130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

PRESIDENT ROCK:

The hour of nine-thirty having arrived, the Senate will please come to order. Will the Members be at their desks, and will our guests in the gallery please rise. Our prayer this morning by the Reverend Michael Fitch, Prairie Avenue Christian Church, Decatur, Illinois. Reverend.

THE REVEREND MICHAEL FITCH:

(Prayer by the Reverend Michael Fitch)

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Thank you, Reverend. Reading of the Journal. Senator Hall. SENATOR HALL:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. I move that reading and approval of the Journals on Monday, June 22nd; Tuesday, June 23rd; Wednesday, June 24th; Thursday, June 25th; Friday, June 26th; Saturday, June 27th; Sunday, June 28th; and Monday, June 29th, in the year 1992, be postponed, pending arrival of the printed Journals.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

You've heard the motion as placed by Senator Hall. Is there any discussion? If not, all in favor, indicate by saying Aye. All opposed. The Ayes have it. The motion carries, and it is so ordered. Messages from the House.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

A Message from the House by Mr. O'Brien, Clerk.

Mr. President ~ I am directed to inform the Senate that the House of Representatives has adopted the following joint resolution, in the adoption of which I am instructed to ask the concurrence of the Senate, to wit:

House Joint Resolution 157.

Adopted by the House, June 29, 1992. It is congratulatory. PRESIDENT ROCK:

Consent Calendar. Resolutions, Madam Secretary.

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Resolution 1476 offered by Senator Topinka.

And Senate Resolution 1477 offered by Senator Mahar. They're both congratulatory.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Consent Calendar. All right. Ladies and Gentlemen, we are awaiting the arrival of the Supplemental Calendar, which will contain a number of conference committee reports and, of course, copies of the reports that have already been filed. In the meantime, we will deal with the Executive Committee Report on Gubernatorial and other constitutional officer appointments, and then move to the Order of Resolutions. And I would ask those who have resolutions on the Calendar to be aware that this may be the last time we get back to these - at least we hope. Committee Reports, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senator Kelly, Chairman of the Committee on Executive Appointments and Administration, to which was referred the Governor's Messages of April 1, 1992; May 7, 1992; and June 2, 1992; and the Comptroller's Messages of April 29, 1992, and June 17, 1992, reported the same back with the recommendation that the Senate advise and consent to the following appointments.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Kelly.

SENATOR KELLY:

Thank you, Mr. President. I move the Senate resolve itself into Executive Session for purpose of acting on the Governor's appointments set forth in his Messages of April 1, May 7, June 2nd, 1992, and the Comptroller's Messages of April 29 and June 17, 1992. Mr. President, with respect to the Governor's Message of April 1, 1992, I will read the unsalaried appointments to which the Senate Committee on Executive Appointments and Veterans'

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

Affairs recommend that the Senate do advise and consent:

To be members of the Health Facilities Planning Board for terms ending June 30, 1992 and succeeding terms ending June 30, 1995: Marjorie Albrecht of Princeton, William Marshall of Plainfield, Robert Schrayer of Highland Park, Bernard Weiner of Kankakee.

And to be Members of the Health Facilities Planning Board for a term ending June 30, 1993: Ernest Jenkins of Chicago, Philip Kennedy of Elk Grove Village, Pam Taylor of Danville, Joyce Washington of Chicago and Richard Wright of Metamora.

To be Members of the Health Facilities Planning Board for a term ending June 30, 1994: Pat Chamness of Anna, Harry Kurshenbaum of Chicago and Irene Stone of Lombard.

Mr. President, having read the unsalaried appointments, I now seek leave to consider these appointments on one roll call, unless some Senator has an objection to these appointments. And Mr. President, will you put the question as required by our rules?

PRESIDENT ROCK:

All right. The Gentleman asks leave to go to the -- have us resolve ourselves into Executive Session. Further seeks leave to consider these nominees on one roll call. Without objection, leave is granted. Any discussion? Is there any discussion? If not, the question is, does the Senate advise and consent to the nominations just made. Those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed will vote Nay. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 58 voting Aye, 1 voting Nay, none voting Present. A majority of the Senators elected concurring by record vote, the Senate does advise and consent to the nominations just made. Senator Kelly.

SENATOR KELLY:

Thank you, Mr. President. With respect to the Governor's

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

Message of May 7th, 1992, I will read the salaried appointments to which the Senate Committee on Executive Appointments and Veterans' Affairs recommends that the Senate do advise and consent:

To be a member of the Court of Claims for a term ending January 19, 1998: Robert Frederick of Champaign.

To be members of the Prisoner Review Board for terms ending January 20, 1997: William Harris of Marion, Barbara Hubbard of Collinsville and Rafael Nieves of Chicago.

To be the Small Business Utility Advocate for a term ending February 5, 1996: Vincent Gilbert of Chicago.

Mr. President, having read the salaried appointments, I now seek leave to consider these appointments on one roll call, unless some Senator has an objection to these appointments. And Mr. President, will you put the question as required by our rules? PRESIDENT ROCK:

The Gentleman seeks leave to consider those nominees on one roll call. Without objection, leave is granted. Is there any discussion? If not, the question is, does the Senate advise and consent to the nominations just made. Those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, vote Nay. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 59 Ayes, no Nays, none voting Present. A majority of the Senators elected concurring by record vote, the Senate does advise and consent to the nominations just made. Senator Kelly.

SENATOR KELLY:

Thank you, Mr. President. With respect to the Governor's Message of May 7th, 1992, I will read the unsalaried appointments to which the Senate Committee on Executive Appointments and Veterans' Affairs recommend that the Senate do advise and consent:

To be a member of the Illinois Community College Board for a term ending June 30, 1995: Miriam Lugo-Gonzalez of Chicago.

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

To be members of the Illinois Community College Board for terms ending June 30, 1997: Gwendolyn Laroche of Chicago, Judith Madonia of Springfield, Delores Ray of East St. Louis and John Schultz of Effingham.

To be a member of the Board of Higher Education for a term ending January 31, 1995: Ramon Martinez, Jr. of Evanston.

To be a member of the Board of Higher Education for a term ending January 31, 1997: Jerry Blakemore of Chicago.

To be members of the Kaskaskia Regional Port District Board for terms ending June 30, 1994: Edwin Cockrell of New Athens, George Donner of Mascoutah, Robert Keller of Waterloo, Elmer Prange of Waterloo, Normal Rieso of Freeburg and Clyde Trexler of Columbia.

To be members of the Medical Licensing Board for terms ending January 8, 1996: Dr. Gene <sic> (Dean) Bordeaux of Peoria, Dr. Joan Cummings of Glen Ellyn and Dr. Arvind Goyal of Itasca.

To be the Public Administrator and Public Guardian of Bureau County for a term ending December 6, 1993: Robert Shultz of Walnette -- Walnut.

To be the Public Administrator and Public Guardian of Kane County for a term ending December 6, 1993: Barbara Carlson of Elburn.

To be members of the State Soil and Water Conservation Advisory Board for terms ending January 16, 1995: Roger Dunham of New Salem, Kenneth Kesler of Dewey and Eldora Zimmerman of Durand.

Mr. President, having read the unsalaried appointments, I now seek leave to consider these appointments on one roll call, unless some Senator has an objection to these appointments. And Mr. President, will you put the question as required by our rules? PRESIDENT ROCK:

Gentleman seeks leave to consider these nominees on one roll call. Without objection, leave is granted. Is there any

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

discussion on these nominees? If not, the question is, does the Senate advise and consent to the nominations just made. Those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, vote Nay. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 59 Ayes, no Nays, none voting Present. A majority of the Senators elected concurring by record vote, the Senate does advise and consent to the nominations just made. Senator Kelly.

SENATOR KELLY:

Thank you, Mr. President. With respect to the Governor's Message of June 2nd, 1992, I will read the salaried appointment to which the Senate Committee on Executive Appointments and Veterans' Affairs recommend that the Senate do advise and consent:

To be a member of the Illinois International Port District Board for a term ending June 1, 1995: Anthony DeAngelis of Flossmoor.

Mr. President, having read the salaried appointment, I now seek leave to consider this appointment on one roll call. PRESIDENT ROCK:

Gentleman seeks leave to consider this nominee on one roll call. Without objection, leave is granted. Any discussion on this nominee? If not, the question is, does the Senate advise and consent to the nomination just made. Those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, vote Nay. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 58 Ayes, no Nays, 1 voting Present. A majority of the Senators elected concurring by record vote, the Senate does advise and consent to the nominations just made. I'm glad somebody is gainfully employed, Aldo. Senator Kelly.

SENATOR KELLY:

Thank you, Mr. President. With respect to the Governor's

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

Message of June 2nd, 1992, I will read the unsalaried appointments to which the Senate Committee on Executive Appointments and Veterans' Affairs recommend that the Senate do advise and consent:

To be members of the Illinois State Medical Disciplinary Board for terms ending January 11th, 1996: Kathryn Rosypal of Chicago and P. S. B. Sarma of Wilmette.

Mr. President, having read these few unsalaried appointments, I now seek leave to consider these appointments on one roll call, unless some Senator has an objection.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

All right. The Gentleman seeks leave to consider these nominees on one roll call. Without objection, leave is granted. Is there any discussion? If not, the question is, does the Senate advise and consent to the nominations just made. Those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, vote Nay. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 59 Ayes, no Nays, none voting Present. A majority of the Senators elected concurring by record vote, the Senate does advise and consent to the nominations just made. Senator Kelly.

SENATOR KELLY:

Thank you, Mr. President. With respect to the Comptroller's Message of April 29, 1992, I will read the unsalaried appointments to which the Senate Committee on Executive Appointments and Veterans' Affairs recommends that the Senate do advise and consent:

To be a member of the State Mandates Board of Review for a term ending June 30, 1993: Sharon U. Thompson of Dixon and William Stafford of Evanston.

Mr. President, having read the unsalaried appointments, I now seek leave to consider these appointments on one roll call. PRESIDENT ROCK:

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

The Gentleman seeks leave to consider these nominees on one roll call. Without objection, leave is granted. Is there any discussion on these nominees? If not, the question is, does the Senate advise and consent to the nominations just made. Those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, vote Nay. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? All voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 59 Ayes, no Nays, none voting Present. A majority of the Senators elected concurring by record vote, the Senate does advise and consent to the nominations just made. Senator Kelly.

SENATOR KELLY:

Thank you, Mr. President. With respect to the Comptroller's Message of June 17, 1992, I will read the unsalaried appointments to which the Senate Committee on Executive Appointments and Veterans' Affairs recommend that the Senate do advise and consent:

To be a member of the Comptroller's Merit Commission for a term ending January 19, 1998: Kitty Kidd Robinson of Chicago.

And to be a member of the Comptroller's Merit Commission for a term ending January 14, 1994: Marylou Lowder Kent of Springfield.

Mr. President, having read the unsalaried appointment, I now seek leave to consider these appointments on roll call -- one roll call, unless some Senator has an objection.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

All right. The Gentleman seeks leave to consider these nominees on one roll call. Without objection, leave is granted. Are there any questions -- discussion with respect to these nominees? If not, the question is, does the Senate advise and consent to the nominations just made. Those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, vote Nay. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 59 Ayes, no Nays,

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

none voting Present. A majority of the Senators elected concurring by record vote, the Senate does advise and consent to the nominations just made. Senator Kelly.

SENATOR KELLY:

Mr. President, I move that the Senate arise from Executive Session.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

You've heard the Gentleman's motion. All in favor, indicate by saying Aye. All opposed. The Ayes have it. And the Senate does now arise. All right. Ladies and Gentlemen, if I can turn your attention to page 17. Senator Raica in the hall? Page on the Order of Secretary's Desk, Resolutions. We will go through the Order of Secretary's Desk, Resolutions, perhaps - I hope - for the last time. ... (machine cutoff)...we will move to the Order of Secretary's Desk, Concurrence and Non-concurrence, again, I hope, for the last time, and then move to the Order of Conference Committee Reports. Top of page 18. Page 18 on the Calendar. Senator DeAngelis awake? Senator -- no, okay. 558. 652. Senator del Valle. 995. Senator Ralph Dunn. Vadalabene. 998, with leave, we'll get back to. 1144. Senator Marovitz. Senator Topinka. All right. Senator Woodyard. 1335. Ladies and Gentlemen, we're on the Order of Secretary's Resolutions, page 18 on the Calendar. Page 18. Senate Resolution 1335, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Resolution 1335.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Topinka.

SENATOR TOPINKA:

Yes. Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, Senate Resolution 1335 would create a Task Force on Fireworks to study the quality, manufacture, transportation, storage, sale and

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

all other things that you see on the Calendar. It does exactly what it says. And this would fall to the appointment of the State Fire Marshal. It basically would bring together all potential players that involve the fire service and the manufacture of fireworks, to see if we can come up with some recommendations on all of the items that have been put forward here, because it is a somewhat interesting and controversial subject. Currently, certain fireworks are banned in Illinois, but yet they continue to be sold outside of Illinois and then come into the State. Sales taxes are involved. It may be a way making -- making money for us. It also involves safety. ultimately we'd like to turn this over to the experts to see what they have to say about it, and that is the nature of this resolution.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Any discussion? Is there any discussion? If not, the question is the adoption of Senate Resolution 1335. Those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, vote Nay. And the voting's open. All voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? All voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 55 Ayes, 3 Nays, none voting Present. Senate Resolution 1335, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator del Valle, you want to go back to 652? Madam Secretary, the top of page 18, on the Order of Secretary's Desk, Resolutions, is Senate Resolution 652, please.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Resolution 652.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator del Valle.

SENATOR dEL VALLE:

Thank you, Mr. President. This resolution urges the Illinois Attorney General and the State's Attorney to investigate and

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

prosecute fraudulent immigration practices. I ask for support.
PRESIDENT ROCK:

Discussion? Any discussion? If not, the question is, shall Senate Resolution 652 be adopted. Senator Hawkinson. I'm sorry. SENATOR HAWKINSON:

Thank you, Mr. President. Question of the sponsor. PRESIDENT ROCK:

Indicates he'll yield, Senator Hawkinson.

SENATOR HAWKINSON:

Senator, Downstate, anyway, the State's Attorneys' offices are not equipped to conduct investigations. The investigations are done by the sheriff's office and by the police departments. I don't have any trouble with prosecution of crimes that are uncovered, but I am troubled a bit by imposing any -- some new duty of investigation on them when that's not their role. You want to explain what you're asking them to do?

Senator del Valle.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

SENATOR dEL VALLE:

Senator Hawkinson, the resolution urges the Attorney General and the State's Attorney. What that means is that wherever possible, we would like for them to aggressively pursue the individuals that are committing fraud under the Immigration Act. And so there isn't a requirement here. It just simply urges them to aggressively investigate.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

All right. Senator del Valle has moved the adoption of Senate Resolution 652. Those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, vote Nay. And the voting's open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 55 Ayes, no Nays, none voting Present. Senate Resolution 652, having received the required

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

constitutional majority, is declared passed. 1361. Senator Severns. 1454. Senator Dudycz. Madam Secretary, please.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Resolution 1454.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Dudycz.

SENATOR DUDYCZ:

Thank you, Mr. President. Senate Resolution 1454 expresses the Senate's disappointment at the widespread promotion and distribution of the audio recording by the rap artist, Ice-T. The recording "Cop Killer" clearly encourages violence against law enforcement officers.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Discussion? Any discussion? If not, the question is, shall Senate Resolution 1454 be adopted. Those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, vote Nay. And the voting's open. All voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? All voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 55 Ayes, no Nays, none voting -- 1 voting Present. Senate Resolution 1454, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator Topinka, on 1459. Madam Secretary, please.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Resolution 1459.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Topinka.

SENATOR TOPINKA:

Yes. Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, this basically extends the deadline to November 1st, 1992 from June 30th, 1992 for the Health Facilities Planning Board and Department of Public Health to make their report, which ties into Senate Resolution 571. Basically, we've passed that. All they ask for is an extension, but in order to achieve that, we had to pass the

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

resolution all over again. So that's all that this does. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Is there discussion? Senator Topinka has moved the adoption of Senate Resolution 1459. All in favor will indicate by saying Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it. Resolution is adopted. With leave of the Body, we'll return to Senate Resolution 998, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Resolution 998.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Rock.

SENATOR ROCK:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. Senate Resolution 998 is not at all controversial, and it urges the United Kingdom and the Republic of Ireland to continue negotiations to bring peace to all of Ireland. I know of no objection, and I would solicit your approval.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Is there discussion? If not, Senator Rock has moved the adoption of Senate Resolution 998. All in favor will indicate by saying Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it. The resolution is adopted. Bottom of page 18. Senate Resolution 1475. Senator Topinka. Madam Secretary, please.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Resolution 1475.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Topinka.

SENATOR TOPINKA:

Yes. Senate Resolution, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, would create a Task Force on School Physical Exams. This directs attention to the -- the bills that we've had this year that we need to more fully explore and document, regarding

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

the possibility of mandatory dental exams and mandatory tuberculosis exams. And I would appreciate a favorable vote so we can explore it and document it further.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Is there discussion? Senator Topinka has moved the adoption of Senate Resolution 1475. Indicates that there might be some money involved. We'll take a roll call. All in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, the Ayes are 53, the Nays are 3, none voting Present. Senate Resolution 1475 is adopted. Page 19 at the top. House Joint Resolution 48. Senator Etheredge. House Joint Resolution 127. Senator Palmer. Senate Joint Resolution 141, please.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Joint Resolution 141.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Rock.

SENATOR ROCK:

Thank you, Mr. President. Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, Senate Joint Resolution 141 is in response to a trend that I think has alarmed and should concern all of us with respect amount of money that is appropriated for - or the authority for spending for - the public university systems in this State. We have found - and I think those of you who've read the Chicago Tribune in the last few weeks have read about - an alarming trend, where the money for instructional costs - the percentage of and the available funds that's spent instructional costs - appears to be going down, while the amount of money for administrative costs appears to be going up. The papers focused essentially on the differential apparent

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

differential - between the amount of money allocated for research as opposed to instruction. This resolution concerns itself more with administration costs versus instructional costs. And what it does essentially is encourage -- by virtue of Senate action, encourages each public university, community college and governing board to correct that trend - the trend that has given rise to higher administrative costs, while underfunding instruction. And we further strongly encourage each public university to distribute personal service dollars in a manner which decreases proportion of the budget devoted to administration. further resolve that the salary increases be distributed faculty and civil service staff in a manner which moves toward the goal of equity within appropriate comparison groups, and that we are asking, through the Board of Higher Education, that each one of our public universities, community colleges and governing board report to the General Assembly regarding this resolution by I'm sure most of you received, as did I, the lengthy letter from Mr. Quern, as the Chairman of the Board of Higher Education. This is a matter they are currently considering, and all this does is encourage each of the universities to consider this, and let us know by October where they think they are or how they think they're doing. I think this is a worthwhile exercise. I think it's a -- it will be, in the coming years, a matter of much sharper focus, but I think the sooner we can get this kind of information and make an effort to reverse this trend, I think the better served we -- we would all And so I encourage an Aye vote on Senate Joint Resolution be. 141.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Discussion? Senator Holmberg.

SENATOR HOLMBERG:

Thank you, Mr. President. I rise in strong support of this

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

resolution. As Chairman of Higher Education Committee for the last year and a half, I have tried to not miss an opportunity to transmit this message to the chancellors and the presidents of our public universities, to tell them that this is the issue of the next decade, that the public is looking to them to increase the amount of dollars they spend on direct instruction. One of the ways they can do this — as the articles we've been reading have so clearly pointed out — is to not increase the percentage of money they spend on administration faster than they are increasing the percentage of money they spend on instruction. It is the thing that will be — bring strength to our universities. It's right on target, and I ask all of you to support this.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Further discussion? Senator Donahue. SENATOR DONAHUE:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. I, too, rise in strong support of this resolution, and feel that our universities need to work towards getting more dollars into the instructional fields. I'm very happy to report that I represent Western Illinois University, which has one of the highest percentages of instructional dollars in the system, or in this State, of all our universities. Sixty-two percent of their dollars go into instruction. I think it's an excellent idea, and I support the resolution.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? Senator Palmer.

SENATOR PALMER:

Thank you, Mr. President. I, too, rise in support of this bill. It is one that we should have had a long time ago. We have lost our direction in some ways. If we are serious about the oft-repeated statement that young people are our future, then this is one of the ways we can show that to be true.

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? Senator Barkhausen.

SENATOR BARKHAUSEN:

Mr. President, I have a statement -- or a comment, and maybe a question of the sponsor. I believe that your resolution is -- is certainly well-taken, but as I've read some of the recent reports that the resolution seems to be in response to, it seems that -- the bigger problem - although certainly a more complicated and perhaps controversial question - is whether the amount of money from the federal level on down to -- to the State level, but perhaps most of the money coming from the feds, is focusing research activities of our universities, and that instruction, in the process, is getting somewhat shorter shrift. So -question to you, having made that comment, is -- is whether the resolution or -- I -- I don't understand whether a task force being created here or this is simply a statement on our part, but -- but whether we ought not to be at least looking into question of whether an arguable overemphasis on research is also part of the reason that the level of instruction in our universities perhaps isn't what we'd like it to be.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Rock.

SENATOR ROCK:

Thank you. Senator Barkhausen, that concern is well-taken, but this Senate joint resolution does not directly confront that. I alluded to that apparent disparity also in my opening remarks. I think that's for a second or subsequent study. We are not setting up a task force. What we are doing is literally affording the governing boards and the public universities and community colleges kind of a red flag that the General Assembly - the Senate, in particular - is aware of this trend, and we would like their response by October 1st. I think they too are aware of this

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

trend. But I think the first level that we ought to confront is the disparity between rising administrative costs and less costs attributable to instruction. And then when you get into the instructional area, it's a question of research versus classroom teaching. And I — I thoroughly agree. I — I am a little disturbed about the disparity, lack of parity, between classroom instruction and research, but I think we first are better advised to take a look at administration versus instruction, and that's what this purports to do.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? Senator Weaver.

SENATOR WEAVER:

Thank you, Mr. President. I certainly stand in support of this resolution, but I would like to point out also that there are certain universities that are land grant universities -- that one of their missions is research - that being the University of Illinois, and many others throughout the country. Part of the -part of the fault, and one which I have been concerned with many years, is the equity in pay for those nonacademics working for higher education Statewide, compared with that which we're paying State employees Statewide. There's been a discrepancy of between twenty to twenty-five percent in many cases. So part of ours here in the General Assembly in the fault is appropriating sufficient funds for equity. We're going to continue to work on that. We're going to continue to look at overhead costs and many other administrative costs in -- in public higher education. I think it's a good resolution and should be supported by all of us.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? Senator Welch.

SENATOR WELCH:

Thank you, Mr. President. Senator Rock, I wanted to ask you a

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

question, if I could.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Indicates he will yield. Senator Welch.

SENATOR WELCH:

Senator Rock, a few years back we had a task force on the governing boards. Lieutenant Governor Kustra just had another task force that came up with a diametrically opposed opinion. Is your resolution -- since it talks about higher administrative costs, are you contemplating going back into that issue as to governing boards at all?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Rock.

SENATOR ROCK:

I think again, as Senator Holmberg so aptly pointed out, I think that's an issue that we're going to have to confront in the future. I unfortunately - or fortunately - will be watching from the sidelines through heavy lenses. I will not be directly involved, but I think this is a -- this is simply a recognition of what I think is -- ought to be a very disturbing trend: that we annually appropriate, as we will this year, additional monies for levels of spending authority in the higher systems, and the fact is the administrative costs are rising much more dramatically than are the instructional costs. And it seems to me that ratio probably can be and should be reversed.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? Senator Schaffer.

SENATOR SCHAFFER:

I think it -- obviously we're all going to support this amendment, because it's as close to apple pie and motherhood as we're likely to see today. But I think it should be pointed out that some of those trends in additional spending in management probably are mandated directly or indirectly by this Body and the

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

Body across the hall. I think particularly of many of the probably worthwhile programs for very minorities and underprivileged citizens that we have established our universities that I'm sure fall on the management end So don't be too surprised if somewhere down the road the universities, in responding to this resolution, step on a few our toes. I think, however, even having said that, it's still I do think, however, the point that worth doing. Barkhausen made is probably more in line with the concept trying to get more money into education. I think higher education has traditionally rewarded research and publication - not good teaching. And until such time as we can convince the higher ed community that good teaching is every bit as important as good research and publication on nebulous subjects, then this problem will perpetuate itself. I would be much more enthusiastic about this resolution if, in fact, we had addressed the research component, and I still understand, as Senator Weaver said, that higher ed has a research role. Unfortunately, the reward system for an educator in higher ed is much more likely to direct them into research and publication than in becoming an -- a even better instructor. And that is the one fundamental change that we, if we could make, would have the greatest impact on the children of this State.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? Senator del Valle.

SENATOR dEL VALLE:

Well, thank you, Mr. President. I would just like to briefly address Senator Schaffer's comments. I don't think that the rising costs in administration are due to minority programs or other programs that are for the purpose of providing direct services to the students. It's not the minority students that are taking advantage of all the perks that have been created over the

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

years for the presidents of the systems and -- and their offices. If we look at the overall expenditures of those offices, they have grown tremendously. And so I rise in full support of this resolution, but I do agree that the next step should be to take a look at the research costs and how they have increased, and the need to transfer some of those funds over into the area of instruction, where they're needed the most.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? If not, Senator Rock may close.

SENATOR ROCK:

I would seek an affirmative vote. I think the subject matter causing this much discussion at 10:30 on a -- the last day of Session obviously deserves our concern, and I would hope everybody would vote accordingly.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Rock has moved the adoption of Senate Joint Resolution 141. All in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, the Ayes are 59, the Nays are none, none voting Present. Senate Joint Resolution 141 is adopted. Senate Joint Resolution 159. Senator Palmer. Madam Secretary, please.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Joint Resolution 159. No committee amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Palmer. I beg your pardon. There is an amendment that's been filed.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Amendment No. 1 offered by Senators Donahue and Dudycz.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

I'm sorry. Senators who? All right. Senator Donahue. Senator Donahue.

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

SENATOR DONAHUE:

Thank you. I don't have the resolution in front of me, Senator Palmer, so I apologize, but this is an agreed-to amendment between the sponsor and myself and Senator Dudycz. And it just simply deletes some of the language that refers to the jury system, and I would move for its adoption.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Is there discussion? If not, Senator Donahue has moved the adoption of Amendment No. 1. Those in favor, indicate by saying Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it. Amendment No. 1 is adopted. Further amendments?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Amendment No. 2 offered by Senator Palmer.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Palmer.

SENATOR PALMER:

Mr. President, this is not the amendment; this is the -- the actual resolution. Oh. I'm sorry.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Apparently you...

SENATOR PALMER:

Okay. All right. This is the resolution itself. This was agreed upon with the addition of the amendment that Senator Donahue added, and it says, in essence, that we feel that further action is necessary to restore the faith of the people in our law enforcement officials and our American justice system, following the Rodney King case decision. I would ask that we support this resolution. What it asks is that we urge the Attorney General and Department of Justice — the U.S. Attorney General and Department of Justice — to pursue an investigation to determine whether any further action should be taken against the four police officers. I ask for support.

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Senator Palmer has moved the adoption of Amendment No. 2. All in favor, indicate by saying Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it. Amendment No. 2 is adopted. Now, further amendments?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

No further amendments.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Palmer, on the resolution. Senator Palmer, on the resolution.

SENATOR PALMER:

I'm sorry, I'm sorry, Mr. President. I didn't hear you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

We just adopted Amendment No. 2.

SENATOR PALMER:

Okay.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

There are no further amendments. Do you wish to speak on the amendment? I mean -- do you wish to speak...

SENATOR PALMER:

I would just ask for...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Okay.

SENATOR PALMER:

Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Palmer has moved the adoption of Senate Joint Resolution 159. All in -- all in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, the Ayes are 55, the Nays are 1, none voting Present. Senate Joint Resolution 159 is adopted. Senate Joint

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

Resolution 170, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Resolution <sic> (Joint Resolution) 170.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

Yes. Thank you, Mr. President. This creates the Illinois License Plates Task Force with the -- within the Office of the Secretary of State. As you know, we've had several pieces of legislation on the Floor this year dealing with the expansion of -- of license plates. And what we're trying to do here is enable the General Assembly, along with the Secretary of State and others, to enter into some sort of an agreement, hopefully, on the future of license plating in this State. I'd be glad to answer any questions. Otherwise, appreciate your support.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Discussion? If not, Senator Watson has moved the adoption of Senate Joint -- Senator Brookins.

