161st Legislative Day

June 25, 1992

- Speaker Keane: "The House will come to order. Members be in your seats. The chaplain for today is Reverend Dymann Jirovec of Immanuel Lutheran Church in Broadlands, Illinois. Reverend Jirovec is a guest of Representative Weaver. Our guests in the gallery may wish to rise for the invocation."
- Reverend Jirovec: "Gracious heavenly Father, what a joy to be alive this beautiful day which You have given to us is another blessing that we do not deserve, but Your love and mercy are with us continually. Lord, we ask for Your presence here today upon all our government officials. Especially we ask for Your wisdom and quidance with Legislature. May their business that they accomplish today be motivated by the interest of those they represent and for the entire State of Illinois. Let not personal gain nor selfish wants interfere with doing what is right for the people of this great state. Pour out Your blessings upon everyone. Let all people everywhere live in harmony and peace. May our purpose in life be the same to benefit our fellow man and to the praise and the worship and glorifying of Your holy name. We ask this in the name of the Lord, Jesus Christ. Amen."
- Speaker Keane: "We will be led in the Pledge by Representative Hensel."
- Hensel et al: "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."
- Kubik: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Let the record reflect that Representative Virginia Frederick is excused due to illness today."

161st Legislative Day

June 25, 1992

Speaker Keane: "Representative Matijevich, any excused absences?"

Matijevich: "Speaker, we have no excused absences on this side."

Speaker Keane: "One-hundred sixteen Members voting...answering 'present', a quorum is present. We'll begin today with Third Readings. As you know, as the Majority Leader indicated yesterday, we will be adjourning early this evening. If you pass your Bill, you cannot be assured that we're coming back to it. So pay your money and take your chances, and we will be saying this again and again as we go over these Bills: If you don't call them, we may not get back to them, and if we adjourn at a reasonable hour, then we don't want to hear any complaints. On the Order of Third Readings, Government Administration, appears Senate Bill 1722, Representative Lang. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1722, a Bill for an Act to amend the Burial on Sunday and Holiday Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Keane: "Representative Lang."

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

Senate Bill 1722 now represents an Agreed Bill relative to the cemetery problem we had previously discussed. It's been debated often and it's agreed now between the Jewish Federation and all parties with the cemetery people, and I would move passage."

Speaker Keane: "Representative Black."

Black: "Yeah. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. An inquiry of the Chair. Can you tell me what Amendments are on this Bill?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendments #1, 2, 3 and 5 are adopted."

Black: "And 4 was withdrawn, correct?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Correct."

Black: "All right. Thank you very much. Mr. Speaker and Ladies

161st Legislative Day

June 25, 1992

and Gentlemen of the House, the Sponsor of this Bill has done an outstanding job, long, long hours of negotiation. He's to be commended. I join to support his proposal. Amendment #5 has been worked out and represents many hours of work on his part, and I think it's a very, very reasonable compromise to a very difficult situation. I urge your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Keane: "Representative Hultgren."

Hultgren: "I have a question of the Sponsor. At one point, the proposal addressed only the situation in Cook County. My question is, this new compromise, does that address the situation in all 102 counties or just Cook?"

Lang: "Representative, I'm sorry. I did not hear your question.

Did you ask if it applies statewide?"

Hultgren: "Well, yeah. At one point, your proposal only dealt with the problem that existed in Cook, and I'm wondering whether your compromise proposal addresses only Cook or whether it also hopes to address the same problem in other counties?"

Lang: "Representative Homer's Amendment, Amendment 3, made it a
statewide Amend...Bill."

Hultgren: "And...and that remains a part of this proposal then?"

Lang: "That is correct."

Hultgren: "Thank you."

Speaker Keane: "Question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Jay Hoffman votes 'aye'. Represen... The board is still open. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 112...113 voting 'aye', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', and this Bill, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On Senate Bills,

161st Legislative Day

June 25, 1992

Third Reading, Municipal, County and Conservation, three Sponsors are: Hartke, Brunsvold and Stepan. Senate Bill 1828, Representative Hartke. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1862, Representative Brunsvold. Out of the record. Senate Bill 2101, Representative Stepan. Out of Third Reading, the record. On House Bills, Banking, appears Senate Bill 1519, Representative Capparelli. of the record. On the Order of Insurance, Third Reading, Senate Bill 1638, Representative Regan. Out of the record. On the Order of Civil Law, Third Reading, there are three Bills. Three Bill Sponsors are: Representative Obrzut, Representative Lang and Representative McCracken. Senate Bill 1892, Representative Obrzut. Out of the record. Senate Bill 2076, Representative Lang. Out of the record. Mr. Clerk, Senate Bill 2134, Representative McCracken. read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 2134, a Bill for an Act to amend the Code of Civil Procedure. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Keane: "Representative McCracken."

McCracken: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill has been debated before. This would provide limited immunity for attorneys who participate in structured settlements but only to the extent those attorneys require the funding party (that is the insurance company or the annuity company), to be of the highest grade or quality. The language stated in the Bill is drawn from the Uniform Periodic Payment of Judgments Act. The characteristics set forth in the Bill which are required to be met for this limited immunity are characteristics drawn from that uniform act and which identify the funding party (the annuity company or the insurance company), as one of the best quality companies. This is not something that is designed to hurt injured

161st Legislative Day

June 25, 1992

defendants or plaintiffs. In fact, over the course of a pay-out on a structured settlement, the terms can be more advantageous for the plaintiff. In any event, it's the plaintiff's decision whether to accept a structured settlement in all cases but malpractice or medical malpractice, and the immunity applies only, only, where the qualifications of the Bill are met which require, in effect, a very responsible funding party. I move its passage."

Speaker Keane: "Is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 103 voting 'aye', 0 voting 'no', 11 voting 'present', and this Bill, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Regan, do you want to go back on Insurance, Third Reading and pick up Senate Bill 1638? Out of the record. On Senate Bills. Transportation, Third Reading, is Senate Bill 2039, Representative Obrzut. Out of the record. On the Order of Public Utilities, Third Reading, is Senate Bill 1766, Representative Steczo. Out of the record. On the Order of Professional Regulations, Third Reading, is Senate Bill 963, Representative Steczo. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 963, a Bill for an Act to amend the Court Reporter's Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Keane: "Representative Steczo."

Steczo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. As amended yesterday, Senate Bill 963 contains two items. First is a licensure measure which addresses geologists.

Second is an Amendment that we approved which addresses

161st Legislative Day

June 25, 1992

professional athletes and provides that those professional athletes, if convicted twice of state or federal drug offenses, cannot participate in their sport and play professionally here in the State of Illinois. That's what the Bill does, Mr. Speaker. I would answer any questions and, if not, would ask for a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Keane: "Representative Black."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. We rise in opposition to this Bill. We were opposed to the Amendment that licenses geologists. The Department of Professional Regulation is opposed to that Act. There is no money to implement the Act. So because that Amendment is in there, I ask for a 'no' vote, and I will seek a verification should this get the requisite number of votes to pass."

Speaker Keane: "Representative Steczo."

Steczo: "Out of the record."

Speaker Keane: "Out of the record. Senate Bill 1662,
Representative Steczo. Out of the record. On the Order of
Revenue, Third Reading, Senate Bill 1479, Representative
Lang. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1606, Representative
Hartke. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1606, a Bill for an Act concerning local government. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Keane: "Representative Hartke."

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

(Senate Bill) 1606, as it came over (sic - from) the House, contained provision that Senator Kelly included that allows townships to secure money through various methods for senior citizens housing. As it came over here, we put a couple Amendments on it. One of mine, dealing with a transfer of property in my district... Excuse me, the sale

161st Legislative Day

June 25, 1992

of property in my district and the change of statues (sic - statutes) as regards to city council members. And the third item on the Bill is...was agreed to yesterday in Amendment #5, which is Representative Flinn's Amendment, dealing with animal control wardens in downstate counties, and I'd be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Keane: "Any discussion? There being none, the question is...Representative Black."

Black: "Yeah. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I...I think the Gentleman's tried very hard to get this Bill in order. I just want to remind some people that even though they've tried very hard to work out the animal control language that many of your animal control officers will oppose this even though it is permissive. On behalf of the county boards, if they wish to take police powers away from animal control wardens, they are free to do so. It's certainly in better shape than it was when it was mandatory, but for those of you that (sic - who) have been contacted by your animal control people, your vote should be delivered very carefully, and I just wanted to call that to some Member's attention."

Speaker Keane: "Representative Hartke, to close."

Hartke: "I would just ask for your support on this legislation."

Speaker Keane: "Question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative... Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 102 voting 'aye', 8 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', and this Bill, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On Government Operations, Third Reading, are... the Sponsors of these Bills are: Representative

161st Legislative Day

June 25, 1992

Levin, Representative Steczo, Representative Churchill and Representative Hultgren. Senate Bill 1749, Representative Levin. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk McLennand: "Senate Bill 1749, a Bill for an Act to amend the Condominium Property Act. Third Reading of this Bill."

Speaker Keane: "Representative Levin."

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of Levin: "Okay. the House. First of all, as is my practice, I'd like the record to reflect that I do represent condominium associations as well as unit owners. Senate Bill 1749 is... The underlying Bill is technical Bill in nature and simply codifies what everybody has thought has been the law for the last 20 years: that if you want to make a change in the common elements of a condominium association, you need to get 100% approval from the unit owners. There was an Appellate Court decision to the contrary and the title industry asked for this legislation. There were two Amendments that were added to this Bill. House Amendment #2, by Representative White, deals with the Indemnity Fund, and Amendment #3, also by Representative White, was a cleanup Amendment in terms of, I believe, the Torrens System. If there are any questions, I'll be happy to answer them. Otherwise, simply ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Keane: "Is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 111 voting 'aye', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', and Senate Bill 1749, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared

- l61st Legislative Day

 passed. Senate Bill 1769, Representative Steczo. Mr.

 Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk McLennand: "Senate Bill 1769, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Physical Therapy Act. Third Reading of this Bill."

Speaker Keane: "Representative Steczo."

Steczo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Senate Bill 1769 contains a number of provisions, as amended yesterday in the House, that deal with the Department of Professional Regulation or a number of professions in the state. Much of the Bill is technical Amendments that were requested by the department. There are a few other items which were adopted yesterday which relate to other Acts the General Assembly has passed dealing with professions. I would prefer, Mr. Speaker, if possible, because these Amendments were adopted on voice votes, non-controversial voice votes, yesterday, simply to answer any questions should Members of the House have them."

Speaker Keane: "Representative Black."

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

Speaker Keane: "He indicates he will."

Black: "Representative, for the record, there were two Amendments on the Bill dealing with some grandfathering of physical therapists. I think it was Amendment #5 and #6. Those Amendments have been withdrawn from the Bill, correct?"

Steczo: "Those Amendments were withdrawn yesterday. That is correct."

Black: "And that language does not appear in any subsequent Amendment or the Bill?"

Steczo: "That is correct. It does not appear in any subsequent Amendment."

161st Legislative Day

June 25, 1992

- Black: "Thank you very much. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, with those Amendments being withdrawn, we do not stand in opposition to the Bill. As the Sponsor has accurately portrayed, there are a number of things in this...in this Bill, as amended, that, I trust, all of you are familiar with, and you should vote accordingly."
- Speaker Keane: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 111 voting 'aye', 0 voting 'no', 2 voting 'present', and this Bill, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 2163, Representative Churchill. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 2163, a Bill for an Act to create the

 Limited Liability Company Act. Third Reading of this Bill."

 Speaker Keane: "Representative Churchill."
- Churchill: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This would create a new type of business entity called the Limited Liability Company. This is a Bill that had great debate in the House Judiciary I Committee, and we put some Amendments on it to satisfy most of the people that had complaints with it. And at this point in time, I would propose this Bill and ask for an affirmative vote."
- Speaker Keane: "Is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 111 voting 'aye', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', and this Bill,

161st Legislative Day

June 25, 1992

having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Lang, for what purpose do you rise? Representative Lang."

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I inadvertently voted 'yes'. I intended to vote 'no' on that last Bill, Senate Bill 2163."

Speaker Keane: "The record shall so read."

Lang: "Thank you."

Speaker Keane: "Senate Bill 2190, Representative Hultgren. Out of the record. On the Order of Senate Bills, Agriculture and Environment, appears Senate Bill 2177, Representative Hartke. Out of the record. On the Order of Senate Bills, Third Reading, Elementary and Secondary Education, appears Senate Bill 1655, Representative Cowlishaw. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk McLennand: "Senate Bill 1655, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. Third Reading of this Bill."

Speaker Keane: "Representative Cowlishaw."

Cowlishaw: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies Gentlemen of the House. This is a Bill that was suggested by Senator Jeremiah Joyce. It has to do with making certain that certain special education teachers who are...who were formerly employed in DuPage County schools and are now employed in the Chicago schools shall not suffer any salary detriment because of the fact that their jobs were changed to a different school district, and then, there is also an Amendment that provides that limitations relevant to the Board of Education membership do not apply to any unit district that was formed prior to January 1, 1975. As far as I know, Mr. Speaker, there is absolutely no opposition to this Bill, and I would urge its adoption."

Speaker Keane: "Is there any discussion? There being none, the

161st Legislative Day

June 25, 1992

question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 112 voting 'aye', 0 voting 'no' and 6 voting 'present', and this Bill, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of Senate Bills, Third Reading, Educational Financing, Senate Bill 1988, Representative Cowlishaw. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk McLennand: "Senate Bill 1988, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. Third Reading of this Bill."

Speaker Keane: "Representative Cowlishaw."

Cowlishaw: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is a Bill that was... There were several Amendments added to this Bill yesterday. The initial Bill was one that was provided by Senator Berman in order to make...make available some right to borrow funds for school districts because of the late payment. That language was carefully crafted by Chapman and Cutler and approved by them. So, of course, that portion of this Bill is certainly not controversial. Then we went on and yesterday that... One from added some Amendments Representative Hultgren that has to do with the requirement for a public hearing before they can make changes in the boundaries of school districts there. Amendment #3 of Representative Brunsvold that has to do with a request from the Illinois High School Association. An Amendment offered by Representative Stern which has to do with a...an exception that needs to be made for one of the school districts in her district only applies there, nowhere else in the state. We then adopted a couple of Amendments. One by Representative Levin and one by Representative Davis

161st Legislative Day

June 25, 1992

that have to do with the flextime provisions for the Chicago public schools. And, finally, we adopted an Amendment that simply is a cleanup Amendment, a technical Amendment, that has to do with certain words in the School Code that needed to be made plural rather than singular. So it's just a grammatical kind of thing more than anything else. Those are the elements that are now contained in this Bill, Mr. Speaker, and to the best of my knowledge and all of those whose names I have mentioned, it is totally uncontroversial. There is no one that we know of who has any objection to any of the provisions of this Bill, and I move for its adoption."

Speaker Keane: "Representative Black."

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

Speaker Keane: "She indicates she will."

Black: "Representative, this thick file and all these Amendments.

There isn't anything in any of these Amendments that would alter the traditional make-up of a school district? What we call the old Congressional Township Rule, where rural interests have to be..."

Cowlishaw: "Representative, that was a Bill. And the Bill, I believe, was lost over in the Senate Rules Committee, and the Illinois Association of School Boards has been trying to find a home for that Bill, but this was not its home. So that is not in this legislation."

Black: "So there's... We don't have anything to worry about.

That tenet is not in this..."

Cowlishaw: "That is not..."

Black: "Thank you very much."

Cowlishaw: "That is not...I realize it's confusing when there are 11 Amendments, but that was not one of them."

161st Legislative Day

June 25, 1992

Black: "Thank you. I appreciate that. I simply rise to support the Sponsor's Bill."

Speaker Keane: "Representative Stern."

Stern: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I simply rise in support of the Bill. It's got important information in it for all areas of the state. I ask your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Keane: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 108 voting 'aye', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', and this Bill, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. We have now completed a full run-through of Third Readings. If any of the Bills that are on Third Reading that weren't called die by the time we adjourn today, you have only yourself to blame. You will have other opportunities... You will have other opportunities to pass these Bills, as the Majority Leader stated yesterday, we're going to get out of here at a reasonable hour. So we may end up... You may end up getting your Bill on the second or third go-round, but don't count on it. There was a Bill on Consumer Protection, Third Reading, that I missed because it was on the top of the page on my...on my Calendar was cut off. It's Senate Bill 1516, Representative Kubik. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk McLennand: "Senate Bill 1516, a Bill for an Act to amend the Consumer Fraud and Deceptive Business Practices Act.

Third Reading of this Bill."

Speaker Keane: "Representative Kubik."

Kubik: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This particular Bill is...deals with the issue of

161st Legislative Day

June 25, 1992

providing immigration services for recent...new immigrants. We're trying to craft the Bill in a form that is acceptable to all parties. Originally, when I was in committee, we had agreed to hold it on Second Reading. We have not reached an agreement. I've spoken to the Chairman of the Consumer Protection Committee and the spokesman, and we have amended this Bill so we can send it over to the Senate and try to work an agreement between all parties including the City of Chicago on language which is agreeable to everyone. So what I'd like to do is, send this Bill over to the Senate and create a Conference Committee, and I would appreciate your support in passing this Bill so that we can accomplish that purpose. Thank you. I'd be happy to respond to any questions you might have."

"Is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All those in favor vote 'ave': all opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. this Bill, there are 110 voting 'aye', 0 voting 'no', 2 voting 'present', and this Bill, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. We will now go to Orders of Second Reading. On the Order Second Reading, Government Administration, appears Senate Bill 1912, Representative Hicks. Out of the record. the Order of Second Reading, Municipal, County Working Cash Fund. Senate Bill 1625, Representative Churchill. Representative Churchill. Out of the record. On the Order of Senate Bills, Second Reading, Labor, appear two Bills. The two Sponsors are Representative Satterthwaite and Representative Lang. Senate Bill 1983, Representative Satterthwaite. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1986,

161st Legislative Day

June 25, 1992

Representative Lang. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk McLennand: "Senate Bill 1986, a Bill for an Act to amend the Code of Civil Procedure. Second Reading of the Bill.

This Bill's previously been read a second time. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee."

Speaker Keane: "Any Motions filed?"

Clerk McLennand: "No Motions filed?"

Speaker Keane: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk McLennand: "Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Lang."

Speaker Keane: "Representative Lang."

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Amendment #2 amends the Illinois Child Labor Law. It makes numerous changes relative to employment certificates to minors, et cetera. This was embodied in a prior Bill that passed the House, with, I believe, 100...a 115 to nothing. It was originally House Bill 3107, and I move adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker Keane: "Any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt Amendment #2?' All those in favor say 'aye'; all opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it.

Amendment #2 is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

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

Speaker Keane: "Representative Lang."

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Amendment #4 (sic) takes the original language of the original Bill and puts it back in except it would be limited to apply to counties of under 500,000."

Speaker Keane: "Representative Lang, we're on Amendment #3."

Lang: "I'm sorry. We're on Amendment #3. Thank you very much,

Mr. Speaker. Amendment #3 deals with the issues of

quarantors and co-signers on a motor vehicle retail

161st Legislative Day

June 25, 1992

installment contract, and what it does is really cleanup language, and it straightens out and makes the same the language in that Act as language in other Acts dealing with notes relative to the rights and responsibilities of co-signers. I don't believe it's controversial. I would move adoption."

Speaker Keane: "Representative Wennlund." Wennlund: "Thank you,

Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Keane: "He indicates he will."

- Wennlund: "What change, if any, does this make in the obligation of a guarantor of a note or other instrument than what is existing law today?"
- Lang: "Representative, I don't believe it makes any substantial change. I believe it... The purpose is to make the language mirror language in other sections of the Illinois Revised Statutes that deal with the rights and obligations of guarantors."
- Wennlund: "Before the holder of an obligation or note can proceed against a guarantor, what actions must be take if this Bill becomes part of the law?"
- Lang: "The holder would have the opportunity to, separate and apart from the remedies now, ...if they would be able to show a court that it was apparent that it was useless to proceed against a primary obligor, they could then proceed against the co-signer."
- Wennlund: "But the primary obligor has to have been determined to be insolvent by what, filing bankruptcy or..."
- Lang: "Well, this is in addition to the statute. It's an addition to the current remedies, and as you know, as a practicing attorney, you can always go against the co-signer, but..."
- Wennlund: "There's a difference between a quarantor and a

161st Legislative Day

June 25, 1992

co-signer."

- Lang: "Well, that's correct, and I thank you for straightening me out on that, but this would add, in addition to the current remedies, if you could show that they become insolvent or that they can't serve summons or it's otherwise apparent that that it's useless to proceed against the primary obligor, then you could proceed against the co-signer."
- Wennlund: "What's the genesis of this Amendment? Can you tell

 me, Representative Lang? How do the Illinois bankers feel

 about it, in other words?"
- Lang: "I don't think the bankers are opposed in any way. This would certainly make it easier for the bankers to collect money in the case of default. It would make it easier for credit unions. It would make it easier for any creditor to proceed against a co-signer. It just...it gives them an additional hook, an additional opportunity, to go after a co-signer when the primary obliqor can't handle the debt."
- Wennlund: "Still haven't got to the bottom-line yet. The bottom
 line is where did it come from? What's the genesis of the
 Amendment?"
- Lang: "Frankly, I don't... I remember who gave it to me, but I don't remember who they were representing. I have to be honest with you."

Wennlund: "Was it the Illinois Trial Lawyers?"

Lang: "No."

- Wennlund: "It was not. What a... I still don't understand (maybe
 I'm a little thick this morning), but I still don't
 understand what change this really makes in existing law?"
- Lang: "Give me one second. Let's see if I can find my analysis,

 Representative. Mr. Speaker, might I take this Bill from
 the record briefly, and we'll come back to it?"
- Speaker Keane: "Take the Bill out of the record. On the Order of

161st Legislative Day

June 25, 1992

Second Reading, Transportation, appears Senate Bill 2088. Representative Lang. Out of the record. On the Order of Revenue, Second Reading, appears Senate Bill 1590. Representative Schoenberg. Out of the record. On the Order of Senate Bills, Mandates, appears Senate Bill 1692. Representative Trotter. Representative Trotter. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk McLennand: "Senate Bill 1692, a Bill for an Act to amend the Hospital Licensing Act. Second Reading of the Bill. The Bill's previously been read a second time. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Keane: "Representative Trotter. Mr. Clerk, any...what's the status of the Bill? Any Motions on Amendment #1?"

Clerk McLennand: "No Motions."

Speaker Keane: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk McLennand: "No Floor Amendments."

Clerk McLennand: "Senate Bill 1692, a Bill for an Act to amend the Hospital Licensing Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Keane: "Representative Trotter."

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

Senate Bill 1692 amends the Illinois Hospital Licensing Act requiring hospitals licensed under the Act stating that they shall comply with the duty requirements for residents and interns established by the Accreditation Council for Graduate Medical Education. It's a simple reporting Bill.

It's...no opposition to the Bill that I know of. The Illinois Department of Public Health has signed off on it and so has the IMS. So there's no opposition at this time."

Speaker Keane: "Representative Black."

161st Legislative Day

June 25, 1992

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

Speaker Keane: "He indicates he will."

Black: "What does...What does the Bill do, as amended?"

Speaker Keane: "We're in our last day. It's a deadline day.

Let's take all unnecessary conversations off the floor
while we're amending Bills. Proceed. Representative
Trotter, did you hear Representative Black's question?"

Trotter: "No. I did not."

Speaker Keane: "Would you repeat the question? Representative Black, would you repeat the question?"

Black: "Yeah. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Representative, as amended, does the Bill do anything besides require some paperwork?"

Trotter: "No. It's my understanding it's just a simple reporting procedure that has to be done when hospitals apply for licensure."

Black: "My records indicate that the Hospital Association and the Medical Society opposed this Bill. Was that prior to your Amendment?"

Trotter: "No, that was after the Amendment. The opposition?"

Black: "Yes."

Trotter: "It was prior to the Amendment, correct."

Black: "All right, so, as amended, it really doesn't put any onerous requirements on a hospital. It just asks them to comply with what's already in regulation?"

Trotter: "Already...it's codifying some language."

Black: "All right. Fine. Thank you very much."

Speaker Keane: "Representative Lang."

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

Speaker Keane: "He indicates he will."

Lang: "Thank you. I have a cryptic note on my file that

161st Legislative Day

June 25, 1992

indicates that Cook County was opposed to this. Do you have any idea why?"

