have the sludge and the rain water that carries this into the rivers which back up into the lake, there's a very, very serious problem. We're only asking for this study, this is not Appropriation Bill. And I would ask for your favorable support."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved to override the Gubernatorial Veto of House Bill 789. On the question, the Gentleman from DuPage, Representative McCracken."

McCracken: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Again, we see the use of the Supplemental Calendar. This Bill has already been voted on. This is the second override. Naturally it's a Democratic Bill. Naturally both Motions are to override. And this will be considered first before a long list of other Vetoes which your side of the aisle has gratuitously classified as Gubernatorial Noncompliance. You know, I suppose we are all desensitized to the Calendar abuses, but this is another one that we should say 'no' to and let me crumple up another Calendar for you all. I've had it with this stuff. Let's use the Regular Calendar. Let's give everybody a vote before anyone gets a second vote. I know

72nd Legislative Day

October 19, 1989

my plea falls on deaf ears. Hopefully the votes will be here to stop this once again."

Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 789 pass, the Veto of the Governor notwithstanding?' All favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Seventy-one votes are required to override. all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative McCracken will request a verification. vote your own switches. Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 66 voting 'aye'...Representative Deuchler votes 'no'...46 voting 'no', 2 voting 'present' and the Motion fails. the Regular Calendar, Representative McCracken, on the Order of Amendatory Veto Motions, Gubernatorial Compliance. We'll do the four Bills that have yet to be heard on that order and then we'll move to Noncompliance. The first Bill is House Bill 8...Representative Preston, do you seek recognition?"

Preston: "Yes, Madam Speaker. If we're going back to the Regular Calendar, I want no part of that and I want the Special Calendars back."

Speaker Breslin: "House Bill 852, Representative Regan. the record. House Bill 1567, Representative Harris. Representative Harris in the chamber? Out of the record. House Bill 1619, Representative Keane. Present your Motion, Sir. It's a Motion to...Oh, I see. Out of record. On page 12 appears House Bill 2405, Representative 2405. Did you already do this? Okay, it's already Krska. been done. The Sponsor indicates that 2405 was already Yes, it was, by Amendatory Veto Motions #2. Under Amendatory Veto Motions appearing Supplemental on page 13 on your Calendar, appears House Bill 45, Representative Hicks. Mr. Hicks, Motion #1. Out of the

72nd Legislative Day October 19, 1989 record. House Bill 250, Representative Ropp."

- Ropp: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. House Bill 250 will attempt to accept the changes made by the Governor. The intent of the Bill is to encourage through some kind of instruction the development of course options for careers for students. And the Governor still agrees with that, but has not made it quite as firm, allowing school boards to develop those programs on their own. I move to accept the Governor's amendatory change."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved to accept the Governor's Amendatory Veto of House Bill 250. On that question, is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Cullerton."
- Cullerton: "Yes, Madam Speaker. With regard to all of these Bills on the Gubernatorial Noncompliance, I would recommend to all our Members on the Democratic side of the aisle to vote 'present'. We have met in the Rules Committee, we've reviewed these Bills, they're sponsored by both Democrats and Republicans, and we've indicated that the Governor has exceeded his authority under the Constitution. We've made that recommendation in the Rules Committee, and I would pass that recommendation on again to the Members of the House."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Parke."

 Parke: "Yes. Earlier in the debate on the question of

 Representative McGann, you said from the Chair that you

 were not going to do this and that all the Bills would be
 heard."
- Speaker Breslin: "We're doing it. They're being heard."
- Parke: "Yes, but now we're seeing that Representative Cullerton is trying to have all their Members vote 'present', which in fact is not giving the issues on merit rather than political considerations of which the Chair said it would

72nd Legislative Day

October 19, 1989

not do that."

- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Matijevich on a point of order."

 Matijevich: "Point of order. Is this Gentleman telling me that
 we can't follow the direction of one of our people here? I
 just saw you follow footstep by footstep what Tom McCracken
 asked you to do. We're doing the same 'darn', I said
 'darn', I talk like Dave Phelps sometime, same 'darn'
 thing."
- Speaker Breslin: "Okay. Just remember, Ladies and Gentlemen, the longer we debate this the longer we are here and not on the road. Representative Parke."
- Parke: "Thank you. Representative Matijevich can do any 'darn' thing he wishes."
- Speaker Breslin: "And he usually does. Now, the question is, 'Shall the House accept the specific recommendations for change with respect to House Bill 250?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Sixty votes are required for acceptance. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 52 voting 'aye', 4 voting 'no', 54 voting 'present' and the Motion fails. House Bill 530, Representative Hultgren."
- Speaker Breslin: "Withdraw Motion 1 and 2. House Bill 576,
 Representative Williamson. Representative Williamson, do
 you wish to proceed with your Motion? Would someone ask
 Representative Williamson if she wants her Motion heard?
 Proceed."
- Williamson: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I move to accept the Governor's Motion...the Governor's Veto."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Lady moves to accept the Governor's

72nd Legislative Day

October 19, 1989

specific recommendations for change to House Bill 576. On the question, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Cullerton."

- Cullerton: "Yes. This is a Motion to accept, is that what I understand?"
- Williamson: "Yes, accept the Amendatory Veto. All it does is to change the starting date of the Bill. It changes it from January 1st, 1990, to January 1st, 1991."
- Cullerton: "Well, I would make the same recommendation that we vote 'present' on this Motion and that the Governor's exceeded his constitutional authority."
- Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall the House accept the specific recommendations for change with respect to House Bill 576?' On that question, Representative Matijevich."
- Matijevich: "I was going to echo the remarks of Representative Cullerton..."

Speaker Breslin: "Very good."

Matijevich: "...that we vote 'present'. I didn't know my light was on."

Speaker Breslin: "Okay."

Matijevich: "Alright."

Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall the House accept the specific recommendations for change with respect to House Bill 576?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Sixty votes are required to accept. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 51 voting 'aye', 3 voting 'no' and 57 voting 'present' and the Motion fails. House Bill 776, Representative Countryman. Out of the record. House Bill 77...House Bill 977, Representative Hannig. Is Mr. Hannig in the chamber? Out of the record. House Bill 1571, Representative Ryder. Out of the record. House Bill 1724,

72nd Legislative Day

October 19, 1989

Representative Mautino. Out of the record. House Bill 1876, Representative Pullen."

Pullen: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Ι move to override the Governor's Veto on House Bill 1876. This Bill has several provisions in it which deal with the control of the HIV epidemic. The Department of Public Health apparently went to the Governor after the Governor's Office negotiated with in June, to resolve problems with this Bill so that it was acceptable to the Governor's Office at the time that this House passed it last June. The negotiations were specifically for the purpose of avoiding the potential of an Amendatory Veto, so that we could move forward with the important provisions in this Bill. Apparently Governor's Office did not see fit to hold to that agreement, as after the intervention of the Director of Public Health, I am certain, whose responsibilities with respect to the HIV epidemic have made it necessary for us to pass legislation because he will not act himself to stop this deadly disease. After his intervention, the Governor filed this Amendatory Veto without providing any courtesy to me either in terms of holding to the agreement or in terms of even notifying me that he might be doing this. The Bill does require, as we approved it last June, that persons seeking treatment at the Department of Public Health sexually transmitted disease clinics, and persons seeking treatment from the Department of Alcoholism Substance Abuse Drug Treatment Programs, not including alcohol treatment, be offered routine testing for HIV infection with the right of refusal if they prefer not to be tested, because I do not want to preclude anyone from seeking treatment for these serious conditions. The screening test for this terrible disease has been available since March, 1985, and the Department of Public Health

72nd Legislative Day

October 19, 1989

still does not test the high risk persons in this state who seek treatment at sexually transmitted disease clinics. But apparently they don't want to test them now either, because the Governor has after the agreement of his office to the provisions of this Bill changed the deadline, and the effective date was one of the provisions that was agreed to, but he has changed the effective date to next July, so that we can go another 9 months without testing these high risk persons or offering them routine testing. It also has a provision in it which deals with a collective contract situation by the Department of Central Management Services for HIV testing by state agencies so that we can cut costs, another provision that was agreed to and which CMS said they could implement immediately, that is delayed till next July 1st so that we can continue to waste money instead of cutting costs when it is available to do so. It also has a provision concerning the testing of correctional inmates who are about to be released. This has nothing to do with testing prisoners who are staying in prison or who are entering prison, but only those that are being released, so that if they are infected, and we know that up to 900 Illinois prisoners are, but we don't which ones, they can be referred for proper medical care when they leave prison. They can be counseled so that they will be concerned about their behavior outside the walls so that they can prevent themselves from transmitting the virus and their spouses can be notified in order to warn them of the potential of transmission of the disease. T+ is my understanding after last evening's activity, that there has been significant contact of Members of the House on this Bill from the administration. I simply ask you to please realize that if the administration were doing what should be doing about the AIDS epidemic, legislation

72nd Legislative Day

October 19, 1989

wouldn't be necessary. But this Bill is indeed very necessary and I ask you, please, to join me in overriding the Governor's Veto on this Bill which passed this House 87 to 20 last June. Thank you."

Speaker Breslin: "The Lady has moved to override the Governor's

Veto of House bill 1876. On the question, the Gentleman
from Will, Representative Wennlund."

Wennlund: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise in opposition to the Sponsor's Motion and suggest that the Governor's Amendatory Veto was a wise Veto. The Governor deleted the provisions for mandatory testing for inmates. We're admitting inmates to the Department of Corrections at the rate of 86 inmates per week. Last week there was 123. Our burgeoning prison population is exceeding 23,000, filling up more than the 23 prisons we now...have. It's a question of dollars and cents. The Department of Corrections is understaffed and its under budget. The effective date has been delayed by the Governor to give the state agency the time to develop a contract and a program that will assure quality and cost effectiveness. And it's a situation where we don't have the dollars to match the simply growing population of the Department of Corrections and I 'no' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Turner."

Turner: "Thank you, Madam Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Assembly. I rise in support of this Bill. As many of you know, the prison population is...consists of about 90 percent of the minorities here in the State of Illinois. Those are the people who are my nephews, my cousins, my neighbors, who will in turn be released back to my community. I think the provision of AIDS testing of prisoners that are about to be released back to my

72nd Legislative Day

October 19, 1989

community is a very important provision, and I ask that you consider it. I know that many of you, because you think that your people don't get arrested or for some reason tend not to be incarcerated, will not be affected by particular issue. But, when those people are released from prisons and come back to my community, there's a good chance that it will be my sister, it will be my niece, aunt, my grandmother, my grandfather, who could very well be contacted by this disease because of the AIDS virus and because of the effect that it has, because there is really no...definite cure for this. And the cost of medication for it, I think that it's a...or the cost for the remedy for it, I think that this is a good cause. a good first step and I'm extremely concerned because those again are inmates who are people that I know, people are related, people that are friends and neighbors. And I think that this is a safe, good health policy to test those inmates when they are released, and I urge each and every one of you to support the override of this Veto. Thank you."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Yes, thank you, Madam Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in opposition to the Lady's Motion. The...if the goals of the previous speaker are good ones, then what we should do is appropriate the money in order to do it. But we haven't done that. All we're doing is passing Bills that put more and more prisoners on top of each other in the prisons and we're not passing Bills to create new prisons. And we don't have enough money to do all this testing. Now, the Governor explained in his Amendatory Veto that he did sign another Bill, Senate Bill 1411, which requires the Department of

72nd Legislative Day

October 19, 1989

Corrections to test IV drug users, who are the high risk people who we...that we have enough money to test for. we didn't appropriate any money to do what this Bill calls So, I would suggest that if you think it's a good idea that they be tested, we at the same time appropriate the money. We haven't done this. The Governor should have vetoed the Bill because what he's done, of course, was to exceed his authority in trying to rewrite the whole thing by delaying the effective date. And the appropriate thing is to vote 'present', come back in the next...two weeks from now, do a supplemental in order to pay for this. But we don't have the money in there right now, and it's irresponsible to vote for it now. So, I would ask for a 'no' vote."