SENATOR BROOKINS:

Thank you. Will the sponsor yield for a question?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Indicates he will yield. Senator Brookins.

SENATOR BROOKINS:

How do this different from the task force and committee that we put together and the recommendations that we gave to the Secretary of State during the Session?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

Well, Senator, that -- of course, that task force is ongoing within the Transportation Committee. This is an attempt to expand on that, and also with the fact that a new plate could -- is being

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

discussed now - possibility of a new Illinois plate. That's what -- something that this task force would be -- would be doing. The Transportation task force did primarily concerns that dealt with additional of special plates and the proliferation of the -- of plates. This is also certainly a part of the agenda of this commission, but it will be more expanded.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Brookins.

SENATOR BROOKINS:

In the past, the Secretary of State opposed all efforts of this type. Will he -- is he in favor of them now, to your knowledge?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

I don't know that the Secretary of State opposed all those. I believe the Secretary of State left it up to the General Assembly, as far as their -- their opinion and how we would handle it. I don't believe the Secretary of State really took an active part in the license plates -- the specialized plate. Maybe on a few issues, but certainly not to the extent that he opposed everything.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Brookins.

SENATOR BROOKINS:

The question is, is he in favor of this legislation or this resolution?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

Yes, he is.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

Further discussion? Senator Hawkinson.

SENATOR HAWKINSON:

Thank you, Mr. President. Will the sponsor yield?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Indicates he will yield. Senator Hawkinson.

SENATOR HAWKINSON:

Senator, I apologize for getting up on this one, as opposed to some of the past ones, which I've also opposed. But how much is this going to cost? And what expense -- there's going to be expenses; that's why we take roll calls. Who's going to do the staffing for this?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

The appointments will be made by the various leaders, by the Secretary of State. There'll be public members. I mean, I think this is an issue that we've dealt with time and time again, Session after Session, dealing with specialized plates. What we're trying to do is get some sort of coherent and -- a decision to be made on it.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Hawkinson.

SENATOR HAWKINSON:

You didn't answer my question. What's it going to cost?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

Minimal. I have no idea.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator -- further discussion? Senator Leverenz.

SENATOR LEVERENZ:

The sponsor yield?

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Indicates he will yield. Senator Leverenz.

SENATOR LEVERENZ:

Senator, could you help us? If you're expanding the -- the focus by this resolution, will they also be making a recommendation of whether to eliminate or not to eliminate the words "Land of Lincoln," as we heard this past week? One proposal said to remove "Land of Lincoln" from the license plate.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

I surely wouldn't suggest that, and I wouldn't recommend it, but I'm certain that the commission can take that matter up -- or the task force.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Leverenz.

SENATOR LEVERENZ:

Maybe one of the things they could look at then would be "Land of Deficits."

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

I don't think that was a question. Further discussion? Senator Topinka.

SENATOR TOPINKA:

Yes. Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, I stand in support of this, and I think it really does the job in terms of expanding the concept of this whole idea of license plates, where they go, what they do, who gets them, why we have them. I think the last time I looked, there was something like this was about two years ago there were about a hundred and seventy-six State license plates floating around. And it does cause a problem for the police, yet we continue to have groups that are interested in expanding on the numbers. The cost of

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

license plates, what their purpose is, how long we can keep them. It's an issue that constantly keeps coming up. The best way to handle this is under the resolution form. The Secretary of State is a proponent, does feel that the cost can be absorbed, you know, by his office and current staff. I think it's something that's long overdue, and let's see what we can come up with in terms of recommendations for the Legislature that once and for all provides a logical methodology for how to handle license plates.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Further discussion? If not, Senator Watson may

SENATOR WATSON:

Well, I would just echo what the previous speaker has said. I thought that was excellent closing, and I'll ask for your support. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Question is on the adoption of Senate Joint Resolution 170. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, the Ayes are 47, the Nays are 7, none voting Present. Senate Joint Resolution 170 is adopted. Senate Joint Resolution 179. Senator Berman. Senate Joint Resolution 180. Senator Severns. Mr. Secretary, please.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. HARRY)

Senate Joint Resolution 180 offered by Senators Severns, Topinka and Palmer.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

WAND has requested permission to videotape. Is leave granted? Leave is granted. Senator Severns.

SENATOR SEVERNS:

Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. Senate Joint Resolution 180 is the resolution that requests that State

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

Government review current rules, regulations and field audits with the intention of reducing duplicative or unnecessary administrative activities and paperwork. This same kind of proposal was offered in the State of New Jersey and credited - rightly or wrongly - with reducing paperwork by twenty percent. I know of no opposition, and would urge favorable consideration of this resolution.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Is there discussion? If not, Senator Severns has moved the adoption of Senate Joint Resolution 180. Those in favor will indicate by saying Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it. Senate Joint Resolution 180 is adopted. The <u>Tribune</u> has requested permission to take still pictures. Is that it? They can't afford motion pictures, I guess. Leave is granted. Senate Joint Resolution 181. Senator Dart. Mr. Secretary, please.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. HARRY)

Senate Joint Resolution 181 offered by Senators Dart and Philip.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Dart.

SENATOR DART:

Thank you, Mr. President and Members of the Senate. This is a joint resolution that's been cosponsored by both myself and Senator Philip. Senate Joint Resolution 181 would rename the Centennial Building after the late Michael J. Howlett. It would also rename the State of Illinois Building after former Governor, James Thompson. I was going to speak as far as to the Centennial Building. This would be a fitting tribute to name the Centennial Building after Michael Howlett, a person who was Secretary of State for one term, but also has the distinction of being the first Democrat to be elected to four consecutive terms in the State office. He is a man whose reputation is that of being one

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

of the best that public officials -- that we have ever seen. Hе was not only an outstanding public official, though. He was also an outstanding friend and family man. When I initially started off trying to get this resolution passed, I talked to numerous and I found that whether they were Democrats Republicans, he was held in the highest regard. This was a bipartisan move that I talked to Secretary of State George Ryan, talked to the Speaker, the President of the Senate and also Senator Philip in regards to it. I also personally had the privilege of knowing Mike Howlett on a personal level. to be a very kind, sincere man who held family and friends above all. I find -- I feel that this renaming of the Centennial Building would be a fitting tribute to a man who did so much for the State, and I would ask for its adoption. Senator Philip was going to speak as to the renaming of the State of Illinois Building. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Further discussion? Senator Philip. SENATOR PHILIP:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. I couldn't agree more with Senator Dart. Mike Howlett has been a friend of mine for a long, long time. He's been a great American, a great public official, and it's certainly befitting to name a building after Mike Howlett. Let me also say this - that this resolution also names the new State of Illinois after James Robert Thompson. As you know, he's the longest-serving Governor in the history of the State of Illinois. He's the longest-serving Governor - continual-serving Governor - in the United States. There's only one Governor has served longer, and that was Governor Rhoades from Ohio, but he got beat and came back and ended up with, I think, eighteen years. But as you know, Jim Thompson will go down as one of our great Governors, and I think it's --

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

certainly we ought to pass both of these resolutions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? Senator Vadalabene.

SENATOR VADALABENE:

Yes. Would the sponsor yield to a question?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Pardon me, Senator -- Senator Smith. Senator Smith. Could we ask your -- guest please. Senator Dart. Indicates he will yield. Senator Vadalabene.

SENATOR VADALABENE:

Yes. Senator Dart, have you included everyone on that resolution?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Dart.

SENATOR DART:

I'd be happy to include everybody on the resolution.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Vadalabene.

SENATOR VADALABENE:

Yeah. I think -- I think it would be fitting and proper if you would suggest on your resolution that we all be included on that resolution.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Dart.

SENATOR DART:

I would move to amend and add everyone as joint sponsors of this, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Well, there seems to be -- let me just say this. Those of you that wish to come down and indicate to the Secretary to be a co-sponsor, Senator Dart has indicated that they would, in fact, be added. So we'll leave it at that. Further discussion?

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

Senator Lechowicz.

SENATOR LECHOWICZ:

Mr. President, I move that -- ask leave of the Body to include everybody as a co-sponsor on this resolution.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Well, there -- is -- is leave granted? There is -- there are some objections, and so the Chair had indicated, and suggested, that those wishing to be a co-sponsor may come down and indicate to the Secretary, and they will be added. Senator Lechowicz.

SENATOR LECHOWICZ:

I move that all Members be co-sponsors on Senate Joint Resolution 181. Like to request a roll call.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Well, there -- there is -- there's objection. There's objection to adding Members as a co-sponsor, and so the Chair has indicated what the remedy is in. Further discussion? Senator Dart may close.

SENATOR DART:

I would just move for the adoption.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Senator Dart has moved the adoption of Senate Joint Resolution 181. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, the Ayes are 50, the Nays are 5, none voting Present. Senate does adopt Senate Joint Resolution 181. Page 19, Secretary's Desk, Concurrence, Senate Bill 221. Senator Kelly. Mr. Secretary, Senate Bill 221.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. HARRY)

House Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill 221.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Kelly.

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

SENATOR KELLY:

Thank you, Mr. President and Members of the Senate. I would move to non-concur in House Amendment No. 1, and request that a conference committee be created. This is a -- regarding coterminous townships. We would like to place it into conference and then have some agreed proposals included that would meet with no objection.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Senator Kelly has moved to non-concur with House Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 221. All in favor, indicate by saying Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it. The motion passes, and the Secretary shall so inform the House. Senate Bill 689. Senator Jones. Page 20. 911. Senator Mahar. Madam Secretary, Senate Bill 911.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

House Amendment No. 3 to Senate Bill 911.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Mahar.

SENATOR MAHAR:

Thank you, Mr. President. I would move to non-concur with the House amendment on Senate Bill 911.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Mahar moves to non-concur with House Amendment No. 3 to Senate Bill 911. Those in favor, indicate by saying Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it. Motion carries. Secretary shall so inform the House. Senate Bill 1519. Senator Luft. 1635. Senator Macdonald. Senate Bill 1667. Senator Leverenz. Senate Bill 911. Senator Madigan. I'm sorry. 912 <sic> (1912). All right. Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

House Amendments 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 912 <sic> (1912).

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

Senator Madigan. 1912. Senate Bill 1912. Senator Madigan. SENATOR MADIGAN:

Thank you, Mr. President and Members of the Senate. Senate Bill 1912 left the Senate with the agreement that the agreed language would be worked on over in the other Chamber. There were two amendments added by the House. There is a portion yet to be completed, as far as an agreement between all parties. It is my understanding that that language will be incorporated in a conference committee report that we'll see later today. Since the -- President Rock had indicated earlier that this may be the last time - or hopefully this will be the last time - we're on this Order of Business, at this point in time I would move that we would concur with Amendments 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 1912.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Is there discussion? If not, the question is, shall the Senate concur with House Amendments 1 and 3 to Senate Bill -pardon -- 1 and 2 - 1 and 2? - to Senate Bill 1912. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed will vote Nay. voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who Take the record. wish? Have all voted who wish? question, the Ayes are 58, the Nays are none, none voting Present. The Senate does concur with House Amendments 1 and 2 to Senate Bill 1912. And the bill, having received the constitutional majority, is declared passed. Is there leave to have Senator Di Turi on Senate Bill 1939? Leave is granted. Madam Secretary, Senate Bill 1939.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

House Amendment No. 2 to Senate Bill 1939.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Di Turi.

SENATOR DI TURI:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate.

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

I would like to non-concur on House -- Senate Bill 1939.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Di Turi moves that the Senate non-concur with House Amendment No. 2 to Senate Bill 1939. Those in favor will indicate by saying Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it. Motion carries, and the Secretary shall so inform the House. Senate Bill 1986. Senator Welch. Before we leave this Order of Business, Senator Leverenz has asked to return to Senate Bill 1667. Is leave granted? Leave is granted. Page 20, in the middle of the page, is Senate Bill 1667, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

House Amendments 1 and 3 to Senate Bill 1667.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

KWQC of Davenport, Iowa, has requested -- nothing. We don't know. Senator Leverenz.

SENATOR LEVERENZ:

Thank you, Mr. President. I would move that we would non-concur in Senate <sic> Amendments 1 and 3 so we can get to a conference committee.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Senator Leverenz has moved that the Senate refuse to -- I'm sorry, non-concur with House Amendments 1 and 3 to Senate Bill 1667. All in favor, indicate by saying Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it. Motion carries, and the Secretary shall so inform the House. All right. Page 20. Secretary's Desk, Non-concurrence. House Bill 2166. Senator Etheredge. Madam Secretary, House Bill 2166.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 2166.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Etheredge.

SENATOR ETHEREDGE:

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. I will be moving to recede from Senate Amendment No. 1. So this will be final action, Mr. President. The -- House Bill 2166, as it stands as amended, consists of two parts. The first part is noncontroversial. It is a recodification of the Statutes as they affect the Illinois Student Assistance Commission. The second part is an amendment that was put on in -- in the House, and attempts to resolve a problem that exists down in Senator Rea's district. There is an elementary school down in Southern Illinois that has been condemned because it is quite literally falling into a -- an abandoned coal mine, and the authorities seek to solve the problem by selling life safety bonds in order to construct a new school building. The impact of the -- of receding from Senate Amendment No. 1 is to permit them to -- to do this. I'll be happy to respond to any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Discussion? Senator Keats.

SENATOR KEATS:

How large -- a question of the sponsor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Indicates he will yield. Senator Keats.

SENATOR KEATS:

How large is this school district that we will allow them to put in life safety bonds to fix the school? I mean, do they not have options nearby, other schools, other districts they could work with? Are we simply shoring up a ultrasmall district with no tax base?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Etheredge.

SENATOR ETHEREDGE:

I will yield to Senator Rea. I think he is in a better position to respond to those questions than I am.

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Rea.

SENATOR REA:

They -- they are at their limit, and they're in a situation where the school has been condemned because of the mine subsidence, as the Senator pointed out earlier - a very critical condition. They are at their maximum in terms of bonding, and this would give them the opportunity, which they requested themselves, to increase the district indebtedness through the issuance of life safety bonds. And it also adds the requirement, I believe, of a referendum for -- in our amendment, referendum for nonlife safety bonds as -- which was discussed in committee. So they are at their maximum, and this is the reason that they would have to come up.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? Senator Cullerton -- or Keats. Senator Keats.

SENATOR KEATS:

As explained to me is -- this amendment takes out the call for the referendum so that there would not be any referendum? They can do this without a referendum?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Rea. All right. Senator Etheredge. Etheredge.

SENATOR ETHEREDGE:

Senator, the Senate amendment required the referendum. The point is, here, what the amendment - the House amendment - does is to raise the debt ceiling for this district. Okay. The House amendment raises the debt ceiling. If the -- if they were not already at the debt ceiling, there would be no need for them to come to the General Assembly to ask permission to use life safety bonds to correct the problem which they now face.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

Senator Keats.

SENATOR KEATS:

I won't ask any more questions. The reason they're at their debt limit - the reason we impose debt limits - is so they might someday be able to pay it off. So here's a group who obviously is beyond their ability to pay their debts. We are now taking out the referendum and allowing, without a referendum, themselves to get themselves more hopelessly into debt, with no ability to pay it off, without referendum. This is a unique rip-off of those local taxpayers. We ought to at least let them vote on us allowing them to sink so deeply into debt that they will never be able to flounder out again.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Further discussion? Senator Cullerton.

SENATOR CULLERTON:

Yes. The sponsor would yield?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Sponsor indicates he will yield. Senator Cullerton.

SENATOR CULLERTON:

Senator Etheredge, if you could just -- I'm getting a little confused as to which amendment we're talking about. This is a House bill. The House passed a bill with an amendment on it that affected Senator Rea's district, apparently. There was also a substantive bill, or was it a shell bill? And let me further question you by saying, apparently we put a Senate amendment on, and that's what you want to take off, and I don't know what the affect of that Senate amendment is. How did it affect the House amendment that was put on?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Etheredge.

SENATOR ETHEREDGE:

There is -- the -- this was a substantive bill, but it was

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

noncontroversial. It impacted the recodification of some of the -- the law as it affects the Illinois Student Assistance Commission. But as I say, that's not controversial. It -- that -- but the -- what I am doing here is to -- receding from the Senate amendment, which have -- would have required a frontdoor referendum in order to sell the life safety bonds. But the House amendment will, obviously -- I mean, that's the thing that we're addressing here in this discussion.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Cullerton.

SENATOR CULLERTON:

Okay. So when you -- when the bill came over, you didn't object to Senator Rea's amendment, but you did require a frontdoor referendum. And then the House refused to accept our amendment, and somehow you became convinced that it wasn't necessary. Could you tell us what it was that convinced you that we don't need the frontdoor referendum?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Etheredge.

SENATOR ETHEREDGE:

Well, since I have learned more of the details regarding the situation of the school district, and I think their -- their original request was fair, and I support it; and therefore I am moving to recede from the Senate amendment.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? Senator Rea.

SENATOR REA:

Thank you, Mr. President. Just in response also to Senator Cullerton's question, the -- this will expedite the -- as to how fast the community will be able to move in a very bad situation there, and I think this is one of the -- this is the reason the district is requesting that we take the action that we do now, so

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

that they will be able to speed up the process. I would ask for an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? Senator Etheredge, do you wish to close? Senator Etheredge.

SENATOR ETHEREDGE:

Well, I -- I think there has been sufficient discussion of this issue. I would simply ask for a favorable roll call, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO

All right. This is receding. This is final action. The question is, shall the Senate recede from the adoption of Senate Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 2166. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, the Ayes are 37, the Nays are 14, none voting Present. The Senate does recede from Senate Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 2166. And the bill, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. WICS, WAND, WCAI <sic> (WCIA) have all requested permission to videotape. Is leave granted? Leave is granted. House Bill 2750, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 2750.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Madigan.

SENATOR MADIGAN:

Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. I would move that the Senate refuse to recede from Senate Amendment No. 1, and request a conference committee.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Madigan has moved that the Senate refuse to recede from the adoption of Senate Amendment No. 1 to Senate Bill --

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

House Bill 2750, and that a conference committee be appointed. All in favor, indicate by saying Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it. The motion carries, and the Secretary shall so inform the House. House Bill 3139, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Amendment No. 2 to House Bill 3139.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Cullerton.

SENATOR CULLERTON:

Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. some discussion on this measure, and my motion would be to recede from Senate Amendment No. 2 on House Bill 3139. This would therefore be final passage. And what the bill would do would be two things. First of all, it has a noncontroversial - I believe noncontroversial - provision that says that a person -- actually just changes one word. It provides that a person may be found guilty of aggravated driving under the influence if the person's driving under the influences was "a" proximate cause of a serious motor vehicle accident, instead of "the" proximate cause. second thing it does is to restore, but not add - restore - judges that would otherwise be lost in two districts. County, where there would be a loss of five associate judges based on the federal census, and the other is in the Peoria area, where there would be a loss of -- in the 10th Circuit of one associate judge. I would be happy to answer any questions, and ask for a favorable vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Is there discussion? Senator Keats.

SENATOR KEATS:

Thank you, Mr. President. As you may remember, we in the Senate had held this bill up in the past because we felt that this would be an unfair change in the way the judges were apportioned.

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

We met in Senator Brookins' Office. Senator del Valle, Senator Cullerton and myself have worked it out; and while I don't think we're a hundred percent happy, I think this is as reasonable a solution as we're going to reach. The judges will, for all intents and purposes, end up in the -- out in the subcircuits. You know? Sometimes you just do the best you can, and I think this bill, in its present form, is about the best we're going to work out, and I would solicit your support.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? Senator Cullerton may close. Senator Brookins. I'm sorry. I did not see your light. Senator Brookins. SENATOR BROOKINS:

Thank you, Mr. President. I, too, rise in support of this bill. We have worked with Senator Cullerton with it, and it is not to all of our liking, but it will do what we want it to do. And it will not be any jeopardy to the program that we have put together with judges. And therefore, I support this amendment.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? Senator Cullerton may now close. SENATOR CULLERTON:

Just ask for a favorable vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. The question is -- this is final action. The question is, shall the Senate recede from the adoption of Senate Amendment No. 2 to House Bill 3139. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, the Ayes are 58, the Nays are none. The Senate does recede from Senate Amendment No. 2 to House Bill 3139, and the bill, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. 3188. Senator Jones. 3261. Senator Macdonald. Madam Secretary, 3261, House Bill.

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Amendments 1, 2, 3 and 4 to House Bill 3261.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Macdonald.

SENATOR MACDONALD:

Thank you, Mr. President. I refuse to recede from Senate Amendments 1, 2, 3 and 4, and request that a conference committee be appointed.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Macdonald has moved that the Senate refuse to recede from the adoption of Senates Amendment <sic> 1, 2, 3 and 4 to House Bill 3261, and that a conference committee be appointed. Those in favor will indicate by saying Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it. Motion carries, and the Secretary shall so inform the House. House Bill 3707, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Amendments 2 and 3 to House Bill 3707.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Schuneman.

SENATOR SCHUNEMAN:

Thank you, Mr. President. I move that the Senate refuse to recede from Senate Amendments No. 2 and 3, and request the appointment of a conference committee.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Schuneman has — has moved that the Senate refuse to recede from the adoption of Senate Amendments 2 and 3 to House Bill 3707, and that a committee of conference be appointed. All in favor, indicate by saying Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it. Motion carries, and the Secretary shall so inform the House. With leave of the Body, we'll skip back to House Bill 3188. Senator Jones indicates he wishes to have that called. House Bill 3188, Madam Secretary.

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 3188.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Jones.

SENATOR JONES:

Thank you, Mr. President. I move the Senate refuse to recede from Amendment No. 1, and request a conference committee.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Jones has moved that the Senate refuse to recede from the adoption of Senate Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 3188, and a conference committee be appointed. All in favor, indicate by saying Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it. Motion carries. Secretary shall so inform the House. All right. House Bill 3986. Senator Dart. We're loading the machine here with some additional information, so we'll stand at leave for a second. Senator Di Turi, for what purpose do you rise? I'm sorry. We -- we have everything shut down while we load the machine. The -- I can speak, but the Members cannot, so I'll come right back to you. Ladies and Gentlemen, Senator Di Turi, now, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR DI TURI:

Point of personal privilege, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. State your point.

SENATOR DI TURI:

I would like to introduce very -- two very good friends of mine, Kim O'Neil and John Brost from Chicago.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Our guests will please rise. Welcome to Springfield. Nice to have you here. Page 21, Conference Committee Reports, is House Bill 104, the Conference Committee. Senator Rea. We are on page 21. House -- the Conference Committee Report with respect to

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

House Bill 104, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

First Conference Committee Report on House Bill 104.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Rea.

SENATOR REA:

Thank you, Mr. President. As a result of a review of the Conference Committee Report, I find that there is a Section in there that apparently is obsolete because of the last Session, and it was a carryover. So as a result, I would move to non-concur with -- and request a Second Conference Committee Report.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Is there discussion? Oh, I'm sorry. Senator Rea -- Senator Rea, would you repeat your motion, sir?

SENATOR REA:

We move to reject the Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 741 <sic>, and request a Second Conference Committee Report. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Well, the motion will be placed in the affirmative, with the idea that if it doesn't get 30 votes, the sponsor indicates he'd like to go to a second conference committee. So we keep that in mind. The question is, shall the Senate adopt the Conference Committee Report on House Bill 104. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, the Ayes are 9, the Nays are 20, 2 voting Present. The Conference Committee Report is not adopted, and the Secretary shall so inform the House. Page 22. Page 22 is the Conference Committee Report on House Bill 1352. Senator Welch. Madam Secretary, please.

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

END OF TAPE

TAPE 2

SECRETARY HAWKER:

...(machine cutoff)...Conference Committee Report on House Bill 1352.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Welch.

SENATOR WELCH:

Thank you, Mr. President. What this conference committee will do is create the Kankakee River Dam Transfer Act. It authorizes the Department of Transportation to accept the donation of the Kankakee River Dam and connected facilities. It also authorize — authorizes cities to collect utility taxes from businesses that are in enterprise zones, and increases from five hundred thousand to six hundred thousand the population at which a county is required to form a Fair and Exposition Authority. I'd be glad to answer any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Is there discussion? If not, the question is, shall the Senate adopt the First Conference — the Second Conference Committee Report on House Bill 1352. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, the Ayes are 49, the Nays are 1, none voting Present. The Senate does adopt the Second Conference Committee Report on House Bill 1352, and the bill, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator Keats, I did not see your light on. All right. 741. Senate Bill 741. Senator Rea. Madam Secretary, 741.

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

SECRETARY HAWKER:

First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 741.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Rea.

SENATOR REA:

Thank you, Mr. President. Senate Bill 741 alters the general State aid payment schedule to provide double payments for the Downstate schools in June, and a double payment in August to Chicago, which ends up with the same number of payments during the year of twelve for both Downstate and for Chicago. I would move for adoption of the Conference Committee Report.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. WSSU-FM has requested permission to tape. Is leave granted? Leave is granted. Is there discussion? Senator Maitland.

SENATOR MAITLAND:

Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. Senator Rea,

I -- I just started listening late. Does this have the borrowing
in it as well?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Rea.

SENATOR REA:

Yes. This -- it does. It requires the State to borrow the June double payments. That is correct.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Maitland.

SENATOR MAITLAND:

Just perhaps for clarity, is this the same -- is this in the same form now as Senator Joyce's bill was?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Rea.

SENATOR REA:

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

Senator, it's in the same form as House Bill 2296. Yes.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Maitland.

SENATOR MATTLAND.

I -- you know, the arguments have been made for and against this -- this measure. I think we are sending the wrong signal. We're not being honest with school districts. It's great for press releases, but it simply doesn't mean any more money for school districts, plus it creates for us a very difficult hole, as we begin the process of building next year's budget. And -- and don't forget that we're going to be back here having to deal with this issue, should the Governor sign this, next year, and I would urge rejection.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Berman. Discussion? Senator Berman.

SENATOR BERMAN:

Thank you, Mr. President. I rise in support of this bill. I think it is a responsible approach to action that we in the General Assembly have taken. We - the General Assembly and the Governor - have shifted money away in the June payments, away from these school districts. If we're going to shift the money away and expect them to be able to meet the same obligations that they've previously had - we haven't relieved them of any obligations - I think it's our job to go out, borrow the money and give it to them. And on top of it, it is a more fiscally responsible approach. The State can borrow money at a lot lesser cost than most of these school districts. I urge an Aye vote on this amendment.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? Senator Fawell.

SENATOR FAWELL:

Thank you very much. You know, I've -- I've got all kinds of

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

papers here. I don't find this amendment on my -- on my sheaf of papers here. Has this amendment been distributed or conference committee been distributed at all? I -- I can't find it, if it has been.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Fawell, it's been -- Secretary has indicated to me that it's been distributed previously. Senator Rea.

SENATOR FAWELL:

Wait a minute. Wait a minute.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Fawell.

SENATOR FAWELL:

Is there -- are there five that would like to join me and get a copy of this, because I think we're talking millions of dollars. I don't know how in the world we're going to get this, and at least I'd like to know what the heck the bill says.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Rea.

SENATOR REA:

Senator, I have had a copy of this Conference Committee Report on my desk for some time. I don't know exactly the date that it was distributed, but certainly I've had a copy of it.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Fawell, let me point out that the Secretary indicates to me that they were, in fact, distributed some time back. We do not redistribute Conference Committee Reports. We let those lay on the Member's desk until that Member decides that they're going to call their specific report, but they have, in fact, been distributed. Senator Fawell. Senator Fawell.

SENATOR FAWELL:

I've now got the -- at least the analysis, which is more than I had before. We are requiring the State to borrow the amount

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

necessary to make a double State payment in June. In June, for Downstate school districts, for Fiscal Year '92? We are requiring the State now to do it on June 30th? We are requiring the -- what -- are you planning on doing this this afternoon?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Rea. Senator Rea.

SENATOR REA:

And that applies to next year also, Senator.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Fawell.

SENATOR FAWELL:

What this analysis says is -- it says it's -- we're borrowing it for June of Fiscal Year '92 - that's today. The borrowing must be repaid by August 1st in '92 and in '93 respectively. You know, how are you planning on doing this? This is June 30th. This is fiscal year -- as of midnight, we are through. How are you planning on -- on borrowing it and then repaying it by August 1st? We haven't even borrowed it yet.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Rea. Senator Rea.

SENATOR REA:

Well, we are certainly running behind on doing it right now, but if -- we will return then to the double State aid payments, both in June for Downstate, and in August for Chicago. We will get it back on course and -- and we should have already taken action on this here earlier.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Fawell.