Trotter: "Let me...let me take it out of the record. For my understanding that they have cleared up that problem."

Black: "If they've cleared it up, I believe you. If they've cleared that up, that'll resolve the problem."

Speaker Keane: "Take the Bill out of the record."

Trotter: "Take it out of the record at this point."

Speaker Keane: "On the Order of Second Reading, Agriculture and Environment, Senate Bill 1931. Representative Novak. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk McLennand: "Senate Bill 1931, a Bill for an Act to amend the Environmental Protection Act. The Bill's previously been read a second time. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Keane: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk McLennand: "Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Novak."

Speaker Keane: "Representative Novak."

Novak: "Yeah. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1931 is a recalculation of the formula used to...determine the tipping fee. It uses the 3.3%...3.3 ratio, and it would enable counties that have landfills to collect a greater tipping fee. This is not any kind type of an increase in the tipping fee. It's just a recalculation and a revision of the formula to...collect the tipping fee, and it would also... It would help our recycling programs because the counties that receive the tipping fee will enable them to spend more dollars on recycling and solid waste management programs, and I ask for your support."

Speaker Keane: "Representative Black."

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

161st Legislative Day

June 25, 1992

Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Keane: "He indicates he will."

- Black: "Representative, according to my notes, in 1991, over \$5 million was transferred from the Solid Waste Management Fund and deposited into the General Revenue Fund. So, I guess my question is, if we have an excess of money in that fund, why are we after a tipping fee increase at...at this time?"
- Novak: "Well, you're correct, Representative Black. There was some dollars transferred. This is a fairer way to logically calculate this, and it's going to enable the counties and...incidentally, the genesis of this Amendment is from DuPage County and the Solid Waste Administration Program. They are losing vast amounts of money that they need, including my own home county, Kankakee County, will see a, you know, considerable increase in those needed dollars."
- Black: "Well, and...I...think I understand that, but...how are we gonna... How are we gonna answer the question that... This is just simply going to be passed on to the consumer, is it not?"
- Novak: "Well, you know, I can't say no, it's not going to be, but these are needed environmental dollars that should go back to the local communities."
- Black: "Okay, well, I...I appreciate your patience on Amendment #1. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'm...I'm in a dilemma. I think what the Sponsor of the Amendment says is probably true, that it needs to be done, particularly in those counties where scales have been put in, but at the same time, if you're gonna increase the tipping fee by a considerable percentage, then I can't help but think that cost will be passed on to the taxpayer, if

161st Legislative Day

June 25, 1992

you will, or the generator of the waste, I guess, in this case, and since we've transferred money out of the fund just last year, maybe the timing's wrong. I don't know. I think the Gentleman's given us a...a fairly solid reason as to why he wants this Amendment, and I...I just simply stand in reluctant opposition to the Amendment."

Speaker Keane: "Representative Novak, to close."

Trotter: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. Representative Black, you're...you're right, but these...these costs are already being passed on to the business people. That's why the business community is not opposed to this measure...The costs are already being passed on to the, you know, the local residents, and this revision of this formula calculation is verv... It's а very substantial environmental concern. I think we all should be for to accumulate as many dollars as we can so we can implement these solid waste management programs that have mandated...that have been mandated by the General Assembly in the last few years, and I ask for your 'aye' support."

Speaker Keane: "Question is, 'Shall the House adopt Amendment #1?' All those in favor say 'aye'; all opposed, 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk McLennand: "Amendment #2, offered by Representative Novak."

Speaker Keane: "Representative Novak."

Novak: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House.

Amendment #2 seeks to rectify some problems that...that...concerning composting operations. Under current law, a composting facility - and remember, a composting facility is quite different from a landfill - must be located at least 200 feet from any residence, and one which is developed or expanded after November 17, 1991,

161st Legislative Day

June 25, 1992

and must be located at least an eighth of a mile from the nearest residence. This Amendment requires any composting facility that is developed or expanded, once permitted by the EPA, after the effective date of this Bill, to be located at least a quarter-mile from the nearest residence other than a residence located on the same property, and there not can be...and there cannot be more occupied non-farm residences within a half-mile of the facility of the date of application. There's been some problems with...with some composting facilities with some people that (sic who) have...running those facilities that...that are irresponsible, especially in...in the Monee area in southern, southeastern Will County and also in the Peotone area. Representative Hasara has problems in her district with situations of this. Representative Balthis has also...has problems, as does Representative Regan, and I ask for your support."

Speaker Keane: "Representative Black."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Again, I... I rise in opposition to the Amendment. Let me try to explain, very briefly, why. Here's...here's an idea that the General Assembly created. You can't dump yard waste in a landfill; have to compost it. That was our law. We passed that. Now, we come back with a proposal says, 'Well, we passed a law that says you can't dispose of yard waste in a landfill. You have compost it.' We came back here in 1991 and 1992 with proposals very similar to this that were defeated. Now in 1991, we reached a compromise that said you couldn't locate or expand a composting area within an eighth of a mile of a residence. Now, we're back to a quarter of a mile of a residence or a half-mile of any ten residences. I mean, to

161st Legislative Day

June 25, 1992

me, "this just smacks of absolute chaos and confusion on our part. We create the law. We demand that...that separate out yard waste and compost it. Now, we seem to be making it more and more and more difficult to put this compost (that we've mandated can't go to a landfill), into compost area that we now are trying to turn around every year and mandate you can't put it here, you can't there. Well, at some point, we're going to have to reach a compromise on this issue, and I don't think we can come down hear every year and continue to expand the buffer zone between composting and...and where people live. I...I understand the Gentleman's desire. It certainly doesn't smell very nice, but I...I just can't understand how we can continue to do this when we're the ones who mandated they compost it in the first place. So, I think is opposed by the Department of Energy and Natural Resources. It's opposed by the National Solid Waste Management Association, and because I think it contradicts the intent of an earlier law we passed, Mr. Speaker, in all due respect to the Sponsor, I would ask for a roll call on Amendment #2."

Speaker Keane: "Representative Kulas."

Kulas: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I can only say one thing about this Amendment: It stinks. It stinks just like some of the composting sites stink. Representative Black was absolutely correct in what he said. I'm not going to repeat it. We've looked at this issue a number of years. We passed laws. We want composting. We wanna get rid of land-waste from landfills, but then, where are we gonna put it? Nobody wants 'em in their areas, so we keep changing it. If we wanna do anything good for the environment, let's kill this

161st Legislative Day

June 25, 1992

Amendment."

Speaker Keane: "Representative Balthis."

Balthis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Two points on this: One, the word 'mandate' has been used, and the other one is that this is something that somebody else doesn't want in their back yard. We have people in this state that have to put up with a composting facility right next to their homes. I think this was a bad law when it was passed, because there was no regulation in it, there was no way to restrict what these people were doing. I agree, wholeheartedly, with composting. This Amendment needs to be passed, and I urge your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Keane: "We've got a number of people that wish to speak.

What I'm going to ask is that we briefly go...roll call's

been requested. We'll take the roll call and we'll let you

explain your vote. Representative Novak, to close on the

Amendment, briefly, briefly."

Novak: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, this is not an unreasonable request. I was the House Sponsor of the Composting Bill in 1988 when it passed, and, as you recall, it went into effect in 1990. So the communities had two years to set up composting facilities. Unfortunately, we do have some unscrupulous and mismanaged composting facilities that are located in Illinois that are not doing the right things, that are not running their operation the right way. They're not windrowing the material correctly. They're not spreading it around correctly. This is causing problems in residential areas. Now, as a chief proponent of the Bill to keep yard waste out of landfills..."

Speaker Keane: "The question is...the question is, 'Shall the House adopt Amendment #2?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Representative

161st Legislative Day

June 25, 1992

Klemm, to explain your vote."

"Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I guess I have to relate to a more real-live case because when we passed the law McHenry County we had one composting facility. Now, this would prevent this one and only composting facility to expand even if it went in a different direction from the residences. In other words, this one facility that we have (and it's gotta meet all the requirements we would expect that to do that), but this would then close that one facility down because it could not expand anymore because it's within or just less than...or a little bit over an eighth of a mile, following the existing law. Now that's ridiculous and it's unreal that we take an existing facility that met the law and try to close it up leaving us no place to put any of our yard waste. This is an ill-advised Amendment."

Speaker Keane: "Representative Hasara, one minute."

When we pass a Bill Hasara: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. obviously, we did limiting landfill space), we need to use balance, I believe, in how we implement that law. We're not limiting the siting of anything. We're simply saying that if we're going to site, it should be half a mile from a subdivision. That's not asking very much, in my opinion, and a quarter of a mile from the nearest house. It has nothing to do with limiting siting. We have a large geographic county here in Sangamon, and every time somebody site a compost facility, they go to the wants fast-growing west end of Springfield and wanna put it right next to a subdivision. That is ridiculous when we're sitting here with all this agricultural area, and no one has even tried to get siting in some of the agricultural Let's use some common sense and some balance. areas.

161st Legislative Day

June 25, 1992

We're all for composting. Let's just put it where it needs to be in a less..."

- Speaker Keane: "Representative Regan, one minute. Representative Regan, one minute."
- Regan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. One Representative mentioned something about stink. Well, let me tell you, if you ever visit a compost site, you will smell the most acid, horrible smells there are. It's methane gas and it's horrible. There is...there is styne (sic sty) language for pigs' sties. This is the same language that put's in the law for agriculture. In other words, you can't put a pig farm in the middle of a subdivision. You shouldn't be able to put a compost in the middle of a subdivision. I urge a...a green vote."

Speaker Keane: "Representative Williams, one minute."

- Williams: "Okay. I'm not certain if the Sponsors there could clear something up. As I understand it, this Bill, Amendment #1, which I believe is on this Bill, is opposed to by both the City of Chicago and the County of Cook. I'm assuming, based upon the change in the funding formula for the solid waste surcharge that we're changing it, the formula, I believe, in a manner that would add substantial cost to both units of government. Now, if I'm incorrect in that assumption, I'd like to know it, but otherwise, I do believe that this Bill is being opposed by both the City of Chicago and the County of Cook."
- Speaker Keane: "Representative Giglio, one minute to explain your vote."
- Giglio: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just wanna say,

 Representative Nowak...Novak was right. He tried, but if

 you come out and I'll show you three of them in my area
 like Representative Regan said, the smell's atrocious. It's

161st Legislative Day

June 25, 1992

not working. It doesn't belong there. It doesn't belong...only one place in my mind. Put it back in the landfills. Let the landfill people dispose of it, and don't pollute. In one area it's about two blocks from a school. Those poor children get that odor every time they forget to spray and they forget to turn it over. It's ridiculous. You really want to do a good job? Bring it back where it belongs. Get it away from the homes and the businesses and the parks and the forest preserves and put it back in the landfills and let them dispose of it like they are...are supposed to."

- Speaker Keane: "Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 62 voting 'aye', 38 voting 'no', 16 voting 'present', and the Amendment is adopted.

 Any further Amendments?"
- Clerk McLennand: "Amendment #3, offered by Representative McGann."
- Speaker Keane: "Representative McGann. Representative Novak."
- Novak: "Mr. Speaker, Representative McGann has deferred to me to present this Amendment. This Amendment has been introduced at the request of the Environmental Protection Agency. It would make technical changes in the Act to resolve three compliance audit findings in the Auditor General's '89 '90 financial compliance audit of the EPA. I'd ask for your support. Non-controversial."
- Speaker Keane: "Representative Black."
- Black: "Yeah. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I'm...I'm pleased to get up and support the Gentleman's Amendment.

 This...this is a good Amendment. It might even save the state money. Vote 'aye'."
- Speaker Keane: "Question is, 'Shall we adopt the Amendment?' All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed, 'no'. The 'ayes' have

161st Legislative Day

June 25, 1992

it, and the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

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

Speaker Keane: "Representative Novak."

Novak: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Amendment again, it's a request of the Environmental hazardous... Protection Agency. It exempts household Please, can I have your attention because this is kind of important? I wanna make sure that we differentiate between landfills and household hazardous waste collection centers. This Amendment exempts household hazardous waste collection centers, which are established by the EPA, from local requirements regional pollution siting as The example is that the EPA has chosen the facilities. community of Naperville as a permanent collection center for household hazardous waste. The legislation we've had last year, we all know what that is, it's the stuff that accumulates under your sink, in your garage, in your basement, the paint, the solvents, the thinners and other toxic chemicals that you don't use all the time, that we wanna to keep out of the waste stream going to the The EPA has a very ingenious waste collection landfill. program where people come in on a voluntary basis, deposit their household hazardous wastes at a local center, and then they are processed and packaged and shipped off to a hazardous waste disposal site. The law has to be amended because, now, Naperville, which will be accepting this on a permanent basis, will be accepting this household hazardous waste from more than one community. So, under the law, that would constitute that as a regional pollution control facility. We simply wanna exempt this from the siting requirements."

Speaker Keane: "Representative Black."

161st Legislative Day

June 25, 1992

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

Speaker Keane: "...indicates he will."

Black: "Thank you. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think Representative Novak was right on target when he asked for order a while ago because I don't want this to sneak up on anybody, and for that purpose, Representative, I need to establish your clear intent. There's nothing in this Amendment that reduces the local siting authority as embodied in, what was it, Senate Bill 172 or...?"

Novak: "Yes, Representative Black, to answer your question, there is no language in this Amendment that would dilute, water down or delete the local siting requirements of Senate Bill 172."

Black: "All right. Basically, what you're asking for, then, if...if your home community wanted to have a day to collect household hazardous waste and neighboring communities wanted to bring theirs into that, technically, those neighboring communities are violating the law. Correct?"

Novak: "Yes."

Black: "Okay. Now, if a community doesn't have a collection day and just simply disposes of this material in their normal garbage, these people aren't at risk at being fined or cited, are they?"

Novak: "Correct."

Black: "All right. I...I think it's a very reasonable Amendment as proposed by the department. I think there are sufficient safeguards in here to maintain local siting control, and if your community isn't involved in this collection process, I see no penalty or difficulty created for any other community. So, in that case, I'm pleased to join the Gentleman in supporting the Amendment #4."

161st Legislative Day

June 25, 1992

Speaker Keane: "Representative Cowlishaw."

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

Speaker Keane: "He indicates he will."

Cowlishaw: "Representative, did you mention the City of Naperville in your remarks?"

Novak: "I'm sorry, Representative. Pardon me. Would you repeat that?"

Cowlishaw: "Did you mention the City of Naperville in your remarks?"

Novak: "That wonderful community of Naperville, I did mention."

Cowlishaw: "Could you please repeat what you said about it?"

community of Novak: "That wonderful Naperville, which resides...which is in your district, has agreed to be a permanent. household hazardous waste collection center for the EPA, and the reason why this Amendment is being asked for is so we can exempt that area there which...because Naperville will be collecting household hazardous waste from many surrounding communities to be processed and shipped off to a local hazardous waste disposal site. We need to exempt the local...that from the local siting requirements, but Naperville will be the recipient of the site."

Cowlishaw: "Thank you very much. I appreciate your answers to those questions, and I would like to point out to you that, probably, Naperville, Illinois, is the absolute top recycling community in this state. We have...we have curbside collections for cans, for pape...newspaper, for a lot of things like that, and we are glad to help in any way that we can to solve our environmental problems, and thank you for answering my questions."

Speaker Keane: "We will send our poor, our sick, the halt and the

161st Legislative Day

June 25, 1992

lame to Naperville. Question is, 'Shall the House adopt Amendment #4?' All those in favor say 'aye'; all opposed, 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

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

Speaker Keane: "Representative Novak."

Novak: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. Please withdraw Amendment #5."

Speaker Keane: "Withdraw Amendment #5. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk McLennand: "Amendment #6, offered by Representative Churchill."

Speaker Keane: "Representative Churchill."

Churchill: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #6 permits the Illinois EPA to receive funds for hazardous waste management and hazardous waste substance response activity from other governmental units. This has been submitted by the EPA."

Speaker Keane: "Is there any discussion? The question is...Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Would the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Keane: "He indicates he will."

Matijevich: "Representative Churchill, this Amendment is the same as a House Bill that you introduced. Can you tell the Body what happened to that House Bill?"

Churchill: "I believe the House Bill was up in one of the committees and did not make it through the committee."

Matijevich: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would oppose this Amendment. It has already been considered by the...by a committee and has been defeated in that committee, and maybe the reason for the defeat of the Bill in committee could have been the authority to receive funds from other agents, state agencies or departments or units of local government. I'm not sure

161st Legislative Day

June 25, 1992

what that means. Does that mean that funds that should go to education, for example, would go to the EPA for certain circumstances? I don't know. I was not in the committee that defeated this Amendment. I'm not sure if I was or not, but...but I don't recall the debate on the Bill, but, in any event, because of that I would urge the defeat of the Amendment."

Speaker Keane: "Representative Churchill, to close."

Churchill: "Thank you. First of all, the Bill was never called for a vote in the committee so the committee did not have a chance to hear it. This is a perfectly sensible Bill, because what this does is it says that the Illinois EPA can receive funds from other governmental units. In other words, if we're having a hard budgetary time down here, rather than having the EPA do something that it can make an agreement with another unit of local government so that the EPA can do something for that unit of local government and receive funds back. It makes perfect sense. Almost every agency in state government has the right to collect funds from other units of local government and this is just a loophole in this law for the EPA that should be closed by this Bill."

Speaker Keane: "Question is, 'Shall the House adopt Amendment #6?' All those in favor say 'aye'; all opposed, 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment's adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk McLennand: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Keane: "Third Reading. Senate Bills. Second Reading.

Elementary and Secondary Education. Senate Bill 1526,

Representative Steczo. Representative Steczo. Mr. Clerk,

read the Bill."

Clerk McLennand: "Senate Bill 1526, a Bill for an Act relating to

161st Legislative Day

June 25, 1992

school conservation. Second Reading of this Bill.

Amendments 1, 2 and 5 were adopted in committee."

Speaker Keane: "Any motions filed?"

Clerk McLennand: "No Motions."

Speaker Keane: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk McLennand: "Floor Amendment #7, offered by Representative Steczo."

Speaker Keane: "Representative Steczo."

Steczo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House.

Amendment #7 adds language to the Act that exempts from the definition of a public utility the ownership or operation of a facility that sells compressed natural gas at retail to the public for use only as a motor vehicle fuel and for the selling of compressed natural gas at retail to the public for use as a motor vehicle fuel. This is a non-controversial Amendment. I would ask for its adoption."

Speaker Keane: "Representative Black. The question is, 'Shall the House adopt Amendment #7?' All those in favor say 'aye'; all opposed, 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk McLennand: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Keane: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk McLennand: "Senate Bill 1526, a Bill for an Act relating to school conservation. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Keane: "Representative Steczo."

Steczo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Senate Bill 1526, as amended, does three things: Number one, it provides for a study of integrated pest management in schools. That is a noncontroversial provision that was added in the committee. Secondly, it adds the language that was just added by Amendment #7. And second...thirdly,

161st Legislative Day

June 25. 1992

Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this provides that the schools can adopt energy conservation measures and, in accordance with those energy conservation..."

Speaker Keane: "Representative Steczo, I'm sorry. Could you take the Bill out of the record? Thank you. Out of the record. On the Order of Professional Regulations, Third Reading, appears Senate Bill 963, Representative Steczo. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk McLennand: "Senate Bill 963, a Bill for an Act to amend the Court Reporters Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Keane: "Representative Steczo."

Steczo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Senate Bill 963 contains two items: Number one, as amended yesterday, it addresses the question of licensure of geologists, and, secondly, the language that was offered and adopted by Representative Rotello which deals with professional athletes who violate drug laws on two occasions not being able to participate in the State of Illinois in their respective sports. I'd answer any questions that the Members might have. If not, I'd ask for a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Keane: "Any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk...Representative Black, did you want to speak...take the record. On this Bill, there are 78 voting 'aye', 36 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', and this Bill, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. What we'll do right now is, we have finished going through the Calendar once on Third Reading. We have finished going through the Calendar once

161st Legislative Day

June 25, 1992

on Second Reading. We're now going to go to the Supplemental Calendar. The Agreed Bill List. There are three Bills on that Agreed Bill List that have to be amended, and we're going to do that and then we're going to open the... We're going to vote on the Bills and then give Members a chance to change their votes or to vote any way they want on any of the Bills on the list, and on that, we will proceed. The first Bill that has to be amended is Senate Bill 1823, Representative Bugielski. Representative Wennlund. Representative Matijevich. I'm sorry."

- Matijevich: "Yeah. I'd like to introduce an old friend, a former

 Representative. Mike Slape is over here. Mike Slape right

 up here in front. Representative Slape."
- Speaker Keane: "Welcome back. Take 1839...1823 out of the record, Mr. Clerk. House Bill...or Senate Bill 1941, Representative Ryder. Mr...Representative Ryder, do you wish to bring this Bill back to Second for purpose of an Amendment? Bill...Is there leave? Leave, and the Bill is now on Second. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk McLennand: "Senate Bill 1941, a Bill for an Act in relation to amusement. Second Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Keane: "Representative Ryder."
- Ryder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As a result of negotiations with Great America and the Carnival Ride Owners' Association, we would ask that Amendment #3 be adopted which would remove from the Bill any references to carnival rides."
- Speaker Keane: "Is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall House adopt Amendment #3?' All those in favor say 'aye'; all opposed, 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"
- Clerk McLennand: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Keane: "Third Reading. Third Reading. Appears Senate

161st Legislative Day

June 25, 1992

Bill 1909, Representative Peterson. Mr. Clerk...Representative Peterson moves to return to the Bill...to the Order of Second Reading for purpose of an Amendment. Is there leave? Leave, and the Bill is on Second Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk McLennand: "Senate Bill 1909, a Bill for an Act to create the Producer Controlled Insurer Act and to amend certain Acts in relation to insurance regulation. Second Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Keane: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk McLennand: "Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Granberg."

Speaker Keane: "Excuse me. Mr. Clerk, who represent...who's the...Representative Peterson, will you handle the Amendment?"

Peterson: "Which Amendment? One?"

Speaker Keane: "Yes."

Peterson: "All right. Hold on a minute. Amendment 1 is submitted by Representative Granberg and that has to do with forming an outreach consumer program to show what insurance options are available to small business. I ask for adoption of Amendment 1."

Speaker Keane: "On that, Representative Regan. Is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt Amendment #1?' All those in favor say 'aye'; all opposed, 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Amendment #1 is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk McLennand: "Amendment #2, offered by Representative Hartke."

Speaker Keane: "Representative Hartke, Amendment #2."

Hartke: "Thank you very much, Speaker. Amendment #2 is strictly technical in nature and there should be no opposition."

161st Legislative Day June 25, 1992

Speaker Keane: "Do you wish to explain it?"

Hartke: "It changes the word 'state' to 'state'."

Speaker Keane: "Representative Wennlund."

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

Speaker Keane: "He indicates he will."

Wennlund: "You want to tell us what really this Bill does? I mean, from 'state' to 'state'. It doesn't even change the spelling of 'state'."

Hartke: "What we hope to do is file another Amendment that deals
 with a Glass Insurance Replacement Bill."

Wennlund: "That deals with what?"

Hartke: "The Glass Replacement...Windshield Replacement article.

We're trying to work out a compromise between State Farm

and Allstate in the Windshield Replacement Bill, and I was

not aware that Granbergs had an Amendment on this which

would throw it back in the Senate for a Conference."

Wennlund: "Okay. Thank you."

- Speaker Keane: "Question is, 'Shall the House adopt Amendment #2?' All those in favor say 'aye'; all opposed, 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Amendment #2 is adopted. Any further Amendments?"
- Clerk McLennand: "Amendment #3, offered by Representative Bill
 Peterson."
- Speaker Keane: "Representative Peterson, on Amendment #3."
- Peterson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Amendment 3 just gives the Bill an immediate effective date. I move for adoption of Amendment #3."
- Speaker Keane: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Amendment #3. All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed, 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"
- Clerk McLennand: "Amendment #4, offered by Representative Regan."

161st Legislative Day

June 25, 1992

- Speaker Keane: "Representative, has the Amendment been printed and distributed? The Amendment has not been printed and distributed. What's your pleasure, Representative Peterson? Representative Peterson."
- Peterson: "Will we be able to come back to this or should we move it to Third Reading?"
- Speaker Keane: "I would recommend you move it to Third Reading,
 especially if you're talking about a Conference Committee."