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

Barger: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen, I have been listening to the discussion on this for a considerable length of time, and I find it almost incredulous that with all of these highly intelligent, well-educated attorneys, that they don't know that by moving some people from one jail to another and taking the people in that second jail, moving them back to the first, or from one wing to another, does not require building any new jails. It doesn't require stacking people on top of each other. It merely requires shifting the prison population. Now if we shift female prisoners out away from male prisoners, we should easily be able to shift infected prisoners away from noninfected prisoners. That is a ridiculous argument. It's ridiculous on the part of the Department of Corrections, and it's ridiculous on the part of those our Members who are sitting here and trying to expound that philosophy. I agree wholeheartedly with Representative

72nd Legislative Day

October 19, 1989

Turner. We need to protect his friends, we need to protect his relatives and we also need to protect everyone that they might come in contact with, because we know Representative Turner, and he's a fine upstanding Gentleman, although apparently his relatives have a little problem. So, let's help his relatives out in this case and help Miss Pullen out with her problem and we can make everybody happy. So, let's all vote 'yes' on this silly Bill and get it back out of here."

- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative McNamara."
- McNamara: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. It's incredulous that we are asked to vote 'present' on this measure. This measure does exactly what we have when we take a look at the section of the Calendar it's under, it's Gubernatorial Noncompliance. So, the Sponsor of this measure has said, let's override it because that Sponsor agrees that it is noncompliance. I think it is very important for us not to put those 'present' votes on. If you don't like the Bill, fine, vote 'no', but definitely if you like the Bill, it is noncompliance. It is the proper Motion to be made at this time. I urge 'yes' votes."
- Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 1876 pass, the Veto of the Governor notwithstanding?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'.

 Representative Turner is recognized to defend his relatives."
- Turner: "...Personal privilege. Thank you, Madam Chairman. I just wanted to clarify that on relatives, these aren't blood relatives, those are my brothers."
- Speaker Breslin: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Seventy-one votes are required. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question

72nd Legislative Day

October 19, 1989

there are 57 voting 'aye', 24 voting 'no' and 24 voting 'present'. The Motion fails. House Bill 1926, Representative Currie. Out of the record. House Bill 2031, Representative Keane. Present your Motion, Sir."

Keane: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I move to override the Governor's Veto...Amendatory Veto on House Bill 2013. This was a Legislative Audit Commission Bill. It's con..."

Speaker Breslin: "I'm sorry. Proceed, Representative Keane."

Keane: "Thank you. 2031...we have..."

Speaker Breslin: "Mr. Clerk, House Bill 2031."

Keane: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. House Bill 2031 was originally a...is a Legislative Audit Commission Bill and was entitled the Internal Auditing Act. One of the key...one of the key portions of the Act was Article III which established a process for agencies to annually review their major systems of internal control to document the review and clearly define how they are going to correct their weaknesses. The Article...the main goal of this Article, which is the guts of the Bill, is to stimulate management and make necessary corrections before weaknesses in an agency become a scandal. This is a difficult...I can ima...I understand why the Governor vetoed this. it was a Republican, Democrat or Independent Governor, they will probably veto it because it does put a tremendous responsibility onto the member...or onto the leaders of the agency. I do believe that it belongs there. The federal agencies have similar requirements. It puts the Director of an agency on the spot. He has to say, 'Here's what they told me was wrong and here's what I've done to correct it and here's what I'm about to do.' Many times the audits come in, the Directors do little or nothing about it, goes on from one to another. I would ask for my colleagues to override the Governor's Amendatory Veto on House Bill

72nd Legislative Day

October 19, 1989

2031."

- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved to override the Governor's Veto of House Bill 2031. And on that question, the Gentleman from Adams, Representative Mays."
- Mays: "Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. I simply rise in support of the Gentleman's Motion on this particular Bill. I believe that the Audit Commission has demonstrated over the years that we've been a bipartisan group. We've tried to correct inadequacies when we see them and when they become evident to us in the audit process. And I believe that the steps forward that we've tried to make with this Bill ought to be progressed with. So, I rise in support of the Gentleman's Motion and would like to see many, many 'green' votes on this Bill."
- Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 2031 pass, notwithstanding the Veto of the Governor?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Seventy—one votes are required. Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative McCracken, one minute to explain your vote."
- McCracken: "Yes. Is this on the Gubernatorial Noncompliance Calendar, Representative Matijevich? Yeah, but didn't we just kill an override because of its compliance? Sure, you guys had about 25 'present' votes cause it was a Republican Bill. I remember that. Super job. Super job."
- Speaker Breslin: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 110 voting 'aye', none voting 'no' and none voting 'present' and the House does adopt the Motion to pass House Bill 2031, this Bill having received the required Three-Fifths Majority. House Bill 2035, Representative Parcells."
- Parcells: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I would also move to override...a complete override of the Governor's...of the

72nd Legislative Day

October 19, 1989

Governor's Amendatory Veto on the Laboratory Review...of the Legislative Audit Commission. We study all of boards there. We found out there was a great deal of duplication and overlap. We were using money we didn't need to use and we wanted to create a board made up of those...each board appointing someone to be committee. And for those boards who thought this had something to do with Central Management Services, it does not. The board would be made up of each...each board would be able to appoint a member to this committee who would then make various and sundry decisions. The Governor changed the whole feeling of the Bill by changing one simple word which we've seen happen around here before, from 'shall' to 'may'. He thought that that would make it an advisory board, but it doesn't. It means the board would have nothing to do if they didn't choose to. We want them to do something. We want them to make decisions on this board, to reduce backlogs, to overlook projects that are very expensive, to eliminate duplication and inefficiency and perhaps even cut some costs. He also said that this would...he wanted to delete the requirement to establish a quality assurance program. Quite clearly the board is given options about the kind of quality assurance requirements that they would impose. The requirement need not be uniform or generic. Some labs, such as a lab of the state police, might be evaluated by nationally recognized organizations or authorities, while other labs might require less stringent evaluations. They also have the right to set fees if they want to. They don't have to fees, it's up to them to decide this. It's a good Bill. 108 to 2 passed it out of this House and 59 out It think it's excellent and I ask for a the Senate. complete override of the Governor's Veto."