SENATOR FAWELL:

Well, to the bill: I mean, you know -- this is a nutty bill. I'm sorry, but I -- this is June 30th. We are saying, by this bill, we are going to borrow the money today and repay it back

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

August 1st, and we can't do it. I mean, you are requiring something that is impossible to do. I just think this is a -- a bad precedent, when we start passing laws on June 30th for fiscal year -- June -- for a fiscal year. We can't do this. We are setting ourselves up for lawsuits. This is crazy. We ought to reject this bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Is there further discussion? Senator Jacobs.

SENATOR JACOBS:

Thank you, Mr. President. I stand in strong support of this legislation. I -- you know, I get a kick out of it, I guess. We can do anything we want to around here as long as there's 30 votes on a bill. So it doesn't make any difference when the time comes. The one question I do have - not a question, comment I would like to make though is just to reiterate the same thing that we've been saying for quite some time: that we're already borrowing the money, but we're borrowing it from people who are not in the business of loaning money. School boards are not in the business of loaning money. So let's put it in its proper perspective, give them the extra payment, so the school boards don't have to go out and borrow themselves so they can loan it to the State. So I think it's a good bill, and we ought to support it.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? Senator Joyce.

SENATOR JOYCE:

I rise also in support of this one more time. I know you're probably thinking, how many times do we send this to the Governor? Possibly if we send it often enough, he will realize how serious it is that we recognize the schools as needing our help. Please vote Ave.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? If not, Senator Rea may close.

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

SENATOR REA:

Well, I think, as pointed out by Senator Berman, that this —the State can borrow much cheaper than what the school districts. This is — would be an added burden if we did not pass this. They need to know in terms of their planning. They're finishing up their fiscal year. Without this, it leaves them in a bind. I would simply ask for an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Question is, shall the Senate adopt the First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 741. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, the Ayes are 39, the Nays are 19, none voting Present. The Senate does adopt the First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 741, and the bill, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. All right. With leave of the Body, we'll now go to the Order of House Bills 3rd Reading. House Bills 3rd Reading is House Bill 4037. Page 12. All right. With leave of the Body, we will go to the Order of House Bills 3rd Reading. Page 12, is House Bill 4037, Madam Secretary. Read the bill.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

House Bill 4037.

(Secretary reads title of bill)

3rd Reading of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Karpiel.

SENATOR KARPIEL:

Thank you, Mr. President. House Bill 4037 is, among other things, the implementation of the Federal Clean Air Act Permit Program. It does put in place the Federal Clean Air Act Program by initiating permit fees of thirteen dollars and fifty cents per

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

ton of emissions, with a hundred-thousand-dollar cap and a one-thousand-dollar minimum. It also calls for streamlining for rulemaking. So it establishes a fast-track rulemaking procedure for the Clean Air Act regulations. That's because the Federal Act does say that they have to be done in a -- in a short period of It also puts in place the Pollution Prevention Program. It makes it a State policy to prevent pollution, rather than address it after the fact. It establishes a Pollution Prevention Advisory Council and it creates two bans. It restricts the use of toxic components in packaging materials, and it prohibits landfill disposal of liquid used oil. It also calls for hazardous waste cleanup fees. The backup of the cleanup sites that are awaiting on the list in Illinois is about a hundred and five and growing. There's been no money in this fund since 1990. This would give it a fund of eight million dollars. The initial increase would be an increase in the hazardous waste fee from nine to twelve cents a gallon, with a phase-in of one cent a year till 1996, culminating a fifteen-cent total fee. It also increases tipping fees from sixty to seven <sic> cents per cubic yard. And I do want to that as far as the Clean Air Act portion of this bill, it does not include anything to do with the employer trip reduction - the ETRs. That part was left until fall. It's still negotiated, so that is not a part of this bill at all, and I ask for your Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Is there discussion? Discussion? If not, the question is, shall — the question is, shall House Bill 4037 pass. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, the Ayes are 51, the Nays are 5, 1 voting Present. Senate Bill 4037, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

passed. All right. The Supplemental Calendar has been passed out. Supplemental Calendar No. 1. Supplemental Calendar No. 1. Leave of the Body, we will go to that Order of Business. Is leave granted? Leave is granted. On the Order of Supplemental Calendar No. 1 is Senate -- Motions in Writing. Senate Bill 487 <sic> (484). Madam Secretary, please.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

I move to waive Senate Rule 5C with regard to Senate Bill 484, so that the Conference Committee Report may be considered this Session.

Filed by Senator Severns.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senate Bill 487 <sic>, the motion. Senator Severns.

SENATOR SEVERNS:

Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. I move that we waive...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

484. 484, Madam Secretary.

SENATOR SEVERNS:

...waive Senate Rule 5C with regard to Senate Bill 484, so that the Conference Committee Report may be considered this Session.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Is there discussion? If not, the question is, shall the -- Senator Hudson. Well...

SENATOR HUDSON:

A question of the sponsor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Sponsor indicates he will yield. Senator Hudson.

SENATOR HUDSON:

Yeah. Is this the -- what we know of as the Family Leave Bill revisited here? Is that what we're doing?

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator, are you posing that question to the maker of the motion?

SENATOR HUDSON:

Yeah.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Well, then, we will call on her. Senator Severns.

SENATOR SEVERNS:

The answer is Yes.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Hudson.

SENATOR HUDSON:

All right.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? All right. You've heard the motion as placed by Senator Severns. All in favor of the motion will vote Aye. Those opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, the Ayes are 40, the Nays are 11, none voting Present. The motion is adopted. Motion carries. Conference Committee Reports is House Bill 3594, Madam Secretary, please.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

First...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Wait. Senator Luft? You wish to have that called? All right. House Bill 3594, the Conference Committee Report, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

First Conference Committee Report on House Bill 3594.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Luft.

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

SENATOR LUFT:

Thank you, Mr. President. The Conference Committee Report on House Bill 3594 ran into problems in the House. There was a misunderstanding. So what I'm going to have to do is ask that this be defeated, and ask for a second conference committee.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Senator Luft, the -- the question is placed in the affirmative with the idea that you would like to have not enough votes to go to a second conference. Is there discussion? The question is, shall the Senate adopt the First Conference Committee Report on House Bill 3594. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, the Ayes are 8, the Nays are 28, 2 voting Present. The Conference Committee Report is not adopted, and the Secretary shall so inform the House. Senate Bill 484. Senator Severns. Madam Secretary, Senate Bill 484.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 484.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Severns.

SENATOR SEVERNS:

Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. As we all know, most progress comes as a result of genuine and productive compromise. Senate Bill 484 is such a product. Because the Family Leave Bill we've sent to the Governor's desk has been vetoed three times, it has been our challenge to fashion a bill that will permit an effective family leave policy on the books in Illinois, and I believe Senate Bill 484 offers such an opportunity. Senate Bill 484 allows eight weeks of unpaid leave for employees of employers of one hundred or more persons, instead of fifty, in the prior bill. That means instead of covering

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

sixty-five percent of the Illinois working families, of the Illinois working individuals, we cover fifty-three Instead of 2.8 million, it's 2.3. We've accepted the language that IRMA offered a few days ago to suggest that the top ten percent of salaried individuals be exempt from this in the event that their absence would cause undue hardship to the employer. We've provided - as offered in the compromise offered a week ago a tax credit. But the progress we've made in a week means that this tax credit will be delayed until calendar year 1994, specifically not take effect, or not have any impact, If our State is to promote the importance of families, let us realize the magnitude of that task. Ι Senate Bill 484 is a compromise that still permits the longtime supporters of family leave, and those who have even offered concerns for the last six years, an outcome that will benefit over 2.3 million individuals in our State. I'll welcome any questions, and would urge your favorable vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Is there discussion? Senator Jacobs.

SENATOR JACOBS:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. I would just like to say that -- first of all, that I think Senator Severns is to be congratulated to keep fighting on an issue that I think is very, very important, not only to this Body, but to the working men and women of this State. I do have a question, though, that -- that I'd like to ask, if the sponsor would so yield.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Indicates she will yield. Senator Jacobs.

SENATOR JACOBS:

Earlier this Session we had made an attempt for the Quad City area to -- to bring in five thousand jobs - federal jobs - and use

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

a tax credit, of which the other side of the aisle and the Governor came unglued upon. I guess my question to you would be whether or not the Governor has given any position on that tax credit on this bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Severns.

SENATOR SEVERNS:

Thank you, Mr. President. Senator Jacobs, the Governor has not personally given me any information on this. I was -- I was told specifically by the Illinois Manufacturers' Association that the concern voiced to them was that the credit was effective immediately. If that is correct, or if that understanding is correct, this bill addresses that by not having it effective until June 30th, 1994, and therefore having no fiscal impact until FY'95.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Jacobs.

SENATOR JACOBS:

Thank you, Mr. President. Just one final note, if I might. I still am not the happiest camper around in attempting to cut from the -- the employers who employ from a hundred -- from fifty people up to a hundred. That doesn't make me real happy, but I think that the Senator has done a lot of work to make this at least a -- a better bill, and to make it a little closer, and also I think that it's going to be the only show in town. And I definitely want to make sure that we get a bill on the Governor's desk, and will be voting Aye.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Further discussion? Senator Davidson.

SENATOR DAVIDSON:

Question of the sponsor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

Indicates she will yield. Senator Davidson.

SENATOR DAVIDSON:

Senator Severns, does this Conference Committee Report contain the amendment that was put on that Senator Jacobs sponsored two or three or four days ago about exempting the top ten percent or twenty percent of the retail personnel or something?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Severns.

SENATOR SEVERNS:

Thank you. Senator Davidson, it does contain the -- the one who hope -- who brought the amendment, I believe, to Senator Jacobs, was the Illinois Retail Manufacturers' Association, and it does contain the language that they want. Quite bluntly, it's not identical, but it's -- it's cleaned up and approved and supported by IRMA.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Davidson.

SENATOR DAVIDSON:

Could you tell me what page or what Section, so we could see what that language is, please?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Perhaps, Senator, while we're -- all right. Senator Severns. SENATOR SEVERNS:

Thank you, Mr. President. It's on page 7, beginning on line 9.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Davidson.

SENATOR DAVIDSON:

Thank you. Then the other question is -- I don't know whether this is the bill, but we had one bill somewhere where they could take this family leave on two hours a day or one hour or one day a week - not continuous. Is this eight weeks continuous, maximum,

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

or are they still able to take so many hours a day or one day a week or something like that?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Severns.

SENATOR SEVERNS:

Thank you. Intermittent leave is still permitted, Senator Davidson, and the intent clearly, as it's spelled out in the bill, is that it's for that parent, for example, who is taking care of that child on dialysis. There's also language in the bill that says it must be worked out with the employer so it does not cause undue interruption.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator -- further discussion? Senator Donahue.

SENATOR DONAHUE:

Well, thank you, Mr. President. I know this has been a long, hard fight, and I commend the sponsor for the work that she's done, but it puts us all in kind of a difficult situation. feel very strongly that when we rose and opposed this legislation - what - two weeks ago, three weeks ago, whenever it was here, that some of the facts or the information that we used then is -is as true today as it was back then. In my estimation -- I said then that this is what's wrong with government today, because if the IMA's facts were correct then, they indicated that ninety of the businesses of this State comply with this legislation, if not exceed this legislation. And in -- and to me, you're going to come down. This will be the minimum and not the maximum and not the minimum. And I think that's a shame. I still think that by increasing the employees from fifty to a hundred, that you've taken out a lot of the small businesses of this State. And I know that's a compromise, and I understand the sponsor. I also believe that it has not changed one iota the fact that it will be negative to the very women and the very people

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

you're trying to help that are in that age group. They won't be able to ask questions. They won't be able to do any of these things because of other rules and regulations we have, so they won't be hired; they won't be the ones that are going to be helped. And I think this is — it's on the track. It's leaving the House, and it's on its way, and that's fine. God bless it. But I intend to vote No.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Any further discussion? Senator Rea.

SENATOR REA:

Thank you, Mr. President. A question of the sponsor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Indicates she'll yield.

SENATOR REA:

Senator, in the negotiations, would you review for me again as to who all was involved in coming up with this proposal, and who supports it at this time?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Severns.

SENATOR SEVERNS:

Thank you, Mr. President. Senator Rea, since we last spoke, we've had more people in the -- in my office trying to meet and discuss this issue than our office could almost accommodate. Clearly, not only the President of the AFL-CIO and -- and members of AFSCME and nearly every -- not all, but most of the key -- certainly the key women's organizations, but also IMA, who of course offered the -- the proposal in the first place, and IRMA, among others who have floated in and out.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Any further discussion? Senator Rea.

SENATOR REA:

Senator, could you tell me if the, for instance, the Illinois

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

Lady Garments Workers' Union, if they were involved in any way at any point in time during these discussions?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Severns.

SENATOR SEVERNS:

Well, by the fact that the President of the AFL-CIO was there, I would -- I would certainly think that they were represented. We didn't have every individual union in the office, if that's the question.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Rea.

SENATOR REA:

Thank you, Mr. President. I have -- I certainly support family leave. I -- one of the things that disturbed me most about, I guess, where we're at right now, is that this is being looked at as a negotiated bill, and I'm not sure that all the players have been involved that heavily or do agree. And for instance, when I asked the guestion about the Illinois Lady Garment Workers' Union, know that they have been working on this for quite some time, and certainly have had a great interest in it and have been an advocate for family leave. I also -- concerned in terms of whether the minority community in this State and those working men and women of the minority groups -- if they have been involved, and to what extent. You know, and -- another area that I'm concerned about is the -- is the tax loophole in terms of the largest corporations, perhaps at the expense of the working people of this State. I guess, you know, I really urge real discussion and negotiation on this issue, because I would certainly like to see us have a real true family leave that can be enacted within the State of Illinois.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Any further discussion? The Lady from Lake, Senator Geo-Karis.

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

Would the Lady yield for a question, please?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Indicates she will.

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

Your other bill - that you did not call - did have Senator Jacobs' amendment about the upper ten percent of management not being affected. Is that correct? Is that still -- I want to make sure that's still in your bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Severns.

SENATOR SEVERNS:

It -- it is not identical, Senator Geo-Karis, but it was signed off on. We -- actually, it was a -- I think it was kind of a hurried-up amendment. We've cleaned it up. IRMA has signed off. IRMA, along with the IMA, are in full support of the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Geo-Karis.

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

Well, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, I have consistently voted against these bills in the past, because I didn't think they were very fair. I mean, if we don't have management satisfied, we're not going to have labor very much, because management can move. However, if this bill does have the amendment - basic amendment - that Senator Jacobs had on and the other amendment that went on, giving a tax credit to the businesses who have to have unemployment tax to pay, I think maybe this bill might be a better version than any that I have opposed in the past.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Lady from Winnebago, Senator Holmberg. Emil. Senator Holmberg.

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

SENATOR HOLMBERG:

Thank you, Mr. President. I think several of us have taken pride and ownership of the original Family Leave Bill first Dawn Clark Netsch, and now repeatedly introduced by Senator introduced by Senator Penny Severns. It, we believed, absolute model legislation for what we could do in a State for the Federal Government what they should be about. I think it's important to know that although some concessions have been made, that more people have been brought aboard and are satisfied that this is the way that industry and labor should move the future. Ι look at this bill as a cost-containment bill, because if you look at health statistics, the greatest costs that impact on health care come beginning of life and the end of life. Most of the Medicare and Medicaid money is spent in the last year of life. And whv Because so many of the caretakers are in the work force. With this bill allowing people unpaid family leave, business labor will be able to harness some of the health care costs that we are now facing and that are impacting in our assessment from last night, and are impacting on the budget we will hopefully It will affect some 2.3 million people. pass today. average family in Illinois contains four people, that work force 2.3 million, times four, brings us pretty close to the eleven million population that Illinois contains. I see this legislation having the potential, therefore, to influence at some time every Illinois citizen at least once in their lives. And let me remind you that we have traditionally had the precedent for doing this very thing - allowing leave, at times of emergency, to our military reserve units, without even flinching. If they need two training or they need six months overseas, weeks for absolutely automatic. And I think that the working community and the business community of Illinois are saying, "Yes, we've done

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

things like that before. It's time to do things like family leave today." I strongly support this legislation.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

The Gentleman from DuPage, Senator Hudson.

SENATOR HUDSON:

Thank you -- thank you, Mr. President. Would the sponsor...(mike malfunction)...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Hudson. Indicates the Lady will respond to a question. Senator Hudson, please. I believe your mike is not working, Senator Hudson. We'll just check it for a moment. Try it now. Try it now, Ray.

SENATOR HUDSON:

Thank you. Thank you very much.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Hudson.

SENATOR HUDSON:

Senator Severns, would -- may I ask: Is the entire -- the impression seems to be here that the entire business community has signed off on this. Is that true? Are there some organizations yet that are still opposed to this measure?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Severns.

SENATOR SEVERNS:

Thank you. Senator Hudson, I don't think the entire business community has ever supported a bill that I've offered, and certainly I'm certain it's the -- the case in this -- with this bill. I can tell you specifically, the Illinois Manufacturers' Association, who first brought forward a proposal of theirs, and the Illinois Retails Merchants' Association have signed on actively in support of this bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

Senator Hudson.

SENATOR HUDSON:

Are there some that are still opposed to it? Have you said yes to that? Some organizations - business organizations - that are...(mike malfunction)...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Severns.

SENATOR SEVERNS:

Yes.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Hudson.

SENATOR HUDSON:

Can you tell me which ones those are? The Illinois Business Association and so forth. Do you know?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Leverenz. Senator Severns.

SENATOR SEVERNS:

I don't know who the Illinois Business Association is. Are you talking -- are you talking about the Chamber? If you're talking about the Chamber, the Illinois Chamber of Commerce has not signed onto this measure, but I'm not certain who the Illinois Business Association is, Senator.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Hudson.

SENATOR HUDSON:

To the bill, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Please proceed, sir.

SENATOR HUDSON:

Senator Severns, first of all, I would -- I would like to commend you on the hard work that I believe you have done - and others believe you have done - in -- in tailoring this bill to --

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

to make adjustments and concessions and compromises that you felt were necessary. So I -- I commend you for that. I have in the past risen in opposition to this -- the family leave concept, did so not -- not so much -- not that I am opposed to people being given a chance to do the things that they would do under the provisions of your bill - that is, the concept of family leave but I have risen to speak against this on what I believed was a basic principle, and the principle being that it just seemed to me that once again we are having the State of Illinois - we are having government, in effect - step into the private sector and -and purport to do for the businessman or business people in the State of Illinois things that I have always believed that they are perfectly able to do - and indeed, in most cases, want to do - for themselves. So I have looked upon this as an intrusion and a kind of a usurpation of what I feel should be private responsibility and private business. And I still feel that that basically is what we are doing when we pass these kind of bills. But I do not rise in opposition to the concept of -- of giving working women a break when they -- when they need it in this respect. But I do -my -- my objection is that government steps in and presumes to "We will tell you when and we will tell you how to do these things." And I -- I just feel that - on that grounds - I still have to stand, with all due respect, in opposition to this particular bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Any further discussion? Senator Demuzio.

SENATOR DEMUZIO:

Well, thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. I'm sort of amazed by the debate I hear this morning. I mean, we have to find out who's for -- what special interests are for this bill and who's against it. I'll tell you who's for it - the voters of Illinois are for it. They have been for it for a

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

long time. And the reason that we are in the posture that we in this morning is because everyone is afraid that it's going to be the campaign issue, because it's a family value issue. Ιt They believe that we are polarized on this issue, truly is one. that we can't come to grips with solving the problems government anymore, that we have to be concerned about what this group is for it, and that group is against it. We have to go out and find out what these groups are doing so that -- it may have something, in fact, to do in our election. Ladies women are in the workplace. The public wants this Gentlemen, issue resolved. We helped to put them there. They don't believe that women ought to be punished because they have to take time out to help to rear their young children in days like today. After all, you know, we are in the 21st century. The fact of the matter is, what I regret is that this bill does not go far enough. As Senator Severns has indicated, it only takes care of fifty-three percent of the population. We ought to be making public policy in here that benefits every person in Illinois. We ought to not making public policy in this State that benefits a few to make victims of the many. The fact of the matter is, unfortunately for us, that we are in this posture this morning of practicing our art practicing our art of politics, which is compromise. That's where we are here today. And that's why I think the time really come to start this in the right direction. I don't believe it ought to be started in 1994 or 1995. It ought to be started tomorrow, at the beginning of the fiscal year. But again, this is all we can get. And so I rise in strong support of this, because the voters of Illinois believe that the time has come for this issue to pass. Let's guit talking about this issue and finally the public in Illinois, that we can finally do like, to something productive around here in the Illinois General Assembly. So, Mr. President, I rise in strong support of this bill today.

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Any further discussion? Senator Raica.

SENATOR RAICA:

I was simply going to ask Senator Demuzio, is he for or against the bill. Thank you, Mr. President...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

He indicates he's for the bill, yes.

SENATOR RAICA:

...Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. As you know, I was for this piece of legislation when Senator Netsch brought it over the only Republican who voted for it then - probably the only Republican that voted every time that the bill came up, whether it was Penny who put it up or Dawn who put the bill up. what's really ironic, though, is you sit here in the General Assembly and you listen to -- to the original battle that says, "Well, I'm voting for it because it's a union issue." And then you had the other side that says, "Well, I'm voting for it because either the Manufacturers or the other business groups are opposed to the bill." But then when it came time for labor and business to sit down and work things out, the Manufacturers stood up and says, "We're going to sit down and we're going to work So now you have people standing here saying, "Well, something's really got to be wrong now. Unions worked it out. The Manufacturers and IRMA worked it out. I got to have a different position. Well, maybe I'll vote against it, because I vote against it all the other times it came to this Body." Well, that's totally illogical. You're forgetting about the people the district, the people back home, the people that this bill was intended to help. It wasn't intended to serve our egos, or to serve our political goals or ambitions. I'm a Republican. I should have been with business right from the start with this, and I don't deny that. But if that was the case, business wouldn't

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

have sat down and worked this case out with the unions or sat down and says, "You know, maybe this piece of legislation - the time has come. You know, a lot of us are doing it now." So I have to compliment the Illinois Manufacturers and IRMA and organizations that sat down. But for some people to sit here and say that "I'm going to vote against this, because I voted against it since the very start," is really stupid, and the wrong way to go about it. The people back home want us to do the job. People are together on this. I've voted from it from the very start. It was the right thing to do. It wasn't the union thing. It wasn't the business thing. It was the right thing; and it's still the right thing. So I just solicit a lot more of my colleagues on this side of the aisle to vote Aye for something that has long come. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? Senator Leverenz.

SENATOR LEVERENZ:

The sponsor yield?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Indicates she will yield. Senator Leverenz.

SENATOR LEVERENZ:

We know that AFSCME and the women's groups are against this, but with the Manufacturers' Association and IRMA coming to the table now, could you help us -- understand with an example or two how the tax credits part of that work? Because I've sent two bills over to the House for tax credits for business, and they say it's bad policy to give credits at all for anything, and those two bills have failed. So could you give a couple of explanations of how the tax credit part will work here?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Severns.

SENATOR SEVERNS:

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

The tax -- the tax credit would take effect -- effective June 30th, 1994, and not have any impact on -- on the State's fiscal condition until FY'95. It would provide that any business of one hundred employees or more who, contrary to the evidence documented evidence that we have in this country - who hires a temporary employee, a replacement for that permanent employee who is on family leave, that if additional unemployment insurance costs are incurred, then that employer of one hundred people or more will be permitted to take a credit to offset those additional But I should say, Senator Leverenz, that the Family and Work Institute, who surveyed four states with family leave policies on the books, had eighty-five percent of the companies respond that there was not a single impact - fiscal impact - of additional unemployment insurance costs. Every documented study, including the -- one of the most recent, or perhaps even the last one, from the Small Business Administration, has spoken to that point. The evidence suggests it's not going to increase the costs. The fear has been, it will. This credit to have a delayed effective date attempts to address that fear.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Leverenz.

SENATOR LEVERENZ:

Perhaps you could just then nod your head. If they have a higher unemployment cost, they would write that off their State liability in terms of their State corporate tax, and sixty-five percent of the corporations in the State have no tax liability at all, but that is how it would work? Is that correct?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Severns.

SENATOR SEVERNS:

Not -- it's not quite that simple, Senator Leverenz. Fortunately, into this bill - and I think it's one of the -- one

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

positive compromise that came about this week since the original offer was made - we've written into this bill very tight reporting guidelines, so this credit, if needed, will not be misused or abused. Documented evidence provided on the quarterly reports to the Illinois Department of Employment Security will assure that no one is taking a credit for an employee that is not permitted under this Act.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Leverenz.

SENATOR LEVERENZ:

Then to the bill, Mr. President: The -- if you have tax credits as a possibility to coerce, apparently, corporations to be in favor of this -- I don't know if the Governor's Office has even given any indication of whether it would be for it or against it. But many of the big corporations already do this. They have a consciousness raising, I think, already. And this bill doesn't address all but those over a hundred. It's so watered down, it's almost like -- the reverse, I guess, would be dehydrated. I guess you can vote for this. You might get a half a flagpole. But I would encourage you to vote for this, and also for -- I guess it's coming back in 1892 also. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? Senator Karpiel.

SENATOR KARPIEL:

Thank you, Mr. President. I just have a very brief question.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Indicates she will yield. Senator Karpiel.

SENATOR KARPIEL:

Senator Severns, my question really is for Senator Leverenz, because I don't know if I heard him correctly. Did he say that the women's groups are opposed to this bill?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

Senator Severns.

SENATOR SEVERNS:

The women's groups are concerned about the tax credit. Many
-- I mean, not many - some - signed on board initially, but later
became concerned about the tax credit.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Karpiel.

SENATOR KARPIEL:

Well, there are just some days you just can't win. I've been voting against this bill for years and getting the wrath of the women's groups, and now I'm prepared to vote for it and they still don't like it. I'm just having a bad day.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Further discussion? We have still a number of speakers to go. Senator Welch.

SENATOR WELCH:

Thank you. I just had a question about the tax credit as well.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. The sponsor indicates she will yield. Senator Welch.

SENATOR WELCH:

Senator Severns, the -- apparently it's contemplated that if an individual takes eight weeks of family leave, is business anticipating that when they apply for the eight weeks, they will immediately file a claim for unemployment insurance; and for the seven weeks they get paid, that's what they're going to be reimbursed for - the increased costs?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Severns.

SENATOR SEVERNS:

If that business, contrary to the documented evidence to date

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

from states that have family leave policies on the books, opts to -- to replace that permanent employee with a temporary employee, that business has the obligation -- unemployment insurance obligation of that individual after he or she has been employed for thirty days. When that permanent employee returns to the business, that obligation continues for the temporary employee. This language attempts to -- to address that.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Welch.

SENATOR WELCH:

Is there anything in the bill that would prohibit an individual from taking eight weeks' leave for the birth of a baby and applying for unemployment insurance or some other -- for taking care of their parents? If you're going to get eight weeks of leave, could a person go down to the unemployment office and apply for unemployment insurance, since they're not going to be paid by the employer during that eight weeks of time?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Severns.

SENATOR SEVERNS:

The bill is silent on that, but current law covers that.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Welch.

SENATOR WELCH:

So a person could apply for unemployment insurance and receive it for seven weeks?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Severns.

SENATOR SEVERNS:

To be blunt, I'm not certain what all of the UI Law says, except to be advised that it covers it, and I simply don't know the answer to that. This bill is silent on that question.

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? Senator Keats.

SENATOR KEATS:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate.

I had a series of questions, but frankly they have all been answered. So I'm just going to say very briefly...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Thank you. Oh ...

SENATOR KEATS:

I was going to commend the sponsor, both Senator Severns here, Representative Kulas in the House. You know, we could make a lot of noise, but this is how the process works. There have been a lot of pressure one way or the other. To the credit of both of the sponsors, they stood up to people on both sides. Some people got a little of this, some a little of that. Compromise is not, by definition, a good thing, but in — this is a case where all the groups compromised a little bit. We've come up with a bill that is fairly practical, fairly livable. The issues many of us have raised — the tax problem — is solved. If there's a tax liability, as we think, it'll be taken care of. It does take out the small businesses. I don't know how much farther we can go. I think the two sponsors ought to get a pat on the back once in a while for having done a good legislative job, and I intend to support them for it.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? Senator Schuneman.

SENATOR SCHUNEMAN:

Thank you, Mr. President. Will the sponsor yield for question?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Indicates she will yield. Senator Schuneman.