 Peterson: "Move for Third Reading, Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker Keane: "Representative Peterson moves to table Amendment #4. Any further Amendments?"
- Clerk McLennand: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Keane: "Third Reading. Because the Agreed Bill List is so short, we've only have a few Bills on it. We'll just go through them one by one. It will cut down a lot of the paperwork on the Clerk's...for the Clerk. The first Bill on the list is Senate Bill 1657, Representative McAfee. Those in favor of Senate Bill 1657 vote 'aye'; those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk McLennand: "Senate Bill 1657..."

Speaker Keane: "Have all voted who wish? McGuire, 'aye'."

- Clerk McLennand: "...a Bill for an Act to Amend the Emergency

 Medical Services Systems Act. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Keane: "Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 109 voting 'aye', 3 voting 'no', 3 voting 'present', and this Bill, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill...Representative Black."
- Black: "Yeah. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. We had a question about Senate Bill 1657. It was our understanding the Sponsor had an Amendment to that Bill. Was it adopted?

161st Legislative Day

June 25, 1992

- Okay, I'm going to have to slow the process down. We're not functioning too quickly here today."
- Speaker Keane: "No, it's my...I apologize. I didn't see your
 light."
- Black: "All right. Okay."
- Speaker Keane: "Okay, what we can do then is we'll go to Senate Bill 1736. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk McLennand: "Senate Bill 1736, a Bill for an Act relating to alcohol, drug abuse and dependency, and related educational programs and services. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Keane: "Representative Black, do you have any questions on...Representative...Representative Black. Question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Representative Hultgren."
- Hultgren: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If I understand the content of House Amendment #1, it is a curriculum mandate for our public schools and like so many of the mandates, well-intended and hard to disagree with, but I think, particularly in view of some of the discussions that occurred on this floor even yesterday, that we ought to be a little bit more concerned about further burdening our public schools with more curriculum mandates."
- Speaker Keane: "Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 112 voting 'aye', 1 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', and this Bill, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1772. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk McLennand: "Senate Bill 1772, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. Third Reading of this Bill."
- Speaker Keane: "Question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All those

161st Legislative Day

June 25, 1992

in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 112 voting 'aye', 0 voting 'aye', 0 voting 'present', and this Bill, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1823. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk McLennand: "Senate Bill 1823, a Bill for an Act to amend the Cook County Forest Preserve District Act. Third Reading of this Bill."

Speaker Keane: "Representative Black."

Black: "Yeah. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. An inquiry of the Chair. Has any Floor Amen... Have any Floor Amendments been adopted to this Bill?"

Speaker Keane: "Mr. Clerk."

Clerk McLennand: "Only Amendment #1 has been adopted."

Black: "Committee Amendment or Floor Amendment?"

Clerk McLennand: "Committee Amendment."

Black: "Oh. All right. No Floor Amendments?"

Clerk McLennand: "No Floor Amendments."

Black: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Keane: "Question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 108 voting 'aye', 1 voting 'no', 2 voting 'present', and this Bill, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1941. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk McLennand: "Senate Bill 1941, a Bill for an Act in relation to amusements. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Keane: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All

161st Legislative Day

June 25, 1992

those in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 109 voting 'aye', 0 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present', and this Bill, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1909. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

- Clerk McLennand: "Senate Bill 1909, a Bill for an Act to create
 the Producer Controlled Insurer Act and to amend certain
 Acts in relation to insurance regulation. Third Reading of
 the Bill."
- Speaker Keane: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 114 voting 'aye, 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', and this Bill, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 2131. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk McLennand: "Senate Bill 2131, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Purchasing Act. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Keane: "Representative Black."
- Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. This Bill, as amended yesterday, put's a responsible bidder provision in the statutes. Now, I would simply say to the Members of this Body..."
- Speaker Keane: "Representative Black, could I hold you up one minute? The Sponsor of this Bill is Representative McGann. Representative McGann, we're on one of your Bills. Mr... Thank you, Representative Black, proceed."
- Black: "All right. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Bill has the potential,

161st Legislative Day

June 25, 1992

the potential, to take emerging minority businesses, and emerging female-owned businesses and take them out of loop as far as being able to bid on state contracts, and the reason I say that, is that if you pass this Bill, responsible bidder must provide benefits equal to or greater than the prevailing weight...prevailing wage rate and also must have the same as or better types of health insurance that are required under the prevailing wage guess I could section. Now, if you want to do this, I understand why you would want to, but at at a very time in the history of this state, when we're doing everything we can to encourage jobs and to create minority-owned business and female-owned business to be able to bid on public works projects, if they're only a year or two old, they don't have the capital or the contract background or the cash to be offering better benefits than a union company who's been in business for 25, 30, 40, 50 years. You're qoing to put them at an extreme disadvantage and, quite frankly, you're just going to remove them from being able to access public contracts. I don't think it's a very good idea in a time when we are doing everything possible to incubate minority owned businesses, and female-owned businesses, to bid on state projects. So, for that reason, I rise in opposition to the Bill, and I would urge your 'no' vote."

Speaker Keane: "Representative McGann."

McGann: "Excuse me. Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the Assembly. The basic Bill is an Audit Commission initiative. There is an Amendment that Representative Black is talking about, it's Amendment #3. That Amendment, I would like to refer to Representative Giorgi to explain because we allowed his Amendment on the Bill. So, I would

161st Legislative Day

June 25, 1992

ask Representative Giorgi to explain to Representative Black and others their concerns."

Speaker Keane: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' I'm sorry, Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "This is a Bill...this is the old Responsible Bidder Bill that organized labor has been trying to put onto the books in Illinois to bidders, so that when they bid for Illinois work, that they're bonafide bidders and they're responsible The name of the Bill was the Responsible Bidder bidders. Bill, and all it says is that they maintain health and welfare programs, ...medical insurance benefits, and these programs, for example, they should have product liability. They should have automobile and truck liability insurance. They should have workman's comp insurance. They should have performance and labor bonds, and they should have apprenticeship programs in the main, and these apprenticeship programs should be approved by the Department of Labor of Illinois and the Department of Labor This only will insure that United States. οf the businesses receiving state contacts are good corporate Now, the state should not be paying out tax dollars to businesses that do not meet these basic legal and moral obligations, and, in some instances, there are businesses that actually defraud workers out of their wages, and there are businesses that terminate workers when they, by accident, have an industrial accident. Also, some these businesses raid the pensions funds without any retribution by the law, and some of these firms ship their So what we're trying to do, is work out of the state. trying to bring some respectability in the bidders law of Illinois, so that the people that bid for these jobs are bonafide reputable bidders that won't defraud an Illinoisan

161st Legislative Day

June 25, 1992

out of his wages. I urge your support of this Bill."

- Speaker Keane: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'no'.

 Representative Williams, to explain your vote."
- Williams: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the hate to oppose the past speaker, but this chamber. I particular Amendment does have a negative effect that will affect the ability of minority and other small businesses to be able to do compete and get contracts from the State Government. In spite of the fact that it's a concept that might create some degree of assurance to the state in one area, but it almost cuts out an entire segment of the business community from growth, from and any other form of possibility of to being able to meet some of these particular requirements, which are too...just too sweeping at this time to allow minority businesses to compete fairly in state contracts, and I would oppose...and I would advise a 'no' vote."
- Speaker Keane: "Representative Klemm, one minute to explain your vote. Representative Klemm. Turn on Klemm."
- Klemm: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I don't think I need to say anymore, but, I think Representative Williams is correct.

 This will hurt small businesses in trying to compete for Illinois state contracts. Amendment 3 is the one that I think we're opposed to, and it's a shame it's maybe hurt a fairly decent Bill. So I do recommend your opposition."
- Speaker Keane: "Representative Hoffman, one minute to explain your vote, Jay Hoffman."
- Hoffman: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, on this Bill is an Amendment that is very important to Scott Air Force Base and the commercial use of Scott Air Force Base joint use. I would ask that we at least get 47 votes so we can and put this on postponed

161st Legislative Day

- June 25, 1992
- and maybe take the things the people are offended by out of it."
- Speaker Keane: "Representative McGann, you have one minute to explain your vote."
- McGann: "Mr. Speaker, I would ask the cooperation of Representative Black and others to give me the 47 votes needed to put it on Postponed Consideration, with an understanding that Amendment #3 will come off. Would you please give me that? Then I'll ask immediate leave to pull it back to Second."
- Speaker Keane: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 51 voting 'aye', 59 voting 'no'. Representative McGann, for what purpose do your rise?"
- McGann: "Yes, I'm wondering if... Could I move this back to..."
- Speaker Keane: "Requests Postponed Consideration. The Bill is on Postponed Consideration. Now, Representative McGann."
- McGann: "Could I have leave to take it back to Second?"
- Speaker Keane: "Is there leave to take the Bill back to Second?

 There is leave, and the Bill is on Second."
- Speaker Keane: "What Amendment do you wish?...Are you..."
- McGann: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to table Amendment #3."
- Speaker Keane: "Is there leave for the Gentleman to table

 Amendment #3? All those in favor say 'aye'; all opposed

 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and Amendment #3 is adopted."
- McGann: "Now I would like to move it back to Third for immediate consideration."
- Speaker Keane: "The Bill will be on Third. We will not call it yet. The Bill is now on Third."
- McGann: "All right. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the Assembly. Amendment #3..."
- Speaker Keane: "No, No. Sir, we are not on... We've moved the

161st Legislative Day

- June 25, 1992
- Bill to Third, and now we'll have the Clerk read the Bill, on Third."
- Clerk McLennand: "Senate Bill 2131, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Purchasing Act. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Keane: "Representative McGann."
- McGann: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the Assembly. The controversial Amendment has been moved out of this Bill, and I would ask your support. This is an Audit Commission initiative, and I would be happy to answer any questions."
- Speaker Keane: "Representative Black."
- Black: "Yeah. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Just an inquiry of the Chair. I think there was a slip of the tongue, and I don't want there to be any confusion. I think the Chair said Amendment #3 was adopted. I think the Chair meant to say Amendment #3 was tabled."
- Speaker Keane: "To clarify the record, thank you very much.

 Amendment #3, I meant to say, was tabled, if I didn't.

 Thank you. The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 110 voting 'aye', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', and this Bill, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Deering, for what purpose do you rise?"
- Deering: "Mr. Speaker, my light failed to work on that last Bill.

 I would like the record to reflect that I would have voted
 'aye' on that Bill."
- Speaker Keane: "The record shall so reflect. We will proceed for the second time through the Order of Bills on Third Reading. On Third Reading, Government Administration,

161st Legislative Day

June 25, 1992

appears Senate Bill 1740, Representative McPike. Out of the record. On the Order of Municipal, County and Third Reading, Senate Bill 1828, Conservation, Representative Hartke. Out of the record. On the Order of Senate Bills, Second Reading, I'm sorry, Senate Third Reading. Senate Bill 1862, Representative Brunsvold. Out of the record. Representative Brunsvold, do you wish to call Senate Bill 1862? Out of the record. Senate Bill 2101. Representative Stepan. Out of the record. On the Order of (Senate) Bills Third Reading, Banking, is Representative Capparelli. Representative Bill 1519, Capparelli. Representative Capparelli, do you wish to call On the Order of Senate this Bill? Out of the record. Third Reading. Insurance, Senate Bill 1638, Representative Regan. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1638, a Bill for an Act to amend the Comprehensive Health Insurance Plan Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Keane: "Representative Regan."

Regan: "I'd like to bring the Bill back to Second for purposes of an Amendment, please."

Speaker Keane: "Have you notified the Clerk of your desire to do so?"

Regan: "Yeah. It's been on the list. So, I guess we'd better take it off the list and off the board forever, huh?"

Speaker Keane: "Thank you. On the Order of Civil Law, Third Reading, appears Senate Bill 2076, Representative Lang. Out of the record. On the Order of Transportation, Third Reading, appears Senate Bill 2039, Representative Obrzut. Out of the record. On the Order of Third Reading, Public Utilities, appears Senate Bill 1766, Representative Steczo. Out of the record. On the Order of Senate Bills Third

161st Legislative Day

June 25, 1992

Reading, Professional Regulations, is Senate Bill 1662, Representative Steczo. On the Order of Revenue, Third Reading, Senate Bill 1479, Representative Lang. Out of the record. On the Order of Senate Bills, Third Reading, Government Operations, Senate Bill 2190, Representative Hultgren. Out of the record. On the Order of Bills, Third Reading, Agriculture and Environment, Senate Bill 2177, Representative Hartke. Out of the record. the Order of Senate Bills, Second Reading. We've just finished the second pass-through on Third Reading Bills. We'll now start our second pass-through on Second Reading Bills. Second Reading, Municipal County and Conservation, Senate Bill 1625, Representative Churchill. Out of the record. On the Order of Second Reading,...on the Order of Second Reading, is Senate Bill 2088, Transportation, Representative Lang. Out of the record. On the Order Second Reading, Revenue, Senate Bill 1590, Representative Schoenberg. Out of the record. On the Order of... WA have just finished our second pass-through on Second Reading. On the Order of Third Reading, Senate Bill 1931, Representative Novak. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1931, a Bill for an Act to amend the
Environmental Protection Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Keane: "Representative Novak."

Novak: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I think we've debated and adopted and spoke about all the Amendments just a little while ago, and I think we've touched on each subject in a timely manner. The original Bill, prior to the adoption of all the Amendments, just simply required the EPA to do some landfill studies on multi-tiered landfills. I think all these Amendments are good environmental Bills. They address certain needs in communities around the State of

161st Legislative Day

June 25. 1992

Illinois, and they also help the Agency and the Environment Protection Agency with certain administrative requirements and changes that they need to make in the law, and I ask for your support."

Speaker Keane: "Representative Williams."

Williams: "I would just ask the Speaker: Did you find it...to my knowledge... I've just been informed that it is the case, that the City of Chicago and the County of Cook is opposed to Amendment #1, which has been adopted to this Bill. I believe that the Amendment changes the fee structure that is now presently involved with...for the collection by state and local government of the solid waste surcharge, and that being the case, we believe that it's gonna be an extended cost to those units of local government and for those individuals from those areas. I would just respectfully let you know that the City of Chicago and the County of Cook are opposed to this Bill as it is amended."

Speaker Keane: "Representative Hultgren."

Hultgren: "Well, and I wanted to simply clarify my records - (we did this earlier today) adopted Amendment #2, which makes it more difficult to locate...Representative, a question? We did adopt Amendment #2, if I understand correctly, which makes it more difficult to locate a composting facility, is that right?"

Novak: "Well, if you consider one-eighth of a mile to one-quarter of a mile more difficult, that's your definition, but I suppose you could say that."

Hultgren: "All right, thanks."

Speaker Keane: "Representative Hasara."

Hasara: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of Senate
Bill 1931. It has some items in that that are very
important to many of us, particularly those of us in

161st Legislative Day

June 25, 1992

downstate Illinois, where there are large agricultural areas in which compost facilities should be easily sited. Remember, this does not restrict the permitting of compost facilities; it simply is extending the distance from a subdivision or a home in which they can be sited. I read this morning in the paper that the General Assembly this year has not addressed any of the environmental issues that were before us. This is one vote in which we can do that before the end of Session. I urge your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Keane: "Representative Novak, to close."

Novak: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, ...to address some of the concerns. Once again clarification, this is not an increase in the tipping fee. All of these communities are certainly gonna need and deserve all these extra dollars they're gonna be getting. This is not any statutory language change to increase tipping fee. Let me make that perfectly clear, as one of our previous presidents used to indicate all the time. But, also, on Amendment #2 concerning the set-back lines, while it may to some degree make it a little bit difficult, it takes the concerns of the residents, puts their priority as their first concern with respect to the operation of a composting facility, and as I indicated before, if a composting facility is run and managed and operated correctly, like it should be, we won't have problems with smell and stench and odors that are offensive So, we do have some to neighbors. very important provisions in here, and I ask for your support."

Speaker Keane: "The part...the Gentleman has asked to suspend the rules to hear this Bill on Third Reading and has received leave. On that Bill, Representative Black."

Black: "Has he already had leave?"

161st Legislative Day

June 25, 1992

Speaker Keane: "I'm sorry, let me continue my chant, and you can explain your vote."

Black: "All right, that's fine."

Speaker Keane: "The question is 'Shall this Bill pass?' All those in favor say 'aye'; all opposed, 'no'. The voting is open. Representative Black, to explain your vote."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I think the Gentleman has tried to put together a reasonable Bill, and I don't purport to be an expert mathematician, but if you establish a conversion chart on landfills that go to scales by establishing a 3.3 yard-per-ton conversion ratio, I believe, and many people believe, that you will increase the tipping fee by upwards of 50%. Fifty percent increase. In the same fund that transferred \$5 million to the General Revenue Fund in 1991. Now you can package this any way you want to - and there are some good parts in this Bill, there's no question about that - but I'm very concerned that Amendment #2... I'm very concerned that Amendment #2 simply eliminates some county's ability to have a composting site that's already there. I'm also very concerned that Amendment #1 may very well create a tax increase by using the conversion chart. don't know that it does that - and I'm certainly not going to question the Sponsor's integrity if he tells me it doesn't, then I would tend to believe the Sponsor - but there are some problems with this Bill. Maybe the Sponsor could take it out of the record, and we could work on it just a little bit longer."

Speaker Keane: "Representative Regan, one minute to explain your vote."

Regan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Amendment #2 does nothing to stop existing compost sites. They're grandfathered in.

161st Legislative Day

June 25, 1992

It's just that they cannot expand that site to within a quarter or a half a mile of a subdivision. There's no question in my mind that in Will County we have plenty of room. We have plenty of room for Cook County's compost. All you have to do is move five miles farther south than the Peotone site, and you've got all the farms in the world to put compost on without bothering any people. So, please, put some green votes up there."

- Speaker Keane: "Representative Kulas, one minute to explain your vote."
- Kulas: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would just like to caution all the Members from the City of Chicago, if you're voting for this Bill, you're voting for an increase in property taxes to help DuPage County. So, I would strongly suggest, yes, there are other parts of this Bill that are good, but I would vote against this Bill because of Amendment #1."
- Speaker Keane: "Representative Wennlund, you have one minute to explain your vote."
- Wennlund: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Sponsor's done an excellent job of trying to solve a lot of problems, and in the, what appears to be objectionable Amendment, really converts from a volume base fee, from the fee before it was based on cubic yards. It goes to tons and encourages landfills to install scales at their facilities. It does not automatically result in an increase in fees to anybody, but it encourages weight by tonnage instead of by cubic yards. The rest of the provisions of the Bill are excellent provisions that really need to be adopted. I encourage more 'yes' votes."
- Speaker Keane: "Representative Novak, you have one minute to explain your vote."
- Novak: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. Well, looks like the renowned lobbying

161st Legislative Day

June 25, 1992

group called Waste Management's been up and down the hallways talking to Legislators. You know, you voting against this Bill, this is a bad, bad anti-environmental vote. It's not going to look good on your record. This thing addresses some major problems. It's gonna help your communities back home. It's gonna help us carry out the mandates of the solid waste management legislation that we've passed over the years. It's gonna help individual citizens and homeowners and communities concerned with problems of composting sites, and I just want to congratulate Waste Management for the excellent job they've done - again."

Speaker Keane: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 45 'ayes', 36 'noes', 30 voting 'present', and this Bill...Representative Novak."

Novak: "Mr. Speaker, you haven't closed the roll have you?"

Speaker Keane: "No."

Novak: "Okay. I'm requesting about two more votes so that we can put it on postponed..."

Speaker Keane: "Are you requesting Postponed Consideration?"

Novak: "Yes, Sir."

Speaker Keane: "Postponed Consideration. I'm sorry. I'm sorry, pardon me."

Novak: "I'd like to have two votes to put this on Postponed Consideration, so we can work out the problems."

Speaker Keane: "Representative McAfee votes 'aye'.

Representative Stern votes 'aye'."

Novak: "Thank you."

Speaker Keane: "Representative Parke votes 'no'. Representative Kirkland votes 'aye'. We are trying to do that right now, Sir. Thank you. The Bill is on Postponed Consideration.

161st Legislative Day

June 25, 1992

On the Order of Elementary and Secondary Education, appears Senate Bill 1526, Representative Steczo. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill. (Senate Bill) 1526. The Gentleman asks leave for immediate consideration of Senate Bill 1526. All in favor say...I'm sorry, he doesn't need it. The Bill has been read a second time. Our Parliamentarian is... My advisor is not doing a good job. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1526, a Bill for an Act relating to school conservation. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Keane: "Representative Steczo."

Steczo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. First, the board should be corrected to show that the Bill is on Third Reading, I Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Senate 1526, in its amended form, does three things: First all, Amendment #7, which was adopted this morning, deletes from the definition of public utilities 'compressed natural gas sold as motor vehicle fuel', which was a...is non-controversial item. Secondly, it provides for a study of integrated pest management in schools, which was a noncontroversial item that was adopted in committee, and, thirdly, after many many days of negotiations, this Bill provides for the opportunity for school districts to enter into school energy conservation contracts which quaranteed. What that means is those schools would be able energy conservation...into the enter the energy conservation contracts with suppliers to do energy conservation work at those schools at a guaranteed cost savings. If, in fact, the energy conservation cost savings are not realized by the school district, the manufacturer, supplier, provider, what have you, would be the guarantor and pay the difference. So, this would...this is a

161st Legislative Day

June 25, 1992

valuable thing, we feel, so that schools can become involved in a realistic way in energy conservation matters. I would answer any questions, Mr. Speaker, that the Members might have. If not, would ask for a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Keane: "Is there any discussion? Representative Black."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I was afraid my light burned out. An inquiry of the Chair. Is a... We filed a fiscal Amendment to this Bill, as impacted by Amendment #5.

Is that... Anything been filed on that? Check."

Speaker Keane: "My understanding is the Bill was moved to Third before the request was filed." >

Black: "You mean my request wasn't timely?"

Speaker Keane: "I guess you got that right."

Black: "I just don't understand that. I'm always about a second or two behind. All right. Okay. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in opposition to the Gentleman's Bill simply because, as amended, it's my understanding that while it doesn't create a mandate, if, in fact, the school gets into this integrated pest management. By the way, this is aimed at insects and not students, isn't it? Pest management?"

Steczo: "Supposedly, Mr. Black."

Black: "Well, all right. But anyway, where was I? Yes, it's my understanding that if a school gets into this integrated pest management program, once they're into it, then they get caught up in several hoops that they have to jump through, and there seems to be some confusion as to whether they could ever get out of it. So, I guess at some point, the question brought to me by members of school boards et cetera, that it isn't an initial mandate, but it certainly may become a mandate if they get into the process, and for that reason, I would stand in opposition."

161st Legislative Day

June 25, 1992

Speaker Keane: "Representative Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Just in response to the comments of the prior speaker. This Bill... That section of the Bill that Representative Black addressed is supported by the school boards, as well as by the teachers' unions, and the language there is that is approved and drafted by the Department of Public Health. There is no mandate in this program. I think that the school boards wouldn't be supporting the Bill if they thought that there were. What the Bill requires, is that the Department of Public Health make available quidelines for schools in respect to integrated pest management programs. As I say, the language was worked out with the teachers and the school boards and the Department of Public Health, and I think that there must have been a misreading of this provision when Representative Black spoke in opposition."

Speaker Keane: "Representative Black, would you like to clarify
 your remarks?"

Black: "Yeah. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate the opportunity. If I'm wrong, I apologize to the Sponsor, but I was just called out of the chambers within the last 30 minutes and was asked to oppose this Bill on behalf of the Illinois Association of School Boards. So, either we're not communicating very effectively, or I misunderstood or something, but's that's why I rose in opposition."

Speaker Keane: "Representative Steczo, to close."

Steczo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just in closing, I will, you know, indicate to the Members of the Body, that the school energy conservation measures which are the main portion of this Bill are sought to be an assist to schools and save

161st Legislative Day

June 25, 1992

them money, and, in committee, when this Bill was heard, the sections on integrated pest management simply were agreed to by everybody and adopted on a unanimous vote, so there was no reason why anybody should at the last moment find some specter of opposition to that, which has pretty much been signed off to by everybody. I would just ask for a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Keane: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; all opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 105 voting 'aye', 4 voting 'no', 2 voting 'present', and this Bill, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On Senate Bill 1662, Representative Steczo. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1662..."