72nd Legislative Day

October 19, 1989

Speaker Breslin: "The Lady has moved to override the Governor's

Veto of House Bill 2035. And on that question, the

Gentleman from Cook, Representative Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Yes. Would the Sponsor yield? Representative Parcells, you indicated that the Governor's Amendatory Veto changed the word 'shall' to 'may'?"

Parcells: "That is correct."

Cullerton: "You view that as a substantial change to your original Bill as you passed it?"

Parcells: "Yes, I did."

Cullerton: "If you were sitting in committee and somebody offers an Amendment to change your...a 'shall' to a 'may', don't you normally view that as more than technical in nature?"

Parcells: "Yes. That's what I said in my testimony."

Cullerton: "And so you...in your opinion one of the reas..."

Parcells: "So, that's why I'd like to override the Bill."

Cullerton: "Because the Governor has gone too far in this case, in his Amendatory Veto."

Parcells: "I think I was agreeing with you."

Cullerton: "Yes, thank you."

Speaker Cullerton: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Keane."

Keane: "I just rise to agree with the Sponsor of the Bill. The Bill as it left the House and Senate, went to the Governor, was in great form, and I would urge my colleagues to support the override. Thank you."

Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 2035 pass?'

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

Voting is open. Seventy—one votes are required to override the Governor's Veto on this Bill. Have all voted who wish?

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

On this question there are 111...112 voting 'aye', none voting 'no' and none voting 'present'. This Motion having

72nd Legislative Day

- October 19, 1989
- received the required Three-Fifths Majority, the Motion to override prevails and House Bill 2035 passes.

 Representative McCracken, for what reason do you seek recognition?"
- McCracken: "Penny said I can't do it, so I'm not seeking recognition."
- Speaker Breslin: "House Bill 21...Yes, this Bill...House Bill 2035...House Bill 2035 passed, the Veto of the Governor notwithstanding. House Bill 2123, Representative Parke, on a Motion to accept. Do you wish to proceed, Sir? Proceed."
- Parke: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Ladies and Gentleman of the House, I accept the Governor's Amendatory Veto on House Bill 2123."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved to accept the Governor's Amendatory Veto on House Bill 2123. On that question, is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Matijevich."
- Matijevich: "Well, if Representative Parke would allow me, I'd like the Democrats on this side of the aisle to follow my directions and vote 'present', because the Governor has exceeded his authority. And also, if any Bill shows that we're not playing around with that issue, that last Bill, the Governor just rewrote the Bill. And that's what we're trying to avoid, so I would urge a 'present' vote on this issue."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Parke, do you wish to close?

 No. Yes? The question is, 'Shall House Bill 2123 pass,
 the Veto of the Governor notwith...shall the House accept
 the specific recommendations for change with respect to
 House Bill 2123?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those
 opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Sixty votes are
 required for acceptance. Have all voted who wish? Have

72nd Legislative Day

October 19, 1989

all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 54 voting 'aye', I voting 'no' and 54 voting 'present' and the Motion fails. House Bill 2351, Representative Keane...Young...Keane. Proceed, Sir."

Keane: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. House Bill 2351 went over...it went to the Governor and what it did was it dealt with the Radiation Protection Act. The...and during the last session you may remember the Bill was supported by the Medical Society and by others who do radiation work. meeting...because there was a lot of difficulties meeting the requirements of the...educational requirements of the Act. In downstate Illinois it's very difficult get any radi...people who take x-rays to go in and take the ongoing education or to even meet the basic education, simply because the courses are not offered. The Medical Society has urged that we override the Governor's Amendatory Veto at this time, so that they can continue to have doctors and others who cannot find theoretically qualified radiation technologists so they can continue to practice. The Medical Society did indicate to me that they are committed to meeting with the Governor and the agency and working out all the problems between now and next year, June of...the end of the Session...of next Session, will come up with a compromise Bill. But I would ask...I'd be happy to answer any questions, but I would ask for you to join in the override of the Governor's Veto... Amendatory Veto."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved to override the Governor's Veto of House Bill 2351. On that question, is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 2351 pass, the specific recommendations for change of the Governor notwithstanding?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is

72nd Legislative Day

October 19, 1989

open. Seventy—one votes are required. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 109 voting 'aye', 1 voting 'no' and none voting 'present'. This Motion having received the required Three—Fifths Majority, the Motion to override prevails and House Bill 2351 is declared passed, the specific recommendations for change of the Governor notwithstanding. House Bill 2369, Representative Keane."

Keane: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. 2369 took care of junior colleges. The only active and retired state agency and university employees that are not covered by state group health insurance plan are the junior college teachers. This Bill as it went to the Governor would do that. Many of us in higher education have fought for a number of years to get this passed. The Governor's Amendatory Veto makes the effective date...brings the effective date to July 1, 1990. In effect, it emasculates the Bill because it leaves the retirees with absolutely nothing. It keeps them outside of the system in which they belong. I'd be happy to answer any questions and ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Breslin: "The Gentleman has asked to override the Speaker Governor's Veto of House Bill 2369. And on that question, is there any discussion? There being none, the question 'Shall House Bill 2369 pass, the specific recommendations for change of the Governor notwithstanding?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Seventy-one votes are required to override. Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative McCracken, one minute to explain your vote."

McCracken: "Okay. This matter has been under negotiation with the Governor's Office to work this out. I would ask that this side of the aisle not vote in favor of this Override

72nd Legislative Day

October 19. 1989

Motion. Give the Executive an opportunity to conduct these negotiations, and if, in fact, there is a need for legislation in the near future, we can do it in January."