SENATOR SCHUNEMAN:

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

Senator, the bill indicates that there is an entitlement created for an employee to get a total of eight work weeks of unpaid family leave because of the birth of a child of the employee. Now as I read the bill, that — that entitlement applies not only to the mother, but also — but actually to both parents. Is that correct?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Severns.

SENATOR SEVERNS:

Yes, the bill is gender-neutral.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Schuneman.

SENATOR SCHUNEMAN:

Second question is, what kind of proof need be submitted in order for the employee to have that entitlement?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Severns.

SENATOR SEVERNS:

I'm looking for the specific pages in the bill, but it spells out specifically the kind of medical documentation and otherwise that must be provided to assure that an individual is not abusing the policy. Track record, fortunately, in the states where it does exist, has shown that that abuse has not taken place.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Schuneman.

SENATOR SCHUNEMAN:

Well, I won't belabor this, but as I read the bill, I see very little that indicates that there is documentation and that sort of thing that's required. But what I want to do is point out that in the policy statement of the bill, you indicate that the purpose of this bill is to strengthen the family, that people should be entitled to assume family responsibilities without jeopardizing

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

their employment. And I think most of us agree with that concept. It's just that when government gets into the act, we generally tend to go too far. It appears to me that we've gone too far again in this bill. I'm thinking particularly of the fact that in Illinois, I think almost fifty percent of the births in Illinois now are illegitimate births. Now every one of those children has Some of them are employed. And as I read your bill, father. every one of them is now entitled to eight weeks of unpaid family Shouldn't there be some kind of provision in this bill that, in fact, requires that there be a family somewhere, you're trying to strengthen the family? Or is this an entitlement that is given to any biological father who happens to have a job? You know, I think it's a typical case of government trying to solve what should be left to the private sector to solve. For those of you who are interested, you might read the issue. the bill. I think it does precisely what I'm suggesting.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? Senator Kelly.

SENATOR KELLY:

Thank you very much, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. I am proud - extremely proud - to support Senate Bill 484. Senator Severns has worked long hours diligently throughout the years for this family leave proposal, and has worked with all factions and, as was pointed out, has stood up to pressure and is still standing up to tremendous pressure from different areas. This has been a decade of conciliation. We've achieved world peace in the nineties. I am extremely proud that Congress -- you know, Congressman Henry Hyde supported this same concept, even before these changes were made in Washington, and I can't think of anyone who's more respected in Washington than Henry Hyde. There -- I don't see any problem with raising this from fifty to a hundred. I would prefer that it be at fifty, but a hundred still takes care

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

of the vast majority of employees that we have. I'll say one thing: there's no better labor leaders in the world, or at least in the United States, than we have in Illinois. And I'm proud of what they've done and what they've achieved throughout the years. But this legislation, we know, is opposed partially by labor, partially by business, partially by some other groups and organizations. I think it's a real good compromise, and that's a good reason why. A week ago we had an opening prayer, and in that prayer we prayed, and we said, "a workable compromise for the people of this State." This compromise embraces that concept. I'd ask for your favorable support for Senate Bill 484.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Further discussion? Senator Palmer. SENATOR PALMER:

Thank you, Mr. President. I want to commend Senator Severns. I'm very, very proud of her at this moment, as a woman and as a colleague, for the work that she has done, for the pressure that she has withstood, and for the continuing pressure that she is under at this moment. I guess when I look at this bill - and I've been sitting here reading it - it reminds me of that old argument about, is the glass half full or half empty. Objectively, it's at midpoint. And given that, passing this legislation permits us to fill the glass at a later date. There will be friends who are not happy with this, and I am sure each of us could well hear about But the beauty and value of legislation and the legislative process is that by having put one thing in place, one can build take away from it, whatever is responsible upon it, reasonable, at a later time. I suggest that we vote for this get on with it. I can't see that we can fill the glass much farther at this point. Let's vote Yes and stop arguing about something that is as responsible and reasonable as it can be at this moment.

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Further discussion? Senator Rock.

SENATOR ROCK:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen I rise in strong support of the Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 484. I would like this Chamber to recognize the Comptroller of Illinois, the Honorable Dawn Netsch, who seated in the back of the Chamber. And I bring that up on the basis that Dawn Netsch and I, for many years, stood, shoulder-to-shoulder, on this issue and attempted more than once to persuade the Members of the General Assembly a matter of public policy, was something we ought to readily adopt. We fought with Governor Jim Thompson, I think, three or four occasions when he vetoed this legislation, and interestingly enough, watching television, as I'm sure all of did last night after we met in the Governor's Office and finished about eleven o'clock, I keep hearing Ross Perot and Dan Ouavle and Governor Bill Clinton as they are traipsing across this country attempting to secure support, that the single biggest issue that they are talking about, Ladies and Gentlemen, is family values. dare say, as I have said before, there is no single issue And I that impacts on the family as much as the Family Responsibility Think about it for a moment. For the first time, we Act does. apparently, those of us who support this -- and many of you supported it with respect to State employees. This law has been on the books with respect to State employees for many years. But for the first time, we have, by virtue of, I think, an acceptable compromise, we have the opportunity to literally cover and protect two million people who otherwise will be bereft of this coverage and protection. Two million people in our State will enjoy coverage who do not today enjoy coverage. And we're to turn down because of some fit of personal pique by some individuals in

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

this building who are not even elected? That they're going to suggest to us, who are elected, that, "Gee, we weren't at the table, so we're going to reject this out of hand." I suggest to you that is shortsightedness, at best. I suggest to you that I, for one, am willing to question their otherwise longtime sincerity on this issue. This, as a matter of public policy, is long overdue. And I congratulate those who had the courage to effect a compromise on both sides — on both sides. This, as a matter of public policy, is long overdue. Two million people in Illinois will benefit from this. We ought not turn it down. I urge an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? If not, Senator Severns may close. SENATOR SEVERNS:

you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. Just to correct the record, I want to say that the policy proposed Senate Bill 484 would be effective immediately upon signing by the Governor, if he signs it. The credit is the part of this bill that is delayed. If it is signed - or if we override it because not - that credit would not take -- or have effect until Fiscal Year '95. Some have said that this bill is -policy is for women only. While that's more important than any of us can express, it's for everyone - for the father who is going to take the time to take care of a critical -- critically ill child, to a sibling who wants to take care of a parent, to a mother who needs to take time off because of the time that is required to meet a critical illness in the family, anyone in a family who, during that time of critical illness, wants to do what all of us in this Chamber want to do - take care of our loved ones. think this policy affords us that opportunity. In fact, it does afford over two million people in Illinois that opportunity. think after six years of debate, it offers the single best

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

opportunity to put family leave on the books, and I would urge an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

The question is, shall the Senate adopt the First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 484. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, the Ayes are 42, the Nays are 14, 3 voting Present. The Senate does adopt the First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 484. And the bill, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 1508. Senator Rock. Madam Secretary, please.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

First Conference Committee...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

I beg -- pardon me -- Senator Raica, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR RAICA:

I apologize for interrupting, Mr. President. A point of personal privilege, if I might.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Yes, sir. State your point.

SENATOR RAICA:

Thank you, Mr. President. In the gallery on the Republican side is an individual from Senator Savickas' district and my district, the Mayor of Bridgeview. He's been ill for a while, but he's -- he's well and he's joining us in the General Assembly today. Mayor John Oremis from Bridgeview.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Mayor, welcome to Springfield. Nice to have you here. We also have some special guests that are with us. Senator Ralph

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

Dunn.

SENATOR R. DUNN:

Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Legislature. It's a great deal of pleasure I introduce to you the Apple City Barbecue Team World Champions from Murphysboro. They're accompanied by my good friend, Bruce Richmond, who's retiring after this year, and I thought I'd let Bruce introduce them and tell a little more about them. Bruce, please.

REPRESENTATIVE RICHMOND:

(Remarks by Representative Richmond)

MR. MIKE MILLS:

(Remarks by Mr. Mike Mills)

SENATOR R. DUNN:

Thank you very much.

SENATOR BROOKINS:

Senator Dunn, I'd like to take this opportunity to invite your barbecue champs to Chicago to the Mike Royko Barbecue, and we're going to bring you up to Chicago and we're going to see if that barbecue is that good.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Back on the Supplemental Calendar No. 1 is Senate Bill 1508, Mr. Secretary, please.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. HARRY)

First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1508.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Rock.

SENATOR ROCK:

Thank you, Mr. President. Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, Senate Bill 1508, as it left this Chamber, dealt with the question of commercial fishing licenses on the -- on Lake Michigan, and we've had about fifteen or sixteen meetings with the Department of Conservation since the bill left this Chamber and went over to the

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

The House added two amendments to put it in a conference committee. And what we've finally now decided, with the absolute concurrence of the Department of Conservation, is that yes, indeed, there will be an increase of two licenses on the Lake, for a total of five. The Department will, by rule, provide for amount of fish - the tonnage or the poundage - that can be taken out of the Lake in an attempt to accommodate the sport fishermen. Virtually everybody that's been involved has signed off on this. By virtue of this Conference Committee Report, we withdraw -- or recede from the two House amendments, and put in new language that meets with the -- meets with the support of the Department of Conservation and will provide for two additional equal licenses, for a total of five. And the Department will, by rule and regulation, handle all the other questions that they are in a unique position to do. And so I would urge a favorable vote on the Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1508.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Is there discussion? Senator Philip. SENATOR PHILIP:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. I certainly concur with Senator Rock. As you're probably aware, we have an overpopulation in Lake Michigan of chubs and perch. Unfortunately, there is no market for — for chub. People don't eat smoked chubs anymore, but there certainly is a great market for Lake Michigan perch. We ought to vote for this. We only have three people fishing commercially. This allows another two, and allows the Department some regulations over those two new ones. So I would hope that we'd all vote Aye.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? If not, the -- the question is, shall the Senate adopt the First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1508. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed, Nay. The

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, the Ayes are 53, the Nays are 1, none voting Present. The Senate does adopt the First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1508, and the bill, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 1823, Mr. Secretary.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. HARRY)

First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1823.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Lechowicz.

SENATOR LECHOWICZ:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. I move that the Senate do adopt -- Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1823. It does the following items: It authorizes the Cook County Forest Preserve District to enter in a purchase lease agreement involving annual payments over a maximum period of forty years: it authorizes the District to adopt an annual appropriation ordinance before the commitments of its fiscal year; it increases the District's Working Cash Fund from seven fourteen million outstanding at any one time; it adds bonds issued for improvements for the Brookfield Zoo may not exceed twenty-seven million six hundred and forty thousand dollars outstanding at any time; zoo bonds mature in thirty years, rather than twenty years; it exempts Cook County Forest Preserve District from taxation - the same provision that we did for DuPage and it increases from 1.5 million to three million the in 1989: amount of bonds that may be issued for the Zoological Working Cash Fund. Let me just point out to the Membership, earlier this morning you were -- you received a reprint of the article that appeared in Saturday's Chicago Tribune as far as Brookfield Zoo's plans to redo on the -- on this bond bill. Also, you received a

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

copy of a map that appeared in Sunday's <u>Sun-Times</u> where it pointed out the highlights as far as the number of millions of people - tourists that come into this State and in this City of Chicago from all over the world. It was pointed out in the article that there were people coming in from foreign countries because of the value of the dollar, which increased tourism. In fact, it pointed out that tourism will probably be one of the leading growth industries in this State. It's very important, Ladies and Gentlemen, that we do adopt this Conference Committee Report on 1823; that Brookfield Zoo can raise two dollars in private money for every one dollar that they receive from the County Board, and this authorization will do that. I ask that the Senate do concur in Senate Bill — in this Conference Committee Report on 1823. Be more than happy to answer any questions.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

The Gentleman has moved passage of the Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1823. Discussion? Senator Fawell.

SENATOR FAWELL:

Thank you very much. Will the sponsor yield for a question?

He indicates he'll yield. Senator Fawell.

SENATOR FAWELL:

Senator, there's no one that loves the Zoo more than I do with my -- I love to go there, but we are doing something fairly major here, and I think people should be aware of it. We are issuing bonds not to exceed fourteen million dollars without referendum, and right now we are limited to seven million dollars. My understanding is that although this will cause a tax increase, it's -- it's not that much. Do you have any idea approximately what this will cost the Cook County homeowner?

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Lechowicz.

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

SENATOR LECHOWICZ:

To tell you the truth, Bev, I had the same concerns about this bill. The figures that I received was that -- one -- one said that the assessed valuation is growing at a rate now that would negate the increase. According to the calculations I received from the Assessor's Office, he stated that a -- be approximately a dollar per average home, based on a sixty-thousand-dollar home, or two dollars on a hundred-and-twenty-thousand-dollar home. And you know, earlier we passed on -- as far as for the EPA, and I thought to myself after I digested the number of people in support of that proposal, and after I reflected and seen exactly what the papers thought the importance of Brookfield Zoo and the rest of the contents of this bill, I thought it was well worth the money.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Further discussion? Senator Keats.

SENATOR KEATS:

Thank you, Mr. President. Just as a Suburban Cook Member, this is a Cook-County-only bill. We've looked at it. It looks like a very reasonable bill. I -- we have worked with the sponsors on it. I would just solicit your support. Again, it is a Cook-County-only bill, but it is not of controversy, and it's truly beneficial to the whole State. Thank you.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Question is, shall the Senate adopt the Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1823. Those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, vote Nay. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? All voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 49 Ayes, 7 Nays, 2 voting Present. Senate does adopt the Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1823. And the bill, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator Lechowicz, 1831. Mr. Secretary, please.

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. HARRY)

First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1831.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Lechowicz.

SENATOR LECHOWICZ:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. This Conference Committee Report recommends a -- and implements a recommendation of the Civic Federation which was brought to the Board -- Cook County Board's attention in May of last year. Basically this Conference Committee Report applies only to Cook County. It's permissive, as well. It permits the Cook County Board to carry forward a fund balance in its budget from year to year. Fund balances would be for the general purpose of maintaining the County's bond rating and for paying tort claims. I know of no opposition to this proposal. In fact, they received the endorsement of everyone on the conference committee. I hope it meets your approval as well.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

All right. The Gentleman has moved the adoption of the First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1831. Discussion? Senator Keats.

SENATOR KEATS:

Just another comment, as a Member from Suburban Cook. This is a Cook-County-only bill. It has been worked out. There is no problem whatsoever, and would solicit your support.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Question is the adoption of the First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1831. Those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, vote Nay. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 59 Ayes, no Nays, none voting Present. The Senate does adopt the First Conference

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

Committee Report on Senate Bill 1831, and the bill, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Messages from the House.

SECRETARY HAWKER.

A Message from the House by Mr. O'Brien, Clerk.

Mr. President - I am directed to inform the Senate that the House of Representatives has refused to recede from their Amendment No. 1 to a bill of the following title, to wit:

Senate Bill 186.

I am further directed to inform the Senate that the House of Representatives requests a First Committee of Conference to consider the differences of the two Houses in regard to the amendment to the bill.

Action taken by the House, June 30, 1992.

I have a like Message on Senate Bill 698, Senate Bill 1567, Senate Bill 2233.

Action taken by the House on all of those on June 30, 1992.

A Message from the House by Mr. O'Brien, Clerk.

Mr. President - I am directed to inform the Senate that the House of Representatives has refused to adopt the First Conference Committee Report on House Bill 3594, and requests a Second Committee of Conference to consider the differences between the two Houses in regard to Amendment No. 1.

Action taken by the House, June 30, 1992.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Vadalabene will move that the Senate accede to the request of the House with respect to those bills. All in favor, indicate by saying Aye. Opposed. The Ayes have it. The motion carries, and it is so ordered. The Senate does accede to the request of the House. All right. Ladies and Gentlemen, we are in the unique position of having virtually concluded what is before us on the Calendar. I am happy to report that Senator Philip and

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

I have been working late last night and again early this morning. I think we may have a budget compromise within reach. The drafting will take a while. In the meantime, I would encourage all of you who are Members of conference committees to please make sure that those committees meet if you wish, and get the reports filed. We have, I think, two or three messages we have now received with respect to non-concurrence. We will prepare a Supplemental Calendar, which we will present probably in the neighborhood of three o'clock, by the time we get the paperwork. So the suggestion is — and I've discussed it with Senator Philip — that we will stand in recess until the hour of three o'clock. I'd ask you to please be back here at three o'clock. Hopefully we'll have some sincerely good news on the budget, but we will certainly deal with what else is on the Calendar. Senate stands in recess until the hour of three o'clock.

(RECESS)

END OF TAPE

TAPE 3

(SENATE RECONVENES)

PRESIDENT ROCK:

The hour of four-fifteen having arrived, the Senate will reconvene. I would ask the Members who are attending conference committees or in their offices to please join us on the Floor. We have Supplemental Calendars 2 and shortly 3 to be distributed.

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

The Members directly involved are Senators Etheredge, del Valle, Palmer, Jacobs, Mahar, Dart, Welch and Davidson. Messages from the House.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

A Message from the House by Mr. O'Brien, Clerk.

Mr. President - I am directed to inform the Senate that the House of Representatives has refused to concur with the Senate in the adoption of their amendment -- amendments to a bill of the following title, to wit:

House Bill 3418, together with Senate Amendments 1 and 3.

I have a like Message on House Bill 4070 with Senate Amendment No. 2, and they were both non-concurred in by the House on June 30, 1992.

A Message from the House by Mr. O'Brien, Clerk.

Mr. President - I am directed to inform the Senate that the House of Representatives has concurred with the Senate in the adoption of the following joint resolution, to wit:

Senate Joint Resolution 113, together with House Amendment No. 2.

Passed the House, as amended, June 30, 1992.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Secretary's Desk. Resolutions.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Resolution 1478 offered by Senator Dudycz.

Senate Resolution 1479 offered by Senator Dudycz.

And Senate Resolution 1480 offered by Senator Karpiel.

They are all three congratulatory.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Consent Calendar. ... (machine cutoff)...begin at Supplemental Calendar No. 2. Supplemental No. 3 is being passed out. And with our precision timing around here, by that time 4 will be out. I

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

would ask all those Members who are within the sound of my voice to please join us on the Floor. The Chair's intent is to go through Supplementals 2, 3 and 4 and take a slight recess so that Senator DeAngelis can have some dinner. I know I fouled up his lunch, and I apologize for that. And for all the Members, I wish to announce Senator DeAngelis is buying dinner. Wherever he decides to go when we break, we're all going to follow him. Senator Butler, for what purpose do you arise, sir?

SENATOR BUTLER:

Thank you, Mr. President. Ladies and Gentlemen, a point of personal privilege, please.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

State your point, Senator.

SENATOR BUTLER:

Ladies and Gentlemen, I'd like to introduce some distinguished guests we have in the President's Gallery. First of all, Mayor John Geils, Mayor of Bensenville, who is also the Chairman of the Suburban O'Hare Commission. John Geils.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Mayor, nice to see you, sir.

SENATOR BUTLER:

Secondly, Mayor Chuck Garrigues of Elmhurst, up there.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Mr. Mayor, thank you.

SENATOR BUTLER:

Chuck Zettek, who is the distinguished Mayor of Elk Grove Village. And Ron Wietecha, Mayor of beautiful Park Ridge.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

All right. Mayors, welcome to Springfield. All right. Those within the sound of my voice, we will be dealing with Senators Etheredge, del Valle, Palmer, Jacobs, Mahar, Dart, Welch and Davidson. Resolutions.

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Resolution 1481, Senate Resolution 1482, and Senate Resolution 1483 offered by Senator Topinka.

They are all congratulatory.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Consent Calendar. As a matter of fact, Consent Calendar A. Consent Calendar A is the Topinka Calendar. If you want to get on it, you better be nice. You know what I mean? ...(machine cutoff)...Ladies and Gentlemen, again, I would ask those within the sound of my voice who are attending conference committee meetings, to please join us on the Floor. We have Supplemental Calendars No. 2, 3, and shortly we'll have No. 4, and then we will be in a position to recess. On the Order of Supplemental Calendar No. 2, on the Order of Secretary's Desk, Non-concurrence, Senator Etheredge, is House Bill 3418, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Amendments -- Senate Amendments 1 and 3 to House Bill 3418.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Etheredge.

SENATOR ETHEREDGE:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate.

I move that the Senate not recede from Senate Amendments 1 and 3 and that -- and that I further ask that a conference committee be appointed.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

All right. Senator Etheredge has moved that the Senate refuse to recede from the adoption of Senate Amendments 1 and 3 to House Bill 3418, and that a conference committee be appointed. All in favor, indicate by saying Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it. The motion carries, and the Secretary shall so inform the House. On that same Calendar, on the Order of Motions in Writing, there's

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

a motion with respect to House Bill 180, Madam Secretary. Read the motion, please.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

I move to waive Senate Rule 5C with regard to House Bill 180, and that the bill be exempted from the Committee on Rules so that it can be considered by the Senate.

Filed by Senator del Valle.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator del Valle.

SENATOR dEL VALLE:

Thank you, Mr. President. I move to waive Senate rules and exempt from the committee House Bill 180 so that it can be considered. This bill will be used for the agreement on unemployment insurance.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Discussion on the motion? Senator Hudson.

SENATOR HUDSON:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. Would the sponsor yield for a question?

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Indicates he will yield, Senator Hudson.

SENATOR HUDSON:

Senator del Valle, I understand that what this basically is is an old conference committee report that increased the wages for farm workers and so forth. It's come over and you want to bypass — instead of sending it to Rules, you want to bypass Rules. My question to you, sir, is, what are your intentions?

PRESIDENT ROCK:

SENATOR dEL VALLE:

Senator del Valle.

Yes. The current content of the bill will be removed. It will be totally stripped, and it will contain only the agreement

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

for the unemployment insurance.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Rea. Oh, I'm sorry. Senator Hudson.

SENATOR HUDSON:

No, I just wanted to say thank you.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Rea.

SENATOR REA:

Thank you, Mr. President. This bill will be used for the agreed bill process on the unemployment insurance, and I would ask for an Aye vote.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

All right. Senator del Valle.

SENATOR dEL VALLE:

Let's do the motion first.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

All right. All right. The Gentleman has moved to waive Senate Rule 5C with respect to House Bill 180, and that the bill be exempted from the Committee on Rules so that it can be considered - will be considered - by the Senate. All in favor will vote Aye. Opposed will vote Nay. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? All voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 53 Ayes, 2 Nays, none voting Present. The motion prevails, and it is so ordered. Senator del Valle.

SENATOR dEL VALLE:

Thank you, Mr. President. With leave of the Body, I'd like to change the sponsorship of the bill to Senator Rea, and have me added as hyphenated sponsor.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

All right. The Gentleman seeks leave of the Body to show Senator Rea as the chief sponsor of House Bill 180, along with

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

hyphenated co-sponsor, Senator del Valle. Without objection, leave is granted. It is so ordered. ...(machine cutoff)...Karpiel, for what purpose do you arise? I'm sorry.

SENATOR KARPIEL:

Thank you, Mr. President. On a point of personal privilege. PRESIDENT ROCK:

State your point, please.

SENATOR KARPIEL:

I would like to introduce the -- the Senate to Mr. Ross Ferraro and Don Sutenbach and Greg Bielawski from Carol Stream. Ross is the Mayor, trustee and village manager of Carol Stream - the Garden Spot of DuPage County. They're up in the Republican Gallery behind me.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Will our guests from Carol Stream please stand and be recognized. Welcome to Springfield. All right. Ladies and Gentlemen, we're still on Supplemental No. 2. We are now on the Order of Conference Committee Reports. Senator Palmer. Madam Secretary, on the Order of Supplemental Calendar No. 2, on the Order of Conference Committee Reports, is House Bill 4079, please. SECRETARY HAWKER:

First Conference Committee Report on House Bill 4079.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Can I ask the staff to take the conferences off the Floor so that we can -- Senator Palmer can present her conference committee? Senator Palmer.

SENATOR PALMER:

Thank you, Mr. President and Members of the Senate. House Bill 4079 originally was a -- the Nursing Home Act. The Senate amendment -- the Senate receded from Senate Amendment No. 1 because this bill had already been passed on another one that passed out of both the Senate and the House. House Bill 4079 is

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

now a bill to assist a homeless General Assistance recipient to obtain housing. The asset -- by making the asset disregard no less than the one for AFDC persons. It defines also what constitutes homelessness. Just so you understand what this bill does - shelters for homeless persons normally spend staff time and effort to assist residents in moving into permanent housing. Most shelters, however, do not have cash assistance available. So what they do is to work with residents to help them save a deposit and first and last month's rent. Typically, this sum is anywhere from six hundred to a thousand dollars. The irony is that in many cases this effort on the part of staff and shelter residents is for nothing if the -- if the person is a Assistance recipient, because the asset limitation imposed by law on GA recipients is a hundred and fifty-four dollars. If they save that amount or more, they're cut off Public Aid entirely. So what this bill does is to permit them to have the same asset as people on AFDC. And I would urge your support for this. If we are very serious about breaking the cycle of homelessness, this is a fine way to do so.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Any discussion? Senator Marovitz.

SENATOR MAROVITZ:

Thank you very much, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. Well, lots of times we talk about doing things for the homeless, and I know the budget's already cut. This bill - of all the bills that we're going to do anything with this Session - will do more to help the homeless than anything we could do this Session in the State of Illinois. Yesterday we had a discussion and Senator Schaffer spoke, others spoke - I spoke - about the possibility -- when we do registration of homeless voters, we spoke about the possibility -- there was discussion about the possibility of vote fraud. Well, this bill will do a lot to prevent any chance of

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

vote fraud, because it'll give these homeless people a chance to get an apartment, a chance to have a permanent residence, a place to live, so they don't have to go to some shelter in order to register to vote and spend a month at the shelter - thirty days -so that they can register to vote. This will give people a chance to get off the streets, to get off the tents, to get out of the alleys and to get a place to live. All they're doing is having the same asset disregard as people on AFDC. Right now their asset disregard is a hundred and fifty-four dollars. This will bring it to one thousand dollars, and the cost is minimal. Ιt probably only will cost about a hundred thousand dollars, and if we can help homeless people around the State get a place to live, gosh, we can get out of here and be -- have something to be proud of.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Any further discussion? Lady from Cook, Senator Topinka. SENATOR TOPINKA:

Yes. If I may ask the sponsor a question. Originally, I was going to ask her what the cost would be. Senator Marovitz says a hundred thousand. How -- how many homeless do you think that this would be applicable to? Because that obviously would be the multiplier for any type of money you're talking here.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Palmer.

SENATOR PALMER:

I think we should be very careful looking at that fiscal note, because, in fact, DPA does support this in principle and they are saying they're concerned about that. But, in fact, to reach DPA's high-end estimate of five hundred thousand, two hundred and seventy homeless, chronically needy people must continue to receive assistance for a whole year longer than they would have. So this is an assumption, I think, that is -- is very much over

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

the mark.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Topinka.

SENATOR TOPINKA:

Well, I -- I would point out that, you know, we've been in budget discussions -- I mean, not we - most of us here on the Floor - but certainly our Leaders have been all day long, and have faced some pretty severe budget cuts. I admire what the sponsor's trying to do here. God knows it's a major problem, but I'm wondering, if -- if we really don't have a feel for what kind of costs we're going to have here - and it could get upwards of a half a million dollars - that we might want to take that fiscal note into some kind of consideration at this time and maybe look at this program sometime in the future, when the State might be a little flusher.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Any further discussion? Senator Palmer, to close.

SENATOR PALMER:

Thank you, Mr. President. I just want to point out that this bill passed in the House on a bipartisan roll call 88 to 17, and I really urge us to take this opportunity to take this small step to relieving homelessness. I would ask for an Aye vote. Thank you. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

The question is, shall the Senate adopt the Conference Committee Report on House Bill 4079. All in favor, vote Aye. All opposed, vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please take the record. On this question, there are 46 Ayes, 10 Nays, 1 recorded as Present. And the Senate does adopt Conference Committee Report 4079. This bill, having received the constitutional majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 837. Senator Rock. Read the bill, Madam Secretary.

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

SECRETARY HAWKER:

First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 837.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Rock.