Speaker Keane: "The Gentleman has requested leave to bring the Bill back to Second Reading for purpose of an Amendment.

Leave? Leave has been granted. This Bill is now on Second Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1662, a Bill for an Act to amend the Barber, Cosmetology, Esthetics and Nail Technology Act of 1985. This Bill has been read a second time previously, Amendments #1 and 2 have been adopted previously."

Speaker Keane: "Any Motions filed?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Keane: "Any Floor Amendments?"

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

Speaker Keane: "Representative Steczo."

Steczo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Senate

161st Legislative Day

June 25, 1992

Bill 1662 was heard yesterday, and the provisions that it had for new licensure did not receive enough votes to pass the House. Since that has happened, it's been our decision to attempt to just try to gut the Bill now, send it to Conference Committee and hold it there either for later in the Session or the fall, when perhaps some cleanup is necessary on the licensure types of issues. So, Amendment #3 simply guts the Bill and makes it a shell."

Speaker Keane: "Any discussion? Representative Weller.

Representative Black's."

Weller: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just to get a clarification of the Sponsor's intent. It's my understanding that you just to want to put this Amendment on so that the Bill will go to Conference Committee, Representative?"

Steczo: "Representative Weller, yes, and it will not, in Conference Committee, come out with anything similar to what it had as per our vote on Third Reading yesterday.

This is just going to be, hopefully, cleanup and things that have to be taken care of."

Weller: "Okay. So, Representative, this Amendment guts the
Bill?"

Steczo: "Correct."

Weller: "Okay, thank you, Representative."

Speaker Keane: "The question is, 'Shall the House adopt Amendment #3?' All those in favor say 'aye'; opposed, 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Keane: "Third Reading. The Gentleman now asks leave to suspend the appropriate rule to hear the Bill on Third Reading. Is there leave? Leave, and, Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

161st Legislative Day

June 25, 1992

- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1662, a Bill for an Act to amend the Barber, Cosmetology, Esthetics and Nail Technology Act.

 Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Keane: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye; all opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill there are 111 voting 'aye', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', and this Bill, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Matijevich."
- Matijevich: "I'd like to introduce a former Member, Judge
 Barry...Toby Barry, Appellate Court Judge, former Member,
 and if he didn't win as an Appellate Court Judge, he'd have
 been Speaker of the House in a landslide. Toby Barry, my
 good friend."
- Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Pursuant to House Rule 37(g), I move to suspend the Third Reading deadline until January 13, 1993, on the following Bills. These are all Senate Bill numbers: 1641, 1806, 1912, 1983, 2088, 2104, 2190."
- Speaker Giglio: "You heard the Gentleman's Motion. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye'; opposed, 'no'.

 Representative Black."

Woolard: "Yeah. I'm substituting for him here."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Woolard."

Woolard: "Mr. Speaker, with this list of Bills, was that agreed to with our side of the aisle?"

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Lang."

Lang: "I'm sorry, I did not hear the question."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Woolard, would you repeat the

161st Legislative Day

June 25, 1992

- question."
- Woolard: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative, has this been agreed to anyone on our side of the aisle?".
- Lang: "Frankly, some of these have; some of these have not."
- Woolard: "All right. We're particularly concerned about Senate
 Bill 1641 and 1983. We object to them being extended."
- Lang: "Those are the two Bills that I was told you had not agreed to."
- Speaker Giglio: "Representative Hultgren."
- Hultgren: "I wonder if the Sponsor could read that list of the Bills again, please?"
- Lang: "I'd be happy to. Senate Bills 1641, 1806, 1912, 1983, 2088, 2104, 2190."
- Hultgren: "Thank you."
- Speaker Giglio: "All right. ...the Gentleman's Motion. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye'. Representative Woolard. All those in favor say... The 'aye's have it, and the Motion's adopted by the use of the Attendance Roll Call. Representative Lang."
- Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have an additional Motion pursuant to House Rule 37(g). I move to suspend the Third Reading deadline until January 13, 1993, on the following single Bill: Senate Bill 318. This is agreed to by both sides of the aisle."
- Speaker Giglio: "All those in favor of the Gentleman's Motion, signify by voting 'aye'; opposed, 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question, there are 94 voting 'yes', 11 voting 'no', and this Motion, having prevailed, is adopted. Representative Hartke."
- Hartke: "Mr. Speaker, I move to...pursuant to House Rule 37(g),

161st Legislative Day

- June 25, 1992
- move to suspend the Third Reading deadline until January 13, 1993, on the following Bills: Senate Bill 1519 and Senate Bill 2177."
- Speaker Giglio: "You heard the Gentleman's Motion. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye'; opposed, 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the Gentleman's Motion is adopted by the Attendance Roll Call. Representative Klemm."
- Klemm: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On Senate Bill 1806, I'd like to move to suspend Rule 37(g) and extend the Third Reading deadline until January 9th, 1993."
- Speaker Giglio: "Representative Klemm, that was in the first group of Bills that Representative Lang made the Motion on."
- Klemm: "Oh, I didn't catch it on there. All right, thank you very much."
- Speaker Giglio: "That's okay. We took care of you. On the Order of Conference Committee Reports, on page 14 of the Calendar, appears Conference Committee Report, Senate Bill 699. Representative Steczo. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 699, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Dental Practice Act. First Corrected Conference Committee Report."
- Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Steczo."
- Steczo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I would move for the adoption of the First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 699. This Conference Committee Report deletes everything after the enacting clause and addresses a subject matter that we in this Legislature have addressed once before, and that's the question of the licensure of electricians, the Illinois Electrician Licensing Act. As we all know, this was heard last year at

161st Legislative Day

June 25, 1992

this time. This same Bill, or a Bill similar to this, was approved with 100 votes in the House and 44 votes in The Governor vetoed that Bill, and last fall, rather than coming back and confronting the Legislature with a veto override, organized labor, the AFL-CIO, decided sit down with the Governor's Office, and to sit down with all the groups that may have had objections to this Act, and attempt to try to work out any differences that those groups have, and this Bill, in the course of getting to where it is today, went through a number of revisions and many of the objections that have been addressed, brought forth by opponents, have been dealt with in this Bill, and I would like to mention, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, a number of those. The retail merchants had a problem. This Bill accommodates the problem that they It indica... This Bill says that companies primarily engaged in the retail sale of consumer products are exempt from licensing provisions of the Act, for the purposes of installation, replacement, service or repair of household products. The Municipal League had a problem. They let us know what that problem was. We tried to accommodate that problem. We indicate in this Bill that the repair of existing electrical systems that does not require changes in the wiring to or from electrical fixtures, is exempt from the licensing provision of this Act. Governor had a problem. Other people had problems with certain provisions of this Bill. We tried to accommodate those objections. Another provision of the Bill indicates that the Department of Labor, or authorizes the Department Of Labor for the purposes of inspections, to utilize authorized representatives, and the intent of this, of course, is to reduce delays due to the inspection process

161st Legislative Day

June 25, 1992

and eliminate the need for the state to hire inspectors. The Illinois Manufacturers' Association came and had a problem. So their problem had been accommodated. fact, accommodated to the point where the IMA, at this point, is neutral on this legislation, and we've provided a change in the Bill from last year that says that employees of industrial or manufacturing businesses are not required to be licensed to perform on-the-job activities. Such businesses are also exempt from inspections for work performed by its employees. So, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, Senate Bill 699 attempts to address all problems with the Illinois Electrical Licensing Act that we were confronted with last year, or were brought to our attention either by the Governor's Office, or by those other groups and individuals that had a problem with this provision. This is a good Bill. This is a Bill should pass. This is a Bill that had 100 votes last year in this House of Representatives and should have 118 year because of the changes that have been made to try to accommodate everybody, anybody who had an objection. Mr. Speaker, I would ask for an affirmative vote on the adoption of the First Conference Committee report."

Speaker Giglio: "Any discussion? The Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I have a great deal of respect for the Sponsor of this legislation, but I do rise in opposition to this Conference Committee Report. The reason it got 100 votes last year is that not very many people were aware of it quite frankly. I'm holding in my hand just a few of the dozens and dozens of letters I've received from all over the State of Illinois in abject opposition to this Bill.

161st Legislative Day

June 25, 1992

Let me tell you what this Bill will do. This prohibits a city, or any political subdivision therein, from engaging in electrical maintenance work unless the work is done by a licensed electrician. So, if your city operates a sewage treatment plant, a water treatment plant, they currently have people on the payroll who can do the day-to-day maintenance work on some of those gauges, motors and electrical parts. It's their understanding - and I letters from sewage treatment plant operators and from cities all up and down the state - that if this Bill passes, they can't do that maintenance work anymore. have to go outside and hire a licensed electrician. Now it's true, that a city could adopt its own inspection ordinance that would be in compliance with this Act. you're putting a mandate on local governments to go out and hire inspectors that will meet the qualifications of this Act. Make no mistake about it, Ladies and Gentlemen, every construction, installation electrical in any remodeling, replacement or repair (except minor repair as to be defined by the Department of Labor), is subjected to the inspection for compliance by the Department of Labor in Section 90 of the report, except in those cities that choose to adopt their own inspection ordinance, includes a house you may be building for yourself. I tell you right now it's going to increase your costs. It's going to put forth another group of inspectors and regulators that go throughout the State of Illinois and make it increasingly difficult to do business in the State The opponents to this Bill are too numerous of Illinois. to mention, but they certainly include - and let me us just give you a few of them - the opponents of this Bill include the Governor of the State of Illinois, the Illinois Farm

161st Legislative Day

June 25, 1992

Bureau, the Homebuilders Association of Illinois, the Electrical Security Association, Telephone, Growmark Incorporated, , the Little Independent Electrical Contractors, the Northern Illinois Independent Electrical Contractors, and on and on and on. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the Sponsor has, indeed, tried to accommodate many divergent interests and concerns on this Bill, and I commend him for his efforts, but we aren't there yet. We certainly do not have a Bill agreed to by the vast majority of organizations and people that live in this state. If you pass this Bill, if the Governor doesn't veto it (and I've been told that he will), you will add immensely to the cost and mandates on local governments and your local contractors. This Bill may have some good ideas in it, but it hasn't been worked out yet, and I you to vote 'no'."

Ryder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have some questions for the Sponsor if he would yield, please."

Speaker Giglio: "Indicates he will."

Ryder: "Thank you. Representative Steczo, we have some information indicating that there's a requirement for electrical inspectors within your Bill. Is that correct?"

Steczo: "Could you repeat the question, Mr. Ryder?"

Ryder: "Some people who have examined your Bill indicate that there is a requirement for electrical inspectors."

Steczo: "From the Illinois Department of Labor you mean?"

Ryder: "I'm not sure of the source. That's why I'm asking the question."

Steczo: "No, No. From the Illinois Depart...electrical inspectors employed by the Illinois Department of Labor, is

161st Legislative Day

June 25, 1992

that your question?"

Ryder: "My real concern is that in some of the communities that I represent, they do not have the resources to hire even building inspectors, much less electrical inspectors, and I'm told that your Bill makes that requirement."

Steczo: "The Bill, I believe, makes an...allows the Illinois

Department of Labor or its authorized representatives, and
they can authorize people locally to do their job for
them."

Ryder: "Well, thank you for answering my question, Representative. I think the problem that I have is the Department of Labor doesn't have the resources or the people to provide the inspectors. In those communities already have building inspectors, or electrical inspectors, if you will, this may not be a problem, but for the communities that I represent, it's a problem. We do not have the resources and counties to have building inspectors in any event. Most communities don't have building inspectors, and as a result, the Department of Labor is going to pass this on to local communities and say, 'Now you're required to have build...electrical inspectors to look at this work,' and my belief is that as a result of that, we're simply passing a mandate on local communities. So, you can add those names of the folks who will ultimately be opposed to the Bill, along the others that Representative Black just indicated. I admire the work that Representative Steczo has done. don't believe, however, it's sufficient to overcome my opposition to the Bill, and, therefore, I stand so opposed. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman from Will, Representative Regan."

Regan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. We're

161st Legislative Day

June 25, 1992

just coming out of a recession, and we're coming out slow. Home starts (are) very part of the economy. This Bill in no way in the world will make it easier for young people to buy their first homes, or to move into a new home for older people. The housing starts are, again, the most important part of the economy, and I think that this Bill will hinder it, and, therefore, I'm opposed."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Steczo, to close."

Steczo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Sometimes hearing some of the comments that were...that were brought forth from the other side of the aisle, I'm not so sure that we're reading the same Bill or not. Mavbe reading one of the previous drafts, or Senate Bill 443 that was passed last year. The question really is one of safety. I would like to know that those people that those new homes know that the electrical work that was done in those homes is of the best quality. I'm not sure if you've ever had an electrical fire in your house. I have, and, believe me, I would want to know that anybody who does electrical work in my house or any place that I happen to be, is qualified and licensed. The question, I Speaker, is that we in the State Of Illinois license nail technicians. We license nail technicians. Licensing electrical...electricians in this state is really a matter of safety to the upmost. The least that we can do to protect the safety of our Illinois citizens is to make sure that electrical work that they do is done by qualified people. That's the very least that we can do, Mr. Speaker. I would ask for a 'yes' vote on this Bill."

Speaker Giglio: "The question is, 'Shall the House adopt the First Corrected Conference Committee Report to Senate Bill 699?' All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; opposed,

161st Legislative Day

- June 25, 1992
- 'no'. This is final action. Excuse me, Representative Balthis."
- Balthis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. I believe we've all been talking about mandates, and I certainly hate to see this mandate passed along when all of us agree that we're spending local tax dollars."
- Speaker Giglio: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. Representative Wennlund, for what purpose do you rise?"
- Wennlund: "To request a verification of the roll call."
- Speaker Giglio: "Representative Steczo. On this question, there are 61...62 voting 'aye', 42 voting...46 voting 'no'. The Gentleman asks for verification. Representative Steczo asks for a poll of the absentees. Mr. Clerk, poll the absentees."
- Clerk O'Brien: "A poll of those not voting: Ackerman. Laurino.

 McAuliffe. Morrow. Ronan and Anthony Young."
- Speaker Giglio: "Representative Laurino, for what purpose do you rise? Vote Representative Laurino, 'aye', Mr. Clerk. There are now 63 'yes's 46 'nos'... Poll the affirmative, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Balanoff. Brunsvold. Buqielski. Capparelli. Curran. Currie. Deering. Deets. DeJaegher. DeLeo. Dunn. Edley. Farley. Flinn. Giglio. Giorgi. Hannig. Hartke. Hasara. Hicks. J. Hoffman. Granberg. Homer. Shirley Jones. Keane. Kulas. Lang. Laurino. Martinez. Matijevich. F. Mautino, Levin. Marinaro. McAuliffe, that's McAfee. McDonough. McGann. McNamara. McPike. Mulcahey. Novak. Obrzut. Phelan. Phelps. Preston. Rice. Richmond. Rotello. Saltsman. Santiago. Satterthwaite. Schakowsky. Schoenberg.

161st Legislative Day

June 25, 1992

Stange. Steczo. Stepan. Stern. Walsh. White. Wolf. Woolard and Mr. Speaker."

Wennlund. Giglio: "Representative Excuse Speaker me, Representative Satterthwaite. Representative Wennlund, does Representative Satterthwaite have leave? Leave is Representative Schoenberg asks Representative. Leave is granted. Kirkland votes 'aye', Mr. Clerk. Questions of the affirmative, Representative?"

Steczo: "Representative Hicks."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Hicks. Representative Hicks is in back of the Speaker's podium here, Representative."

Steczo: "Representative Shaw."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Shaw. How is the Gentleman recorded, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman's shown as voting 'present'."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Wennlund. Representative Shaw is voted as 'present'."

Steczo: "Representative Flowers."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Flowers? The Lady is recorded as voting 'present'. Does Representative Curran have leave, Representative? Leave is granted. Representative Flowers is voting 'present'."

Steczo: "Representative Schoenberg."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Schoenberg, we just had leave. I asked you about Schoenberg. Okay."

Steczo: "I apologize, I'm sorry."

Speaker Giglio: "That's all right. Representative Preston, does

he have leave? Leave is granted to Representative

Preston."

Steczo: "Representative Giorgi."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Giorgi. Representative Giorgi.

I believe he is in negotiations. Remove the Gentleman from

161st Legislative Day

June 25, 1992

the... How is the Gentleman recorded, Mr. Clerk?"

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

Speaker Giglio: "All right, temporarily remove Representative Giorgi."

Steczo: "Representative Farley."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Farley. Is Representative Farley in the chamber? How is the Gentleman recorded, Mr. Clerk?" Clerk O'Brien: "The Gentleman's recorded as voting 'aye'."

Speaker Giglio: "Remove Representative Farley from the roll call."

Steczo: "Representative White, Jesse White."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative White? Representative White is in his chair. Does Mr. Keane have leave, Representative Wennlund? Leave is granted, Representative Keane.

Representative Flowers, are you seeking recognition?"

Flowers: "Mr. Speaker, would you please change my 'present' vote to 'aye'."

Speaker Giglio: "Change the Lady's present vote to 'aye', Mr. Clerk."

Flowers: "Thank you."

Steczo: "Representative Hannig."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Hannig is in his chair."

Steczo: "Representative Lang."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Lang is in his chair.

Representative Farley has returned. Restore Mr. Farley to the roll call, Mr. Clerk."

Steczo: "That's all, Mr. Speaker. Thank you."

Speaker Giglio: "On this question, there are 64 voting 'yes' and 45 voting 'no'. The House does adopt the First Corrected Conference Committee Report to Senate Bill 699, and this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of Special Calendar,

161st Legislative Day

June 25, 1992

under Revenue, Representative Lang, appears Senate Bill 1832. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1832, a Bill for an Act concerning the validation of appropriations and tax levy ordinances.

Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Lang."

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 1832 is identical to a House Bill we passed, which has an uncertain fate in the Senate, and that would validate the tax levy ordinance of the Cook County Forest Preserve District. I would move passage."

Speaker Giglio: "Any discussion? Representative Wennlund."

Wennlund: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. You vote in favor of this. What you're doing is, is that, notwithstanding any mistakes that may have been made in the Cook County Forest Preserves District's levy for the tax year (which, in fact, extends taxes, real estate taxes), you're cutting off anybody's right to challenge the validity of the levy. If someone were to protest their taxes by protesting and contesting the levy, what you're doing is, you're cutting off all property owners' rights in Cook County to contest the validity of the levy. So, if you've got some rather large taxpayers in your district, you may not want to be on record as voting to validate the levy notwithstanding that it might not be valid. In addition to that, you're cutting off all property payers...property taxpayers' rights to contest the levy. So, you should think about that when you're voting on this Bill 'cause what they expect us to do is, is to cut off the rights of all taxpayers in Cook County to contest the levy of the Forest Preserve District, and I don't think that's good policy in Illinois. ought to do it right. If they don't do it right, then they

161st Legislative Day

June 25, 1992

ought to suffer the penalty for not doing it right."

Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Kubik."

Kubik: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Gentleman yield for a question?"

Speaker Giglio: "Indicates he will."

Kubik: "Representative, I was just curious. Does this Bill only affect Cook County, or are any other counties included in the contents of this legislation?"

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Lang."

Lang: "The Bill affects Cook County, and downstate forest preserve districts."

Kubik: "And downstate forest preserve districts. So that would include other neighboring counties to Cook, for example?"

Lang: "Representative, I don't have a list of the counties, but if you'll look at the Bill, it covers in various sections...counties of various sizes, and I should add, Representative, that we have done this routinely since 1965 for Cook County forest preserve district and other forest preserve districts. I should also add, that we're only talking about non-substantive procedural objections: the date is incorrectly added on paperwork; someone forgets to sign something. We're not talking about substantive objections to the levy. That is not waived by this validation. These Acts are periodically amended to update them. We have passed this through 1990; this merely adds FY '91."

Kubik: "Representative, I would think that our side of the aisle would be reluctant to support this particular proposal, if it contained only Cook County. So, I would join Representative Wennlund, at this point in time, in opposing the Bill because it only affects Cook County. So I would rise in opposition and would agree with the previous

161st Legislative Day

June 25, 1992

speaker's remarks, Representative Wennlund's remarks, that this only affects Cook County, and I think our Members ought to be a 'present' or a 'no'."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Lang, to close."

- Lang: "Again, this only represents a validation of non-substantive procedural problems, nothing of substance.

 We've done this routinely. We've passed this Bill before.

 I would ask for green votes."
- Speaker Giglio: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1832 pass?'

 All in favor signify by voting 'aye'; opposed, 'no'. The voting is open. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk? Mautino 'aye', Mr. Clerk. Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question, there are 61 voting 'yes' and 48 voting 'no', and Senate Bill 1832, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of Labor, Second Reading, appears Senate Bill 1986, Representative Lang. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1986, a Bill for an Act to amend the Code of Civil Procedure. Second Reading of the Bill. This Bill has been read a second time previously."
- Speaker Giglio: "Any Amendments filed?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Amendments 1 and 2 have been adopted previously.

 Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative Lang."
- Speaker Giglio: "Representative Lang, on Amendment #3 to Senate
 Bill 1986."
- Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Amendment #3 is the Amendment that we were discussing when I took the Bill out of the record, and, as I understand it, Representative Wennlund has no problem with it at this time. What it does is, is

161st Legislative Day

June 25, 1992

change the language in the Motor Vehicle Retail Installment Sales Act and makes it the exact same language as to this section, as we see in the Illinois Retail Installment Act. IRMA is in favor of this, the new car dealers are in favor of this, and I would move adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker Giglio: "Any discussion on the Amendment? Hearing none, all those in favor of the Amendment signify by saying 'aye'; opposed, 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment's adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #4, offered by Representative Lang."

Speaker Giglio: "Amendment #4."

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Amendment #4 is a portion of the original Bill which was shelved in committee. This would apply to counties of under 500,000, and what Bill...what this Amendment would do, would be allow service of process in garnishment cases to be made by certified or registered mail. Now, although I'm the Sponsor of this Amendment, and I'm doing it as a favor to Senator Welch, I have to inform the Body that on another Bill, due to a federal district court case, we've changed dramatically, notice provisions in the area of bank garnishments. may be some question as to whether Floor Amendment #4 can be worked in to what we needed to do on the other Bills that we passed here, relative to the federal district court case. There is some value to creditors to allow service by registered mail, but there is some question as to the notice provisions and, so, at this time I'll move that we adopt the Amendment."

Speaker Giglio: "Any discussion on the Amendment? Hearing none, all those in favor of the Amendment signify by saying

161st Legislative Day

June 25, 1992

'aye'; opposed, 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The Amendment's adopted. Further Amendments."

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

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Lang, on Amendment #5."

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My name appears on Amendment #5, but I would yield to Representative Levin to explain the Amendment."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Levin."

Levin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the First, as is my practice, I'd like the record to reflect the fact that Ι do represent condominium associations, as well as unit owners. Amendment #5 is, basically, House Bill 3865, which passed out of this chamber by an overwhelming vote, and did not get out of Senate Rules. It does exclude lien provisions that were in the original 3865. It clarified...because of objections that were raised to those provisions. It does guarantee that lake associations in downstate Illinois are entitled to the same tax breaks as common interest community associations. It clarifies proxy voting procedures that we had adopted last year and caused some problems with some associations. If there are any questions, I'd be happy to answer them."

Speaker Giglio: "Any discussion on Amendment #5? All those in favor of the Amendment signify by saying 'aye'; opposed, 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment is adopted. Are there further Amendments?" .

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #6, offered by Representative Giorgi."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Giorgi yields to Representative

161st Legislative Day

June 25, 1992

Levin. Representative Levin, on Amendment #6."

- Levin: "Yes. Mr. Speaker, Amendment #6 to Senate Bill 1986, is what was in House Bill 2944, which was one of those Bills that never got called on the last day of the Session in terms of House Bills. It simply provides a mechanism whereby co-op, residential co-op associations may use the Forcible Entry and Detainer Act where there are unpaid assessments by the shareholders. It provides for them to be able to opt into the Forcible Act, and at the same time, if they do, it provides certain guaranteed rights to the shareholders, like open meetings and access to books and records. It comes as a result of a court decision that says that residential co-ops cannot use the Forcible Act. I'd ask for the adoption of this Amendment, unless there are any questions."
- Speaker Giglio: "Any discussion on the Amendment? Hearing none, all those in favor of the Amendment signify by saying 'aye'; opposed, 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment's adopted. Further Amendments."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #7, offered by Representative Lang."
- Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Lang, on
 Amendment #7 to Senate Bill 1986."
- Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Amendment #7 was given to me by the Illinois Department of Labor. It contains two provisions regarding administrative hearings relative to wage payment collections and minimum wage and overtime law. I know of no opposition. I move adoption."