Speaker Breslin: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 67 voting 'aye', 33 voting 'no', 12 voting 'present' and the Motion fails. House Bill 2634,

Representative Hannig. Proceed, Sir."

Hannig: "Yes. Thank you, Madam Speaker and Members of the House. This is a battle that we've fought now I guess for the third time, and in the previous two debates we've this legislation out of this House by...with well over a hundred votes. This Bill...this Bill would provide that the sex education courses where they are taught in schools, shall emphasize abstinence as an expected norm. requires that the State Superintendent of Education develop a method of measuring the effectiveness of family courses. That's really all the Bill has done, and as I said before, we debated this two times, once when it came out of this House initially when I sponsored it, once when it came back for concurrence. It got over a hundred votes both times. I'm not really sure what the Governor's objections are, but I think that we've been on record in favor of this Bill twice before and I'd ask for your 'yes' vote once again."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved to override the Governor's Veto of House Bill 2634. And on that question, is there any discussion? Any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 2634 pass, the specific recommendations for change of the Governor notwithstanding?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Seventy—one votes are required. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who

72nd Legislative Day

October 19, 1989

wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 94 voting 'aye', 12 voting 'no' and 1 voting This Motion having received the required Three-Fifths Majority, the Motion to override prevails and Bill 2634 is declared passed, the specific recommendations for change of the Governor notwithstanding. Are there any more Motions for acceptance or override this order that people would like to go back to? If not, we will have completed this order of business. Going to Supplemental #1 appears...under Speaker's Table, appears SJR 54, Representative Kubik. I believe there is Amendment. Read the Amendment, Mr. Clerk. Do you have an Amendment filed?"

Kubik: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Floor Amendment #1, what it would do is to make this particular Joint Committee an Advisory Committee that would report to the Department of Historic Preservation. The underlying Bill has to do with a...looking at the whole issue of the preservation of sacred places, that is churches, synagogues and religious buildings alike, what we'd like to do is look at these particular buildings, because some of them have a lot of...I think I can briefly explain..."

Speaker Breslin: "Hearing no..."

Kubik: "...Of the Resolution in my explanation of the Amendment.
Again I would be happy to respond to any questions..."

Speaker Breslin: "...All those..."

Kubik: "...And would appreciate your support..."

Speaker Breslin: "...On page six, appears Total Veto Motions

House Bill 1559, Representative Younge. Wyvetter Younge,

proceed Representative Younge."

72nd Legislative Day

October 19, 1989

Younge: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, House Bill 1559 would establish the Financially Distressed Communities Act. Bill was totally vetoed by the Governor, because he...felt unsure he said as to how the repayment plan would go for the debt service on the bonds. The Bill is quite specific about this. It gives the authority to the Illinois Development Finance Authority in conjunction with agreement with the municipality to enter into an agreement for the reservation of funds which are due from the State of Illinois to municipalities. That means that the debt service of the monies to retire the bonds could be set aside in the treasury by agreement and therefore, there would be a very fiscally sound way of retiring the bonds that are...are to be floated for very necessary municipal I appeal to you today to override this Veto because there is a very desperate emergency situation that exist in my community and in other communities in Illinois. With the very high tax rate and in our situation there is a \$19 per \$100 assess valuation, in whereas in the surrounding areas it's five and six dollars. In the very high tax situation without police and fire services, it is very improbable that there will be economic development economic growth as a result of attracting industry in the immediate future. The whole process we all know, takes time, and therefore, if there is to be fire protection and police protection that has to come through some means provided by the state immediately. I hope that you never have the experience of trying to live in a town that does not have adequate fire or police protection. At night in my city, there are one or two police cars and there is police protection, therefore we have children who are being killed and mutilated and we have fires as a result of arson. I had the experience last week of standing

72nd Legislative Day

October 19, 1989

watching my church burn. It wasn't that the arson's hand would have burned the church because the fire equipment was there in adequate time to save the church, happened was after the equipment arrived there, it was in such a state of disrepair that the church burned anyway. This Bill is the product of a task force appointed by the Governor. The task force adopted this approach. Section of the Bill on bonds was written by the attorney for the Illinois Finance Development Authority and it is quite good. Our situation is hopeless. It is in an emergency. I ask for your compassion. Compassion is feel sorrow in a suffering situation where other people suffer. I think that our principles of government would belie that this is a situation where I call upon the Members of the General Assembly to feel a compassion for police protection, for fire...adequate fire protection, and for what is a basic right of citizens. I ask for your support to override this Veto."

Speaker Breslin: "The Lady has moved to override the Governor's

Veto on House Bill 1559. And on that that question, the

Gentleman from Madison, Representative Stephens. Mr.

Stephens."

Stephens: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. The...the Lady makes an impassioned plea and I think we've discussed this Bill and its similarities of intent at least with Representative McNamara's Bill, which we agreed with and passed...overrode the Governor's Veto and took care of that issue. But most specifically she talks about the City of East St. Louis and I...I bring your attention to page three of the St. Louis Post Dispatch, Thursday's issue. The...she does have a problem in her city with police protection. There's a reason for that. It's a reason of questionable priorities. We have the mayor of East St. Louis, and I'll just quote

72nd Legislative Day

October 19, 1989

this, 'driving around the city by a police bodyguard Thursday afternoon when they saw some suspected activity'. 'Suspected activity' is what he says. The chase occurred while TV crews from the show 60 Minutes were appropriately at his side. The mayor has...it's just amazing. In the middle of a city riddled with crime he decided to take his already weakened police force and weaken it further. Took five drug crime unit, the entire drug crime unit, off the streets to provide personal bodyguards that ought to embarrass all of us. The mayor is not deserving of special intervention..."

Speaker Breslin: "...Excuse me, Representative Flowers...excuse me...you have been interrupted. Representative Flowers, for what reason do you intercede?"