SENATOR ROCK:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. The Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 837 contains, this moment, only one subject matter. When Senate Bill 837 left this Chamber, it was intended to deal with last year the subject of disproportionate share hospitals and/or reimbursement for the County of -- the hospital in the County of Cook. solved that problem then on a different vehicle, and so this has languished in the House. It is now being used to implement one of the recommendations of the Acute Care Task Force that was created by House Joint Resolution 77 and House Resolution 767. The Task Force did indeed recommend other models, and it essentially deals with the subject of health care. And Senator Topinka was kind enough to try to put all those in one bill, and the bill failed; because, while this model, I think, will meet with the approval of literally everyone, the other two did not meet with the approval of, among others, the Hospital Association. This will deal. frankly, with the only subject of -- the one and only subject of a subacute care hospital, and that is defined as a designated site which provides medical specialty care for patients who need a greater intensity and complexity of care than generally provided in a skilled nursing facility, but who no longer require acute hospital care. The fact of the matter is, when you get into acute care at the hospital, it is, one, very expensive. And there are some patients who could indeed be removed from that expense, literally, at this moment, there is literally nowhere for them to go. And so this will provide, as a demonstration project, opportunity for the Department of Public Health to authorize the

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

institution of this kind of program to see if it works. I suppose it could be said I have something of a conflict because my daughter is an acute care nurse, but the fact is, she readily relates to me that there are some patients for whom she cares that really are paying too much money. They could be in another facility receiving the same kind of care, but at a much lesser expense than they currently receive in one of the big hospitals in Chicago. I think this is a project that deserves our support. I am told that both the Department of Public Health and the Department of Public Aid are — are in favor of this. I — I know of no serious objection. Even the Hospital Association admits that this is something that is worthy of a try, and that's what this is. It is a demonstration project. I solicit your Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Is there any discussion? The Lady from Lake, Senator Geo-Karis.

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

Would the Gentleman leave -- yield for a question?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Indicates he will.

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

Is the Illinois Hospital Association in favor of this?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Rock.

SENATOR ROCK:

I thought I said that. The answer is Yes.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Geo-Karis.

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

You did say about the Illinois -- I didn't hear you, Senator Rock, that's why. The Illinois Hospital Association.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

Any further discussion? President Rock, to close. SENATOR ROCK:

I think this is a subject that is worthy of the approval of all of us, and I'd hope it goes out of here unanimously. I solicit your Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

The question is, shall the Senate adopt the Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 837. All in favor, vote Aye. All opposed, vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please take the record. On this question, there are 57 Ayes, no Nays, none recorded as Present. The Senate does adopt the Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 837. This bill, having received the constitutional majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1665. Senator Jacobs. Read the bill, Madam Secretary. 1665.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1665.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Jacobs.

SENATOR JACOBS:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. Senate Bill 1665, Conference Committee, we want to concur in House Amendment No. 1, which becomes the bill. This is a bill that went out of here originally and had some tax credits in it. When we found out the Governor doesn't like tax credits, we removed those tax credits. And the bill now just strictly permits the Quad City Regional Economic Development Board to request the Rock Island County Board to impose a quarter-cent sales tax for funding of a U.S. Department of Defense facility. Requires a referendum. I know of no known opposition, and ask for your support.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Any discussion? The question is, shall the Senate adopt the

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1665. All in favor, vote Aye. All opposed, vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Please take the record. On this question, there are 58 Ayes, no Nays, none recorded as Present. And the Senate does adopt the Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1665. This bill, having received the constitutional majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 2049. Senator Mahar. Read the bill, Madam Secretary.

First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 2049.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Mahar.

SENATOR MAHAR:

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Thank you, Mr. President and Members. When this bill left the Senate, it allowed townships to maintain, as in mow, retention and detention ponds. The House in their first amendment put on clarifying language. The second amendment was, in effect, a tax — a property tax increase without a referendum. What this Conference Committee Report does is recede from that second amendment. All conferees signed the Report. I know of no objection, and I would ask for your support.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

there any discussion? The question is, shall the Senate concur with the Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 2049, All in favor, vote Aye. All opposed, vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please take the record. On this question, there are 55 Ayes, no Nays, none recorded as Present. And the Senate does adopt Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 2049. This bill. having received the constitutional majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 2138. Senator Etheredge. Read the bill, Madam Secretary.

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

SECRETARY HAWKER:

First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 2138.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Etheredge.

SENATOR ETHEREDGE:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. This Conference Committee Report does just as exact -- just exactly as your Calendar indicates. It creates the Podiatric Scholarship and Residency Act. This is identical to the legislation that passed out of this Body last May on a vote of 58 to nothing. Let me assure you that this Conference Committee Report contains nothing more than this language. It does not, for example, include - does not include - the controversial language on TMA -- TMJ, pardon me, language -- that had been so strongly opposed by the insurance industry and the business community. This is the -- as I say, the bill which passed out of here 58 to nothing last May, and nothing more than that. I would ask for your favorable vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Any discussion? The Lady from Cook, Senator Topinka.

SENATOR TOPINKA:

Just a question of the sponsor, if I may.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Indicates he'll yield.

SENATOR TOPINKA:

Yeah. Originally there was a provision in here for any new licensure and regulation of health care personnel, and that has also been removed from this bill, or is that still in here?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Etheredge.

SENATOR ETHEREDGE:

No, there's -- there's no new licensing requirements or

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

anything like that, Senator.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Any other discussion? Senator Etheredge, to close.

SENATOR ETHEREDGE:

I would ask for your favorable vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

The question is, shall the Senate adopt the Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 2138. All in favor, vote Aye. All opposed, vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please take the record. On this question, there are 58 Ayes, no Nays, none recorded as Present. And the Senate does adopt the Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 2138. This bill, having received the constitutional majority, is hereby declared passed. Please turn to Calendar -- Supplemental Calendar No. 3. First item for concurrence on the Secretary's Desk is Senate Joint Resolution 113. Senator del Valle. We're on Supplemental Calendar No. 3. Read the resolution, Ma'am.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

House Amendment No. 2 to Senate Joint Resolution 113.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator del Valle.

SENATOR dEL VALLE:

Thank you, Mr. President. I move to concur with the House amendment. The House amendment just put the task force in the Office of the AG to ensure that it is adequately staffed, and that is all the amendment did. I move for concurrence.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Any discussion? The Lady from Adams, Senator Donahue.

SENATOR DONAHUE:

Well, thank you, Mr. President. A question of the sponsor. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

Indicates he'll yield.

SENATOR DONAHUE:

I understand this -- when this resolution passed the Senate, we all, you know, supported it. We -- totally concur with what you're trying to do, and that's to set up a task force. But now, as it comes back from the House, it's all within the AG's Office. It's not just a task force. It's under the AG's Office, and I'd like to know why that happened.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator del Valle.

SENATOR dEL VALLE:

Yes. It's a very good question. The Speaker and the House decided that they would not support establishing any task force that would be freestanding - the rationale being that these task forces need to be adequately staffed, and if you put it under a particular agency or department, that then that would ensure the staffing of this task force. But let me also point out that this has a limited life. The reporting date remains October 15th. At that time, the work of the task force will have been completed. And so, the mission and the makeup of the task force does not change. All this amendment does is that it establishes a home for the task force for staffing purposes.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Donahue.

SENATOR DONAHUE:

Well, thank you, Mr. President. I -- I would think other task force that we put together similar to this, that we have utilized staff, and I totally understand the reasoning. But we've used staff for that type of purpose, but not put it under the auspices of that specific agency. And I think that's -- I'm just sort of pointing that out to the Membership, that it was supposed to be a task force; now it's the Attorney General's task force, for staff

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

purposes. And I think there's a little bit of a difference. And I just want to point that out, Senator, and I appreciate that. Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Any further discussion? Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

Thank you. Question of the...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Excuse me, Senator. Could we have your attention, please? Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

Yes, thank you. Question of the sponsor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Indicates he'll yield.

SENATOR WATSON:

Who now administers the Narcotics Forfeiture Act and the proceeds from that Act? Who now administers that?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator del Valle.

SENATOR dEL VALLE:

Senator Watson, we -- we discussed that when the resolution was presented in the Executive Committee and on the Floor. There are several -- several Acts related to narcotics profit forfeiture, and as you know, there are several law enforcement agencies and the State's attorneys and the AG's Office involved in some way in this. So it's spread out over numerous agencies.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

Well, I guess maybe I had some problem understanding and hearing the previous discussion, Senator, and I apologize. But what this amendment did then was simply say now that the Attorney

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

General will be the chairman of the task force; is that what the House amendment did?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Please, Ladies and Gentlemen. Senator del Valle.

SENATOR dEL VALLE:

Senator Watson, absolutely not. This amendment does not change the makeup of the task force. It does not change the time frame of the task force. It does not change the appointment process. It doesn't change anything, except that it puts it within the Office of the Attorney General for the duration, which is until October 15th. So there is no change in the makeup. None whatsoever.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Any further discussion? Senator del Valle, to close.

SENATOR dEL VALLE:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I ask for support on this resolution. The mission of the task force has been supported by this Body. It's important that we look at what can be done to support the concept of community policing, which is picking up steam throughout the State and throughout the country. This task force is charged with exploring different options and then reporting to the General Assembly. So I really ask for support so that we can get on with this work.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

The question is, shall the Senate concur in House Amendment No. 2 to Senate Joint Resolution 113. Those in favor, vote Aye. Those opposed, vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please take the record. On this question, there are 52 Ayes, 4 Nays, none recorded as Present. And the Senate does concur in House Amendment No. 2 to Senate Joint Resolution 113. And this resolution, having received the constitutional majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

4070. Senator del Valle. Read the bill, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Amendment No. 2 to House Bill 4070.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator del Valle.

SENATOR dEL VALLE:

Thank you, Mr. President. I move to refuse to recede from Senate Amendment No. 2, and ask that a conference committee be -- report be established.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator del Valle moves that the Senate refuse to recede from Amendment No. 2. Those in favor, signify by saying Aye. Opposed. The Ayes have it. The motion carries, and the Secretary shall so inform the House. Motions in Writing to Reconsider the Vote. Senator Palmer. Please read the motion, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

I move to reconsider the vote by which Senate Joint Resolution 159 was passed, for the purpose of tabling an amendment. Filed by Senator Palmer.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

The Lady from Cook, Senator Palmer.

SENATOR PALMER:

Thank you, Mr. President. Having voted on the prevailing side, I move to reconsider the vote by which Amendment No. 2 to Senate Joint Resolution 159 was adopted. The amendment is technically incorrect and should be tabled.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Lady asks leave of the Body to move to reconsider the vote by which Amendment No. 1 <sic> (2) was adopted. All those in favor, signify by saying -- saying Aye. What purpose the Gentleman from Cook, Senator Dudycz, seek recognition? Dudycz.

SENATOR DUDYCZ:

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

Mr. President, I'd like to address the motion, please.
PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

One moment, please. Lady from Cook, Senator Palmer, what purpose you seek recognition?

SENATOR PALMER:

So that we don't misunderstand: There were two amendments put in; this is Amendment No. 2. I had inadvertently put one in that was the same as yours. We don't need both of them, so I'm withtaking <sic> mine. Okay?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Dudycz. Everyone -- what? We have to move to reconsider the vote by which the bill passed, and that was Senate Joint Resolution 159. All those in favor, signify by saying Aye. Aye. Opposed. The Ayes have it. The bill has now been reconsidered, and the Lady from Cook, Senator Palmer, moves to table Amendment -- which one was it? 2? Is there leave? Hearing no objection, the Lady has leave to table Amendment No. 2. Now back to the original Senate Joint Resolution 159 without the amendment. Read the -- read the resolution, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Joint Resolution 159.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Palmer.

SENATOR PALMER:

Thank you, Mr. President. I move passage of Senate Joint Resolution 159 with Amendment No. 1.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

One. Is there any discussion on that? Senator Dudycz.

SENATOR DUDYCZ:

Yes. Mr. President, I would just like for the sponsor to explain to the Membership what we are going to be voting on, so it would be clear - everybody would know what they are voting --

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

casting their votes on.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Lady from Cook, Senator Palmer.

SENATOR PALMER:

I'd be happy to, Senator Dudycz, but we took up the time of the Senate this morning on this. And we already passed it. This -- we're just trying to make a technical change here.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

The Gentleman's request is in order.

SENATOR PALMER:

Can you excuse me while I dig it out?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Surely. Madam Secretary, would you please read the amendment, if it isn't too lengthy?

SECRETARY HAWKER:

The amendment which was withdrawn - Senate Amendment No. 2.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

He's interested in Amendment No. 1.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Amendment No. 1. "AMENDMENT TO SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION

Senate "AMENDMENT NO. 1. Amend Senate Joint Resolution 159 on page 2, by deleting lines 6 through 11 and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"'WHEREAS, We feel that further action is necessary to restore the faith of the people in our law enforcement officials and our American justice system; therefore, be it'; and

"on page 2, by deleting lines 18 through 20 and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"'beating of Rodney G. King, and to examine the methods used by and taught to law enforcement personnel with regard to the use of force; and be it further'."

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Lady from Cook, Senator Palmer.

SENATOR PALMER:

Thank you, Mr. President. Is that...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Please proceed.

SENATOR PALMER:

...sufficient, Senator Dudycz? I'm sorry I don't have the things in front of me. I didn't bring it, because I thought we had discussed this this morning. This is -- all we're doing is -- I inadvertently put in a -- an amendment. I am taking mine away, in the interest of leaving yours in. This is what we agreed to. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Dudvcz.

SENATOR DUDYCZ:

Well, Mr. President, I just want it to be clear that we are removing the portion that says we "feel that Mr. King's civil rights have been violated by the police and ignored in this verdict, we feel that further..." and the other part that was removed was where -- where -- we are -- we're asking that the United State's Attorney General and the Department of Justice "pursue an investigation to determine whether...further action should be taken against the four police officers involved in the beating of Rodney G. King, and to examine whether the methods used by" - and the part that I want to be clear that -- that is being removed is - "and taught to law enforcement personnel encourage the use of unnecessary force." We don't want to give a message to our law enforcement community that we are condemning them or accusing them of teaching methods that encourage excessive force.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWIC

Senator Palmer.

SENATOR PALMER:

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

Thank you, Mr. President. Senator Dudycz, this is all in your amendment, and we have agreed to this.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Lady moves the adoption of Senate Joint Resolution 159. All those in favor, vote Aye. All those opposed, vote Nay. The voting is open. Have -- have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please take the record. On this question, there are 54 Ayes, 2 Nays, 1 recorded as Present. And Senate Joint Resolution 159, with Amendment No. 1, is hereby declared passed. Conference Committee Reports, appears House Bill 2767. Senator Dart. Read the bill, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

First Conference Committee Report on House Bill 2767.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Dart.

SENATOR DART:

Thank you, Mr. President and Members of the Senate. House Bill 2767 is a criminal bill containing a lot of technical clear-ups. It -- there was a mistake on a portion of it which was supposed to be noncontroversial like the rest of this bill. We're pulling it out. It was voted down in the House. I'd ask for your No votes on this so we can have a second conference committee.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

The question is, shall the Senate adopt this Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 2767 -- on House Bill 2767. All those, vote Aye. All opposed, vote Nay. The voting is open. Take the record. On this question, there are 10 Ayes, 30 Nays, none recorded as Present. And the Senate does not concur in the Conference Committee Report on Senate <sic> Bill 2767 and requests a second conference committee be -- be adopted. Senate Bill 1768. Senator Welch. Read the bill, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1768.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Welch.

SENATOR WELCH:

Thank you, Mr. President. Senate Bill 1768 amends the Environmental Protection Act. What we have done is -- a couple of days ago when Senator Lechowicz objected to two pilot projects in the City of Chicago, we put it in a conference committee. The pilot projects are now out of this Conference Committee Report. What it does do is require that cities in counties of more than one hundred thousand study the feasibility of quantity-based fees and to implement those fees as soon as they can. In addition, there is a provision that creates a Solid Waste Advisory Council no later than October 1, 1992 consisting of fifteen members with balanced representations to make findings and recommendations on the Department and Agency's solid waste programs. I'd be glad to answer any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Any discussion? The question is, shall the Senate adopt Senate Bill 1768 -- the Conference Committee on Senate Bill 1768. All those in favor, vote Aye. All opposed, vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please take the record. On this question, there are 56 Ayes, no Nays, none recorded as Present. And the Senate does adopt the Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1768. Having received the constitutional majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1904. Senator Davidson. Read the bill, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1904.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Davidson.

SENATOR DAVIDSON:

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

Mr. President and Members of the Senate, I move that we accept the Conference Committee Report No. 1 on Senate Bill 1904. bill -- the Conference Committee has the bill as we amended it here in the Senate. Also has the amendments that we had adopted in the House, with the exception of House Amendment No. 4, which was rescinded because it was technically incorrect. Conference Committee includes those, plus this: it reinserts House Amendment No. 4 with the technical corrections. This is accept lands containing United States Army Fort Sheridan Military Reservation to Lake County and the Joliet Army Ammunition Plant, Will County. This was at the request of the Governor's Office. Secondly, it adds acquisition language for land surrounding the Bloomington-Normal Airport Authority needed facilitate the construction of a runway. This will allow the Bloomington-Normal Airport to capture 4.6 million from the Federal Government that would be lost if we don't do this, because they cannot get the acquisition done by July 15th, 1992 deadline. And lastly, at the request of the Capital Development Board Department of Mental Health, the Carlson Specialized Living Center is reverted from Capital Development Board to Department of Mental Health as its sponsoring authority, where it belongs. Move the adoption of the Conference Committee Report No. 1.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Any discussion? The question is, shall the Senate adopt the Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1904. All in favor, vote Aye. All opposed, vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please take the record. On this question, there are 58 Ayes, no Nays, none recorded as Present. And the Senate does adopt the Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1904, and is hereby declared passed. Let's turn to Supplemental Calendar No. 4, please. Motions in Writing. On Senate Bill 62, Senator Welch. We're on Calendar No. 4.

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

Motions in Writing. ...(machine cutoff)...there been a change in sponsorship on this bill? Senator Demuzio, is this your bill now? Senator Demuzio. The Calendar doesn't reflect it. I'm sorry. Read the motion, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

I move to waive Senate Rule 5C with regard to Senate Bill 62, and that the bill be exempted from the Committee on Rules so that it can be considered by the Senate.

Filed by Senator Demuzio.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Demuzio.

SENATOR DEMUZIO:

Well, thank you, Mr. President. I -- I think, either before or after, we need to speak to Senator Welch so that he could put it into the record that he, in fact, is relieving himself as the principle sponsor of Senate Bill 62. But with respect to this motion, Senate Bill 62 will simply be used as a vehicle, perhaps in the fall, if there is a need for such a bill. And therefore, we're just moving to have it exempted for this Session.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Gentleman has moved to suspend the appropriate rules so that it be exempted from Rules. Hearing no objections, it's suspended. Now, Senator Welch, for the purpose of transferring the bill. Senator Welch, please.

SENATOR WELCH:

Yes. Yes, I would ask that I be removed as the chief sponsor, made a hyphenated sponsor and Senator Demuzio be made the chief sponsor of Senate Bill 62.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Gentleman asks leave of the Body to have Senator Demuzio assume the prime sponsorship. He is a co-sponsor on Senate Bill 62. Hearing no objections, be so recorded. Senate -- Senator

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

Lake -- Lady from Lake, Senator Geo-Karis, for what purpose seek recognition? Geo-Karis, please.

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

Mr. President, I was going to ask a question on that Senate Bill 62.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

I'm sorry, I didn't see your light. Senate Bill 699. Senator Cullerton. You want to...

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

I was just going to ask a question of Senator Demuzio.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

All right. Leave of the Body. Hearing no objections, Senator Geo-Karis.

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

Senator Demuzio, are you proceeding with 62 in the fall, did you say or...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Demuzio.

SENATOR DEMUZIO:

Myself and Senator Rea and Senator Davidson just thought that we just probably needed a vehicle later on in the -- in the -- in the fall. And if we did, we wanted to bring the motion to the Membership at this time. And we probably won't move it.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Davidson.

SENATOR DAVIDSON:

Just so this vehicle will be available if we need it. Do we not have to take a recorded vote of 30 votes to exempt it from Rule 5?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Got leave of the Body.

SENATOR DAVIDSON:

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

Thank you.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senate Bill -- any further discussion on Senate Bill 62? Let's move to Senate Bill 699. Senator Cullerton. Motions in Writing. Read the bill, Madam -- or read the motion.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

I move to waive Senate Rule 5C with regard to Senate Bill 699, and that the bill be exempted from the Committee on Rules so that it can be considered by the Senate.

Filed by Senator Cullerton.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Cullerton.

SENATOR CULLERTON:

Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. This motion was debated earlier, and I think that -- I didn't realize that we were going to get into the merits of the bill, the Conference Committee, which has been filed. And so the bill was -- fell few votes -- one vote short, actually. So I thought that what I'd do is explain what the bill does and ask for your affirmative This is very similar to the electrical licensing bill which was Senate Bill 443, which passed the General Assembly, passing in the House with 100 votes and in the Senate with 44 votes. bill is a safety measure which is needed to insure individuals performing complicated electrical wiring are skilled and knowledgeable in their field. After the Governor vetoed the bill - the original licensing bill - the House and the Senate sponsors met -- had several meetings with interested parties. There were a number of changes that were made to the bill at request of those parties. And even in the Governor's Veto Message, he expressed general support for a licensing first change is an exemption that was requested by the Retail Merchants; the licensing requirements for the installation or

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

repair of household products, including audio and video equipment, appliances, fans, garage door openers, et cetera, by a company engaged in the retail sale of consumer products. The second change clarified the definition of "minor electrical work," and it exempts such work from the provisions of the bill. So this includes work which does not require changes in the wiring to or from electrical fixtures or involve the removal, replacement, installation or reinstallation of wiring or electrical fixtures. This was as suggested by the Municipal League. The third change requirements clarifies, in the educational for electrician, that an applicant must have either a bachelor of science degree or one year's experience as a licensed journeyman, five years' experience in directing, completing, supervising and installing wiring. The fourth change is a clarification of the inspection provisions. It was never my intention to require the State to inspect every new electrical installation. Section the bill clearly states that a political subdivision may continue to conduct its own inspections and charge fees for inspections, just as the practice is today. The fifth change is an exemption from the licensing and inspection requirements for the industrial and manufacturing businesses for work performed on its own premises, by its own employees. This was a request of the Illinois Manufacturing Association. So I would say that we did debate on this earlier. have some We license everybody, virtually, in this State, including interior designers landscape architects. and this is an area which is very, very potentially dangerous. There are twenty-four states that license electricians. We are aware of the fact that there's been some very serious fires in Chicago and other parts of the State that came about as a result of unlicensed electricians doing poor work. So I would be happy to answer any questions, and I would urge an Aye vote.

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Any discussion? Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

Yes. Thank you, Mr. President. Just a comment. First of all, the Senator mentioned that this passed with little or no opposition. Well, I think that probably occurred, and I know it occurred, because I supported the first bill when it was brought this last -- over a year ago. But now, I mean, once we've found out the impact that this has on the little guy, and the people realize that -- what is going to happen when this is implemented, we were getting a considerable amount of opposition. And now -- I mean, he mentioned again that it passed the House overwhelmingly. It -- this particular proposal...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Excuse me, Senator Watson. Senator Cullerton can't hear your question. Would you give the Gentleman your attention, please? Please proceed.

SENATOR WATSON:

Well, Senator Cullerton mentioned that this passed the House with limited opposition, and also the Senate. But this particular proposal we have before us now was -- passed the House with 64 votes, a verified roll call - hardly something that would be considered noncontroversial. I would like to ask, if I could, the Senator a couple of questions about the impact this may have on the State.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

He indicates he'll yield.

SENATOR WATSON:

Does Chicago have a licensing procedure now for electricians?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Cullerton.

SENATOR CULLERTON:

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

Chicago licenses electrical contractors now.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

So in other words, the fires and all the concerns that you were talking about in Chicago, they were done by licensed contractors. So by licensing these people isn't going to solve that particular problem. What about...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Excuse me. Senator Cullerton indicates...

SENATOR WATSON:

Pardon me?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Cullerton.

SENATOR CULLERTON:

Well, just to clarify. I just want to make the record clear. The -- the wiring that was done that resulted in the fires were done by -- not by a licensed electrical contractor. They were in violation of the City ordinances. Okay? Just so the record's clear.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

All right. But what about in the rural communities that I represent that will have a problem? And you say that the communities and the local units of government "may" inspect. If -- if the State isn't going to inspect, then who will, if it isn't the local communities?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Cullerton.

SENATOR CULLERTON:

In Section 90 of the bill, the State has the obligation to

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

inspect. However, if the local municipality has inspectors, then the State may delegate that authority to the local inspectors. If you have a small community where there's a new installation and you do not have any municipal inspectors, the State would have that obligation, and fees have to be paid to become licensed, and it's contemplated that those fees would more than adequately pay for the cost of the inspections.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Watson.

SENATOR WATSON:

You had talked about exempting certain major All right. retailers in this State, because the -- now the Illinois Retail Merchants' Association is no longer opposed. Those individual merchants and retailers go out now and can provide contracting service. In other words, they can install conditioning, heating. They sell this type of equipment. Now they're not going to be licensed. So again, the little guy is going to have to compete with somebody who doesn't have that financial obligation to have a licensed electrician. They will not have to be inspected, because you've exempted some of retailers in this State by taking care of the Illinois Retail Merchants' Association, which I don't have any problem with necessarily, but what it does is creates a noncompetitive -- or a competitive situation that just isn't fair, Senator. And the problem right now that we hear and we're seeing -we're not hearing from the little guy. The guy out there with the pickup truck that's been working and doing electrical work State in most of our districts for years - we're not hearing from him, 'cause he has no idea about what we're to do here if this kind of legislation passes. What we're going to do to this type of individual is put him out of business. This is the little guy out there with a family or three or four, making what he can

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

to make a living in this State. We're going to now require him to be licensed. By whom? Primarily a board that will be made up of organized labor, AFL-CIO people, who will not rubber-stamp this guy into -- back into being licensed. He'll have to go through a procedure, probably, that he won't be able to comply. And we -- we just wipe him out. I just think this is the wrong thing to do, Senator, and I think that if we pass this legislation and it ultimately becomes law, we're doing a big injustice, not only to the people of this State, but certainly those little guys out there that are trying to make a living and make things better for themselves. So you're...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Gentleman from Cook...

SENATOR WATSON:

... I certainly support a No vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Brookins.

SENATOR BROOKINS:

Thank you, Mr. President and Members of the Senate. I rise in opposition to this bill. This is -- this is a terrible thing to do to small businessmen and people in business. We know have one of the largest minority contract -- electric contractors in the State of Illinois, Rufus Taylor, who just last month had a nice write-up in the Tribune outlining how he had worked with his father and how they had built their business over sixty-five years, and how he employs people. And he's a member of the Black Contractors United, and I have a letter from them, and they are saying how terrible this bill is. They're diametrically opposed to it, because it will put them out of business -- that they cannot compete, as was said earlier. They are little guys, and they are competing here in the State of Illinois. We're talking about pulling yourselves up by your bootstraps. Why put roadblocks in

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

the way of that? That's what we're talking about. This is a roadblock. Now we defeated this bill once. I can't see any minority in this General Assembly voting for this bill. It is terrible. It is terrible. It's an awful bill, and I ask your No vote on this bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

May the Chair point out that this is really an undebatable motion, but -- we've got a number of other lights who are seeking recognition. Senator Schaffer.

SENATOR SCHAFFER.

Mr. President. Ι think we ought to debate thoroughly, because in my twenty years, I have not seen a fouler, more self-serving piece of legislation presented to this Body. think Watson's soft on it, although it does have one novel concept that we might want to enact for Legislators. I understand this allows the descendant's <sic> (decedent's) heirs of a master electrician to keep his permit, so we make these licenses What a great idea for the Legislature! I should, for the record, like to point out that the Independent Electrical Contractors oppose this bill. The Illinois Manufactured Housing Association opposes this bill. The Illinois State Chamber Commerce opposes this bill. The Illinois Association of Realtors oppose this bill. The Illinois Farm Bureau opposes this bill. The Management Association of Illinois oppose this bill. Illinois Municipal League oppose this bill. Growmark, which is subsidiary of the Farm Bureau, opposes this bill, and GTE opposes this bill. And if more people knew about it, they'd oppose it. You know, a few months ago I had a vacuum cleaner die on me. stopped working. I took it to Sears, who have been - I notice exempted out of this, and they said, "Buy another vacuum cleaner. We can't fix this." I took it to a little quy in my hometown who's in his seventies and works out of his basement. He fixed it

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

seven and a half bucks. That's who this bill is designed to put out of business. That's exactly what this bill's designed to do. You know, they talk about people not being qualified. The kind of guy that we're talking about, the kind of guy who's got a panel truck and has worked in electrical wiring for thirty-five years isn't going to pull up in front of IBM and say, "Let me hook up a twenty-two-million-dollar computer system." They know what they can handle. They only bid on the things they can handle. This Act is designed to exterminate the small businessman in this field in this State, and to drive up costs on senior citizens and every citizen in this State. It is a foul, self-serving piece of legislation that will drive up costs for all of our citizens, and serve the interests of a small special interest group, and it deserves a resounding defeat.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Is there any further discussion? There's a number of lights that are still lit. Senator Jones. Emil. Senator Jones.