161st Legislative Day

June 25, 1992

- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #8, offered by Representative Granberg."
- Speaker Giglio: "Representative Granberg, on Amendment #8."
- Granberg: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Floor Amendment #8 creates the crime of criminal trespass with an intent to harass. It creates the violation and provides that a criminal trespass with intent to harass is a Class 4 felony, and I would move for its adoption."
- Speaker Giglio: "Any discussion on the Amendment? Hearing none, all those in favor of the Amendment say 'aye'... Excuse me. Representative Preston."

Preston: "Would the Gentleman yield for a question?"

Speaker Giglio: "Indicates he will."

- Preston: "Representative Granberg, what exactly is defined as 'harassment' in this Amendment?"
- Granberg: "Representative, 'harassment' is defined as 'knowingly commit an Act that is (a) is not necessary to accomplish a purpose that is reasonable under the circumstances. (2) would cause a reasonable person emotional distress and (3) causes emotional distress to the victim of the act."
- Preston: "Thank you. To the Amendment. You know, we've got to start looking at these Amendments that without any deliberation are just being added to Bills here. This Amendment, I'm sure, is well intended, but I can't imagine how anyone from that language can define what the prohibited act is, and we're only making it a Class 4 felony. So, somebody can enter on a premises within an intent to harass whatever the hell that is and do something that isn't necessary for the intended purpose whatever the hell that means and be guilty of a felony. I mean, for Pete's sake, these things should go through

161st Legislative Day

June 25, 1992

committee so they can be debated and questions can be asked, and a knowledgeable knowing vote can be rendered. I'm voting 'no' on this Amendment. I hope others will do so also."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Wennlund."

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

Speaker Giglio: "He indicates he will."

Wennlund: "First of all, Representative, I wanna to... Is it 'harass' (emphasis on first syllable) or 'harass' (emphasis on second syllable)?"

Granberg: "Representative, I'd like to defer to Representative

Deering on that."

Preston: "Well, he's not here, so I have to depend on you to... I want to use the correct pronunciation before I ask you the question."

Granberg: "Representative, we'll use whatever you want to use."

Preston: "What does it mean?"

Speaker Giglio: "Representative McPike, in the Chair."

Granberg: "It's defined in the Amendment, Lar...Representative Wennlund, as 'knowingly commit an act that is not necessary to accomplish a purpose that is reasonable under the circumstances, would cause a reasonable person emotional distress, and causes emotional distress to the victim of the act'."

Wennlund: "Now, what gave rise to this Amendment? Can you tell the Members of the House?"

Granberg: "Yeah, Representative. When we were...as you know, when the Supreme Court invalidated the Hate Crimes Act declared it unconstitutional, I consulted with my resident circuit court judge, and we were trying to give state's attorneys and prosecutors another means available to them, in case the Illinois statute was itself declared

161st Legislative Day

June 25, 1992

- unconstitutional. This would get us over until that period in the fall, or perhaps next year, if, in fact, our statute was declared unconstitutional, this would be in place to give our state's attorneys another tool to prosecute that type of crime."
- Wennlund: "So, what you're doing is creating a whole new crime and making it a Class 4 felony. For the edification of the Members of the House, what kind of a prison sentence does a Class 4 felony carry?"
- Granberg: "Representative, it's a maximum of three years...and a...a maximum of three years and a maximum of a \$10,000 fine."
- Wennlund: "And with the current prison population over 30,000, are you willing to take all of those whose might be convicted of this new crime in your prison in Centralia?"
- Granberg: "Well, Representative, this is not a new crime in itself because this is in case our Hate Statute is declared unconstitutional. That is on the books currently."
- Wennlund: "Did that carry a penalty of a Class 4 felony?"
- Granberg: "Representative, we thought it was the same penalty, a

 Class 4; that's why we put it in the Amendment, so, that's

 what we're checking on."
- Wennlund: "What is... Now if somebody trespasses, what kind of an act is it that he commits that's not necessary to accomplish a purpose that is reasonable under the circumstances?"
- Granberg: "Well, if you normally trespass, criminal trespass to a person's property, as you are probably aware, if you go on a person's property, and you are given notice to vacate that property, you're going on the property knowingly to...with the intent to harass the property owner, with the intent to harass. If you have no reasonable purpose for

- 161st Legislative Day
 - that, then you would be guilty of a violation of this section."

June 25, 1992

- Wennlund: "Well, suppose I was hunting on Representative Brunsvold's farm, and a..."
- Granberg: "I didn't know Representative Brunsvold owned a farm."
- Wennlund: "Oh yeah, he does. He does. Well, I was huntin' on the farm, and how does he give me notice?"
- Granberg: "That would not be applicable under this section; you are not knowingly going on Representative Brunsvold's farm to harass him unless you're that bad of a shot. I don't know."
- Wennlund: "Well, if hunting bothers him, if hunting bothers him, that would harass him."
- Granberg: "You're not doing it with the intent to harass him."

Wennlund: "Oh yeah."

Granberg: "No, you just said 'no'."

Wennlund: "Then that's a Class 4 felony?"

Granberg: "No, because you're not doing it with the intent to harass him."

Wennlund: "Oh yeah, I would be."

- Granberg: "Oh, you want to? You're going on there to harass
 him?"
- Wennlund: "Well, I know he doesn't like hunters, but I'm...I
 don't care. I don't care if that bothers him, or if he
 loses any sleep over it. But how is 'emotional distress'
 defined?"
- Granberg: "Representative, we're not... We're using the current definition of harassment, under Chapter 38, Section 112A-3, Subsection 4. So, we're not expanding the definition of harassment, and I'm sure you have that handy, so why don't you look at Chapter 38 quickly, and 38's 112A-3, Subsection 4, and if Representative Brunsvold can help you with

161st Legislative Day

June 25, 1992

harassments, and see if you can..."

Wennlund: "How about 'emotional distress'? What is 'emotional distress'? How is that defined?"

Granberg: "Well, emotional distress is..."

Wennlund: "He doesn't know. I asked him. Pardon."

Granberg: "Emotional distress is, I would assume it to be an interpretation of the common law interpretation of...unless it's in the statute,..."

Wennlund: "Unless it's in the statute."

Speaker McPike: "Let's try. Let's try to bring this to a close."

Granberg: "Yeah. Yeah. Okay, Representative, it's in the...the

same subsection. The definition of emotional distress is
in the same subsection."

"Thank you very much. To the Amendment. Wennlund: Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we all know that the Department of Corrections is currently over 30,000 or at least 12,000 over their rate of capacity. Many of the Members on your side of the aisle voted to send a budget out of here that would prevent us from opening Big Muddy and four other work camps and cut \$45 million out of the Department of Corrections' budget which will create an unsafe condition in all of our prisons and, yet, we want to create a new Class 4 felony where a person can be sentenced up to three years in the Department of Corrections. Sometime we're going to have to stop, and I think that whole philosophy is inconsistent to begin with. We have to stop creating new crimes and enhancing penalties until we're willing to solve the problem of where we're going to put them and you and I know that our folks back home don't want 'em out on the street. Well, that may be where they end up going because we simply don't have room for them, in the Department of Correction facilities anymore. I think this is a bad vote.

161st Legislative Day

June 25, 1992

It's inconsistent with a...with our tight budget, and I would ask for a record vote, Mr. Speaker, on this Amendment."

Speaker McPike: "All right. Mr. Granberg to, close."

Granberg: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is not going to overcrowd our prisons. We had this law, similar law, on the books. In case it's declared unconstitutional, it provides our state's attorneys with another means to prosecute these types of crimes, and I'd appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker McPike: "Question is, 'Shall Amendment #8 be adopted?'

All in favor say 'aye'; opposed, 'no'. The 'ayes' have it

and the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #9, offered by Representative Homer."

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Homer."

Homer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 407... This Amendment #9 is identical to House Bill 4073 that passed the House, I believe unanimously or near unanimously and stalled in the Senate Rules Committee. The Amendment simply provides that...provisions of home owner's insurance would be the same as...vehicle insurance now in the statutes that excludes coverage for bodily injury to members of the family. The insurance shall not be applicable when a third party acquires a right of contribution against a member of the insured person's family. The purpose of the Amendment to deal with the situation where an action is filed on behalf of a child who has been injured and the defendant, the third party, then files an action for contribution against the parents of that child alleging...that there was negligent supervision of the child. Under current law and an insurance company may thereby deny defense to the

161st Legislative Day

June 25, 1992

parent, even though the parent was drawn into the case involuntarily. This provision would say that under those circumstances that coverage would not be denied. It's a limited provision that makes the home owner's insurance policy consistent with the statutory scheme on the books now for vehicle insurance. I would try to answer any questions. I think it's noncontroversial and would move adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Black."

Black: "Yeah. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I don't rise in opposition to the Gentleman's Amendment. Can't hear anything he said. You know, I feel like I'm in the Land of Oz; the place is overrun with Munchkins. Can we have little order in here?"

Speaker McPike: "Absolutely."

Black: "Thank you."

Speaker McPike: "Question is, 'Shall Amendment #9 be adopted?'

All in favor say, 'aye'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it

and the Amendment's adopted. Further Amendments."

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #10, offered by Representative White."

Speaker McPike: "Representative White."

White: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House,

Amendment #10 is to be withdrawn."

Speaker McPike: "Gentleman withdraws Amendment #10. Further

Amendments."

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #11, offered by Representative White."

Speaker McPike: "Representative White."

White: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the entire real estate industry is in support of this particular Amendment. It is one by which when there's an

161st Legislative Day

June 25, 1992

election in a condominium association that the results of that information would not be made privy to all the members in the...in that complex. What we're trying to do is to make sure that the next door neighbor of a person running for office would not know how an individual voted, just like in our elections. No one should have that information available to them. So that's the gist of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Question is, 'Shall Amendment #11 be adopted?'

All in favor say 'aye'... All right, Representative Levin.

Representative Levin, your light's on, so go ahead and speak."

Levin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would ask for a record Roll Call Vote on this, despite the fact that I represent, despite the fact I represent condominium associations. rise in opposition to this Amendment. If you or I run for election to the General Assembly and we're declared the loser, we have the opportunity to go back and look at the ballots to see if we should seek a recount or go to court. If this Amendment is adopted, if you're a unit owner and you're running for election to your condominium board and you're declared the loser, it denies you the opportunity to check the ballots to see whether or not they were properly counted. It would suggest that if you have condominiums in your district, there are very few...fewer incumbents who could manipulate elections than there are unit owners who could benef...who would be hurt as a result of this Amendment. So I would urge you to vote with the unit owners to protect them, to ensure that they, like us, will continue to have access to the ballots to ensure that there was a proper count. If this Amendment is adopted and I would disagree with the Sponsor in terms of the support that it has - if it is adopted, then the incumbents can

161st Legislative Day

June 25, 1992

manipulate an election and there is no way for the loser to check the ballots to see whether or not they were properly counted. This is not a good government Amendment, and I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker McPike: "Question is, 'Shall Amendment #11 be adopted?'

All in favor say 'aye'; opposed, 'no'. The 'ayes' have it,
and the Amendment's adopted. Further Amendments."

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #12, offered by Representative
Hartke."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Hartke. Mr. Hartke."

Hartke: "Yes, has Amendment #12 been distributed?"

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Clerk? No. No, it has not."

Hartke: "Withdraw Amendment #12."

Speaker McPike: "Gentleman withdraws Amendment #12. Further

Amendments."

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Trotter."

Trotter: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Having voted on a prevailing side, I would like to make a Motion to table Amendment #4."

Speaker McPike: "Gentleman moves to table Amendment #4. All in favor of the Motion say 'aye'; opposed, 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and Amendment #4 is tabled. We have a request for a fiscal note. Mr. Lang moves that the fiscal note is not applicable. Hearing no objections, the Attendance Roll Call will be used, and the fiscal note is applicable. Third Reading. Mr. Levin. Mr. Levin."

Levin: "I...When I get my remarks to Amendment #11, I asked specifically for a Roll Call Vote."

Speaker McPike: "All right. We now will go to the Order of House Bill 3275. Third Reading. Mr. Lang? Well, we're going...we're going to House Bill 3275 at this time. Yes.

161st Legislative Day

- June 25, 1992
- Mr. Clerk, House Bill 3275. The Bill has been read a second time previously. Are there any Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #20, offered by Representative Shaw and Giglio."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Shaw. Representative Madigan."
- Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that Amendments #20 through 23 are out of order."
- Speaker McPike: "Mr. Clerk, please let us see the Amendments.

 Point is well taken. The Amendments are out of order.

 Further Amendments."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #24, offered by Speaker Madigan."

 Speaker McPike: "Speaker Madigan. Amendment #24."
- Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, this is the latest version of the Amendment that would provide for the creation of a regional airport authority in northeastern Illinois. This airport authority would take jurisdiction over O'Hare Airport, Midway Airport and provide for the construction of the new Lake Calumet Airport. This matter has been thoroughly debated and discussed, and I'm sure that there have been innumerable private discussions concerning the Amendment, so today I would simply move for the adoption of the Amendment and submit for questions."
- Speaker McPike: "Gentleman, moves for the adoption of Amendment #24 and on that question, the Chair is going to limit the number of speakers. We've gone through this for at least six hours at least six hours of debate so Representative Balanoff will be first."
- Balanoff: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. We have been through this before on a number of occasions, but today I think it's important that we talk about the hard, cold facts of political reality, and I ask everybody in this chamber to remember that in November the Mayor and the

161st Legislative Day

June 25, 1992

Governor don't stand for re-election. Everyone in this chamber is concerned about voter reaction to the 't word', the dreaded 't word'. Well, I stand here today to quarantee you that passage of House Bill 3275 and the building of a Lake Calumet Airport will guarantee one of the most whopping tax increases that this state has seen. And, yes, all taxpayers will pay and no voter will forget you because with a 'ves' vote you can be sure your electoral opponents will remind them, and remind them, and remind them again and again and again that you voted for Chicago's \$11 billion pork barrel boondoggle for Mayor Daley because no matter what they tell you (and I hope that laid it out well last Friday), the funding for this project is just not there. And how will your voter's react when they find out that you voted to support Chicago Mayor Daley's \$11 billion project which, when rated against four other sites at the cost of \$7.5 million in federal taxpayers dollars by the independent Tams Consultants, ranked or rated on many different criteria the Lake Calumet site, dead last. The GAO, after looking at the Tams reports has decided to pursue an investigation and to finally rank the sites, something that the city fought and fought and fought against. While this is going on, Federal Aviation Authority will not give them any more money or any more federal dollars for this project, so even more of our state tax dollar will be needed to pay for this project. Taxes, taxes, taxes. How will that play in November in Marion, Illinois? Taxes, taxes, taxes. How will that play in Rockford? How will that play in the Quad Cities? In Hinsdale? In Bloomington? In Peoria? And Charleston and DuPage County? Taxes, taxes, taxes. will that play in November in your districts? And I

161st Legislative Day

June 25, 1992

go on and on and on about the reasons that this is wrong, like the fact that over 8,000 homes, including my own, in neighborhoods that are well established, where you play in the same playgrounds as your father and your grandfather and your kids play in the same playgrounds, go to the same churches and the same schools would be bulldozed. That over 50,000 people, over 50,000 people would be displaced. My friends, this is morally wrong. Fifteen hundred acres of federally protected wetlands, in some cases globally significant, would be gone. Hundreds of businesses would be lost; thousands of good-paying industrials..."

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

Balanoff: "Like the...like the 3,200 at the Ford plant. The cost of each of the jobs created, even those flipping hamburgers at a McDonald's or making beds at a Motel 6, would be created at the cost of \$270,000 per job. Neighborhoods from miles around would get problems like those around O'Hare, of noise and congestion. This proposal even staying on the table will mean more runways and flights and more noise at O'Hare no matter what they say or politically what they put in an Amendment, every expert - including Bob Donahue - who may be up here - the former Director of Aeronautics - (He may be up in the balconv somewhere), has testified that Midway would have to close, that vital economic engine for Chicago's southwest side. We'll be paying more dollars to School aid formula: Chicago from the state pie. Many districts will lose, but in closing I would just like to ask all of you to consider why the city has refused to release technical paper number 17 which deals with financial ve...feasibility. I and many of others have requested it. I have the Freedom of Information request denial..."

161st Legislative Day

June 25, 1992

Speaker McPike: "Representative Balthis. Representative Balanoff, we have debated this for six hours. We have listened to your speeches, and we were going to ask you to be ...tolerant of this Body. Now bring your remarks to a close."

Balanoff: "The city has refused to release Technical Paper Number 17, Financial Feasibility. What are they hiding from and why won't they allow us to see it? And in this year when many of you and many of us have voted for cuts in DCFS, mental health, not to open prisons, to eliminate jobs and much more, do you want to go back to your district and tell voters that all you brought back home was a \$11 billion project for the City of Chicago? I can see the campaign fliers now. Finally, it is morally wrong to displace 50,000 people. Please vote 'no' for the creation of the Airport Authority. Do what is right. Help save my home and my neighborhood."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Curran."

Curran: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative Balanoff has given the Members, especially in the Chicago area, good reasons to vote against this boondoggle. I'm going to give the Members in Central Illinois - many of whom represent state employees who come from their counties to Sangamon county where there are state and in any County installations, where you represent state employees -I'm going to give you a good reason to vote against this boondoggle because just a couple weeks ago, because of funding, we found that we had to cut thousands of state employees' jobs. State employees, who through no fault of their own, found themselves as pawns in a chess game. That was to save about \$50 million if you want to count how much those state salaries actually saved - about 50...\$58

161st Legislative Day

June 25, 1992

million, a couple thousand state employees. What do we do a couple weeks later? We find that somehow we can spend \$11 billion to create the most expensive airport in America. I suggest to you that in defense of those state employees who we voted many of the people in this room voted to lose their jobs a couple of weeks ago, you absolutely cannot vote for \$11 billion when you couldn't find \$50 or 60 million just a couple weeks ago. On the basis of that financial fairness, I ask you to vote against this airport. Thank you."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Giglio."

Giglio: "Thank you, thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Somebody once said, 'make no small plans.' There's a group of us on the south side, the suburbs, got together and thought about (after the data and after all the reading we did that all the future that we thought about not only for our children, but our children's children about) what would happen to the northern part of the State of Illinois? What would happen to those children? What future would they have? Somebody had a vision sometime back when they made O'Hare, when there wasn't much around it, and I don't have to tell ya what O'Hare today. what the economics have done to that area and what's going on. When you think about, and you look, you hear, and you read, about what's going on in places like Texas; what's going on in places like Denver; those states are doing what they're doing; somebody down there must have some vision. In my mind, especially those people in Texas, when they think what's happening in Latin America, when our ports and our commerce is opening up in the Far East, what the Port of the Gulf is doing to Galveston, Texas, and those people. In my belief, if we're

161st Legislative Day

June 25, 1992

going to compete, if we're going to keep that crown jewel at O'Hare, if we're going to make it bigger and better, if we're going to do something, in my mind, yes, we need a third airport. I was glad it didn't go to Indiana. I'm sad that the committee chose the site that it did. disagree with that site. The process now is in the hands of the Federal Government, whether or not to accept that We here have to decide whether or not we agree with site. the Governor of Indiana, the Governor of this State and the Mayor of the City of Chicago whether or not the site at Lake Calumet is going to be worth it, whether or not that site is going to be better, bigger than that crown jewel at O'Hare or whether or not that the site that we would like a green grass site - would be better. Nobody would happen at O'Hare 40 or 50 years ago, whenever it took wonder what would happen around Peotone or Kankakee or the Bi-state if we chose that. The difference the people in the area around Lake Calumet have no choice, and I understand those people on the Dan Ryan, the people that border the Congress and I-55 and the other places where progress was made, had no choice either, they had no places to go. Visualize if that would have to expand what would happen to the rest of A green grass site has so much expansion. A green grass site today, with the laws that we had, would so much opportunity to expand and who knows what the corporate world would do. I think that the industry, I think that the future, I think think that the cargo, everything would be better off on one of the green grass sites. It's sad that this site had to be chosen, in my judgment, for the displacement, for what's happening. Ι can understand what the Mayor of the City of Chicago and

161st Legislative Day

June 25, 1992

the Governor wants to do. I could understand labor. Ι could understand the news media. I could understand the Chicago Chamber of Commerce. I don't blame them in a sense. I would be fighting for something that would bring a lot more money and commerce et cetera to the area, and like the Mayor of City of Chicago says, 'jobs', but if weigh it all out and you weigh the cost, the time, the destruction, the movement of people, there is no comparison if that site was to be in one of the green grass sites. There's so much vision there. There is so much that could be developed, and it's all we have to do is wait, until the process goes the way it's supposed to go; wait until the Federal Government decides whether or not Lake Calumet site is the right site. (Hopefully, it won't be) As I said before, the federal EPA, the federal FAA, the Corps of Engineers and the Department of Transportation, ...I understand the process, will all have to sign off on that site. I don't think they will. I hope not, and we hope that the next site will be one of the green grass sites, and if we're going to protect, and if we're going to do something and if we're going to keep Illinois where I feel it should be and try to make up for all the loss that we had with regards to jobs, manufacturings opportunity, and everything else for our citizens, that's the place to go, one of the green grass sites. Hopefully, this Amendment will be defeated again. Hopefully, we can have patience and wait until the Federal Government makes their decision, and hopefully, we'll all be a lot better off. Vote 'no.' Thank you."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Balthis."

Balthis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. We've heard a lot of talk about what this facility

161st Legislative Day

June 25, 1992

will do, how much good it will bring. We've heard about the homes that will be torn down, the neighborhoods that will be destroyed, the jobs that will be lost before there are ever jobs created. We've heard about the pre-emption of home rule which most people disagree about. We want to bring your attention to one item, and that is the agreement signed by the Mayor of the City of Chicago, the Governor of the State of Indiana, and the Mayor of the City of Gary. Item 17 of that says, 'if it becomes necessary to relocate industrial enterprises because commercial or of construction of Lake Calumet airport, such businesses will be encouraged to relocate within Gary'. Item 18 of that says, 'use its best efforts to help market the Gary Genesis Convention Center as a convenient location for the users of the Lake Calumet airport', use its best efforts to help market the existing former Sheraton hotel site in downtown Gary for airport-related development'. Ladies Gentlemen, we represent people in Illinois. We represent people in Illinois that need jobs, not people in Indiana. I encourage a 'no' vote."

Speaker McPike: "Speaker Madigan, to close."

Madigan: "Once again, Mr. Speaker, simply to thank everyone for their indulgence on this particular issue and to ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker McPike: "Question is, 'Shall Amendment #24 be adopted?'

All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this Amendment, there are 36 'ayes' and 69 'nos'. Amendment #24 is defeated. Speaker Madigan, you want this Bill out of the record? Take the Bill out of the record. Senate Bill 1986. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

161st Legislative Day

June 25, 1992

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1986, a Bill for an Act to amend the Code of Civil Procedure. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Lang."

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just prior to the airport vote, we went through all the Amendments on this. Those Amendments all become the Bill, and I move passage."

Speaker McPike: "Question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1986 pass?'
Representative Black."

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Black: "Yeah. Gentlemen of the House. This may be the closest thing to a Christmas tree we're going to have in this Session. Speaker or the Sponsor said, we went through all of these Amendments. There's one Amendment on here that makes harassment a Class 4 felony - trying to find that one - oh, yes here it is. Ah, we can't find it now, but anyway it was very interesting that, as I read the Bill, it had some very vague language that would... Nah, not...not Amendment #4, Representative, Amendment #8. It defines harassment as 'knowingly committing an act that: One, is not necessary to accomplish a purpose that is reasonable; two, would cause a reasonable person emotional distress and three, causes emotional distress to the victim of the act'. by my interpretation, then the Parliamentarian would be quilty of harassment to the Minority Floor Leader because many occasions, he has knowingly committed an act that is not necessary. He has caused me emotional distress and has caused emotional distress to many of the victims of his rulings. So, I just...I submit that to you as just one reason to vote against this Bill. I have no desire to see a man of his caliber facing Class 4 felony charges. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, there are all kinds of Amendments added to this Bill. Some of them are good; some

161st Legislative Day

June 25, 1992

of them are bad; some of them are supported by this group or that and someone of them are opposed by this group or that. I think Representative Preston said it all earlier today when he said we're adding Amendments to these Bills willy-nilly, we don't know what we're putting on and then you're being asked to vote 'yes' or 'no' on what literally is an Omnibus Bill. I don't think this is a very good Bill as amended. I vote 'no'. I urge you to vote 'no'."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Hasara."