Flowers: "Madam Speaker, I would like to know if his statements are germane to Representative Younge's Bill?"

Speaker Breslin: "Representative..."

Stephens: "...Absolutely...absolutely..."

Flowers: "...No..."

Speaker Breslin: "...Representative..."

Stephens: "...I'll rule on that..."

Flowers: "...No..."

Speaker Breslin: "...Stephens..."

Flowers: "No...the mayor is not in this Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Stephens, confine your remarks to the Bill. Are you finished, Sir?"

Stephens: "Madam Speaker, I...I certainly wouldn't want to...to decrease the decorum of the chamber by not containing...making my remarks pertain to the Motion. But it does talk about financially distressed municipalities and a more glaring example of why municipalities can get in financial distress could not be made other than to refer to the...to the mayor of East St. Louis and his total

72nd Legislative Day

October 19, 1989

disregard for priorities, and that's the reason that I made the point. But let me bring my remarks to a close. We have dealt with this issue. Representative McNamara, in a reasoned effort, had his Bill dealt with and dealt with appropriately. This is...is not an issue that we need to support today and I understand another weather front is coming, so let's kill it and go home."

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

Young: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in support of the Bill and I think anyone who was contemplating voting against it, if they just really listen to the remarks of the last speaker, that ought to be reason to vote for it. We're not talking about a mayor, we're talking about a distressed municipality. These words are recommendations of the task force that the Governor, in fact, participated in. We're talking about distress communities in this state, not just East St. Louis and not just Robbins. Unfortunately, we have small communities who are becoming financially distressed almost on a daily bases. So this is about the citizens of small towns in this state that need our assistance, and I would urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Breslin: "The Lady from Kane, Representative Deuchler."

Deuchler: "Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in support of House Bill 1559. I think throughout the years in the General Assembly, we have seen Representative Younge trying to use some innovative, creative approaches, where some of us may differ, she has a very grievously, serious problem and is attempting to structure something a little out of the ordinary with some creativity and some very deep concerns about people residing in her district.

And I think we all certainly can share that with her at least."

72nd Legislative Day

October 19, 1989

- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Younge, you are recognized to close."
- Younge: "Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. I'll close by saying that we have policemen who do not have insurance.

 And I think that it is a shame and a disgrace to have police officers who are out on the streets without insurance. And I ask for your support."
- Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 1559 pass, the specific recommendations for change of the Governor notwithstanding?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Supplemental Calendar announcement."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Supplemental Calendar #3 is being distributed."

 Speaker Breslin: "Seventy-one votes are required for the...for
 this Override Motion. Representative Younge, one minute to
 explain your vote."
- Younge: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Because of the inadequate police protection, there are a number of small children who are being killed in my town. Last week there was a young lady who was a straight 'A' student, who was brutally murdered. You have a certain lawlessness that occurs when there is no police protection. I think that I'm entitled to a 'combat team' or a support in each of your districts when you have very serious problems, I come forth and I help. I've got a very bad problem in my district, in that there has been an economic collapse. In order restructure an economy, it is necessary to have vital city services. It is a first place. You can't go to the second step of economic growth if you don't have stability in the..."
- Speaker Breslin: "Bring your remarks to a close, Representative."

 Younge: "...In the municipal government. I have attended the

 National Association of State Legislators. One of the

72nd Legislative Day

October 19, 1989

first things one of the speakers said, there has to fiscal integrity. There has to be a reasonable tax rate with municipal services. I'm appealing to you to adopt this approach that will work in the situations in which I work in because people are entitled to reasonable city services. If these services cannot be gotten on municipal level, then they have to be provided by the state and federal government. I stand for self-sufficiency self-determination. Ιt is important that we give municipalities the capability of standing on their own. The State of Illinois has problems in reference to funding education and in reference to funding highways, reference to funding services, and therefore, let us adopt an approach that will not call upon the state's resources but will help a city to become self-sufficient."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Well, I hope that 71 votes stays up there. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, today believe it or not, I was in this Capitol Building at 6:30 in the Sometime...very...most...most of the time I get here at 7:00 a.m. One of the persons I often see coming early in the morning with her briefcase filled up is Wyvetter Younge. And I understand she drives back and forth from East St. Louis, I didn't even know that. right here in town. I want to tell you, I don't know of Member here on the floor that has worked harder for her district with these very, very difficult problems. I think she ought to be commended for it. We don't always agree with everything Wyvetter says or does. You know the other day when she spoke on this issue, I came over to her and 'Wyvetter, on any other day, I've never heard you articulate the issue better than you did today'.

72nd Legislative Day

October 19, 1989

speaking out of compassion for a very difficult problem and that's why we're here as Legislators, to help other districts, to help other people with their problems. That district is in dire straits. And Wyvetter, I commend you for speaking up. Trying something, something to help your people in that district. You are doing nothing else than what we are doing for our people in our districts, and I would urge the Members to give her the 71 votes that is needed to help that district. It's needed direly."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Hicks, one minute to explain his vote."

Hicks: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I would simply say that many of us everyday that we're in Session here, come to each other and ask for support on Bills when we have problems in our districts. Representative Younge certainly has major problems in the district. Those are not of her bringing to...she didn't bring those problems on herself. Those are problems of the economic situation in the community, and I'd urge people to support one of our own Members who has problems just like we do, each and every Member everyday we're here. Thank you."

Speaker Breslin: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 72 voting 'aye', 32 voting 'no' and 6 voting 'present'. This Bill...Motion having received the required Three-Fifths Majority, the Motion to override prevails and House Bill 1559 is declared passed, the specific recommendation for change of the Governor notwithstanding. Supplemental #3, Senate Bills, Third Reading. Senate Bill 1403, Representative Stern.

Mrs. Stern. Representative Stern, you're recognized on Supplemental #3. This is a Motion to exempt from the rules."

Stern: "Madam Speaker and Members of the House, I would like to

72nd Legislative Day

October 19, 1989

make the appropriate Motion to exempt Senate Bill 1403 from the rules so that we may present two Amendments that are very important to the election's process."