SENATOR JONES:

Thank you, Mr. President. You know, nineteen years ago, when I came to this Body, and an old-timer who served in the Body said to me, "Young man, the only thing you have going for you is your word." This piece of legislation came before the Insurance, Pensions and Licensed Activities Committee. There was concern raised on my part as to how it impacted on the small and minority contractors. We stripped the bill, and I personally called those same individuals that my ex-friend, Senator Brookins, alluded to. We had several meetings on that bill. The bill passed this House as a shell bill, because we did not come to any agreement. When we finally came to an agreement, they all said the bill is okay. We made the recommended changes and it was incorporated in the bill. And the same individuals on this side, who purportedly speaks for

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

minorities -- most of them voted for it. Now the bill -- the Governor vetoed it, and I happen to -- I must tell this story. happened to be in the rotunda last fall during the Veto Session, and these same individuals were out there trying to tell people not to override the veto. They admitted to me - right there in the rotunda - that they had no opposition to the bill, Governor Jim Edgar gives them contracts, and therefore, so they won't lose no contracts, they got to tell a lie and put that in writing to try to mislead people. Your word is the only thing that you have going for you, and I am shocked that they had audacity to put that lie on a piece of paper. This bill, as far as the minority contractors were concerned -- I represent minority community equally as well as my colleague, and they spoke quite clearly on that issue this past Primary - because I keep my word. But to come before this Body to spew all these lies and forth as though only one person - one individual - represents the minorities -- uh-uh - it doesn't work that way. you have a Ιf reason to vote against the bill, vote against that bill. But don't come talking to this Body about this group because whole sheet of paper that you read is a pack of lies. And I stand here to say it on this Senate Floor, because I resent - I resent -- Senator Cullerton held that bill, at my request, and it passed out of here as a shell bill to satisfy the concerns of the minority community. And they agreed to the bill. But because they have deals with the Governor, whom they endorsed, and he threatened them with their contracts, that's why they're doing what they're doing. And it's a disgrace and it's a shame on each and every one of them. So for that reason, if you want to vote against the bill for other reasons, okay, but don't bring that to this Senate Floor. Your word is the only thing you have going for you, and I intend to vote Aye on this motion.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

Any further discussion? Emil, easy on the equipment. Senator Butler.

SENATOR BUTLER:

Thank you, Mr. President. I'd appreciate it if the audio monitor were turned up several notches. I can't match Senator Brooks <sic>. Question of the sponsor, please.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Indicates -- Senator Cullerton? He'll yield.

SENATOR BUTLER:

Senator Cullerton, I'm a little confused. It seems to me that no matter how you couch the language, the State remains as -- has the primary responsibility. So we are going into the electrical inspection business on a big-time scale. I can think of a lot of instances where a community, for example, will say, "Well, let the State do it. It absolves me from any kind of responsibility, legal or otherwise." So the question I -- I have to ask you is, is my impression correct? Is the State going to assume a primary responsibility in the electrical inspection business?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Cullerton.

SENATOR CULLERTON:

I have an interesting idea. Why don't we read the bill? Section 90. "Except -- except where any political subdivision has by ordinance provided for electrical inspection similar to that provided by <sic> (in) this Act, every new electrical installation in any construction or -- remodeling, replacement, or repair, except minor repair...shall be subject to inspection by the Department" of Labor. Yes, if there's a brand-new installation and there's nobody inspecting it, this bill says the State has to inspect it. But if a city like Park Ridge, has passed an ordinance providing for electrical inspection, then they have to do it. Can you imagine not inspecting a brand-new electrical

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

inspection in Park Ridge? You wouldn't do it.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Butler.

SENATOR BUTLER:

Senator, I don't think we're reinventing the wheel here. It would seem to me that there's some — there's some mechanism in place now that takes care of the example you gave. So what is — what position does the State have in all of this, except I suppose it's kind of a make-work — make-work proposition from the word — from the word go. That's not a question. I just object — I just object to the fact that the State is going into a — into a — or being put in a position it should not be put in.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator O'Daniel.

SENATOR O'DANIEL:

Thank you, Mr. President, Members of the Senate. I rise in opposition to this bill, and I think there's no one in this Chamber that has any objection to having a licensed electrician doing their work. But I think the way the bill is written, it'll be very detrimental to agriculture in small rural communities, because licensed electricians in these small communities - they can't hire people to help them or to service agriculture or the small communities. I just think -- I'd talk with the sponsor, and thought maybe we could work out some small differences where the -- this thing could be voted on and be agreeable to everyone. But it seems that it can't be. So the way it is, I would object to this bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Lady from Lake, Senator Geo-Karis.

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, I think we're all entitled to our opinion on this Floor. And in defense

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

of Senator Brookins, I think that he has hit the nail on the head. I have had more calls and more letters against this bill, and I voted for this bill last year - unwittingly - but I'd never do it again, because we will be putting a lot of people out of work with it - and whether you want to say so or not. And then when you have a grandfather clause where you have a descendant's <sic> (decedent's) heirs to retain a master electrician and obtain a contractor's license, that's no protection for the public. I think this has -- this bill has been debated so much in the past. I don't think it's fair to the small person, like Senator Watson said, if there's a family trying to make a living. And there's more bureaucracy. The State's going to have to inspect if the municipalities don't have an electrician -- electrical inspector, and many municipalities don't have one. So I speak against this motion, and ask for a No vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Lady from Cook, Senator Collins.

SENATOR COLLINS:

Yes, thank you. Question of the sponsor, please.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Indicates he'll yield.

SENATOR COLLINS:

Senator, there's a lot of talk, you know, about what's in this bill and what's not in. I'm trying to follow this as closely as I can. But if you will please, and be brief, answer my questions without editorializing, so that I can understand it. Does this bill require all persons — the small — to do odd — who make their living now, doing odd and small jobs, repairing certain things for people in their homes? And believe it or not, many of the homeless people and many of the General Assistance people who — who have been deemed eligible really try and make their living by doing odd jobs, and many can do, but not licensed and probably

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

will not be licensed. So could you tell me, does this bill refer to these people -- type of people who does odd jobs around in the community?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Cullerton.

SENATOR CULLERTON:

No.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Collins.

SENATOR COLLINS:

What is the requirement for becoming licensed?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Cullerton.

SENATOR CULLERTON:

There are different degrees of licensure. There's a master electrician, and that person has to have a college degree in electrical engineering, or one year's experience acceptable to the Director of Labor as a licensed journeyman, or five years' experience acceptable to the Director, in supervising the installation of wiring, or six years' experience working for an electrical contractor. There's a journeyman electrician, and that person has qualifications required. There's apprentices, and there's also residential electricians who are electricians who only work in single-family homes or apartment buildings and they have their requirements as well.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Collins.

SENATOR COLLINS:

Senator, would not that category of people take in those -like the janitors and other people that actually take care of
buildings? Many of them have to do that just for their own rent,
but they are like handymen and they can, in fact, in apartment

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

buildings at a reduced level, many of them, for their own places to stay, do handy kind of work and is very good at it, but probably would never meet your requirements in order to be licensed.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Cullerton.

SENATOR CULLERTON:

Well, your question, I thought, was concerning the issue of minor repairs or repairs of household products which are exempt. This bill is aimed at construction that involves complicated wiring of -- like building buildings, and that's what it's aimed at. And so in answering your question about the odd jobs that someone might do, they don't have to be licensed.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Collins.

SENATOR COLLINS:

Senator, my last question to clarify again, but what about those persons we talked about on the last level before of maintaining buildings that work in -- just doing building repairs, upkeep of buildings - as a manager of a building who does odd jobs and electricity, as an electrician would be doing things of that nature on a small scale? It could be a six-flat apartment?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Cullerton.

SENATOR COLLINS:

Is there a definition for what is the size of these buildings that they may be, the size of a job that is considered as an odd job?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Would you let him answer? Senator Cullerton.

SENATOR CULLERTON:

The -- the bill contains an exemption by defining "minor

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

electrical work" and it exempts minor electrical work from the provisions of the bill. So that would be work which does not require changes in the wiring to or from electrical fixtures or involving the removal, replacement, installation or reinstallation of wiring or electrical fixtures, and that was suggested by the Municipal League. And so that is designed to take care of the odd-job minor repairs. It also says if you're an owner, you are exempt. You can do work as owner of your own building without being licensed. Also, if you have your uncle come over and help out, as long as he's not an employee of yours, he's exempt as well.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Collins, I thought that was your last question. SENATOR COLLINS:

But -- but -- but if I - and which I do - get a lot of work done in my house by hiring unemployed people, and especially some of those in recovery homes in my district, are giving these people an opportunity, that -- who are currently now on General Assistance, additional money. Would I then, because I pay that person, would then -- could that person still come to my house and do odd jobs, which includes sometimes electrical kind of things? PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Cullerton.

SENATOR CULLERTON:

Well, if they're doing major electrical work, they would have to be licensed. If they're doing minor repairs or odd jobs, they don't have to be licensed. And you are very much aware of the —of the problems that occur in buildings where someone did a rewiring, they didn't know what they were doing, and people get killed as a result of those fires. So again, if it's a major rewiring, you want to have somebody that knows what they're doing. In the City of Chicago, we already have this. This bill really is

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

designed to -- for those areas outside the City of Chicago, where we don't have the licensing of the electrical contractors.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Gentleman from Cook, Senator Keats. Gentleman from Whiteside, Senator Schuneman. Please. Ladies and Gentlemen, please, could we have your attention, please?

SENATOR SCHUNEMAN:

Thank -- thank you, Mr. President. I oppose this motion because I oppose the idea. Senator Cullerton just said, in his last statement, that in the City of Chicago we already have this. Well, Senator, I really don't think we need your help Downstate on I think that the small business people in Downstate Illinois that are going to be put out by this - put out of business by this bill - are not going to send you a note of thanks. I'm concerned about the people who are not members of the State Chamber of Commerce. They're not members of the IMA. They're not members of the Electrical Contractors Association. They're not a part of this process, and they won't know what you're doing on the Floor of the Senate until a year or eighteen months later - they'll suddenly decide that we here in the Illinois Senate passed a bill to put them out of business. think Senator O'Daniel's point was well-taken - that in rural Illinois we depend upon these people. You tend to make the point that they don't know what they're doing. The fact is just the opposite, sir. They know what they're doing. Most of them have had years of experience, and they're not going to take on some huge job. But, you know, if you want to protect the rights of union workers and big contractors in the City of Chicago, be my guest. But really, we shouldn't extend this to the rest of the State of Illinois. I urge a No vote on the motion.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Cullerton, to close.

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

SENATOR CULLERTON:

Senator, if they know what they're doing, they're going to be grandfathered in. They'll get the license. I don't mind losing a bill for -- on the merits, but people are getting up and giving speeches as if they know what this -- is in this bill, and they're they're missing the point. This is not dominated by some The board that's set up by this bill is appointed by the Director of Labor, who is appointed by the Governor. The fact is, Senator Butler, that there are many parts of this State that have no inspections for brand -- big, brand-new buildings that involve complicated wiring. As far as Senator Brookins' concerns, believe me, what I did -- in fact, I talked today to the Black Contractors United. They had eight concerns, all of which were addressed by this bill. They just didn't take the time to read it and find out that we took care of them. With regard to the Farm Bureau. said earlier, I sat and talked to them to find out what their They said, "Well, we install some problem was. irrigation equipment and we think we might be covered." I told weren't, and they said, "Well, we're still against it." I don't know what else I can do other than answer all these objections that have come up. The fact of the matter is, we don't license electricians. We license other people that perhaps shouldn't be, and it's a very dangerous field. We ought to have some protections, and I urge an Ave vote.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

All right. The question is on the Gentleman's Motion to Waive Senate Rule 5C with respect to Senate Bill 699, and he asks that the bill be exempted from the Committee on Rules so it can be considered by the Senate. Those in favor of this motion will vote Aye. Opposed will vote Nay. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

the record. On that question, there are 29 Ayes, 28 Nays, and the motion fails. On the Order of Conference Committee Reports, Madam Secretary, there's a Report with respect to Senate Bill 2068.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 2068. PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Jacobs.

SENATOR JACOBS:

Before the fight starts, thank you, Ladies and Gentlemen President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. Senate Bill 2068 does two things. Number one, it provides that if the court changes any rules of the Department of Public Aid regarding tissue transplants, and they're declared invalid, that the old bill -the old rules will become the prevailing rules, and that, effect, that the Department will -- will live by that and pay the bills accordingly. I don't think that there's any opposition that portion. Then there is another portion of the bill that, in effect, says that if an applicant for public assistance has moved to Illinois from another state and the applicant was a public aid recipient in the other state within the prior twelve months and during the first twelve months of his or her residency in Illinois, he/she shall not receive a public aid grant more than he or she received in his or her home state. I think that -willing to answer any questions and Senator Welch will also, beings that's his provision, if there be any; otherwise, I ask for your support.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

The Gentleman has moved the adoption of the Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 2068. Discussion? Senator Welch. SENATOR WELCH:

Thank you, Mr. President. I would just rise in support and say that the provision for the welfare reform issue is one that

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

went through the Public Aid Committee and did pass out of the Committee. This bill is projected to save the State of Illinois over six million dollars in the upcoming fiscal year and from then on. What it does is it encourages the State to apply for a waiver from the Federal Government - a waiver that will allow for the State to pay public aid recipients the same amount as they pay -- as the public aid recipient was paid in the previous state they moved to Illinois from. I'd urge an Aye vote on this bill. PRESIDENT ROCK:

Further discussion? Further discussion? If not, the question is, shall the Senate adopt the Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 2068. Those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, vote Nay. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 55 Ayes, 1 Nay, 1 voting Present. The Senate does adopt the Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 2068. And the bill, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Resolutions.

END OF TAPE

TAPE 4

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Resolution 1484 offered by Senator Collins.

It is a death resolution.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Consent Calendar. Ladies and Gentlemen, if you'd just stand at ease. It was our plan earlier to -- to have a recess to afford the Members the opportunity to get a bite to eat. I have to

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

confer with the Minority Leader and see what his pleasure is. Just stand at ease for a moment, please. All right. Ladies and Gentlemen, the Senate will stand in recess until the hour of seven-thirty.

(RECESS)

(SENATE RECONVENES)

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senate will please come to order. Ladies and Gentlemen -yes, it is -- the hour of nine has arrived. We have three hours
before the bewitching hour. We will have two more shots at
Senator Cullerton's electrical licensing bill, and that will use
up the available time. Messages from the House, Madam Secretary.
SECRETARY HAWKER:

A Message from the House by Mr. O'Brien, Clerk.

Mr. President - I am directed to inform the Senate that the House of Representatives has refused to concur with the Senate in the adoption of their amendment to a bill of the following title, to wit:

House Bill 1181, together with Senate Amendment No.

Non-concurred in by the House, June 30, 1992.

I have a like Message -- like Messages on House Bill 1495 with Senate Amendment No. 1 and House Bill 3692 with Senate Amendment No. 1.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

1.

Secretary's Desk.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

A Message from the House by Mr. O'Brien, Clerk.

Mr. President - I am directed to inform the Senate that the House of Representatives has refused to recede from their Amendment No. 1 to a bill of the following title, to wit:

Senate Bill 221.

I am further directed to inform the Senate that the House of Representatives requests a First Committee of Conference to consider the differences of the two Houses in regard to their amendment to the bill.

Action taken by the House, June 30, 1992.

I have a like Message on Senate Bill 911, Senate Bill 1667, Senate Bill 1939.

A Message from the House by Mr. O'Brien, Clerk.

Mr. President - I am directed to inform the Senate that the House of Representatives has refused to adopt the First Conference Committee Report on House Bill 2767, and requests a Second Committee of Conference to consider the differences between the two Houses in regards to Amendments 1, 2 and 3.

I have a like report for a Second Conference Committee Report on House Bill 180.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

All right. Senator Vadalabene will move that the Senate accede to the request of the House for the appointment of those conference committees. All in favor, indicate by saying Aye. All opposed. The Ayes have it. The motion carries, and the Senate again accedes to the requests of the House. All right. Ladies and Gentlemen, we have before us Supplemental Calendar No. 5, and I would ask all of those who are attending conference committee — those who are in attendance at conference committee meetings and all those in their office, we will begin on Supplemental Calendar No. 5. That is Senators Woodyard, Leverenz, DeAngelis, Marovitz, Di Turi, Luft, Dart, Topinka, Topinka, Topinka and Topinka.

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

Senator Woodyard, how about it? It's now 9:10. Senator DeAngelis on the docket, as is Senator Woodyard, Senator Leverenz, Senator Marovitz, Senator Di Turi, Senator Luft, Senator Dart, Senator Topinka, Senator Topinka, Senator Topinka, And Senator Jones, I'm sure, is somewhere on one of these lists. Well. beauty of this is everybody asks to, "Please get my thing on a Supplemental Calendar. I'm in a hurry to get going." Is in a hurry to get going? Yeah, right, All right, Let's go. Madam Secretary, on the Order of Secretary's Non-concurrence, is House Bill 1181.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 1181.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Woodvard.

SENATOR WOODYARD:

Thank -- thank you, Mr. President and Members of the Senate. If this is correct procedurally, I would move to -- to refuse to recede from Senate Amendment No. 1, and request that a conference committee be -- be appointed.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

The motion is correct. The Gentleman has moved that the Senate refuse to recede from the adoption of Senate Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 1181, and that a conference committee be appointed. All in favor, indicate by saying Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it. The motion carries, and the Secretary shall so inform the House. Senator Leverenz, on 1495. Senator Leverenz in the hall? Senator DeAngelis. Madam Secretary, on the Order of Secretary's Desk, Non-concurrence - this is Supplemental Calendar No. 5 - is House Bill 3692. Madam Secretary, please.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 3692.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

Senator DeAngelis.

SENATOR DeANGELIS:

Thank you, Mr. President. I move that the Senate refuse to recede from Senate Amendment No. 1, and move for a Committee of Conference.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

The Gentleman has moved that the Senate refuse to recede from the adoption of Senate Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 3692, and that a conference committee be appointed. All in favor, indicate by saying Aye. Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it. The motion carries, and the Secretary shall so inform the House. Senator Leverenz, do you wish to proceed on 1495? On the Order of Conference Committee Reports is Conference Committee Report on 3493. Senator Marovitz. Madam Secretary, please.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

First Conference Committee Report on House Bill 3493.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Marovitz.

SENATOR MAROVITZ:

Thank you very much, Mr. -- Mr. President and Members of the Senate. House Bill 3493 does several things. First, it is simplified dissolution legislation which allows a simplified divorce, but you have to fulfill an awful lot of requirements to simplified divorce. Among those: irreconcilable differences; no children born or adopted; woman is not pregnant; duration of the marriage under five years; neither party has interest in real estate or real property or a home; parties waive any right to maintenance; the total fair market value of marital property is under five thousand dollars, and the combined income of the two is less than twenty-five thousand; disclosed all their assets; they've executed an agreement of all assets in excess of a hundred dollars. And the second part of the

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

bill is one which has been worked on for the last nine months the -- women's groups, the men's groups, the child support groups, Illinois Department of Public Aid, the Attorney General's Office, child support advocates throughout the State of Illinois -- for about nine months - about seventy, seventy-five hours of meetings. And we've reached an agreement on almost every point in the bill with all of those groups. Among the things in the -- in that bill is a change in the child support quidelines. -- we passed the guidelines about eight years ago in this State. At the time we passed the quidelines, there wasn't a lot of research about where Illinois stood in the guidelines, and there hasn't been any change in the guidelines for the last eight years. Illinois currently ranks forty-fourth of all the states in this country in child support - forty-fourth out of fifty-two. Therefore, we have a quideline change. One child, from twenty to twenty-three percent; two, from twenty-five to thirty-two; three, from thirty-two to thirty-seven; four, from forty to forty-one; five, from forty-five to forty-six; and the six children remains current. I would be happy to answer any questions about the There are -- there is a multiple family credit, so that if you have a second family, you get credit for the second family, and it will reduce your net income so that you will pay less, because of the amount you have to support your second I would be happy to answer any questions. It's a bill that I would say, in all honesty -- this bill - of all the bills that I've worked on in eighteen years - really is the epitome of the way the legislative process should work. A lot of people were brought together with disparate interests. We all sat in a room. The courts were not in session. We had the chief judges there, the bar associations, the women's advocates, the child support advocates, the Department of Public Aid. And we sat there from nine to five, day after day, working through all of these

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

problems, for nine months. This bill passed the House overwhelmingly, and I would hope that in the best interests of the children of this State, that we would overwhelmingly support this -- this Conference Committee.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Any discussion? The Gentleman from DuPage, Senator Philip. SENATOR PHILIP:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. I certainly -- Billy, I love you. You're a great guy. This bill has had no hearing in any committee in the Senate. It's at the last minute. I'll tell you one thing - you want to increase all these things - all you do is encourage divorced men to leave the State of Illinois. Now Senator Dunn has a commission. He's going to have public hearings on it. Let his commission come back to us and make a report. We shouldn't be doing this at the last minute. I would suggest we all vote No. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Hawkinson.

SENATOR HAWKINSON:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. With all due respect to the sponsor, I believe this bill epitomizes the worst in the legislative process. Let's think back as to how this bill has come about this Session. Mr. President? PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Yes, sir.

SENATOR HAWKINSON:

Can't...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Excuse me.

SENATOR HAWKINSON:

Let's review the history of this bill in this Session. This was a bill in the Judiciary Committee to deal with a simplified

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

divorce procedure. The bill had some problems. The sponsor agreed to send it to conference committee, and his agreement was that he would make this simplified divorce procedure apply only to Cook County.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Excuse me, Senator Hawkinson. Ladies and Gentlemen, please. Ladies and Gentlemen, please. Would you give the Gentleman your attention? Senator Hawkinson.

SENATOR HAWKINSON:

Thank you, Mr. President. This was a simplified divorce procedure bill that had some problems, and the sponsor send it to conference to limit it to Cook County. He's limited it to Cook County, but now that part of the bill really becomes irrelevant, because he has now added on the very controversial new child support guidelines. And let's review the history of that little bit. Senator Dunn's committee has scheduled hearings. The hearings are already scheduled. The committee is already appointed for the summer. The hearings will be held. sponsor of this Conference Committee attempted last month, or earlier this month, to take it away from Senator Dunn's committee transfer it to his own committee, the Executive Committee. The Senate wisely defeated that move. Now, without any debate, without any hearings, he's come forth with the same plan again. But what's worse, if you examine this plan, it's got a little something special for every House Member in there that had a part in this. They've got their own special little deal set out So in addition to being a major rewrite of these laws, we have some special interest legislation on behalf of House Members in this bill. It is what is wrong with this process. It is wrong with last-minute conference committees. We ought to give it the same vote that we gave the attempt to transfer this to sponsor's own committee, and vote No.

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Ladies and Gentlemen, please. Lady from Lake, Senator Geo-Karis.

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, I concur with the remarks of Senator Hawkinson, and much as I love the sponsor of the bill - and I do, Billy, I really love you dearly -I do feel that this bill has such great import in these economic times, that it should be afforded the hearings Statewide. Senator Dunn, Chairman of the Judiciary Committee, has arranged three Statewide hearings. I'm on the subcommittee, and certainly we to give the public an opportunity to be heard on this -this bill that's included in 3493. So I would like to ask you, Senator Marovitz, to take it out of the record, or have another conference appointed and take this out of there, because this too important a bill just to be decided just like that. would raise support money, but on the other hand, these are economic times. We've got to have some hearings and find out what is really equitable. And therefore, I have to speak against this bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Marovitz, on a point of personal privilege. What's your point? Senator Marovitz.

SENATOR MAROVITZ:

A point of personal privilege, Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

State your point.

SENATOR MAROVITZ:

Well, I think it's important to set the record straight, since some allegations were made on the other side of the aisle. So I think it's important to set the record straight - the public record straight - and I want to set it straight right now. This

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

bill - this issue - was introduced in 1991 - last year. it had hearings in the Judiciary Committee in both Houses. Ιt went to conference committee. There were some differences, having a full hearing in both Houses. So we didn't move with it on the conference committee, with an agreement that we'd hold joint hearing of both Judiciary Committees in the fall. We did hold a joint hearing of both Judiciary Committees in the fall 1991 on this very issue. And then I went to Senator Dunn, and I said these people want to continue meeting and move on this issue. And I met with those people for about seventy-five hours over next nine months, after we had this joint hearing of both the House and the Senate, and then again introduced another bill, as I did in 1991, and had hearings in '91, and introduced a bill again 1992. That was Senate Bill 1800. That bill went to the Rules Committee. That bill was ruled exempt by the Rules Committee. Leadership from both sides. It was sent to the Senate Judiciary Committee, but the Chairman chose not to post that bill, the fact that it was ruled exempt, and a Member asked him to post the bill. He decided not to post the bill and give a hearing this issue that had already had hearings in the Senate in 1991 and joint hearings in 1991. He didn't want that heard again. It went bill came over from the House with this issue in it. the Rules Committee again. Again the Rules Committee ruled it exempt, with this issue in it. Again it went to the Judiciary Committee, and again it was asked to be posted, and again it wasn't posted, despite repeated requests to get a hearing on issue - something that any Member, minority party or majority party, should be entitled to. But the Chairman didn't give it a hearing. Subsequently, and only then, after asking for this hearing, only then did I ask that the bill be removed and reassigned to another committee - only then - just as we did for a bill of the First Lady of the State of Illinois that we reassigned

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

another committee. That's when it was asked to be reassigned so that this issue involving child support could have a hearing that the Chairman refused to give it. And now, like many other issues, this issue is before us. It had a hearing in 1991 in the It had a joint hearing in 1991. All parties got together and met for the last nine months. This bill has had more hearings and meetings than ninety percent of the conference committees that you're going to vote on here. It involves child support. involves the best interests of the kids. So let's talk about the substance of this issue, and get away from the politics in saying bypassed committee. Nobody wanted to bypass committee. committee Chairman wanted to bypass the issue. Let's call it like it is. And the facts are there. I wanted a hearing on this bill. That's all. Either on the Senate bill or the House bill. Now we can talk about the substance of this issue, and I'll be glad to answer any questions about the substance of the issue.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Any further discussion? Senator Barkhausen.
SENATOR BARKHAUSEN:

Mr. President and Members, I just want to say that I think this -- this issue has been around for a while. I don't know all the ins and outs of it. I think it's, you know, troubling for some of us who try to look at the issue objectively, in that there are experts and caring people, I think, on both sides of this issue. The ISBA is apparently in favor of it. The CBA, we are told, still has some misgivings about it. But -- and -- and -- I hesitate to inject myself into what is obviously a difference of opinion between the Chairman of the Judiciary I Committee on the one hand, and the sponsor of the Conference Committee Report on the other. But I do think that the issue has been with us. Whether we need to act on it now or whether we need further hearings, I -- I can't really say, but there are certainly a

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

number of people who think that we ought to be moving now to add to the requirements for child support, and they have watered down their recommendations in ways that are -- appear to be reasonable to such groups as the American Academy of Matrimonial Lawyers. So I ask you to use your own judgment on this, and -- and not necessarily think that this is an issue that needs to be debated for another year, since it has been around since at least last spring.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Any further discussion? The Gentleman from Will, Senator Tom

SENATOR T. DUNN:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman -- Mr. President. т rise in opposition, not so much for the pure merits of the bill, but in support of what I call full and meaningful hearings that sponsor would like you to believe have occurred. Now we can get personal about this bill or not. I think we've gotten personal already. I don't think that's the way we ought to handle the business of the people. It was my feeling that we ought more than one hearing, because we all know, sitting in committee, at those end-of-May hearings, that we've got room filled with people who want to be heard, and it's the only opportunity to be heard by our Body. And I felt that we ought to have more than ten minutes of testimony from the proponents and ten minutes of testimony from the opponents and to limit it. So I chose to expand the hearings and have one in Springfield on August 11th and one in September in Chicago and one in Joliet in October. Now I've been practicing law for twenty years in the trenches. a little bit about child support. I've represented mothers in increases of child support, and I've represented fathers who have increases, as a matter of fact. So I appointed Senator Geo-Karis, because I thought this is an issue that deals with

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

children and that we ought to (a) have a woman on the committee, and I appointed Senator Hawkinson, and I appointed myself. went one step further. Rather than have the normal three Senators. I said, "Let's add Senator Marovitz." Now Senator Marovitz would have you believe that the children of Illinois out there languishing and not receiving child support. Well, it's not exactly that way. I want to quote to you just briefly this current Statute, because ten years ago the people that sat in this room wrote all-encompassing, all-inclusive language to protect children, to make children the number one item in a divorce. separate the children from the father and the mother, irregardless or wrong - that wasn't the consideration. consideration was what's in the best interests of the children. Let me read you, just briefly, what the language says about child support. "The court may order either or both parents owing a duty support to a child of the marriage to pay an amount reasonable and necessary for his support." Now that doesn't say thirty-two percent, or twenty-nine percent, because ten years ago we were smart enough to say, "Let's establish first the priority of the and then we'll talk about percentages." And you did. You set percentages, and the percentages were fair. Because when you set the percentages, you also gave the court some guidelines, and those guidelines were about five. Number one, that should not go below a certain percentage to maintain the child. And then you added several other things to consider. They call them relevant factors from the Statute - and I'm reading exactly: The financial resources of the child shall be a consideration; the financial resources and needs of the custodial parent: the standard of living of the child who would have enjoyed it had marriage not been dissolved: (d) the physical and emotional condition of the child and his educational needs; the financial resources and needs of the noncustodial parent. Now, Ladies and

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

Gentlemen, these are not elements to take away children's rights or benefits. These are listed items that give children benefits. Now if someone wants to change that all-encompassing law, either to broaden it — and I can't imagine how you could broaden it — or to restrict it, I think there ought to be more hearings. And that was my point — that there are other people that need to be heard from; that not all — and I use the universal "all" — not all sides were heard from on this issue. And I stand for the proposition that we ought to —— on an issue like this that affects every father in the State of Illinois and every mother and every child, that we ought to hear all the evidence before we decide, not just the proponents and not just the opponents.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Marovitz, to close.