Hasara: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would just like to inform the Body that Amendment #4 that went on very quickly on a voice vote is opposed by the sheriffs and the circuit clerks..."

Speaker McPike: "...Representative Hasara, that Amendment was tabled."

Hasara: "I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker. Thank you."

Speaker McPike: "Okay. Question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1986 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'.

Representative Lang."

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I believe that the only Amendment on this Bill that was controversial was Representative Granberg's Amendment. Representative Granberg has indicated that if we can get 47 on Postponed, we'll move it back to Second and table that Amendment. All other Amendments seem to be noncontroversial."

Speaker McPike: "Are there 30 more people would like to assist?

Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this Bill, there are 15 'ayes', and 88 'nos'. Senate Bill 1986, having failed to receive... Representative Lang. Mr. Lang."

Lang: "Mr. Speaker, I'm going to take a crack at this anyway. I would move to return the Bill to Second Reading, so that I

161st Legislative Day

June 25, 1992

can remove the offending Amendment and pass the Bill with the non-offending Amendment, and I would ask for a Roll Call Vote on that at the appropriate time."

- Speaker McPike: "...is hereby declared lost. Mr. Lang, in the middle of a roll call you cannot return a Bill to Second Reading. Had you voted on the prevailing side, you could have. All right. It's the intention of the Chair to go through the Calendar one final time. One final time, and that's it. We will go through the Calendar one last time today, and then we'll see what we do. Mr. Lang, on a Motion. Mr. Homer, on a Motion. Mr. Lang, on a Motion."
- Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Pursuant to House Rule 37(g), I move to suspend the Third Reading deadline until January 13, 1993, on two Bills: Senate Bill 1700, Senate Bill 1892."
- Speaker McPike: "Hearing no objections, the Attendance Roll Call will be used, and the Motion carries. Representative Hartke. Mr. Hartke. Mr. Hartke. 1828, do you wish this Bill called?"

Hartke: "No."

Speaker McPike: "No. Representative Stepan, 2101. Ms. Stepan.

Representative Stepan, do you want this Bill called? No.

Ms. Stepan, we're not coming... We're gonna adjourn. We're

not gonna come back, okay? No. No. Mr. Church...Mr.

Churchill. Oh. Senate Bill 1625. Read the Bill. Mr.

Clerk, this Bill has been read a second time previously.

Are there any Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #1 and 2 were adopted in committee."

Speaker McPike: "Any Motions?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed."

Speaker McPike: "Any Floor Amendments?"

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

161st Legislative Day

June 25, 1992

- Wennlund."
- Speaker McPike: "Mr. Wennlund. Gentleman withdraws Amendment #3.

 Further Amendments."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #4, offered by Representative Duechler."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Duechler withdraws Amendment #4.

 Further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #5, offered by Representative

 Duechler."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Duechler withdraws #5. Further Amendments."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #6, offered by Representative Wennlund."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Wennlund withdraws Amendment #6.

 Further Amendments."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #7, offered by Representative Duechler."
- Speaker McPike: "Ms. Duechler withdraws the Amendment. Further Amendments."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #8, offered by Representative Duechler."
- Speaker McPike: "Lady withdraws that Amendment. Further Amendments."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #9, offered by Representative Wennlund."
- Speaker McPike: "Mr. Wennlund."
- Wennlund: "Thank you very much, Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Floor Amendment #9 adds language that will eliminate the ...for the eligibility list preference points for police cadet training which nobody does anymore. There's no need to give them preference points because nobody does it anymore. With the cadet programs they've

161st Legislative Day

- June 25, 1992
- just proven too burdensome, and it also provides the decisions of the boards of fire and police commissioners are subject to administrative review, and that's all that Amendment does. I ask for its adoption."
- Speaker McPike: "Question is, 'Shall Amendment #9 be adopted?'

 All in favor say 'aye'; opposed, 'no'. The 'ayes' have it.

 Amendment's adopted. Further Amendments?'"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #10, offered by Representative Wennlund."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Wennlund withdraws Amendment #10.

 Further Amendments."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #11, offered by Representative Duechler."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Duechler withdraws Amendment...

 No. Amendment #11, Representative Duechler. What's your

 desire, Ma'am? Ms. Duechler?"
- Duechler: "Withdraw."
- Speaker McPike: "The Lady withdraws the Amendment. Further Amendments."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #12, offered by Representative
 Novak."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Novak, 12. Amendment #12."
- Novak: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House.

 Amendment #12 merely extends the provisions of House Bill 2
 that we passed last year concerning veterans' preference in
 state employment hiring. This Amendment extends it to the
 Illinois Municipal Code and it makes it apply to those
 cities and villages and counties in Illinois that have a
 personnel system...a grading system so whereby qualified
 veterans can receive the same type of preference points
 when they seek to have local employment, and I ask for your
 adoption."

161st Legislative Day

June 25, 1992

Speaker McPike: "Representative Preston. Representative Preston."

Preston: "Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order and question whether or not this Amendment is germane to the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "The Amendment is not germane. Further Amendments."

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Novak."

Novak: "Mr. Speaker, I move that the previous Motion was...inap...inapplicable."

Speaker McPike: "No, you'd have to rule to override the Chair, and the Chair will not will not recognize you on that point at this time. Further Amendments. Third Reading. All right. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk. Third Reading. Read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1625, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Municipal Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Churchill."

Churchill: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Bill now does have the things that were accomplished by the previous Amendments and those Amendments go onto a Bill that initially abolished working cash funds when municipalities desired to do that and just stated that a municipality that did abolish the working cash fund could not reinstitute such a cash fund for four years."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Matijevich, on the Motion."

Matijevich: "No. Inquiry of the Chair?"

Speaker McPike: "Yes."

Matijevich: "Was there only one Amendment adopted - 9 or..."

Speaker McPike: "One and 2 were adopted in committee and only #9 was adopted on the floor."

161st Legislative Day

June 25, 1992

Matijevich: "All right. Thank you."

Speaker McPike: "Question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1625 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this...On this Motion, there are 112 'ayes' and no 'nays'. Senate Bill 1625, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 2076, Mr. Lang. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill. You want this Bill called? Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 2076, a Bill for an Act to amend the Probate Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Lang."

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 2076 was on Postponed Consideration. It's the Bill that would allow grandparent visitation. We've debated this on numerous occasions. I would just move for an immediate 'aye' vote."

Speaker McPike: "The question is... Representative Black."

Black: "Yeah. Inquiry of the Chair?"

Speaker McPike: "Yes."

Black: "Mr. Speaker, what Amendments...Floor Amendments are on this Bill?."

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Clerk. Amendment #1, a Floor Amendment."

Black: "Floor Amendment #2, creating the immediate effective date is not on the Bill?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Number 2 was withdrawn."

Black: "Okay, thank you very much. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Currie on the Motion."

Currie: "Is...Third Reading. This is the Third Reading vote?"

Speaker McPike: "Representative Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. This is the issue that we've debated about 790 times in this House.

161st Legislative Day

June 25, 1992

This is the issue that says that in an intact family a grandparent may haul those parents into court even when both parents reject a petition by a grandparent for visitation. We discussed this issue at length yesterday. We defeated this Bill. The discussion was good and clear yesterday. The vote was the right vote. I hope we'll defeat this measure again. To vote for this is to vote against children and against the family values we all stand...say we stand for."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Dunn."

Dunn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The previous speaker's exactly correct. This Bill in its present form has already been defeated. It was defeated yesterday. The reason it was defeated is that it unfairly attacks family values. (And besides that we don't someone said.) What we have in the statute books now are provisions which allow grandparents to demand visitation under certain circumstances. circumstances were the result of an ongoing series of negotiations that took place over a period of approximately two years. In the statute books now, grandparents can petition for visitation with their grandchildren where the parents are not currently cohabiting on a permanent or an indefinite basis - in other words, where the parents are not living together - the grandparents can now petition. Where one of the parents has been absent from the marital abode for more than one month without the spouse knowing his or her whereabouts, when one of the spouses is absent from the home, the grandparents can petition for visitation independent of any other court action. Where one of the parents is deceased and the grandparents feel they need to go to court for visitation, the grandparents can go to

161st Legislative Day

June 25, 1992

court. When one of the parents joins in the petition with the grandparents, great-grandparents or sibling, grandparents can go to court for visitation. This Bill, in present form, says that the grandparents can go to court to petition for visitation whenever they feel like The previous speaker spoke of family values. When a father and mother bring a child into this world, they responsible for the upbringing of that child. Hopefully, they will get along with their grandparents, but so long as the family is intact, it is the family's responsibility to bring the child up and concordantly it is the family's right to call the shots about how the child is raised. This legislation would permit the injection of unhappy grandparents into the child-raising atmosphere, possibly at great expense to parents who cannot afford it. When things are going well, the parents and the grandparents always get along together. It is only when there is friction...when something went awry, that they have disputes, don't agree and a grandparent might want to be so angry that they may wish to go to court for visitation. Court proceedings are terribly expensive. This is an attack upon family values. is an issue which has been raised unsuccessfully many, many times previously in this Gen...in this Assembly and has been raised unsuccessfully as recently as a day or two ago. Please cast a 'no' vote for values. and if you are a grandparent (as I am grandparent), along with your children get or take advantage of one of the provisions that is in the statute books already. Please do not support this attack on family values. You raised your children. I helped raise mine, and I would have felt that it would have been improper for grandparents to interject themselves into the the

161st Legislative Day

June 25, 1992

day-to-day atmosphere of raising my children and thank goodness, they didn't do that because we get along. Why do we want to allow grandparents to go to court now, whenever they feel like it to attack...to attack the family values and unfairly impact children? Please vote 'no.'"

Speaker McPike: "Ouestion is, 'Shall Senate Bill 2076 pass?' A11 in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take On this Bill, there are 44 'ayes', 64 'nos'. the record. Senate Bill 2076. having failed to receive the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared lost. Mr. Obrzut, 2039. Senate Bill 2039. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 2039, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Vehicle Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Obrzut."

Obrzut: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Senate
Bill 2039 amends the Illinois Vehicle Code. The Bill would
require limousines to go through semi-annual safety checks
at designated stations which are certified by the Illinois
Department of Transportation."

Speaker McPike: "And on that, Mr. Black."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I just rise in support of the Gentleman's Bill..."

Speaker McPike: "There's no opposition to this."

Black: "Department of Transportation has informed me that they are not in opposition of this Bill, so we stand in favor."

Speaker McPike: "Question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 2039 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this Bill, there are

161st Legislative Day

June 25, 1992

106 'ayes', 7 'nos'. Senate Bill 2039, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1766, Mr. Steczo. Last time. Representative Schoenberg. Representative Schoenberg, 1590. This Bill has been read a second time previously. Are there any Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"

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

Speaker McPike: "Representative Schoenberg."

Schoenberg: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #1 was formerly House Bill 4066 which you passed out without opposition from the House Revenue Committee, but as you... It was one of those unfortunate instances, as you may recall, that when we made a quick exodus for Memorial Day weekend, this vote was never called. What this issue does is address the question of smokestack and microchip chasing which is prevalent in our state. Unfortunately, at the present time, we don't make any provisions for...if a business would happen to take any property tax abatements in an enterprise zone, or property tax abatements in general, any tax assistance subsidies TIF districts through or any other statutorial constitutional tax benefits or subsidies. If that company should decide that they could get a better deal in another state, they have no obligation to repay...to repay the State of Illinois the incentives which they acquired. what we have here in this state, currently, is a game of 'Can you top this?' Now what's mystifying to me, is that in February of this past year, the Governor spoke very forcefully and correctly, I believe, to the National Governors' Association, indicating that he thought this game of 'Can you top this?' Has to stop and that we

161st Legislative Day

June 25, 1992

have more coherent economic development policies. Unfortunately, I now find that this measure is opposed by the Department of Commerce and Community Affairs. What this club act provision would do, as I indicated earlier, would provide for repayment calculated at the prime rate plus 3% accruing from the date notification of re...of when received. relocation is Ιn short. I know Representative McPike has...has a facility where he may lose 78 jobs to northwest Indiana and those tax breaks might be gone. I know that Representative Black, who I've discussed this issue with, is getting ready to say adios to Valmont Electric who is going to take 500 jobs to Mexico beginning in August of this month. I think that we need to have an economic development policy that makes sense, and I urge you all to vote 'aye' and would entertain any questions."

Speaker McPike: "Representative McGann."

McGann: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker McPike: "Yes."

Schoenberg: "Yes."

McGann: "Representative Schoenberg, when you became...when you came before us in the subcommittee, the Revenue."

Subcommittee, on this Senate Bill 1590, I believe you agreed that you would not amend this Bill. Is that correct?"

Schoenberg: "Sir, my recollection is that I was asked if I was going to do anything new to this, and I said that I wouldn't. Perhaps, I'm... I don't think it's so far-fetched to say that a measure - which has been considered, which all the Members look favorably upon - that that makes... that that necessarily is something new."

McGann: "I know you've been in the General Assembly some time.

161st Legislative Day

June 25, 1992

Mr. Speaker, to this Amendment. Mr. Speaker, to this Amendment."

Speaker McPike: "Yes, proceed."

McGann: "When you make a commitment, you live by the commitment.

The commitment was made in subcommittee that this Bill would not be amended. Otherwise, if any other commitment was made, this Bill would have been kept in subcommittee.

I want every Member to understand what's occurring here.

This Bill was agreed upon not to be amended, and now we're putting an Amendment on it, and I would ask you to vote 'no' and to kill this Bill. Otherwise it would never have gotten out of subcommittee. Thank you."

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Kubik."

Kubik: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The previous speaker is quite correct. This Bill 1590...because of its...the underlying Bill, was controversial and as a consequence was moved out of subcommittee and committee without any...'no' votes. The Gentleman has offered a rather...rather significant Amendment, an Amendment which, in my judgment, is a faulty Amendment, but not only for the reasons that Representative McGann raises. I would oppose this Amendment because it's purely unworkable. What this Amendment also requests of any business that receives any type of tax abatements or benefits is to notify a year in advance, which is, you just ridiculous. It's just not going to happen, and I just don't see that it's a reasonable way to approach this issue. In addition, I think that this particular provision will have the exact opposite effect that the Sponsor has indicated in that I believe that any businesses who are thinking about moving into Illinois are going to look at these kinds of provisions and say, 'This is not the

161st Legislative Day

June 25, 1992

into because of kind of state that we want to move the penalties involved in this kind of legislation.' think the Gentleman who, although well intended, will this particular proposal will have the opposite effect. I might point out that the obvious and that is the IMA and the State Chamber are opposed to this; DCCA is opposed to this; the Department of Revenue is opposed to particular provision, and it just absolutely makes no sense to try to...to set an arbitrary number like 12 months to tell somebody that they have to let people know they're moving out. It's an unworkable provision. not going to work. What it's simply going to do is drive business out of Illinois and...and stop businesses from moving into Illinois. So when we speak about why we should improve our business climate and how we can improve our business climate, this is not going to do it. I would urge defeat of this Amendment. It's the wrong message. the wrong time, and I would urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Burzynski."

Burzynski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Will the Gentleman yield for a question? Thank you. I have a you...for question for you, Mr. Schoenberg. Representative, if I have a business in my community that has been there and it's received a grant and now they're growing, they want to expand; however, they can't do it in my community and I agree to their moving to another community, how would this Bill impact on their ability to move, receive additional grants, funding, et cetera?"

Schoenberg: "The ability... If... This Amendment deals directly with the issue and is intended to deal exclusively with the issue of businesses which seek to relocate jobs outside of Illinois after that they've...after they've been the

161st Legislative Day

June 25, 1992

beneficiaries of the state...state's generosity, so if a business were to relocate within the state,...it would not... There be no penalty. What we are looking to do is to stop businesses from playing one state off another and, essentially, trying to take an advantage of us at the expense of others."

- Burzynski: "This does not affect businesses that would move within the state? Your Amendment does not?"
- Schoenberg: "Correct. The entire purpose is to impact those businesses which feel that they can get an even better deal from another state and go elsewhere."
- Burzynski: "Well, I still find that there's some discrepancies here, and I would encourage a 'no' vote on this Bill as well. Thank you."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Schoenberg, to close."

Schoenberg: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of What I'm seeking to do with this Amendment is to create a reciprocal relationship between business and the state taxpayers and to establish a compact between those taxpayers and business. Representative Kubik raised a very important point when he said that he felt that this would drive businesses out of the state. Quite the contrary. You may recall that Illinois was bidding to have a maintenance facility at Chanute Air Force Base, and we ultimately lost...and we ultimately lost to Indiana. Well, Indiana was able to include provisions for clawbacks within their agreement that they made with United, and the State of Wisconsin, which neighbors us to the north, has similar arrangements, and this is a prevailing trend that is increasing throughout the country, and I think it's only fair that we adopt some kind of measure here, and I would urge an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

161st Legislative Day

June 25, 1992

- Speaker McPike: "Question is, 'Shall Amendment #1 be adopted?'

 All in favor say 'aye'; opposed, 'no'. The 'nos' have it,
 and the Amendment's defeated. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. Representative Schoenberg, do you wish to call this Bill on Third Reading? Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1590, a Bill for an Act to amend the
 Illinois Enterprise Zone Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

 Speaker McPike: "Representative Schoenberg."
- Schoenberg: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill...Senate Bill 1590 was formerly on the Consent Calendar, and I would urge you all to vote favorably. It requires that any private individual or entity which has received a property tax abatement and an abatement..."
- Speaker McPike: "Does anyone rise in opposition to this Bill?

 Question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1590 pass?' All those in
 favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted? Have
 all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk
 will take the record. On this Bill, there are 110 'ayes';
 no 'nays'. Senate Bill 1590, having received a
 Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate
 Bill 1479, Mr. Lang. 1479. Oh, I'm sorry 1497. Mr. Lang.
 Okay. Representative Trotter. Mr. Trotter, you have
 Senate Bill 1692. Do you wish to call that? Read the
 Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1692, a Bill for an Act to amend the Hospital Licensing Act. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Trotter."
- Trotter: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House.

 We discussed this building...this Bill earlier this

161st Legislative Day

June 25, 1992

morning. This is basically just a reporting mechanism asking hospitals, as they apply for licensure, that they report the hours in which interns and residents worked. There was a little confusion this morning, and we've cleared all that up at this time, and I just ask for a favorable roll call."

- Speaker McPike: "Question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?'

 Representative Black."
- Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Just to let my Members on my side of the aisle know the Sponsor has cleared up any and all problems with this Bill. As far as I know, there is no opposition in the health delivery community. I intend to vote 'aye'."
- Speaker McPike: "Question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1692 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will...The Clerk will take the record. On this Bill, there are 114 'ayes', no 'nays'. Senate Bill 1692, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Trotter, on a Motion."
- Trotter: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Having voted on the prevailing side on Senate Bill 1986, I'd like to reconsider it for a vote. Make a Motion to reconsider it."
- Speaker McPike: "All right. The Gentleman moves to reconsider the vote by which Senate Bill 1986 passed and on that Motion, Representative Black."
- Black: "Well, thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I don't have a roll call of that. Did Representative Trotter vote in the negative which became the affirmative? You don't mess with Mr. In-between. I don't know... Which way did you

161st Legislative Day

June 25, 1992

vote on the thing?"

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Trotter voted on the prevailing side. The Bill lost."

Black: "That's right. It did - big time."

Speaker McPike: "Yes."

Black: "And now, you want to revisit this thing?"

Speaker McPike: "Representative Trotter."

Trotter: "Yes, unfortunately there was some good things in that
Bill as well as the bad. The bad part (which we've all
agreed upon) is Representative Granberg's Amendment, and
he's willing to take that bad part out and vote on the good
stuff that was left in there."

Black: "Um, okay. I'm tempted to make a Motion that...the Chair might not look favorably on, but I think if you can give me some reasonable assurance that we're going to strip some of these wacko Amendments that came out of left field at the last minute, fine. Then let's do that, but I don't intend to support you if you're going to put some of these Amendments back on the Bill."

Trotter: "Right. The totally horrendous Amendment was the one that Representative Granberg had, and I think that was the one that most of the colleagues were in disagreement with."

Black: "Well, I would never call Representative Granberg's

Amendment wacko. Let me make myself clear on that.

Strange maybe, confused perhaps, but not wacko, but he's going to withdraw that."

Trotter: "He is going to withdraw that Amendment, yes."

Black: "All right."

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Black, did you support the Motion? All right. Hearing no opposition to the Gentleman's Motion, the Attendance Roll Call will be used. And the vote by which Senate Bill 1986 passed is reconsidered. Now the Bill is

161st Legislative Day

June 25, 1992

in front of the Body. It's on Third Reading. Mr. Lang asks leave to bring the Bill back to Second Reading. Hearing no objections, the Bill is on Second Reading. Mr. Lang."

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would move to table Amendment 8."

Speaker McPike: "Gentleman moves to table Amendment #8. All in favor say 'aye'; opposed, 'no'. The 'ayes' have it.

Amendment #8 is tabled. Mr. Lang."

Lang: "I would move now for it that we would move the Bill to

Third Reading for immediate consideration."

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Black, Amendment #8 has been tabled."

Black: "One question about 4. I believe 4 was tabled?"

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Clerk."

Black: "Before all this? Okay."

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Clerk."

Black: "All right. Let's roll."

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Clerk, what Amendments are on this Bill?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendments 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7 and 9."

Speaker McPike: "1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7 and 9."

Black: "What about 11?"

Speaker McPike: "Representative White's Amendment was also on there. Mr. Clerk, would you double check this, please?

All right. We're going to check on this before we vote on it."

Clerk O'Brien: "Yeah, Amendment #10 was withdrawn, 11 was adopted, and 12 was withdrawn."

Speaker McPike: "All right, Mr. Clerk, give us the numbers again, please."

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 9 and 11 have been adopted."

Speaker McPike: "All right, Mr. Black. It's... Do you have

161st Legislative Day

- June 25, 1992
- those? All right. Third Reading. This Bill has been read a third time. Read it again, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1986, a Bill for an Act to amend the Code of Civil Procedure. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker McPike: "Question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this Bill there are 111 'ayes' and no 'nays'. Senate Bill 1986, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Giorgi."
- Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, earlier this afternoon I'm a Co-Sponsor of Senate Bill 699, the Electricians' Licensing Bill. I voted 'aye' for the Bill, but was verified off later in the afternoon, and I'd the record to indicate that I voted 'aye'. It was taken off. I would have voted 'aye' had I still remained here."
- Speaker McPike: "Mr. Lang, on a Motion."
- Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Pursuant to the appropriate rule I would move to extend the Third Reading deadline on Senate Bill 2101 to January 13, 1993."
- Speaker McPike: "All right. You've heard the Motion. Hearing no objections, the Attendance Roll Call will be used, and the Motion carries. Mr. Lang."
- Lang: "Thank you. Further Motion. I would move to extend the Third Reading deadline on Senate Bill 1740 to January 13, 1993."
- Speaker McPike: "Hearing no objections to the Gentleman's Motion, the Attendance Roll Call will be used, and the Motion carries, and Speaker Madigan would be recorded as voting 'present' on that last Motion. Senate Bill 1931, Mr. Novak. Mr. Novak."

161st Legislative Day

- June 25, 1992
- Novak: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. May I have leave of the Body to bring the Bill back to Second Reading?"
- Speaker McPike: "The Gentlemen asks leave to return the Bill to Second Reading. Leave is granted. The Bill's now on Second Reading. Mr. Novak."
- Novak: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would like to table Amendment #1."
- Speaker McPike: "The Gentleman moves to table Amendment #1. All in favor say 'aye'; opposed, 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment's tabled. Further Amendments. Further Motions."
- Novak: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. Now may I have leave of immediate consideration to put the Bill back on Third Reading?"

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Black."

Black: "You tabled Amendment 1, but not 2?"