McCracken: "As you very well know, I had my light on for a verification. Our position was not an attack on...on Representative Younge, but it is not a workable plan. We've already discussed it. Why don't we consider it on the merits. You know, you obviously ignored my light. So let's...so let's just...just do it by the rules. You know, you ought to try it, you might like it that way. Try it...try it..."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Parke, for what reason do you
seek recognition?"

McCracken: "...The grand jury Bill can't be considered on the merits. Nothing in this Body is considered on the merits, when the Speaker wants it, when you want it..."

Speaker Breslin: "...Representative Parke..."

McCracken: "...You did it yourself..."

Speaker Breslin: "...For what reason do you seek recognition?"

McCracken: "...You can't blame anyone for this..."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Parke has been recognized."

Parke: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The movement of the Chair just then was a total disregard for the proper procedure of handling this...the work of this Body. I'm embarrassed that you deliberately ignore the floor leader on our side to allow somebody who passionately gave her proposal, but you disregard the rights of this side of the aisle. I'm embarrassed for you and I'm embarrassed for the Chair that you would do that, because that's exactly what we've been complaining about all day. I would hope that the Chair would try to maintain

72nd Legislative Day

October 19, 1989

some semblance of responsibility and not do something like that in the future."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentle...Representative...Representative...

Representative McCracken, do you have a further point,
Sir?"

McCracken: "...I know you're going to ignore it, but let me...let me just say one thing. You know, we are governed by the rule of law in our society, and we all make light of it. You know, we...we don't like the way the process is done. It's...it's an ugly process to witness. But you know something, that's what separates civilized society from uncivilized society. It's what separates tyranny from freedom. It is the difference in our society and you can have fun running over us and passing into law, a Bill that didn't have the votes. Now you can look over there, were probably fifteen votes shy and you wouldn't recognize me, because you wanted to do what in your heart, believe is a nice thing to do. And, you know, that's all very nice and wonderful. I suggest that if you want to do something nice, when you get off the podium, you make a contribution to some charity. That way you can vindicate your moral position on this issue, Madam Speaker. But you have no right to ignore the rule of law. It isn't something to laugh about. You know, the minorities on the other side of the aisle, how many times has the rule of law been ignored to your detriment? Today, it's for your betterment, you think. But do you think it's funny that the rule of law can be just thrown out the window? Do you think it's worth it to set the precedent of throwing the rule of law out the window? You know, do...do...just...just do whatever you want, but why don't you just be truthful about it and not...not hypocrites."

72nd Legislative Day

October 19, 1989

Speaker Breslin: "...The Lady..."

McCracken: "...You'll do it the way you want to do it and you don't care what the rules are."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Davis. Excuse me,

Representative Davis is recognized."

Davis: "Excuse me, Representative McCracken, you mentioned the minorities on this side of the aisle. I do feel that when you don't get your way, then you start talking about rights. Now the Bill was called, the votes were there, she took the total. When you looked up and saw that you lost, you want to change the rules. You cannot change the rules, Mr. McCracken. When they don't suit you, you want to change the darn rules."

Speaker Breslin: "Okay, Representative Davis..."

Davis: "Now this Body has one set of rules. You lost..."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Davis..."

Davis: "Mr. McCracken. You lost. So don't join me with your loss."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Davis. Okay..."

Davis: "Let's go to the next Bill..."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Davis..."

Davis: "Mr. McCracken, I invite you to step outside."

Speaker Breslin: "Ladies and Gentlemen, Ladies and Gentlemen, I appreciate that it has been a long and difficult day. We have one or two more...Orders of Business to complete. We are currently on the Order...we are currently on the Order of Senate Bills, Third Reading. Representative Stern has...is ready to present the Bill. She has asked leave to return the Bill to the Order of Second Reading for the purposes of an Amendment. Is leave granted? I am advised that this is...this is an Order of Business that is important to the Republican side of the aisle, so I would suggest you...you reviews...it. The question is, 'Does the

72nd Legislative Day

October 19, 1989

Lady have leave to return the Bill to the Order of Second Reading for the purposes of an Amendment?' Representative McCracken, do you deny leave?"

McCracken: "I absolutely deny leave..."

Speaker Breslin: "Very good."

McCracken: "And if I could deny more, I would do that as well."

Speaker Breslin: "Okay...Just so you know this is a Motion that is a Bill that is important to your side of the aisle and that's why it's being presented..."

McCracken: "But not as important as the rule of law."

Speaker Breslin: "So, the Motion has been denied, Representative Stern, what is your pleasure on this Bill? Do you wish to hold it or proceed?"

Stern: "Madam Speaker and Members of the House, with my customary exquisite timing, I have a small election's modification to make at the request of two Members, and it will...it will assist the Republicans as well as the Democrats. It is not in any way a partisan Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Stern, perhaps you'd like to take it out of the record and..."

Stern: "I will take it out of the record for the moment, Madam , Speaker. Thank you..."

Speaker Breslin: "...Things will change...Out of the record.

We're going to do the Adjournment Resolution, but there

will be a Death Resolution thereafter. Proceed, Mr.

Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Joint Resolution 101, resolved by the Senate of the Eighty-Sixth General Assembly of the State of Illinois, the House of Representatives concurring herein, that when the Senate adjourns on Thursday, October 19, 1989; it stands adjourned until Monday, October 30, 1989 at 2:00 o'clock p.m. And when it adjourns on the 30th, it stands adjourned until Tuesday, October 31st, 1989 at

72nd Legislative Day

October 19, 1989

twelve o'clock noon. And when the House of Representatives adjourns on Thursday, October 19, 1989; it stands adjourned until Monday, October 30, 1989 at twelve o'clock noon. And when it adjourns on October 30, it stands adjourned until Tuesday, October 31, 1989 at twelve o'clock noon."

- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Matijevich moves the adoption of the Adjournment Resolution. All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The Adjournment Resolution is adopted. Agreed Resolutions."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 1025, Didrickson. 1027, Parke. 1028, Pullen. 1029, Curran. 1030, Curran. 1031, Balanoff. 1032, Parke. 1033, Madigan et al. House Joint Resolution 72, William Peterson. House Joint Resolution 73, Kubik. House Joint Resolution 74, Kubik. House Joint Resolution 75, Munizzi."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Matijevich has moved the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The Agreed Resolutions are adopted. Death Resolutions."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 1034, offered by Representative Bugielski. And House Resolution 1026, offered by Representative Ryder."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Matijevich moves the adoption of the Death Resolutions. All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The Death Resolutions are adopted. Representative Frederick, are you seeking recognition right now? Representative Cullerton moves that this House stand adjourned. All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And this House stands adjourned until the appointed time."

REPORT: /TIFLDAY

STATE OF ILLINOIS 86TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES DAILY TRANSCRIPTION OF DEBATE INDEX

PAGE 1 05/08/90

OCTOBER 19, 1989

HB-0098 VETO ACTION	PAGE	29
HB-0164 VETO ACTION	PAGE	5
HB-0224 VETO ACTION	PAGE	6
HB-0250 MOTION	PAGE	120
HB-0312 VETO ACTION	PAGE	\47
H8-0316 VETO ACTION	PAGE	8
H8-0418 VETO ACTION		
	PAGE	28
HB-0421 VETO ACTION	PAGE	9
HB-0470 VETO ACTION	PAGE	10
HB-0548 VETO ACTION	PAGE	10
HB-0559 MOTION	PAGE	101
HB-0576 VETO ACTION	PAGE	121
HB-0592 VETO ACTION	PAGE	39
HB-0642 VETO ACTION	PAGE	11
HB-0789 MOTION	PAGE	117
HB-0830 VETO ACTION	PAGE	78
HB-0850 VETO ACTION	PAGE	79
HB-0850 MOTION	PAGE	66
HB-0859 VETO ACTION	PAGE	34
HB-1131 MOTION	PAGE	76
HB-1249 VETO ACTION		
•	PAGE	30
HB-1257 VETO ACTION	PAGE	12
HB-1356 VETO ACTION	PAGE	12
HB-1396 VETO ACTION	PAGE	13
HB-1400 VETO ACTION	PAGE	14
HB-1480 VETO ACTION	PAGE	
		30
HB-1487 THIRD READING	PAGE	48
HB-1496 VETO ACTION	PAGE	32
HB-1559 VETO ACTION	PAGE	137
HB-1567 MOTION	PAGE	16
HB-1571 VETO ACTION	PAGE	112
HB-1571 MOTION		
	PAGE	104
HB-1619 VETO ACTION	PAGE	17
HB-1666 VETO ACTION	PAGE	18
HB-1819 VETO ACTION	PAGE	18
HB-1863 VETO ACTION	PAGE	20
HB-1876 VETO ACTION	PAGE	123
HB-1883 VETO ACTION	PAGE	20
HB-1899 VETO ACTION	PAGE	21
H8-2031 VETO ACTION	PAGE	129
HB-2035 VETO ACTION	PAGE	130
HB-2048 VETO ACTION	PAGE	27
HB-2059 VETO ACTION	PAGE	102
HB-2123 VETO ACTION		
	PAGE	133
HB-2130 VETO ACTION	PAGE	21
HB-2334 VETO ACTION	PAGE	22
HB-2351 VETO ACTION	PAGE	134
HB-2369 VETO ACTION	PAGE	135
HB-2405 VETO ACTION	PAGE	102
HB-2511 THIRD READING	PAGE	64
HB-2634 VETO ACTION	PAGE	136
HB-2687 VETO ACTION	PAGE	23
HB-2833 THIRD READING	PAGE	65
SB-1075 MOTION	PAGE	77
SB-1096 SECOND READING	PAGE	111
SB-1136 MOTION	PAGE	77
SB-1276 MOTION	PAGE	77
SB-1322 MOTION	PAGE	77
SB-1379 MOTION	PAGE	77
SB-1403 MOTION	PAGE	144
SB-1403 MOTION	PAGE	77
SB-1403 OUT OF RECORD	PAGE	148
SB-1451 MOTION	PAGE	78
HR-0035 MOTION	PAGE	78

REPORT: TIFLDAY 11:10

> DEATH RESOLUTIONS ADJOURNMENT

STATE OF ILLINOIS 86TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES DAILY TRANSCRIPTION OF DEBATE INDEX

PAGE 2 05/08/90

PAGE PAGE

149 149

OCTOBER 19. 1989

v	٠	v	υ,	_	•	٠	,	7	4	,	v	7	

SJR-0054 RESOLUTION OFFERED SJR-0101 RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE PAGE		
	· AGE	1,0	
SUBJECT MATTER			
HOUSE TO ORDER - SPEAKER BRESLIN	PAGE		
PRAYER - REVEREND HERB HUBBARD OF TAYLORVILLE		1	
		1	
PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE - REPRESENTATIVE ROPP	PAGE	1	
ROLL CALL FOR ATTENDANCE	PAGE	1	
AGREED RESOLUTIONS	PAGE	2	
DEATH RESOLUTIONS '	PAGE	2	
GENERAL RESOLUTIONS	PAGE	3	
COMMITTEE REPORTS	PAGE		
AMENDATORY VETOS	PAGE	5	
	_	_	
REPRESENTATIVE CULLERTON IN THE CHAIR	PAGE		
REDUCTION AND ITEM VETOS	PAGE	39	
INTRODUCTION - SENATOR JAN FATES	PAGE	64	
HOUSE BILLS - THIRD READING	PAGE	64	
CONFERENCE COMMITTEE REPORTS	PAGE	76	
RECESS	PAGE		
REPRESENTATIVE BRESLIN IN THE CHAIR	PAGE	101	
SENATE BILS - THIRD READING			
	PAGE		
AGREED RESOLUTIONS	PAGE	149	