SENATOR MAROVITZ:

Thank you very much, Mr. President. Well, every issue - every single issue - mentioned by the previous speaker has been addressed in this bill. Every single issue has been addressed in this bill. We are mandated by the Federal Government to use percentages and mandate to revisit the percentages regularly. That's what this does. Nobody wants ten minutes hearing an like this. Last fall, when we had joint hearings on this issue, we had joint -- joint hearings just on this issue alone, and gave this issue hours of testimony. On this issue alone, hours of testimony. And then a bill was drafted. I thought that's the way the process works. We had a bill last spring. Then we had joint hearings. We had hours of hearings, and then we introduced a bill that now almost every single group is in favor of. Nobody wants ten minutes of hearings. This is an important issue. We want -previous speaker talked about handling the business of the people. Well that's what this bill does. That's what these people did for hours and hours and hours, who got hearings - all sides. Let's

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

vote Aye for the kids, for child support, for the women's groups, for the men's groups, for the bar associations, the Department of Public Aid. Everybody's worked on this issue. It's a substantive issue. If you want to vote on the process, that's one thing. Let's vote on the substance of the issue of child support in Illinois. Solicit your Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

The question is, shall the Senate adopt the Conference Committee Report on House Bill 3493. All in favor, vote Aye. All opposed, vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please take the record. On this question, there are 22 Ayes, 30 Nays, 6 recorded as Present. Sorry? And the Senate does not concur with the Conference Committee Report on House Bill 3493, and the issue is lost. House Bill 3504. Senator Di Turi. Read the bill, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Senate Amendment -- pardon me. First Conference Committee Report on House Bill 3504.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Di Turi.

SENATOR DI TURI:

I'd like to adopt -- this bill grants the Medical Center District Commission authority to construct, or cause to be constructed, a commercial development within the designated area in the District. This Report represents an agreement between all interested parties, including the District, City of Chicago, UIC and the proposed developer. I ask for an Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Is there any discussion? The question is, shall the Senate adopt the Conference Committee Report on House Bill 3504. All in favor, vote Aye. All opposed, vote Nay. The voting is open.

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

Have all voted who wish? Please. Have all voted who wish? Please take the record. On this question, there are 55 Ayes, no Nays, none recorded as Present. And the Senate does confer --does adopt the Conference Committee Report on House Bill 3504. And this, having received the constitutional majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3594. Senator Luft. Read the bill, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

Second Conference Committee Report on House Bill 3594.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Luft.

SENATOR LUFT:

Thank you, Mr. President. I would move that the Senate concur -- or adopt - I'm sorry - the Conference Committee -- Second Conference Committee Report on House Bill 3594. The Conference Committee excludes from the hotel tax the personnel of any organization, when that personnel obtains lodging in conjunction with training conducted at facilities that are primarily devoted to employee training and owned by the organization. What it simply does is, if a corporation has a training center and incorporated within that training center there is a residential area, you cannot charge the hotel/motel tax on those rooms if they're occupied by people of that -- members of that organization or corporation that are there for training purposes.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Any discussion? Lady from DuPage, Senator Karpiel.

SENATOR KARPIEL:

Thank you, Mr. President. I just stand in support of this legislation. It's been very narrowly drawn, and it -- I think it applies to only one or two places in the State. I'd ask for your support.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

Any further discussion? Senator Maitland.

SENATOR MAITLAND:

Thank you very much, Mr. President and Members of the Senate.

A question of the sponsor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Indicates he'll yield.

SENATOR MAITLAND.

Senator Luft, I'm wondering, any indication here at all as to what the revenue loss may be with this?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Luft.

SENATOR LUFT:

Senator, there is no revenue loss, because the tax has never been applied. What we're trying to do -- and if you remember, last year or the year before last, the unemployment securities --Department of Unemployment Securities <sic> started interpreting the law differently when it came to contractual employees. I'm sure we all received calls that people were starting to get charged for unemployment compensation costs because of a different interpretation. This tax has never been charged to anybody this situation. We're just trying to clarify it an interpretation by Revenue, either today or tomorrow, does not start trying to collect this tax on the individuals.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Maitland.

SENATOR MAITLAND:

Thank you very much, Mr. President. Senator, I -- I really have concerns about this, and I will admit to you that tonight is the first time I've seen this or even heard about it. But I am reliably informed that there is the potential for at least two million - and perhaps more than -- than two million - dollars in revenue loss. And I -- you know, I -- this is one of those issues

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

that come to us the final night, when everyone is tired and a lot of things on their mind, and I -- I would certainly proceed very cautiously with a vote like this tonight.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Gentleman from Cook, Senator Brookins.

SENATOR BROOKINS:

Thank you. Will the sponsor yield for a question?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Indicates he will.

SENATOR BROOKINS:

Would you -- would you tell me - we're going to waive a two-million-dollar bill to a company that is already charged them - is that correct?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Luft.

SENATOR LUFT:

I...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

You want to repeat the question.

SENATOR LUFT:

I am -- I am a corporation. I'm corporation X. I am your company, and on the premise of your company you have three, four, five, ten rooms that you're going to be bringing in trainees to train them in your company's business. While they are staying at that training center, we're saying that you do not have to charge a hotel/motel tax. It has never been applied in the State of Illinois, and we're just trying to clarify the law, and they are not charged for staying there.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Brookins.

SENATOR BROOKINS:

If I rent the -- the rooms to another organization and charge

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

them at a rate -- charge them a rate, then should I pay tax on it?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Excuse me.

SENATOR BROOKINS:

Or will you pay tax on it? This is what we're talking about. What we're talking about is not my trainees coming to my own place of operation; I'm talking about renting or leasing to another business - not my business - another business, where they do pay me. Then do I serve sales tax on it?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Luft.

SENATOR LUFT:

That's correct, and that's the present law, and that's the way it's happening. If anybody comes and they are charged on that room, that are not there for training purposes for that corporation, the tax is presently being applied. We're only talking about those individuals that are employees of that corporation who are there not paying a fee and for training purposes only. Anybody else is charged, and the tax is paid.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator DeAngelis. I'm sorry. Senator Brookins, are you through? Brookins.

SENATOR BROOKINS:

One -- just one more question just to make sure that we're saying the same thing. If company A calls in a lease or rent to another company and they come in, they then will pay tax and they will pay the tax to the State. Is that correct? And if that's correct, I'm on board.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Luft.

SENATOR LUFT:

That's correct.

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator DeAngelis.

SENATOR DEANGELIS:

Ouestion of the sponsor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Indicates he'll vield.

SENATOR DeANGELIS:

It was indicated that there would be a tax loss. Is there any tax being collected on this right now?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Luft.

SENATOR LUFT:

No, Senator. I stated earlier that there is no tax being collected. And as a matter of fact, one can interpret this, if you vote for this, you've just increased taxes to corporations by the tune of two million dollars.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator DeAngelis.

SENATOR DeANGELIS:

Well, I guess the -- I don't understand the tax loss, except that I know one time my wife did come home and tell me she saved fifty dollars because she bought something that would normally cost a hundred for fifty. And I guess the persons who think we lost money here must think we're already collecting it.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Senator Fawell.

SENATOR FAWELL:

Thank you very much. I happen to have one of these facilities in my district. It is a -- it's a building. Looks like an office building. It's got maybe six or seven bedrooms in. It also has a dining room where the executives eat, and it has several conference rooms. And they do indeed bring in trainees, keep them

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

over the weekend, keep them maybe there for a week or two while they tell them the newest products and so on and so forth, and then ship them on home. For us to tax something like this is, frankly, I think, rather absurd. I agree if we are going to rent it out to someone else, that's a legitimate tax. But to try and tax somebody for their own business use is wrong. I stand in support of this bill, and I think we all ought to be voting Yes.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Any further discussion? There's about seven more lights, and it's almost ten o'clock. Gentleman from Whiteside, Senator Schuneman.

SENATOR SCHUNEMAN:

Thank you, Mr. President. A question of the sponsor, if he'll yield.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR LECHOWICZ)

Indicates he will.

SENATOR SCHUNEMAN:

Senator, I think maybe the wrong question has been asked. A couple of people have asked you if any tax has been collected. My question is, has any tax been assessed?

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Luft.

SENATOR LUFT:

To my knowledge, no.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Schuneman.

SENATOR SCHUNEMAN:

Well, I'm advised that the Department of Revenue has in fact levied, or assessed, two million dollars in tax under this issue, and that this bill is being brought forward to solve that issue, rather than the taxpayers going into court and litigating the issue. So I think if that, in fact, is the case, that we're being

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

asked here tonight to act as judge and jury on an issue which perhaps properly belongs before the court - at least until we all have a good understanding of what we're doing here. Under those circumstances, I'd be reluctant to support the bill.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Further discussion? Senator Butler.

SENATOR BUTLER:

Thank you, Mr. President. Ladies and Gentlemen, I have some experience working with conference centers, and I can tell you that it's -- it's ludicrous to charge a hotel tax on properties that are owned by the company, that is rooms that are owned by the -- by the company. I agree that should they rent it out, it should be taxed, but it doesn't make any sense. And if we're -- this two million dollars is -- I think is a -- if we indeed do collect it, I think it's the wrong thing, even though I don't like to use two million -- lose two million bucks. I would urge everyone to vote for this.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Luft, to close.

SENATOR LUFT:

Thank you, Mr. President. Senator Schuneman, I don't know who your handler is over there. You voted for this 58 to nothing. It's more — it's more narrowly defined now as when you voted for it. This has had hearings in both Revenue Committees of the House and the Senate. There has been an audit, and that audit finally showed up after we asked Revenue for the last month what would the revenue be on. It showed up yesterday, right before the vote in the House, on one side of the aisle. That's when this showed up for the first time that there may be an audit and there may be a potential two million dollars in increased taxes to corporations. And I'm going to repeat it. Increased taxes. There has been no tax collected that I know of. If it has, Revenue has not told me,

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

and I've been with this bill for at least six or seven weeks, and it's the first time I've heard it - tonight. This is a very simple concept. It passed this -- or the Senate 58 to nothing the last time, and I would ask for your support.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Question is, shall the Senate adopt the Conference Committee Report on House Bill 3594. Those in favor will vote Ave. Opposed, vote Nay. And the voting's open. All voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 50 Aves all fifty of whom spoke on that bill: against it, 4 Navs, and 1 voting Present. The Senate does adopt the Conference Committee Report on House Bill 3594, and the bill, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. All right. Ladies and Gentlemen, we are on Supplemental No. 5. No. 6 has been distributed. No. 7 is in the works, and there will be a No. 8. So I would ask the Members to please be cognizant of one another. Virtually there are a number of Members who have matters yet pending, most of whom I suspect would like to get it done midnight, if possible, and I would ask you to keep your remarks as brief as possible. On the Order of Supplemental No. is House Bill 4188, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

First Conference Committee Report on House Bill 4188.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Dart.

SENATOR DART:

Thank you, Mr. President and Members of the Senate. I will keep this very brief. I move that we adopt Conference Committee No. 1 to House Bill 4188. It was put into conference to work out some differences in regards to Senate Amendment No. 2. The House has seen the light, and the Senate Amendment was the proper one.

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

In addition to that, we are adding provisions which would allow Peoria County to lower its fees. We added some revisory language, and we also put in a provision dealing with judgeship -- allowing them to maintain a judge in Peoria, an item which has already passed both Houses. It's on the Governor's desk. This bill passed the Senate 58 to nothing, and it just -- the Conference Committee just passed the House 111 to 3. I'd ask for your support.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Any discussion? Senator Hawkinson.

SENATOR HAWKINSON:

Thank you, Mr. President. Will the sponsor yield for a question?

PRESIDENT ROCK:

He indicates he will yield, Senator Hawkinson.

SENATOR HAWKINSON:

Senator, the first part of the amendment on the fee structure for Peoria County, is that permissive to the county board?

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Dart.

SENATOR DART:

Yes, it is, Senator.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Further discussion? If not, the question is, shall the Senate adopt the Conference Committee Report on House Bill 4188. Those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, vote Nay. And the voting's open. All voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 57 Ayes, 1 Nay, none voting Present. The Senate does adopt the Conference Committee Report on House Bill 4188, and the bill, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. On the Order of Conference Committee Reports, there's a

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

Report with respect to Senate Bill 1490. Senator Topinka. Yes, no or maybe. Mr. Secretary, please.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. HARRY)

First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1490.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Topinka.

SENATOR TOPINKA:

Yes, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, I would ask concurrence in -- in the Conference Committee Report on all amendments. Everybody seems to be signed off on it. This is the Taxpayers' Federation of Illinois' Uniform Penalty and Interest Act. It has a number of issues in here, including a voluntary disclosure program with immediate effective date. The Department of Revenue is -- has -- is totally supportive and -- and advocating it. We've also done a number of other things that the Department of Revenue wanted done. Everybody seems to be in concurrence at this time, and I would ask for your positive vote or answer any questions if need be.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Is there any discussion? If not, the question Discussion? is, shall the Senate adopt the Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1490. Those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, vote Nay. And the voting's open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 54 Ayes, no Nays, none voting Present. The Senate does adopt the Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1490. And the bill, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. 1516. Senator Topinka. Mr. Secretary, please.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. HARRY)

First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1516.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

Senator Topinka.

SENATOR TOPINKA:

Yes, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, this -- the Report becomes the bill, and basically amends the Consumer Fraud and Deceptive Business Practices Act to define the various services that can be performed by people in assisting an immigrant in filling out and handling other immigration problems. It's supported by Central Management Services. We've worked with the City of Chicago very closely. It is in conformance with what they want to do. It certainly does not, in any way, disturb their current regulation on how they handle immigration papers and those who are filling them out and performing other services. also do, too, is we add a part of House Bill 4160, which is Senator Severns' bill, which created the State Employment Records provides for the Department of Central Management in cooperation with the State Comptroller and various other agencies, to collect and publish information concerning salaries and minorities and women and other information that would be of interest. CMS has no problem with that language. is also supported by the Illinois Hispanic State Employees' Association. That is all I know at this point. If there are any concerns, I certainly would be happy to address them. But at this point, I think we're pretty well negotiated out.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

All right. The Lady has moved the adoption of the Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1516. Discussion? If not, the question is, shall the Senate adopt the Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1516. Those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, vote Nay. And the voting's open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 55 Ayes, no Nays, none voting Present. The Senate does adopt the Conference Committee

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

Report on Senate Bill 1516. And the bill, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator Mahar. 2048. Mr. Secretary, on the Order of Conference Committee Reports, there's a Report with respect to Senate Bill 2048.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. HARRY)

First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 2048.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Mahar.

SENATOR MAHAR:

Thank you, Mr. President and Members. The -- first of all, would move the adoption of the First -- First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 2048. The first item is the same thing that we dealt with -- when it brought -- I brought this before this Body. Passed 52 to 1. It was the -- to allow the civic center in my hometown to share -- to have -- share its proceeds of bingo with charities in the community. Other items which are in here are -- include the following: To prohibit the Joliet Regional Port District Act from imposing any tax, fee or license on any riverboat gambling casino. Next, it makes a technical correction the Metropolitan Pier and Exposition Authority, at the request of the Department of Revenue, to deposit their two-percent allocation fee into the Tax Compliance and Administration Fund. Following, it allows the Department of Revenue to accept income tax payment by credit card, but only if the State is not required to pay the vendor's discount fee. Also, it creates the Casino Gambling Impact Study Task Force with a report to the General Assembly by September the 30th, 1992. I'd move its adoption.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

The Gentleman has moved the -- that the Senate adopt the Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 2048. Discussion? Senator Hawkinson.

SENATOR HAWKINSON:

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

Thank you, Mr. President. I think that the Members ought to know that on the Casino Gambling Impact Study Task Force, that this does not have the normal bipartisan makeup, that the Task Force shall be composed of three members appointed by the Speaker of the House, three members appointed by the President of the Senate, one member appointed by the Mayor, and one member appointed by the Governor. As I see the Report, there are no members appointed by the Minority Leader of either the House or the Senate, and I think we can imagine what the report will be. PRESIDENT ROCK:

Further discussion? Senator Lechowicz.

SENATOR LECHOWICZ:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. I also stand in opposition to this Conference Committee Report. I don't believe that the Casino Gambling Impact Study Task Force really does give us a fair opportunity to evaluate exactly what's been going on and proposed by the Mayor of the City of Chicago. If there's any -- if there's any study that's been impacted in this State -- in fact, I don't know if you received the voluminous -- number of volumes that I did just this -- a week ago. It probably could give us a study as far as how it implement within this State, the revenue impact, the job impact, and ask -- and also the moral impact of casino gambling. There was a six volume booklets that were presented to me on this subject matter. I don't believe that this matter, as far as it currently is -- is assembled, would do justice to the study that's been on hand. And I strongly encourage a No vote.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Further discussion? Senator Jacobs.

SENATOR JACOBS:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate.

Quickly, even with a chuckle. Senator Lechowicz, as much as I

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

love the Mayor of Chicago, anybody that can believe that report has got to be a little bit goofy. But my biggest concern is really the issue that I think is really at hand, and that is the issue, on page 1 of the Report, which deals with the provision to where we have a regional port district trying to get in on the act, even though that has been prohibited by law, and they're still trying -- or it hasn't been given the right by law and they're trying to take that. And I think that that provision is good enough to pass this, even though, Teddy, in -- in all seriousness, I don't think we need another impact study either. I think we've got enough of those going on. But I think we should support this.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Further discussion? Senator Mahar, to close.

SENATOR MAHAR:

Thank you, Mr. President and Members. The very short history behind the casino gambling — it was imposed by a State Representative from Chicago. The Speaker wouldn't let it out of the House unless this was in it. Interestingly enough, if you note that the date for the report to be to the General Assembly is September the 30th of this year. The bill won't even be signed by September 30th this year. So there will be no casino impact study. And I would move its adoption.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Question is, shall the Senate adopt the Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 2048. Those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, vote Nay. And the voting's open. All voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 17 Ayes, 29 Nays, 1 voting Present. The Conference Committee Report is not adopted, and the Secretary shall so inform the House. 2057. Senator Rea. Mr. Secretary, please.

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. HARRY)

First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 2057. PRESIDENT ROCK:

Ladies and Gentlemen, if I can have your attention. The Decatur Herald and Review has requested permission to shoot some still photographs. Without objection, leave is granted. Senator Rea.

SENATOR REA:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. it deals with the -- amending Mine-inspection Act and the Public Utilities Act, dealing with safety regulations in underground coal mines. And it provides a provision there - a safety factor that the examiner would be more responsive to the safety of the coal miners. In the Conference Committee Report, in concurring with House Amendments 1 and 2, which in the first -- which the Federal Clean Air Act amendments permit the utility to sell or trade emission allowances themselves; this amendment establishes a method by which the Commerce Commission can monitor the activities of the operating in -- within the State. And it also allows grant variances to the requirement of the Act, provided the variance is equal to the health and safety standards and nothing below what the federal standards would be. I would ask for an Aye vote.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Gentleman has moved concurrence or -- adoption of the Conference Committee Report on 2057. Discussion? Senator Keats. SENATOR KEATS:

For a moment, I'm trying to slow this down a little. In my long experience as a coal mine inspector, I was trying to read some of this and figure out - why do you want the coal mine inspector to be a member of the union? This does not give you the world's most unbiased inspector. It would sound to me like you've

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

just guaranteed you have an inspector who's totally biased and won't give you a fair evaluation, and it's a waste of time and money, and we probably shouldn't bother to have them.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Further discussion? Senator Weaver. All right. Senator Rea, to close.

SENATOR REA:

I would just ask for a Aye vote.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Question is, shall the Senate adopt the Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 2057. Those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, vote Nay. And the voting's open. All voted who wish? All voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 36 Ayes, 20 Nays, 1 voting Present. The Senate does adopt the Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 2057, and the bill, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. 2075. Senator Berman. Mr. Secretary, please.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. HARRY)

First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 2075.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Berman.

SENATOR BERMAN:

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. Senate Bill 2075 is the School Visitation Rights Act. I move that we adopt the First Conference Committee Report. This allows up to eight hours of unpaid leave per school year to employees to attend school conferences regarding their children. We have -- since the bill left the Senate, there have been amendments that have been adopted to tighten up and in response to requests of a number of employer groups. All of the school

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

management organizations are on board. The Illinois Manufacturers' Association is on board. And I will be glad to respond to any questions. It's, in effect, a flex-time provision to allow parents to participate in school conferences with their children.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Berman has moved that the Senate adopt the Conference Committee. Discussion? Senator Karpiel.

SENATOR KARPIEL:

Well, thank you, Mr. President. I just rise in support of this bill. This bill and a bill -- my bill very similar to it, Senate Bill 2118, both went out of this -- the Senate, and unfortunately, my bill, Senate Bill 2118, is still over in the House. This bill has been amended several times, so that it now resembles my bill. So it's a good bill. Everybody has signed off on it.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Question is, shall the Senate adopt the Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill -- I'm sorry. Senator Berman.

SENATOR BERMAN:

Thank you. I just want to indicate in the record that it's not the intent of Senate Bill 2075 to grant additional time off to employees who are already receiving personal time which could be used for school visitation. Rather, this bill is intended to facilitate an employee's ability to attend parent-teacher conferences and other school activities when there is not benefit time already available for such purposes. Thank you, Mr. President. I solicit your Aye vote.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Question is, shall the Senate adopt the Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 2075. Those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, vote Nay. And the voting's open. Have all voted who

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 54 Ayes, 2 Nays, 1 voting Present. The Senate does adopt the Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 2075, and the bill, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. We're on Supplemental Calendar No. 6. I'd ask the Membership to be alert. 2824. Senator Marovitz. Mr. Secretary, please.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. HARRY)

First Conference Committee Report on House Bill 2824.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Marovitz.

SENATOR MAROVITZ:

Thank you very much, Mr. President and Members of the Senate. House Bill 2824, in addition to having the per diem increase of twenty-five dollars for the Boxing and Wrestling Board, has the hold harmless provision if a foul ball is hit into the stands. Brings this in compliance with other states around the country, so that there will be no liability on the owner or operator of the facility if a foul ball is hit into the stands, and I would ask for adoption of the Conference Committee Report on 2824.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Discussion? Any discussion? If not, the question is, shall the Senate adopt the Conference Committee Report on House Bill 2824. Those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, vote Nay. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 41 Ayes, 12 Nays, none voting Present. House Bill 2824, having — the Senate does adopt the Conference Committee Report on House Bill 2824, and the bill, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. 3440. Senator Holmberg. Mr. Secretary, please.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. HARRY)

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

First Conference Committee Report on House Bill 3440. PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Holmberg.

SENATOR HOLMBERG:

Thank you, Mr. President. House Bill 3440 retains the original bill that passed the Senate allowing counties to lease lands for public health purposes. Since it left the Senate, several amendments have been added, several of them for the benefit of Winnebago County. Authorizes county boards to provide for the removal of garbage and debris from private property in unincorporated areas when the property owner refuses or to do so, and charge a reasonable amount of money for doing that. Adds that after acquisition by Winnebago County of certain property, a commercial tenant who sold alcoholic liquor at retail on a portion of the property may continue to do so ~ at least until the lease runs out - and also permits the Chicago Board of Education to lease space to a tenant in a building owned by the Board to sell alcoholic liquor at retail if the Board approves and the building is not used for school purposes. I know of no objection to the bill. I'd be happy to answer any questions.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

All right. The Lady has moved the adoption of the Conference Committee Report on House Bill 3440. Discussion? If not, question is, shall the Senate adopt the Conference Committee Report on House Bill 3440. Those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, vote Nay. And the voting's open. All voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take record. On that question, there are 57 Ayes, 1 Nay, 1 voting The Senate does adopt the Conference Committee Report on House Bill 3440, and the bill, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. 3445. Senator Berman. Mr. Secretary, please.

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. HARRY)

First Conference Committee Report on House Bill 3445.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Berman.

SENATOR BERMAN:

Thank you, Mr. President. I move that we adopt -- I move that the Senate adopt the First Conference Committee Report on House Bill 3445. This bill is now identical to the excellent bill sponsored by Senator Rock, Senate Bill 400, that has previously been approved by this Body. I move the adoption of Conference Committee Report No. 1.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Geo-Karis.

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

Sponsor yield for a question?

PRESIDENT ROCK:

He indicates he will yield, Senator Geo-Karis.

SENATOR GEO-KARIS:

Was the weapons part taken out of the bill?

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Berman.

SENATOR BERMAN:

Yes. That's why we went to Conference Committee Report. There was a mix-up. That's been straightened out.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Question is, shall the Senate adopt the Conference Committee Report on House Bill 3445. I'm sorry. Senator Davidson.

SENATOR DAVIDSON:

Question of the sponsor.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Indicates he will yield.

SENATOR DAVIDSON:

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

Has the part about the confiscation of weapons been deleted from this?

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Berman.

SENATOR BERMAN:

Yes. That was Senator Geo-Karis' question.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Question is, shall the Senate adopt the Conference Committee Report on House Bill 3445. Those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed, vote Nay. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? All voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 58 Ayes, no Nays, none voting Present. The Senate does adopt the Conference Committee Report on House Bill 3445, and the bill, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator Raica. 1615. Mr. Secretary, please.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. HARRY)

First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1615.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Raica.

SENATOR RAICA:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. What Senate Bill 1615 -- this Report requires the House to recede from Amendment 2, and adds language stating that the State's attorney may petition the court to obtain HIV test results of a convicted defendant. Such results are relevant to the prosecution of a charge of criminal transmission of HIV. The bill, in this form, now requires the court to notify the defendant in sex-related criminal cases if the defendant tests positive for the HIV virus. It also allows the State's attorney to petition the court to obtain these test results if they are relevant to the -- to prosecute the defendant for a crime of criminal transmission of

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

HIV. And I just ask for favorable consideration.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Is there discussion? Discussion? If not, the question is, shall the Senate adopt the Second -- First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1615. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, the Ayes are 51, the Nays are 4, none voting Present. The Senate does adopt the First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1615, and the bill, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 1717. Senator Collins. Mr. Secretary, please.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. HARRY)

First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1717.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Collins.

SENATOR COLLINS:

Thank you, Mr. President and Members of the Body. 1717 is the result of about four months of hard work with several groups people - organizations representing many of the service providers' groups - who are advocates for the poor and the homeless people in the State of Illinois. And first, I'd like to Department and also the Governor's Office for their cooperation and for the work and information that his staff has supplied us in constructing what I consider to be a giant step in the direction of providing a window of opportunity for persons who are victims of General Assistance and Public Aid to move on to become productive citizens and taxpayers, rather than tax consumers, in the State of Illinois. It is so unfortunate - so unfortunate that this program will go forward. It passed in the House a few minutes ago - 114, I think, to 0. Yet it is not considered at this point - although we are still working - in the budget. I

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

think -- Senator -- Mr. President, I do not intend to speak above the noise, because I can't hear myself. I would please ask that we have some order.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Could we have some order, please? Go a lot faster. Senator Collins.