Novak: "Representative Black, I would like to get the Bill to
Third Reading and discuss why I want to keep the second
Amendment on because I've spoken with Members of the waste
management and..."

Black: "All Right. Okay."

Speaker McPike: "Third Reading."

Novak: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House..."

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Novak, we would like to read the Bill. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1931, a Bill for an Act to amend the Environmental Protection Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Novak."

Novak: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House.

Amendment #2, as you recall, concerns expanding the setback provisions...on composting facilities in the State of

161st Legislative Day

June 25, 1992

Illinois. It was opposed by waste management and that solid waste association. I spoke to those representatives and I've given them my word that I want to keep this Amendment in the Bill, so we can get it into a Conference Committee and work out these problems that currently exist in southeastern Will County and in Sangamon County,...and the...representatives of the industry agreed to this."

Speaker McPike: "Question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1931 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this Bill, there are 110 'ayes', 2 'nos'. Senate Bill 1931. having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Supplemental Calendar #2, Representative Hoffman has a Motion. The Gentleman moves to discharge committee and place on the Speaker's table for immediate consideration. House Resolution 2234. Hearing no objections to the Gentleman's Motion, the Attendance Roll Call will be used, and the Motion carries. The Resolution is before the Body. Mr. Hoffman, on the Resolution."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Resolution 2234 is to address something that we have seen in the papers as of late. In particular, what was called to my attention was in the Post Dispatch, as early as this Tuesday, I believe, there was an article. There was an article concerning contracts in the Department of Children and Family Services. It indicated that \$200,000 advance contract was given to a former retired employee. This \$200,000...the \$200,000 was advanced to this individual to essentially start a new business in order to look at foster homes. Only about an eighth of the work was completed; however, the \$200,000 contract was paid

161st Legislative Day

June 25, 1992

in advance. This is at the same time that our pharmacies. this is at the same time that our nursing homes, this is the same time the people who do business with the are waiting four and five and sometimes even six months to get paid. I understand the problems. We have to look. have to become, in the State of Illinois, responsive to its citizens. We have to become, in the Department of Children and Family Services, responsive to the children, responsive to the people who need us, responsive to the foster Just this year, just this year, we had to make some terrible, terrible cuts out of this House. We need to make sure the confidence of the providers, the confidence of the children, the confidence of society is with this department. Right now it isn't. Several things have happened over the past year, several articles. That's why I'm... We're introducing, Representative Deering and I, are introducing this Resolution asking for an immediate audit of some of these no-bid contracts, asking for an immediate audit by the Auditor General to look into this and to give a report to the Governor, give a report to us, and I believe that the people of the state deserve this audit, and I ask for a favorable vote on this Resolution."

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Black."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. First of all, let me make one thing clear. I stand in support of this Resolution, but let me say this: Rather than try this agency in the press; rather than try this agency by Resolution or rhetoric on the House of the floor...or the floor of the House, whatever, let us get on with the business of trying to protect children in this state. I don't think we need to pontificate about this Resolution. I stand in support of it, but let's not fall

161st Legislative Day

June 25, 1992

into the trap of trying agencies in the newspaper and sensationalize all the accounts and pontificate for 30 minutes here in chambers. Let's pass the Resolution. Let's get on with the audit, and then, hopefully, let's get on with the business of protecting the children of the State of Illinois. Vote 'aye'. Let's get on with it."

Speaker McPike: "All right. Does anyone rise in the opposition to this? Mr. Black, you rose in support of this? You rose in support of this? Does anyone rise in opposition to this Motion? All right. Representative Matijevich would like to speak to it."

Matijevich: "Yes, by the way there is an error on page 2, line 8. It's Copley Press, not Copeley Press, but I would like to speak to it because I do want to commend the Sponsor of the Resolution and add further that this may be a pattern. I got a call a couple of days ago, and I would disagree to this extent with Representative Black (who, he knows, how much respect I have for him). but unfortunately, Representative Black, sometimes the only way we get knowledge of things like this is through the media. The media should not be the first to make us aware of these situations. We ought to be aware of them first. And I got a call a couple of days ago from a gentleman who worked with the Department of Revenue, and he told me that there are some no-bid contracts with regards to work being done had been done previously with field collectors and there's some mysterious situations about those contracts that, he says, are awarded to past...people who worked in the agency, and they are using the facilities of the agency. In other words, facilities being paid by the contractors and they really have what might be called...in in the new vernacular, sweetheart the...you know,

161st Legislative Day

June 25, 1992

contracts. I exposed in the Appropriations Committee, in Andy McGann's committee last year, similar type of thing the Scholarship being done in the...in Assistance So...I think that every time something like Commission. this happens, no matter whose administration it is, the more said about it, the better. Now, we could quickly gloss over this thing, but when we do, it happens again. I would say the more this happens, the more we make an issue out of it... We...we're just going to say, 'Is anybody in opposition?' Close the door, it's adopted and that's it, but that's not the way to do things. When we find something like this happens, pound on a table, raise hell, go after it, let the Auditor General do his work, but keep bringing it up. I commend the Sponsors, and I say, 'Look further because you may look in the Department of Revenue and find the same thing going on.'"

Speaker McPike: "Representative Hannig."

Hanniq: "Yes. Speaker and Members of Thank you, Mr. the I, too, rise in support of this Resolution. Assembly. This is just another example in the long litany of fiscal mismanagement that we've seen as we review these agencies through the appropriation process. Apparently, Governor has yet to inform his agency directors that we have a budget crisis at hand. Because of the national recession, we've seen millions of Americans making do with less, but the Edgar administration directors are still trying to restore their perks and privileges to this budget. They're wasting taxpayers' money, even as we struggle to balance this budget. Let's send this director and all the directors a message that we are now challenging them to do less...to do more with less. That we're challenging them to do what all of these Americans who have

161st Legislative Day

June 25, 1992

seen reductions in their standard of living have done and that's do more with less. It's time that we told the people of the State of Illinois that we're tired of business as usual, and we'd like to see some action, that we would like to see directors try to make economies of government and downsizing of State Government and make sense of our state budget. Vote."

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Dunn."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Dunn: House. I rise in support of the Resolution. It is not easy to rise up and criticize an agency of this state charged with the responsibility of protecting our children who need services from the State of Illinois. Unpleasant as that duty may be, it is, however, our responsibility to bring to light shortcomings, and I commend the Sponsor of this legislation...this Resolution. They are not vindictive people. What they are doing is saying these items have been called to our attention through the news media, and we must do something about them, and an audit is the proper thing to do, but an audit will maybe unwind these situations. What we need to do is to send a clarion call to this and all agencies of State Government. previous speakers have indicated, we do have a terrible financial problem in this state, and it is not time to play cutesy with state dollars and say you're laying people off and give pay raises and let contracts out. Some contracts have to be let and we all know that, and some of them probably have to be let with no bid, but there are some glaring circumstances which pop up and when you see that you wonder if that's the tip of the iceberg. That's what this is all about. Let's get on with this audit and let's...let the Governor on the second floor read

161st Legislative Day

June 25, 1992

Resolution and, as the previous speaker indicated, send a message to all agencies and to all directors to do their best on behalf of all of the taxpayers to provide the services that people need and to do them without playing around with the numbers, without crunching them favorably for the agencies and to the detriment of the taxpayers and the recipients of services who need them so badly. I support this Resolution."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The reason we're here on the House floor, the reason we're talking about it today is not a vindictive reason. I like Sue Sutter. I think she's a fine person, but I think the directors in this state have to get a message, and the message is that this General Assembly is not going to put up with this practice. This General Assembly is going to take some action. In order to get an audit - and the reason we're here - in order to get an audit, we have to pass a Resolution. Otherwise, I'd just call the Auditor General and ask him to do it, but we need a Resolution setting out what we want investigated, what we want looked at and this does that. I ask for an 'aye' vote. Thank you."

Speaker McPike: "Question is, 'Shall House Resolution 2234 pass?'

All those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this Resolution, there are 111 'ayes' and 1 'no'. House Resolution 2234 is hereby adopted. Representative Brunsvold."

Brunsvold: "Speaker, can I make an announcement?"

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Brunsvold."

Brunsvold: "Can I make an announcement, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker McPike: "Yes."

161st Legislative Day

- June 25, 1992
- Brunsvold: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we would like to announce that tomorrow morning at 10:30 we're going to have a press conference on the Sportsmen's Caucus and would appreciate it if all the Caucus Members could be in the press room tomorrow at 10:30. Thank you."
- Speaker McPike: "Where's the Lady? Is Representative
 Satterthwaite here? Ellen Satterthwaite. Representative
 Satterthwaite? Trotter."
- Trotter: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Just on a point of information: I'd like to announce to all the Members that this evening over at Capitol Plaza, Lou Jones is having a party at 7:00, a big pool party. Bring your trunks. There's gonna be food, gonna be music and it's gonna be a lot of fun. That's 7:00, and Monique will be the center of attraction, as she was last year. So, please everyone show."
- Speaker McPike: "...Bill 1796, Representative Keane. Mr. Keane?

 Representative Satterthwaite, on her Motion."
- Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I move to discharge House Joint Resolution 156 from the Executive Committee and place the Motion on the Calendar for immediate consideration."
- Speaker McPike: "All right. You've heard the Lady's Motion.

 There's no objection, the Attendance Roll Call will be used, and the Motion carries. Representative Satterthwaite."
- Satterthwaite: "House Joint Resolution 156 is needed for us to extend the deadline for the report of the joint committee that was formed to give the arguments for and against the Constitutional Amendment..."
- Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall House Joint Resolution 156 be adopted?' All in...favor...All in favor... Hearing

161st Legislative Day

June 25, 1992

no objections, the Attendance Roll Call will be used, and the Resolution is adopted."

Satterthwaite: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker McPike: "Mr....Mr. Keane. Mr. Keane, on Senate Bill 1796. The Bill's on Third Reading. Mr. Keane."

Keane: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Bill is now a vehicle..."

Speaker McPike: "The Bill's on Third Reading."

Keane: "Has the Bill been read the third time?"

Speaker McPike: "Yes...no. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

"Senate Bill 1796, a Bill for an Act to amend the Clerk O'Brien: Illinois Income Tax Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Keane."

Keane: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Bill is now a vehicle. It's my intention to move it into Conference. The Senate Sponsor has asked me to do this. I'm not sure what he wants to use it for."

McPike: "The question is, 'Shall Senate...' Representative Kubik."

Kubik: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Question of the Sponsor."

Speaker McPike: "Yes."

Kubik: "Representative, maybe we have our signals crossed here. My understanding was..."

Speaker McPike: "Representative..."

Kubik: "...this Bill was..."

DeJaegher, Representative Speaker McPike: "Representative DeJaegher. Mr. DeJaegher? Very cautious with the Senator.

Mr. DeJaegher? Be very, very careful with the Senator."

Kubik: "Basically, be careful with the Senator. Representative Keane, I was under the impression we were going to extend the deadline on this particular proposal and leave it right where it's at."

Keane: "The...thank you. The subject matter that was on

161st Legislative Day

June 25, 1992

Bill has been resolved by a ruling of the Department of Revenue, and the Sponsor of the Senate...in the Senate now wants to use the Bill as...in a Conference Committee. And it has nothing...it will have nothing to do with the previous part of the Bill, because the..."

Kubik: "Would you elaborate as to what it might...might do?"

Keane: "I, as I indicated in my opening statement, I don't know
what the Senate has in mind."

Kubik: "Well, with all due respect to the Sponsor, the Senator hasn't let us, the Minority side, know what's in the Bill. We would oppose the Motion. I would encourage my Members to vote 'no' or 'present'."

Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1796 pass?'
All those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this Bill there are 66 'ayes' and 46 'noes'. Senate Bill 1796, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. How about Mr. Lang. Mr. Lang, Senate Bill 1479. This Bill is on Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1479, a Bill for an Act to amend the Senior Citizens and Disabled Persons Property Tax Relief and Pharmaceutical Assistance Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Lang."

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a Motion filed to table an Amendment. I would move to move the Bill back to Second Reading. Wait... Hold that for one second. Hold that for one second."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Lang. The Bill's on Third Reading."

161st Legislative Day

June 25, 1992

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to return the Bill to Second Reading."

Speaker McPike: "The Gentleman asks leave to return to Second Reading. The leave is granted. The Bill's on Second. Representative Ryder. The Bill's on Second Reading. The Bill's on Second Reading. Representative... Mr. Clerk, what is the status... What Amendments are adopted right now?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #3 has been adopted, and there's a

Motion to table Amendment #3 by Representative Lang."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Lang, on the Motion."

Lang: "Move to table Amendment 3."

Speaker McPike: "And on that Motion, Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Gentleman may, if he wish, to table this Amendment. We stand in opposition. We supported the Amendment. It was an Agreed Amendment. We should indicate that in the event this Amendment is not on the Bill, that we will stand in opposition to the Bill and that we would, therefore, object to moving the Bill to Third should any further Amendments be placed on it."

Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #3...' The

Motion is on Amendment #3. Is that correct? The question
is, 'Shall Amendment #3 be tabled?' All in favor say
'aye'; opposed, 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the
Amendment's been tabled. Further Amendments."

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #4, offered by Representative Lang."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Lang."

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Amendment #4 would require a beneficiary under the plan to pay..."

Speaker McPike: "Excuse me, Mr. Lang. Mr. Lang."

Lang: "Withdraw Amendment #4."

161st Legislative Day

June 25, 1992

Speaker McPike: "The Gentleman withdraws Amendment #4. Further Amendments."

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. Mr. Ryder."

Ryder: "Mr. Speaker, I draw the attention of the Chair to Rule 37(g)...(d), I apologize to the Chair. We believe that, according to that, this Bill, having been moved back to Second, we therefore object to it being moved to Third today."

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Ryder, this Bill was not amended; 37(d) says 'if it's amended'."

Ryder: "Mr. Speaker..."

Speaker McPike: "Yes, Mr. Ryder."

Ryder: "If I may respond to you on that. We still believe that it requires 71 votes to move the Bill from Second to Third, when the Gentleman voluntarily moved it to Second, and we would ask the Chair to so rule."

Speaker McPike: "Well, Mr. Ryder, I can't so rule, because I will read you the rule. 'A Bill returned to the Order of Second Reading to which Amendments have been adopted'. That's the rule. There were no Amendments adopted to this, and so it does not need a... There is no 71-vote requirement. Period. That's the rule. Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill. Read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1479, a Bill for an Act to amend the Senior Citizens and Disabled Persons Property Tax Relief and Pharmaceutical Assistance Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Lang."

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Last year in an effort to balance the budget, we made some Amendments to the Pharmaceutical Assistance Act, which benefits senior citizens in our

161st Legislative Day

June 25, 1992

districts, and when we made those Amendments, we knew we some terrible things to those senior citizens, namely, most importantly, putting an \$800 cap on those benefits. When we put the \$800 cap on those benefits, we eliminated the possibility that those seniors who really needed it, in catastrophic circumstances, would be able to access the In an effort to create a new program, a task force of Members of the House, Members of the Department οf Revenue, the Governor's Office. program pharmaceutical people, et cetera met, and the embodied in Senate Bill 1479 is the majority opinion of that task force. What this Bill would do as follows: eliminates the \$800 cap on benefits; puts in a 20% co-pay over \$800; provides a co-pay of...I'm sorry, has no co-pay all up until \$800; lowers the entry fee from \$80 to \$40 for individuals below the poverty level; and retains the \$80 entry fee for those above the poverty level; and it establishes monthly deductibles of \$15 for those below the poverty level and \$25 for those above the poverty level. The bottom line of all this is, and there are some disputes as to the figures, the Governor's Office will probably tell you, the opposition will probably tell you, that this program will be worth approximately \$5 million over and above the Governor's projected numbers and the Governor's for this program. Our figures are different than that. We believe that the growth of this program and the growth of the cost of the program is far less than the Governor's proposed numbers. Our belief is that the growth is somewhere between 4.1 and 4.5%. The Governor pegs it at 7.5%. The bottom line of this is that our program, believe, is at least 3, but probably \$5 million lower than the Governor's estimates on what this program is.

161st Legislative Day

June 25, 1992

care about senior citizens - and I know we all do - if you've received as many calls from your constituents about this program as I have, knowing the effort that this task force took to create catastrophic care for these people, to put into practice an elimination of this \$800 cap, which we all agreed was wrong to do, but was necessary last year because of our budget problems. Let's correct the problem. Let's correct this and help our senior citizens. Let's help those in catastrophic circumstances, those on fixed incomes and those that really need our help. This is a program we can afford based on our own numbers, based on the Governor's numbers, based on the rate of growth that we see, that we've heard from the pharmaceutical industry. This is a Bill we should all be supporting. I would recommend an 'aye' vote."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Kubik."

Kubik: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Gentleman yield for a couple of guestions?"

Speaker McPike: "Yes. Mr. Lang."

Kubik: "Representative Lang, first of all, you mentioned the cost of the pharmaceutical increasing this year. What are the projected costs... What do you believe is the projected increase this year?"

Lang: "Somewhere around \$42 million, Mr. Kubik."

Kubik: "What is the cost of the pharmaceutical...what is the cost to the pharmaceuticals themselves in terms of... What was the number you gave, 4.5%? Is that the number?"

Lang: "Our projections based on numbers we've received from the Pharmaceutical Association is that the rate of growth is somewhere between 4.1 and 4.8%. The Governor had projected this at 7.5% or the Department of Revenue had projected this at 7.5%. Our figures are dramatically lower than

161st Legislative Day

June 25, 1992

that."

Kubik: "Representative, we understand from the Department of Revenue that the pharmaceutical manufacturers, as of yesterday, indicated that the growth would be 7.5% for the coming year. Do you care to respond to that?"

Lang: "That was, Mr. Kubik, before they factored in new generic availability. Let me explain. For the last year under this program, the department has not added to the list of generic availability different drugs that have been approved as generic drugs. Accordingly, for the last year, the department has been paying brand name prices for drugs that might have been generic drugs. Under the new program — and the Department has agreed to do this — they will be updating monthly or quarterly the list of generic drugs. Accordingly, where they might have been paying dramatically more for a drug, once they approve them and put them on the list at a more rapid pace, those drugs will be much less expensive for the program."

Kubik: "Well, Representative Lang, I would also remind you that there are new drugs which are coming onto the market which are more expensive than those that are generic. So, the point is, we have to factor in those drugs as well, and I would suggest to you, that we have not factored into those...those drugs into the mix. I would also point out to you that in 1991, the increase was 11% and the year prior to that was 14%. So now what we're saying is, on a good faith effort from the pharmaceutical manufacturers, we're going to believe that the growth will only be 4.5%, even though it was 11% and 14% the year before. You mentioned, Representative Lang, another question... You mentioned a figure of about \$42 million. Could we... Mr. Speaker... The Governor's Office has estimated that this

161st Legislative Day

June 25, 1992

particular program will have cost approximately \$44 million, which is \$5 million over the Governor's original estimate."

Lang: "I...I would suggest to you that last year the Governor estimated about \$6 million over the actual cost of the program. So, I would further suggest to you that the Governor's figures this year are too high."

Kubik: "Well, Representative, we...we also understand that this program will not meet with the Governor's approval, that he will veto this particular Bill because it is too costly, and it is \$5 million over budget. Now, you have mentioned some figures. You've sighted some figures that you...\$42 million... We, on this side of the aisle, have seen no documentation as to those figures. We have no record of those figures, and I'm not quite sure, you know, and I respect, I respect you, I respect your right to quote that figure. We just don't have any hard data that would indicate that your figures are correct."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Young, in the chair."

Lang: "Was that a question?"

Kubik: "I wonder where you're coming up with the figure."

Lang: "I'm prepared to move on the data that I've given you, but let me suggest to you as to your statement about the Governor vetoing the Bill. If this Governor is prepared to veto a Bill that will endanger the lives of senior citizens, then he'll just have to go ahead and do that and the people of this state will just have to make their own conclusions as to what that means about the priorities of this Governor."

Kubik: "Well, Representative... Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we have a Bill before us which, if it passes, will go to the Governor's desk. I don't

161st Legislative Day

June 25, 1992

think there's anybody in this House who feels more strongly about pharmaceutical assistance than I do. I've supported the program; I continue to support the program. supported the program all along. But to suggest that because we don't go along with a particular program, we're endangering the lives of senior citizens is...is a rather ludicrous statement. The point of it is that this program is the most expensive program that we've come up with. There is another proposal (which I'm sure other speakers may feel free to talk about) that would be significantly less cost and would meet with the Governor's proposal...or would also meet with his budget his approval and quidelines. So, here we are, saying we're going to cut a budget, we're going to balance a budget, and we're going to enact a program right here and now that is five million Doesn't make sense at all. I also bucks out of whack. would ask the Members to consider the fact that these figures simply don't make sense. Do you believe... Let me ask you a simple question. Do you believe that the cost of pharmaceuticals will only rise 4.5% this year when they've arisen...they rose last year 11% and the year before 14%? What makes this year any different? The point is, we don't have the money. I support senior citizens. I support this Unfortunately, we don't have the money to pay for program. We can come up with a compromise Bill. We this program. can come up with a good Bill, a plan that is...that even met with Representative Lang's approval. I think he would support that plan. We ought to put that plan on table, vote on it, send it to the Governor and have him sign this Bill so that all senior citizens can take advantage of this particular program. I would urge the Members to listen to this debate carefully and vote either

161st Legislative Day

June 25, 1992

'aye', or either 'present' or 'no' on this proposal." Speaker Young: "Further discussion. Representative Ryder." Ryder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Let me be brief. This is a significant piece of legislation, but unfortunately the decision of the Sponsor of this Bill to withdraw agreed Amendments has made this Bill unpalatable. With the addition of co-payments, which was the preference of the Sponsor of the Bill - in fact it was his preference as a member of the task force - this Bill was workable. It is not now workable. In order to sustain this position of the Sponsor of this Bill, you would have to believe that pharmaceuticals which rose two years ago, 11% this year, will somehow only raise 4.5% next year. What you do if you vote in favor of this, is to undermine the valid work that you've done previously to cut the budget by now busting the budget by 2 to \$5 million. The Sponsor of the Bill won't tell you this, but it was his preference not to have the Bill in this shape. It was his preference to have co-pay, as it was many other members of that task force, but because of other pressures, he has decided not to go in this fashion. Let me tell you what a reasonable thing to do at this stage would be. Vote 'present' or 'no' on this Bill. I then believe the Sponsor will shell the Bill and put it into Conference Committee where we can find figures that we can believe, where we can find figures that we can justify. We all want to have a circuit breaker system that works. Α pharmaceutical assistance program that...is within the budget. This Bill does not meet that, and as such, I cannot, conscience, vote 'aye'. I would suggest a 'present' vote. In the event, Mr. Speaker, that this Bill should get the

requisite number, we do request a verification. Thank you,

161st Legislative Day

June 25, 1992

Speaker."

Speaker Young: "Representative Flinn."

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

Speaker Young: "The Gentleman moves the previous question. The question is, 'Shall the previous question be put?' All those in favor say 'aye'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. Representative Lang, to close. Representative Giglio, in the Chair."

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Firstly and briefly, to the comments of the opposition as to the Amendment that was tabled that they were so much in favor of that I was initially in favor of also, that Amendment saves exactly \$447,000. That wouldn't solve the number problem that they believe is in the Bill. If you care about senior citizens, if you want to remove the \$800 cap, if you want to take care of them in their catastrophic times on low incomes and fixed incomes, this is the Bill for you. This is the Bill to take care of your senior citizens, to make sure that they have the drugs they need to take care of themselves and to be healthy. We talk a lot about health care in Illinois. This is a Bill for health care. Please vote 'aye'."

Speaker Giglio: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1479 pass?'

All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; opposed, 'no'.

The voting is open. This is final action. Representative

Black, one minute to explain your vote."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. You know, the Pharmaceutical Assistance Program was very popular for a long time in Illinois, and, in fact, some Legislators gave out applications for it in their district office. In its first fiscal year of 1986 it only cost \$3 million, but by early 1991, it cost \$90

161st Legislative Day

June 25, 1992

million. Doug Whitley is guoted in the April 1992 Illinois Issues as saying, 'It's a classic example of what would be nice to do and gracious to do and there is a need. an attractive program. I just don't think that people necessarily recognized it as a social program with a potential for growth that it has had.' Even Senator Penny Severns has said, 'It's grown bigger and faster than anyone ever could imagine when it was enacted.' Ladies and Gentlemen, in the five years we've had this program, according to Illinois Issues, it has increased spending by 1,743%. The April 1992 issue of Illinois Issues. when are we going to take the tough votes that I heard from that side of the aisle a couple of days ago? The tough votes. Here's a program that has grown by over 1,000% in five years, and you're going to put 71 votes on it and go home and promise that you're going to fund it and continue fund it. Another 1,000% increase in the next five years. Who are you kidding? Where are the tough votes? Boy, this is a tough vote. I sure wish I could change my vote, or my voice. 'Oh qosh, this is really a tough vote. We're going to increase something 1,000%. Oh my. We don't have any money, but we're going to do it.' Who are you kidding? You should vote 'no'. This is phoney baloney, and you know it."

Speaker Giglio: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Schakowsky, one minute to explain your vote."

Schakowsky: "If you want to control costs under this program, then you want to vote for this, because it requires 20% co-payment over \$800. A flat co-payment means that as pharmaceutical costs rise, the state is going to have to pay more. If you require seniors to pay 20% of the increase, then this is the most economical way to go. This

161st Legislative Day

June 25, 1992

- is a better program for the state."
- Speaker Giglio: "Representative Hicks, one minute to explain your vote."
- Hicks: "Representative Black, just for your information, in 1983 when I passed the Pharmaceutical Assistance Bill, we knew it would grow. There was no doubt in anybody's mind that a program as good as this would grow, so there were a few people around that did know it was going to grow."
- Speaker Giglio: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 47 'ayes', 74, excuse me, 74 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and Senate Bill 1479, having received the required Constitutional Majority... Representative Ryder, would you persist in your verification?"
- Ryder: "Mr. Speaker, I appreciate you belatedly acknowledging that, indeed, I did ask for one, even though we changed three Speakers during the time of that Bill, but I will not, with 74 green votes, I will not take the time of the Assembly to verify. Thank you."
- Speaker Giglio: "Thank you. On this question there is 74 'yes' and 0 voting 'no', and Senate Bill 1479,... Representative Rice, 'aye'; 75... Representative Davis, 'aye'. There are now 76...Morrow, 'aye'. Anybody else? Representative Cronin, 'aye'. On this question, there are now 78 voting 'no'. Pardon? Deets. 0 Mr. Deets. Representative Deets, 'aye'. Johnson, Mr. Clerk, 'aye'. Olson, 'aye'. Hensel. Persico. Bob Wait, 'aye'. Cowlishaw, 'aye'. All right, Mr. Clerk. On this question, there are 85 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and Senate Bill 1479, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Hicks,

161st Legislative Day

June 25, 1992

Senate Bill 1912. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1912,..."

Speaker Giglio: "The Bill's on the Order of Second Reading."

Clerk O'Brien: "This Bill's...a Bill for an Act in relation to real estate appraisers. This Bill has been read a second time previously. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee."

Speaker Giglio: "Any Motions filed?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Giglio: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Hicks."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Hicks, on Amendment #2."

Hicks: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 1912 is really the result of a year long's work trying to set up a process by which we would have certified residential and certified general appraisers in Illinois. It's been a process that we started on over a year ago and which was an attempt to comply with what some kind...of the federal standards would be. It's been a process that's been negotiated between the realtors in the State of Illinois, a number of appraisal groups throughout the State of Illinois, and most everybody who's been concerned with the appraisal process. I'd be happy to try to answer any...any questions anyone may have."

Speaker Giglio: "Any discussion on the Gentleman's Amendment?

Hearing none, all in favor of the... Representative

Wennlund."

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

Speaker Giglio: "Indicates he will."

Wennlund: "Can you tell us where the various real estate groups stand on this proposal, Representative Hicks?"

161st Legislative Day

June 25, 1992

Hicks: "Well, various groups, Representative Wennlund, as I know, now all the various groups who've been part of the negotiation (and I know of no one who wanted to be a part of the negotiation that were not), have all signed on to the agreement now. I know of no one who stands in opposition to it at the present time."

Wennlund: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Giglio: "All those in favor of the Amendment say 'aye';

opposed, 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have

it. The Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments."

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

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Olson. Representative Olson, on Amendment #3."

Olson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Amendment #2... Excuse me, Amendment #3 deals with the Department of Professional Regulation and their division of real estate...realtors, if you will. Amendment #3 proposes to separate the appraisal section from the real estate section by making them separate entities within that division. It will create the position of an Appraisal Administrator to perform the duties that are currently under the par of the Real Estate Commissioner. The Real Estate Commissioner will continue to exist. There will be an Appraisal Administrator. The fees collected from the realtors and from the appraisers are...currently go into one fund. These will be put in separate funds for the different categories the appraisers and the realtors. This proposal is endorsed by the agency; it's endorsed by the appraisers; and it's endorsed by the realtors. I'll answer any questions."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Hicks."

Hicks: "Thank you. Will the Gentleman yield for a question,

161st Legislative Day

June 25, 1992

- please? Representative Olson, does this set up a whole separate bureaucratic function within the department itself?"
- Olson: "I'm advised that there will be possibly four or five employees assigned to the appraisal section and those will, for the large part, be coming out of the real estate section. So, while I won't say it's a wash, it's a near wash."
- Hicks: "So we have a separate division that's set up apart and away from the Department of Real Estate? Maybe a new head of that division. I guess if you have a division, you have a new head of that division, would you not?"
- Olson: "What you say, Representative, is true, but if you're alluding to a new bureaucracy, I don't believe we're reaching that point."
- Hicks: "But we have a new division within that department?"
- Olson: "Not per se. There is a new division, but there are no more employees."
- Hicks: "Well, Mr. Speaker, to the Amendment. I would stand in opposition to the Amendment. I believe what we're doing here is we are saying that we should set up a total new division. You know, we just saw the Governor who has said we ought to consolidate different agencies, bring them under one. Now we have the same type of work being done, but yet the agency wants to set up a separate division within that agency, another division head, another person. It doesn't matter if it's one person or five people. You know, if you're only going to have five or six people, then the reality ought to be that that could to right under the real estate division as it currently would be, and as I believe it would be if this Amendment is not adopted, and I would ask that those people to stand with me and vote this

161st Legislative Day

June 25, 1992

Amendment down."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Olson, to close."

Olson: "The Federal Government has recommended this, in fact almost demanded it. I might also point out that while there will be two separate funds now, they...these funds are in...supported or funded entirely by the two different groups, the realtors and the appraisers. This is not new bureaucracy. It is agreed to by the agency, by the realtors, by the appraisers, and it's encouraged by the Federal Government, and I ask an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Olson...George."

(unknown): "A Roll Call Vote if you will, Sir."

Speaker Giglio: "All those in favor of the Amendment signify by voting 'aye'; opposed, 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question, there are 44 'yes' and 66 'no', and the Amendment fails.

Further Amendments."

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Giglio: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill on Third Reading."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1912, a Bill for an Act in relation to real estate appraisers. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman from Jefferson, Representative Hicks."

Hicks: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. As I addressed in Amendment #2 that became the Bill. It is the provision by which real estate appraisers in the State of Illinois will be licensed and will be certified. I'd be happy to answer any questions and ask for an 'aye' vote. The grandfathering is in it."

Speaker Giglio: "Any discussion? The question is, 'Shall Senate

161st Legislative Day

June 25, 1992

Bill 1912 pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; opposed, 'no'. The voting is open. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On this question, there are 114 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and Senate Bill 1912, having received the required Constitutional...Representative Hicks."

Hicks: "Mr. Speaker, if I may, I may have spoken incorrectly here. Let me clarify something before we take the vote, if you may. There has never been any licensed real estate appraisers in Illinois in the past. So the grandfathering of those people, per se, as a licensed...is not so because we never had that. What is going to be accepted, though, is past qualifications will be acceptable now to be able to be licensed. So your past experience will be allowable to be used. Just for clarification."

Speaker Giglio: "On this question, there are 114 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and Senate Bill 1912, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The Chair would like to introduce a former Member, Gale Schisler. Gale? Give Gail Schisler a hand. Welcome back. Representative John Dunn in the chamber? Representative Dunn? Would you come to the podium, please? Representative Lang, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Pursuant to Rule 74(a), I move to take House Bill 180 from the table and place it on the Calendar on the Order of Conference Committee Report. This has been cleared with the other side."

Speaker Giglio: "You heard the Gentleman's Motion. Does he have leave? Leave is granted by Attendance Roll Call. Representative Hicks?"

Hicks: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I would ask that you

161st Legislative Day

June 25, 1992

call House Joint Resolution 108."

Speaker Giglio: "House Joint Resolution 108. Mr. Clerk, House Joint Resolution 108."

Hicks: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Joint Resolution 108...is a very simple Resolution urging the United States Congress that they do not mandate the use of motorcycle helmets...to every state in the country. I'd be happy to answer any questions on the Resolution."

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

Black: "Yeah. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. A question of the Sponsor."

Speaker Giglio: "Proceed."

Black: "Did you... Are you now the Chief Sponsor, Larry, or is

Representative Weaver?"

Hicks: "No, I am the Chief Sponsor of this."

Black: "But Representative Weaver is still on this Bill?"

Hicks: "Yes, he's still on the Bill."

Black: "What I'm trying to do is send him a message somewhere.

I...I think he'd probably like to talk on this, but if he isn't here shortly, we'll go ahead and vote."

Hicks: "I believe he's right behind you."

Black: "Oh, there he is. Thank you."

Speaker Giglio: "The Lady from Lake, Representative Stern."

Stern: "I just wanted to be sure I understood it. There was a little noise. This asks the Congress to mandate motorcycle helmets or not to mandate motorcycle helmets?"

Hicks: "No, Representative, what this does... We've been threatened many times by...the Federal Government on the loss of highway funds, and we're simply saying to the Federal Government, we don't want them mandating to us the

161st Legislative Day

June 25, 1992

usage of motorcycle helmets with the threat that they would then take highway funds away from us if we did not implement such a rule. So, or...such a law. So, this is simply saying that if the State of Illinois wants to pass the law saying you can use motorcycle helmets, fine. If you...if we do not wanna pass that law, there's not gonna be loss of federal funds, and we're simply asking Congress to reinforce that by saying they're not going to do that."

Stern: "I hear you, Sir. I think, however, I must vote 'no'."

Hicks: "Thank you, Representative."

Speaker Giglio: "The... Representative Hicks asks that this be the table and be heard for immediate from consideration, and that was the Motion. Does the Gentleman have leave? Hearing none, leave is granted by Attendance Roll Call. All right. Take a... We'll take a Roll Call. All right, Mr. Clerk. All those in favor of taking House Joint Resolution 108 from the table to place on the Order of Immediate Consideration vote 'aye' ... Discharge from... Where's this Bill at, Clerk? This is not a Motion. Dump the Roll Call, Mr. Clerk. Take another Roll Call on the adoption of the Resolution. Dump this Now we're on the Resolution to adopt the Roll Call. Resolution. Representative Weaver."

Weaver: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I'm glad we got that
cleared up now, that we're actually voting on the
Resolution itself."

Speaker Giglio: "That's correct."

Weaver: "Okay. Well, I obviously rise in support of this
Resolution, and those of you who are continually banging
each other about mandates and mandated programs that we
pass on to the local units of government, here's your
chance to sell a Federal Government that we don't want any

161st Legislative Day

June 25, 1992

more of their mandates either. All we're doing is saying, 'Back off. Quit threatening us with...with either removal or telling us how to spend our road funds. We don't appreciate the blackmail. We don't appreciate the mandates,' and it's a good vote for you. I vote 'yes'."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Hicks, to close."

Hicks: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd just ask for an 'aye' vote." Speaker Giglio: "All those in favor of House Joint Resolution 108 vote 'aye'; opposed, 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question, there are 87 voting 'yes' and 13 voting 'no', and House Joint Resolution 108, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 14 of the Calendar under Speaker's Table, appears House Resolution 1747. Representative Parcells. I s Representative Parcells here? Out of the record. Representative Cowlishaw. Representative Parcells, on House Resolution 1747. Mr. Clerk, read the Resolution."

Clerk McLennand: "House Resolution 1747. 'WHEREAS, School design can be an important factor in concerning a safety environment for students'..."

Speaker Giglio: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Parcells."

Parcells: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen, this merely encourages school districts, when building or renovating facilities, to consider the importance of using the school environment to regulate behavior and to work to design safer school structures. We have discovered that crime activities in and around elementary and secondary campuses are increasing at an alarming rate and in recent studies we have concluded that many such activities are related to the design of the school buildings and the

161st Legislative Day

June 25, 1992

campuses where they occur. A recent issue - and I have copies for anybody who would like it - of School Safety Magazine published by the National School Safety Center, includes an article by Timothy Crow who concluded that the buildings do make an enormous difference in the design of that building in decreasing the incidents of crime. And I would ask for your 'aye' vote on House Resolution 1747."

- Speaker Giglio: "Any discussion? Hearing none, all those in favor of the Resolution signify by saying 'aye'; opposed, 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The Resolution has been adopted. House Resolution 1748, Representative Cowlishaw."
- Cowlishaw: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, there was an Amendment that was filed to this Bill quite some time ago, as a matter of fact, and so first I would like to move that the Amendment be adopted."
- Speaker Giglio: "Mr. Clerk, read the Resolution."
- Clerk McLennand: "House Resolution 1748 urges State Board of
 Education to study school crime. Elementary and Secondary
 Education recommends 'do adopt'."
- Speaker Giglio: "Is an Amendment filed?"
- Clerk McLennand: "Amendment #1, offered by Representative Cowlishaw."
- Speaker Giglio: "Representative Cowlishaw."
- Cowlishaw: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Amendment #1 to House Resolution 1748 simply changes the request for the study of school crime from the State Board of Education to the regional superintendents of schools. The State Board of Education certainly realizes that this is a very serious problem, but the State Board is...really feels it does not have the resources to do an adequate job, and that, in fact, because there is a great variety of the types of

161st Legislative Day

June 25, 1992

crimes associated with schools throughout the state, that it would be more suitable for the regional superintendents to undertake this study. I have consulted the Illinois Regional Superintendent's group, and they are more than willing to undertake a serious and comprehensive study of not only the kinds of crime that are associated with and in our schools these days, but what, if any, legislation we might be able to enact to help to solve that very serious problem, and, therefore, in the spirit of being truly helpful to our children in providing them with a safe environment for learning, I move for the adoption of the amended version of House Resolution 1748."

Speaker Giglio: "Any discussion? The Lady from Cook, Representative Davis."

Davis: "Thank you so much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. We all recognize that crime in our schools is serious and a problem in many areas, and crime to our schools is also serious and often happens in this Body. The question I have for the Representative is, Chicago will no longer have a regional superintendent because of legislation passed here. You know, how will we take care of this problem?"

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Cowlishaw."

Cowlishaw: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. It is certainly the intention - and if you read the actual language of this Amendment - it is certainly the intention that this kind of study should be conducted and the report submitted very, very quickly. In fact, the Resolution says to conduct a study on school-based crime and report the findings and recommendations as expeditiously as possible. So that perhaps the Regional Superintendent for Cook County, who is, in fact, not going to be in that office any longer,

161st Legislative Day

June 25, 1992

might feel that undertaking this kind of study and making some recommendations to us about how we can really be helpful in solving this problem, might be a wonderful concluding element in his career as a regional superintendent."

- Davis: "Are you saying... Excuse me, Representative, are you saying that they will complete this study before 1994? I mean, '95? When will the study be done?"
- Cowlishaw: "Well, I anticipated it would be done within about an eight to ten month period so that we could have it at the beginning of the Spring Session next year, so that if we...or if there is any suggestion for any legislation it will have time to work its way through the process in the regular way."

Davis: "Thank you."

- Speaker Giglio: "Further discussion. The question is, 'Shall House Resolution 1748 be adopted?' All those in favor signify by saying 'aye'; opposed, 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The Resolution is adopted. House Joint Resolution 91, Representative Currie. Mr. Clerk, read the Resolution."
- Clerk McLennand: "House Joint Resolution 91 urges Congress to reduce defense expenditures. Human Services recommends 'do adopt'."
- Speaker Giglio: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Barbara Currie."
- Currie: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. This is a Resolution that recommends to Congress some substantial cuts in defense expenditures. The cold war is over and there is no question all parties, all individuals who are involved with defense spending agree that we don't need to spend nearly as much as we have been

161st Legislative Day

June 25, 1992

spending on this enterprise. This Resolution is supported by the United States Conferences of Mayors, by various state and local organizations concerned about overall tax issues. There's no question we're paying a very pretty penny in taxes for a military establishment. Just to allay your concerns, there's no question, of course, that we need still defense programs, and this Resolution in no way would undercut our ability to make sure that we do have an adequate defense establishment. The question is, Do we need today a Cadillac-style defense establishment ever growing, eating up more and more of our tax dollars, or do we need less? With the United States Conference of Mayors and many other groups, I would urge your support for this Resolution."

Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman from Will, Representative Wennlund."

Wennlund: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Giglio: "Indicates she will."

- Wennlund: "Representative Currie, I just have one short, simple question: Has the United States Congress ever listened to any of these Resolutions this General Assembly has passed?"
- Currie: "Well, Representative, I don't know, but a few minutes ago we passed, with a fairly overwhelming vote, a Resolution recommending that the Congress not take a particular action. You voted for that Resolution, and I'd encourage you to vote for this one, too."
- Wennlund: "Oh, I intend to vote for it. I just want to know in your memory, in your long experience in this House, has Congress ever listened to any of the Resolutions we've ever passed?"
- Currie: "Maybe they'd be doing a lot better off with their voters if they did."

161st Legislative Day

June 25, 1992

Wennlund: "I certainly agree with that. Thank you."

- Speaker Giglio: "All in favor of the Resolution signify by saying 'aye'; opposed, 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the Resolution is adopted. Agreed Resolutions."
- McLennand: "House Resolution Clerk 2194. offered by Representative Schakowsky; House Resolution 2233, offered by Representative Trotter; House Resolution 2235, offered by Representative Harris: House Resolution 2236, offered by Representative DeJaegher; House Resolution 2237, offered by Representative DeJaegher; House Resolution 2238, offered by Representative DeJaegher; House Resolution 2239, offered by Representative DeJaegher; House Resolution 2240, offered by Representative DeJaegher; House Resolution 2241, offered by Representative Weaver; House Resolution 2242, offered Representative Harris; House Resolution 2244, offered by Representative Parke; House Resolution 2244, offered Representative Parke; House Resolution 2245, offered by Representative Weaver: House Resolution 2246. offered Representative Parke; House Resolution 2247, offered by Representative Cowlishaw; House Joint Resolution 155. offered by Representative Preston."
- Speaker Giglio: "Representative Giorgi moves for the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye'; opposed, 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The Resolutions are adopted. Death Resolutions."
- Clerk McLennand: "House Resolution 2243, offered by Representative McGuire, with respect to the memory of Bill McGowan."
- Speaker Giglio: "Representative Giorgi moves the adoption of the Death Resolution. All those in favor say 'aye'; opposed,

161st Legislative Day

- June 25, 1992
- 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the Death Resolution is adopted. Representative Giorgi."
- Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, I'd just like the membership to note that former Representative and Congressman Gale Schisler is on the floor near Mark O'Brien. He's a prominent member of the House in the days of the civil rights era and in the days where buying ranches in New Mexico."
- Speaker Giglio: "Welcome back. Representative McPike now moves that the House stand adjourned until 11:00 a.m., 11:00 a.m. tomorrow morning. All those in favor... Representative Dunn?"
- Dunn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If I could have the attention of the Members of the Downstate Caucus: There will be a meeting of the Downstate Caucus at our regular meeting place, Room Ll, 10:00 a.m. tomorrow. Downstate Caucus, 10:00 a.m. tomorrow, Room Ll."
- Speaker Giglio: "House stands adjourned until 11:00 tomorrow morning."

REPORT: TIFLDAY PAGE: 001

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

13:55:23 DEX

92/10/08

JUNE 25, 1992

	MATTER.	0.455	1/1
HB-0180		PAGE PAGE	141 87
	SECOND READING OUT OF RECORD	PAGE	95
SB-0318		PAGE	62
	CONFERENCE	PAGE	63
	THIRD READING	PAGE	5
	THIRD READING	PAGE	36
	RECALLED	PAGE	125
	THIRD READING	PAGE	127
	THIRD READING	PAGE	14
SB-1519		PAGE	63
	SECOND READING	PAGE	34
	THIRD READING	PAGE	35
	THIRD READING	PAGE	56
	OUT OF RECORD	PAGE	36
	SECOND READING	PAGE	106
	THIRD READING	PAGE	111
SB-1606	THIRD READING	PAGE	6
	SECOND READING	PAGE	98
	THIRD READING	PAGE	101
	THIRD READING	PAGE	49
SB-1641		PAGE	61
	THIRD READING	PAGE	11
SB-1657	THIRD READING	PAGE	40
SB-1662	RECALLED	PAGE	59
	THIRD READING	PAGE	61
SB-1692	SECOND READING	PAGE	19
SB-1692	THIRD READING	PAGE	19
	THIRD READING	PAGE	111
S3-1692	OUT OF RECORD	PAGE	21
SB-1700	MOTION	PAGE	98
SB-1722	THIRD READING	PAGE	2
SB-1736	THIRD READING	PAGE	4 L
SB-1740	HOTION	PAGE	115
SB-1749	THIRD READING	PAGE	8
	THIRD READING	PAGE	9
	THIRD READING	PAGE	41
SB-1796	THIRD READING	PAGE	124
SB-1806		PAGE	61
	THIRD READING	PAGE	42
	THIRD READING	PAGE	73
SB-1892		PAGE	98
	SECOND READING	PAGE	38
	THIRD READING	PAGE	43
	SECOND READING	PAGE	137
	THIRD READING	PAGE	140
SB-1912		PAGE	61
	SECOND READING	PAGE	21
	RECALLED	PAGE	115 50
	THIRD READING	PAGE PAGE	55
	POSTPONED CONSIDERATION SECOND READING	PAGE	37
		PAGE	42
SB-1941	THIRD READING	PAGE	61
	SECOND READING	PAGE	16
	SECOND READING	PAGE	75
	RECALLED	PAGE	114
	THIRD READING	PAGE	96
	THIRD READING	PAGE	115
SB-1986		PAGE	112
	OUT OF RECORD	PAGE	18
	THIRD READING	PAGE	12
	THIRD READING	PAGE	105
JU 2037	THIRD READING	PAGE	102
SR-2074			

REPORT: TIFLDAY PAGE: 002

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

STATE OF ILLINOIS

92/10/08

13:55:23

JUNE 25, 1992

SB-2088 MOTION	PAGE	61	
SB-2101 MOTION	PAGE	115	
SB-2104 MOTION	PAGE	61	
SB-2131 RECALLED	PAGE	47	
SB-2131 THIRD READING	PAGE	43	
SB-2131 THIRD READING	PAGE	48	
SB-2134 THIRD READING	PAGE	4	
SB-2163 THIRD READING	PAGE	10	
SB-2177 MOTION	PAGE	63	
SB-2190 MOTION	PAGE	61	
HR-1747 ADOPTED	PAGE	145	
HR-1747 RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	144	
HR-1748 RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	145	
HR-2234 MOTION	PAGE	117	
HR-2234 ADOPTED	PAGE	122	
HR-2234 RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	117	
HJR-0091 RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	147	
HJR-0108 ADOPTED	PAGE	144	
HJR-0108 RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	142	
HJR-0156 ADOPTED	PAGE	124	
HJR-0156 RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	123	
SUBJECT MATTER			
HOUSE TO ORDER - REPRESENTATIVE KEANE	PAGE	1	
PRAYER - REVEREND DYMANN JIROVEC	PAGE	1	
PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE	PAGE	1	
ROLL CALL FOR ATTENDANCE	PAGE	1	
REPRESENTATIVE GIGLIO IN CHAIR	PAGE	61	
REPRESENTATIVE MCPIKE IN CHAIR	PAGE	82	
REPRESENTATIVE ANTHONY YOUNG IN CHAIR	PAGE	131	
REPRESENTATIVE GIGLIO IN CHAIR	PAGE	134	
AGREED RESOLUTIONS	PAGE	149	
DEATH RESOLUTIONS	PAGE	149	
ADJOURNMENT	PAGE	150	