SENATOR COLLINS:

President and Members of the Senate, I've served in this Body now for -- serving my sixteenth year, and I've worked hard many of those -- most of the time as a full-time legislator and also during the Legislative Sessions, working on issues that I would make the State of Illinois a more decent, a more prosperous place to live for humane, and a more all citizens of the State of Illinois. But never before have I worked on an issue that cuts to the heart of what we really are about, and tonight we have an opportunity to say to the people of Illinois that we have the ability, we have the will, and we have the commitment to put the interests of those who are greatest need above some of our own special or political interests, and that we also understand, in a time like this, how make choices and how to prioritize the budget and our responsibilities to the whole of the State of Illinois. bill, and the vote on this bill, and the money for this bill, we go through the rest of this evening, is, in effect, a compliment to what we were all elected to do. This bill sets forth an Earnfare Program that would provide a meager opportunity as it relates to money, for the people on General Assistance - it is not an entitlement program - to earn - to work and earn, only a hundred and fifty-four dollars a month, which they were getting and not working. These are for eligible people that have been deemed employable by the eligibility requirements established by this General Assembly. It goes on to provide for a --

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

demonstration projects to develop a full public works project that would lead to meaningful, full-time employment for many people in the State of Illinois, because we recognize that many of the jobs for the unskilled people and for the aging -- elderly people or middle-aged people, who have been out of the work market for a long time, does not exist in this State. And if they are going to exist, that we, as a State, have a responsibility to put forth some efforts to help in a private venture and a partnership with the private sector to help to create jobs, so that these people can, in fact, support their families and support themselves. This bill provides the opportunity, and it opens the window of opportunity for that to take place. I will be happy to answer any questions. If not, I would just seek a favorable roll call.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

SENATOR DONAHUE:

All right. We have the following speakers: Senator Donahue, Jacobs and Schaffer. Senator Donahue.

Thank you, Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of

Senate. I rise in opposition to this Conference Committee Report, or -- on 1717 dealing with the subject called Earnfare - something that I think many of us in this Chamber believe in and feel would be kind of a good idea, but we're at ten o'clock on June 30th. We haven't passed a budget. We haven't even really discussed a budget, and this has a forty-to-fifty-million-dollar price tag. It's an entitlement program. It's unbudgeted, and it's something we simply can't do. Senator refers to the responsibility, our sense of compassion, our sense of caring. I couldn't agree with you more, Senator Collins. But we're going to have to do some

hard things to a lot of people later this evening or tomorrow morning or next week - who knows? And this is not the time to be

discussing a new program, a new idea, at the midnight hour.

hope we can defeat this Conference Committee Report.

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? Senator Jacobs.

SENATOR JACOBS:

Thank you -- thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. You know, this bill we've talked about for about month now, I know - at least on this side of the aisle. there's very few bills -- you know, down here as elected officials, and being the political animals that we are, many times we talk about bills that we can go home with, that are reelection bills. And this is a bill that I think is a reelection bill for each and every one of us - not just on this side of the aisle, but on that side of the aisle. There was comments about this being an entitlement program. This is not an entitlement program. iobs program. This is about putting people to work - people that normally would be receiving Transitional Assistance. What we're talking about is putting them to work. And you know what, folks? The very strange part of this is exactly the same we're hearing from our constituents day in and day out. giving everyone the free loaf of bread. Let's make them work Let's give them a little dignity. Let's get some jobs programs going. Let's build some infrastructure that is going to hell in a handbasket, and let's stand tall, and let's vote for what I think is the best bill of the entire Legislature this year, and that's Senate Bill 17 <sic> (1717). And I urge a strong Aye vote.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? Senator Schaffer.

SENATOR SCHAFFER:

Mr. President, this sure has not been a fun year. I suspect it won't be a fun night. I personally like this concept. I -- I think it's something we should have started twenty years ago, but this is not the hour. The budget estimates for this program are

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

between thirty and fifty million dollars. We are shortly going to be called upon to vote for a budget that I think most of us will find very painful and very distasteful, and that thirty to fifty million is not there. It's nowhere near there, and it's not going to be there. I would also point out that this bill does -- is not a Statewide program. It affects only two communities in this State - the City of Chicago and East St. Louis. So those of who think that this is something that's going to work in Moline or Crystal Lake or Cairo, it's not. It's just two towns, and -- two very important towns, but it's not a Statewide program. If -- if the sponsor could show me where the money for this bill was, without taking it from education, without closing hospitals, without further cutbacks in health care, I'd cheerfully support it. When I watch what happened over in the House here an hour ago on the assessment bill, you kind of wonder whether we're in Wonderland. It's a very interesting concept, one I think most of us could embrace. But where's the money? Without the money, we're just kidding ourselves. Let's not send this to Governor.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? Senator Palmer.

SENATOR PALMER:

Thank you, Mr. President. Last year at this time we were on this Floor in fairly heated argument across the aisle - both sides - the question of cutting off human beings who were receiving a hundred and fifty-four dollars a month. The compromise was - as I want to remind the Body - that they would receive it for nine months and then be cut back to six. I am sure that every Member of this Body left here with a great deal of concern, and upset about doing that to human beings. What this bill does is to replace what was no option with a humane and reasonable option that should satisfy those who have been calling for jobs, and

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

should satisfy those who have been demanding that people work for and earn what they receive from the State. I say to those who say, "No, this is not the time" - this is in fact the time; because, since we have no budget in front of us, it suggests that the budget negotiations are still going on. The fact that the House passed this so readily should, with the combination of passage in this House, prod those who are preparing the budget to support the best bill to come out of this Session this season. I suggest that we vote Aye on this and go home feeling human again. PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. Further discussion? Senator Holmberg. All right. Senator Collins may close.

SENATOR COLLINS:

Thank you. Let me -- let me clarify something. This bill, as it is drafted, Senator Schaffer, does not require - does not require - one dime at this particular moment. It simply says based on the money appropriated by the General Assembly. Senator Donahue: this is not an entitlement program. I don't know what Conference Committee Report that you're reading, but it is not an entitlement program. But in addition to the Workfare here and the public works pilot projects, there are in also other language in this bill that is essential successful operation of the Public Aid program that we passed last And the Department has worked very closely on it, because it's essential that this bill pass, in order to -- it tightens up the regulations dealing with the eligibility requirements, because what we did last year here -- the people that we turned off General Assistance, the first group of people got turned off - and I want you to listen to this - were the mentally ill in this State - the mentally ill - and those people that were chronically addicted to drugs and substance abuse, are the people wandering around out there in the streets, and most of the people out there

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

believe - the citizens - that we, in fact, turned off able-bodied people who were able to work. The majority of those people out there in the street - or a greater portion of those people out on the street - were not supposed to have been terminated, because of the way the language was, and the Department is willing to make sure. And the commitment from the Governor was that those mentally ill people and those people who are chronically ill would, in fact, be turned back -- put back on the General Assistance roll and they will be, in fact, included in the regular entitlement part of the -- of the Public Aid budget. nothing to do with whether or not the money is in this budget right -- in this particular bill. The House passed this bill 14 <sic> (114) to 1, because they saw the wisdom in it. And even if we don't get the money tonight, which I believe we still will, because I just believe in the people here in this Chamber, that they understand that this is probably the best thing that we've done in twenty years down here that makes a lot of because what we are doing tonight is trying to produce taxpayers, rather than tax consumers. And I would just ask for a favorable roll call.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

The question is, shall the Senate adopt the First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1717. All in favor will vote Ave. Those opposed will vote Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, the Ayes are 30, the Nays are 22, 6 voting Present. The Senate does adopt the First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1717, and the bill, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senator Donahue, for what purpose do you rise?

SENATOR DONAHUE:

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

I request a verification, sir.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

All right. All the Members will be in their seats. The Senator has requested a verification of those Members who voted in the affirmative. Mr. Secretary, please read the Members who voted in the affirmative.

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. HARRY)

The following voted in the affirmative: Alexander, Berman, Brookins, Carroll, Collins, Cullerton, Dart, del Valle, Demuzio, Di Turi, Thomas Dunn, Hall, Holmberg, Jacobs, Jones, Joyce, Kelly, Lechowicz, Leverenz, Luft, Marovitz, Munizzi, O'Daniel, Palmer, Rea, Severns, Smith, Vadalabene, Welch and Mr. President.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Donahue, do you question the presence of any Member who voted in the affirmative? Senator Donahue.

SENATOR DONAHUE:

Senator Severns.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Severns on the Floor?

SENATOR DONAHUE:

She just walked in. Senator Jones.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Severns is right behind me. Senator Jones. Senator Jones is on the Republican side of the aisle at the back.

SENATOR DONAHUE:

Thank you, Mr...

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

On a verified roll call, there are 30 Ayes, 22 Nays, 6 voting Present. The Senate does adopt the First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1717, and the bill, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 1909, Mr. Secretary.

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. HARRY)

First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1909.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Madigan.

SENATOR MADIGAN:

Thank you -- thank you, Mr. President and Members of Senate Bill -- or Conference Committee Report No. 1 on Senate Bill 1909 represents an agreement - and I emphasize agreement - with all parties interested in windshield glass replacement in the State of Illinois. Recently, over the past several companies have been instituting various cost-containment procedures in an effort to provide policyholders with the best value for their dollar. There has been some concern by the glass vendors - the windshield glass vendors - in Illinois just what course and direction these various cost-containment procedures are going to take them and their business in future. This bill represents extensive discussions and agreements between the insurance industry and the glass vendors, and again I emphasize and repeat, this is an agreed bill and agreed language. I need to recite to you just what this bill does. Does about five things. First of all, it prohibits an automobile insurer from unreasonably restricting access to glass repair or replacement facilities; permits an insurer to enter into agreements with auto glass repair -- auto glass repair or replacement facilities in order to contain costs; requires the insurer or producer disclose to the insured their ability to freely choose a glass repair or replacement facility. The fourth thing it does: it prohibits coercion, intimidation or threats against an insured to choose one particular glass provider; and lastly, insured selecting a glass provider, the insurer shall provide payment based on a competitive price as established by that insurer through competitive bids or market surveys. It also

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

allows for reasonable deviation in certain cases. In addition this language, it also contains two other articles, and it -- it adds an immediate effective date for House Bill 1516, which we previously, which allowed limited passed health service organizations to provide point of service products. And it updates Senate Bill 2153, which dealt with the Office of Special Deputy Article. I would like to add that this bill recently passed the House with 111 votes. I would be glad to answer any questions regarding this compromised agreed language.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Is there discussion? If not, the question is, shall Senate adopt the First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1909. Those in favor will vote Ave. Those opposed, voting is open. Have all voted who wish? the record. On that question, the Ayes are 54, the Nays are none, none voting Present. Senate does adopt the First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1909, and the bill, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Senate Bill 2176, Mr. Secretary.

END OF TAPE

TAPE 5

ACTING SECRETARY: (MR. HARRY)

First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 2176.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Welch.

SENATOR WELCH:

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

Thank you, Mr. President. This Conference Committee Report was created with the idea that there would be more in it than the original bill. There is nothing more in it than the original bill, which passed this Body on May 20th, 55 to nothing. The bill authorizes a city to annex contiguous unincorporated improved territory that is contributing to groundwater contamination through the discharge of sanitary sewage into underground mines and injection wells. This applies to one city in the entire State of Illinois, and that's in my district. I'd be glad to answer any questions.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Discussion? Discussion? Senator Macdonald.

SENATOR MACDONALD:

Thank you, Mr. President. I rise in support of this bill. It is a good bill. The Conference Committee Report has negotiated a good compromise, and I rise in support of the bill and urge its passage.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? If not, the question is, shall the Senate adopt the First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 2176. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, the Ayes are 59, the Nays are none, none voting Present. The Senate does adopt the First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 2176, and the bill, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. With leave of the Body, we'll go back to the -- No. 5. There is one remaining Order of Business with respect to that. With leave of the Body, we will return to the Order -- Supplemental Calendar No. 5, for the purpose of taking up House Bill 1495, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

Senate Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 1495.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Leverenz.

SENATOR LEVERENZ:

Thank you, Mr. President. The House would not concur in the Senate amendment that I put on the bill - Senate Amendment No. 1. I now move to recede in that, and ask for affirmative votes to pass the bill.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Is there discussion? Senator Leverenz has moved that the Senate recede from the -- I'm sorry. Senator Schaffer.

SENATOR SCHAFFER:

I'm -- I'm sure it's fine, but could we have a brief explanation of what we're receding from?

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Senator Leverenz.

SENATOR LEVERENZ:

This -- the amendment I put on there was for the high energy use in electrical energy for high temp, and I'm now receding from it.

PRESIDING OFFICER: (SENATOR DEMUZIO)

Further discussion? If not, the question is, shall the Senate recede from the -- from the adoption of Senate Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 1495. Those in favor will vote Aye. Those opposed, Nay. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, the Ayes are 59, the Nays are none, none voting Present. The Senate does recede from the adoption of Senate Amendment No. 1 to House Bill 1495, and the bill, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed. Messages from -- from the House.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

A Message from the House by Mr. O'Brien, Clerk.

Mr. President - I am directed to inform the Senate that the House of Representatives has refused to concur with the Senate in the adoption of their amendment to a bill of the following title, to wit:

 $\mbox{ House Bill 2694, together with Senate Amendments 1} \\ \mbox{ and 2.}$

Non-concurred in by the House, June 30, 1992.

A Message from the House by Mr. O'Brien, Clerk.

Mr. President - I am directed to inform the Senate that the House of Representatives has concurred with the Senate in the passage of a bill of the following title, to wit:

Passed the House, as amended, June 30, 1992.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

All right. Supplemental Calendar No. 7 has been distributed, as -- as have copies of the reports. The Secretary has yet to load the machine properly. If we'll just wait a moment, we'll be all set. All right. Those Messages just read in will go to the Secretary's Desk. Messages from the House.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

A Message from the House by Mr. O'Brien, Clerk.

Mr. President - I am directed to inform the Senate that the House of Representatives has refused to adopt the First Conference Committee Report on House Bill 180, and requests a Second Committee of Conference to consider the differences between the two Houses in regard to Amendment No. 1.

Action taken by the House, June 30, 1992.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Vadalabene moves that the Senate again accede to the request of the House. All in favor, indicate by saying Aye.

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it. The motion carries, and the Senate does accede to the request of the House for a conference committee. Supplemental Calendar No. 7, Madam Secretary. On the Order of Conference Committee Reports, there's a report with respect to House Bill 2833. Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

First Conference Committee Report on House Bill 2833.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Philip, for what purpose do you arise, sir?
SENATOR PHILIP:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate.

I ask for a Republican Caucus in my office immediately.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Ladies and Gentlemen, that request is in order. The Senator and I have discussed this at great length in the last couple of hours. I have been assured that he and his Caucus will be back on the Floor at 11:30. Everybody is painfully aware of the time constraints. There will be a vote on 2833 prior to midnight. With that understanding, the Republicans will go to Caucus immediately; I'd ask everybody else to stay put. Senate stands in recess till 11:30, and we will begin sharply.

(RECESS)

(SENATE RECONVENES)

PRESIDENT ROCK:

The Senate will please come to order. Senator Mahar, for what purpose do you arise, sir?

SENATOR MAHAR:

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

Thank you, Mr. President. I would like to request a Second Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 2048, please.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

right. That request is in order. The Secretary shall so inform the House that the Gentleman requests a Second Committee of Conference on House <sic> Bill 2048. 2048, Madam Secretary. right. Ladies and Gentlemen, we are on Supplemental Calendar No. There are, in the judgment of the Chair, two matters that should and will have to be voted upon before midnight. Supplemental 7 - 2833 - which we will go to immediately. is Senator Topinka's bill on Supplemental No. 8, which is Senate Bill 1783. If I can direct your attention for a moment Senate Calendar No. 8. 1783 is an administration bill of some consequence to the -- and has some dramatic fiscal impact. judgment, should have to be voted on before midnight, so I would admonish the Membership that we needn't engage in long dissertations. Everybody knows what's in both of these bills. Madam Secretary, on Supplemental Calendar No. 7 is House Bill -on the Order of Conference Committee Reports, House Bill 2833. SECRETARY HAWKER:

First Conference Committee Report on House Bill 2833.
PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Carroll.

SENATOR CARROLL:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate. I don't believe anybody could be more eloquent than President Rock in describing this bill when we had it before us before. It does exactly as his bill did, but for, in addition thereto, providing an agreement as to Police and Fire, and I would ask for a favorable roll call.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Discussion? Discussion? If not, the question is, shall the

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

Senate adopt the Conference Committee Report -- there was no light on. Give me a break. I know he just got out. Now I have -- truly -- now twenty-six lights have lit up. Senator Savickas, for what purpose do you arise?

SENATOR SAVICKAS:

I rise for -- move the previous question.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Okay. I would -- I would, again, suggest -- and the agreement that Senator Philip and I had was that this would not be talked to death. I do not intend to, truly, deprive anybody if they have something meaningful to add to this discussion, but the discussion will - I assure you - be mercifully brief. I'm trying to decide

who seriously wishes to address this matter, and who is not so serious. Senator DeAngelis.

SENATOR DEANGELIS:

Thank you, Mr. President. I have pledged, along with our leader, to allow this vote to occur before midnight, but I do believe there are things that have to be said. I will not review the things that were said yesterday, like the two-million -two-billion-dollar hole, that nobody can seem to answer, or forty-one thousand jobs that are going to cost two hundred and seventy-six thousand. I want to address two things tonight. want to address what this bill really is. This bill - and for those of you who think that you're voting on a siting bill, are (a) one-hundred-percent wrong. There is nothing in this bill whatsoever regarding siting. So if you feel like this is the only show in town - the only train you can ride, you are absolutely In fact, I would suggest that the passage of this bill could -- could, in fact, derail the prospect of a third airport not only in Lake Calumet, but anyplace else. This bill is merely putting the cart before the horse. It is telling us up front those who will rule something that isn't even -- been created or

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

exists. And I have to wonder why that anxiety is so strong. Let point out to you: When you vote for this bill, you also vote for two agreements that don't exist with this bill. And I'm going to read something out of those agreements, because they were, fact, the two agreements that brought the parties together that created this bill. We have a Memo of Understanding between Governor of the State of Illinois, the Mayor of Gary, and the State of Indiana. And I just want to read out of that two things. One is that the reason Lake Calumet ought to be done, - now the agreement between these three people - to protect -- to protect the "farmland by selecting the Lake Calumet site instead rural site." I would submit to those three people: are the sixty thousand people that are going to get displaced Are they going to move to some other state, so we can going? protect that farmland? That farmland they're talking about is my district. And at this very moment, as we speak, that farmland is being subdivided piece by piece by piece. The other part -- it says "the sufficient lack of interest regarding the other sites by the airlines" - and let me point out to you tonight that largest airlines servicing the Greater Chicago area - United and American - are both opposed to this site. Now, let me to you another little gem: This is the agreement between the Mayor of the City of Chicago, the Mayor of Gary, and the Governor of the State of Indiana. And for those of you who are going to buy the myth of Midway staying open, let me give you another nail to that coffin. This is dated June 17th, press release, after these parties sat down and talked. And there's many, many items, and let me point out to you just a couple...

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Copies have been distributed. The Members can read that for themselves, please.

SENATOR DeANGELIS:

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

Well, I would just like to point out a couple of them, because we got a lot of stuff on our desks, Senator Rock. Stipulates that to the extent -- you've got time, fellow. Stipulates that to extent that operations need to be shifted from O'Hare or Midway, the Authority will encourage the use of Gary International. We're going to have four airports, folks - not two. parties' interest in making Gary Regional a staging area for the construction that will occur at Lake Calumet. Encourages business - now this is the Mayor of Chicago in an agreement with Gary encourages business forced to relocate from the Lake Calumet footprint to do so in Gary. And it goes on and on and on. fact, this is a DCCA proposal for the State of Indiana. I want to you, I happen to live in that area, and I happen to know a lot of the people that live out there as well. And I can also tell you that if Lake Calumet is to be the site, most people would not object to it. But I'm going to tell you: What they object to is getting that site rammed down their throats. But let me point out to you, also, that for those who think that you can make a decision of this proportions on strictly a political basis, you are wrong - you are very, very wrong - and you're perpetrating a hoax on all the people. But worse than that, you are putting fear into the hearts of people who need not have that fear. Because as we wait - as we wait, if this bill is passed - to find out what's going to happen - and I can tell you the airport will not come pass - I would not want to be one of those people that is there, and I would hope that this Body would take into consideration that there is a process that could be done faster to deal with this in a different way that does not remove - does not remove - getting a third airport. A vote for this is not a vote for a site; it's not a vote for a third airport; it's...

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Further discussion? Senator Keats.

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

SENATOR KEATS:

I've sat there and listened to these debates for sixteen years. I've sat there and said, "We have a problem at O'Hare," and the people who have complained about the O'Hare noise in fifteen years have yet to come up with a solution, other than do away with the largest economic engine in Illinois. We've talked about a third airport; we've talked about expanding O'Hare; we've talked about Greenfield sites; we have talked about Joliet Army Arsenal; we've talked about Gary, Indiana; there's a private sector program by a gentleman named Terry Wooter that been put forth, that's probably superior to any of these. But there's one thing I can tell you that's happened, and nothing - until we got this far. This is the first time we have done anything to improve the situation with the largest economic engine in Illinois, which is O'Hare Airport, and now the air traffic that surrounds it. We've just discussed it in our caucus and given it a great deal of thought to it, and I sit here and say to myself, "We always say 'Wait, we'll come up with a better proposal.'" You know, in sixteen years I'm still waiting proposal, not even a better one. We say we'll do a Greenfield site; we say all these different things; it never happens. sat there and listened to it. We can blame the City of Chicago for that if we want to, but the simple fact is we have a Governor in Illinois, a Governor in Indiana, and a Mayor in Chicago who agree that this is a first step. I think virtually no one on this side of the aisle thinks that Lake Calumet can be built as airport. I think virtually everyone assumes that the EPA, the Army Corps of Engineers, et cetera, will kill the project. anyone who's ever watched this process realizes, the City of Chicago will never accept that it can't be done until given their chance to do it. I frankly think it will fall under its own weight. But if we don't let the City of Chicago move

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

forward with this possibility, and see what the pluses and minuses are, we will continue, year in and year out, talking about how we're supposed to do something, and we will continue to do nothing. I think that is an unacceptable alternative for the people of this State. In the last twenty years we have watched the economy of Illinois deteriorate. Probably only two or three states - Michigan, being one; Pennsylvania, being another - have seen their economy deteriorate the way Illinois' has. This is our largest economic engine; this is the largest strength in the entire economy. And I'm sitting here listening and continuing to think about it - I'll decide in a minute for sure - but I do not know how we can justify continuing to cripple the single largest industry we have. And we say we'll do it in the fall, but somehow I'm just not terribly confident.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Further discussion? Senator Palmer.

SENATOR PALMER:

Thank you, Mr. President. Question of the sponsor.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Sponsor indicates he will yield.

SENATOR PALMER:

Senator, for the last three years that I know of, there have been megaprojects that have been brought before this Body - Navy Pier, McCormick Place, and now, Lake Calumet Airport - all of which have included long affirmative action plans. The last of which, as I understand it - I arrived in the middle -- toward the end of it - took six months of work with the Black Caucus. Would you tell me please, is there a report showing how many African-Americans, Hispanics and women have been hired thus far in any of these projects, what their positions are, and their salaries?

PRESIDENT ROCK:

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

Senator Carroll.

SENATOR CARROLL:

Senator Palmer, not to be cute, but, you know, McCormick Place hasn't been built yet. This is the airport. And in this particular plan, we have the -- a very strong affirmative action component, including the fact that one of the members of the board must be a minority or a woman. Black, Hispanic, or a woman is, in fact, what it says.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Further discussion? Senator Butler.

SENATOR BUTLER:

Thank you, Mr. President. I, too, will respect your urgency for a very short comment. Ladies and Gentlemen, we've heard a lot of statistics, but I want to repeat one. And that is that in this document, what we are doing is condemning - literally condemning fifty thousand people. Nine thousand homes are going to be destroyed. And let me tell you, in the -- in the brief time we've had this document, I just flipped through here, and that it's that many occasions that I think make this document a total sham. And frankly, I'd be ashamed to have anything to do with this. And that goes for both sides of the aisle, and that goes for any floor in this building. To me, it is a disgrace. And we should be ashamed to be even handling a document with as many flaws as this has. I would urge you to vote No.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

All right. Finally, Senator Philip, and thank you for being a man of your word. Senator Philip.

SENATOR PHILIP:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate.

There is no reason at the eleventh day, the eleventh hour we have
to pass this. We all know that. It's unbelievable - the
arm-twisting, the telephone calls, the threats. I mean, it's

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

unbelievable what's going on. Everybody knows it. Let them go through the permit process. Let's see what the FAA says, the If they get their permits, I'll help them form the It's unnecessary. commission. I'll help them with the airport. We don't have to do it tonight. Everybody knows that. You want to displace fifty thousand people? I've toured that area. You ought -- you ought to go through the neighborhood yourself, that people were born and raised there. Their families are there. you're going to say, "Adios." The most expensive airport - if we build it - in the history of this country. When we're cutting budgets; we may not open the prisons; we're laying people off; we're going to lay more people off; and we're going to turn around and say, "Build your grandiose airport," in the worst location possible. You know, I'll tell you one thing: I've been around here a long time - a long, long time - and we tend to be politicians; we tend to go along with the waves and with the Every once in a while we ought to stand up and do the right thing, and now is the time. You ought to do what's right, and you ought to vote No.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Question is, shall the Senate adopt the Conference Committee Report on House Bill 2833. Those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed will vote Nay. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 25 Ayes, 33 Nays, 1 voting Present. The Conference Committee Report is not adopted, and the Secretary shall so inform the House. Supplemental Calendar No. 8 -- is Senate Bill 1783, Madam Secretary.

SECRETARY HAWKER:

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

First Conference Committee Report on 1783.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Topinka.

SENATOR TOPINKA:

Yes. Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, you know, this is going to be kind of an interesting bill, so maybe if we could have some order. I think people are going to want to listen to it, 'cause it does include the various budget cuts that we're going to have. And I'm sure people will want to discuss this to some extent.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

I'm sorry.

SENATOR TOPINKA:

No. If...

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Topinka.

SENATOR TOPINKA:

Mr. President and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate, Senate Bill 1783 keeps the provisions that we had in the original bill, which would start monitoring printing that goes on around here, so as to make sure that we don't get into excesses, are recyclable, that we are no longer having eleven-dollar-and-thirty-cent reports going out of here. also addressing the question of those folks who have been -- taken an early retirement, somehow or other have been hired back on contract, have also gone on to receive unemployment compensation all of those issues. And then we get to probably the nitty-gritty of this bill, which are cuts in various programs. extremely numerous. I'm sure that many of you have not seen the -- the report. I have to admit, mine's pretty hot off the press as well. But let me go through some of these issues, and then if you have any specific questions, I will attempt to answer, you

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

to the best of my ability here. What we -- let me start off: Some of the things that we will be cutting here would include the HMO's sixty-day payment cycle. That will reduce the budget by twenty-three -- twenty-three million nine hundred and ninety-four thousand four hundred dollars. Will eliminate the QUIP Program; would reduce the budget by thirteen million eight -eight hundred and twenty-five thousand dollars. We would -- it would eliminate long-term care bed reserves, to save two million nine hundred and seventeen thousand. We would suspend the Prompt Payment Act. That would save us seventy-two million three hundred We would eliminate Transitional Assistance Employment Grants, to save the State seventy-seven thousand six hundred and six dollars and six hundred dollars <sic> (7,606,600). Let me give you some of the others. We would transfer the Lottery funds that are unclaimed prizes. We would defer Road Fund repayment. We would transfer General Revenue Fund monies in the Build Illinois Bond Act under the Casual Deficits Act. We would have a payment of debt service from GOBRI, which is a program, tell you, I'm not familiar with. In Commerce and Community Affairs we would have a reduction in the Tourism Fund. eliminate some technical assistance to local governments. Corrections, eliminate inspections of local facilities and many others. I would ask your help on this. I would ask for a positive roll call, and let's go forward.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

All right. The Lady has moved the adoption of the Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1783. Discussion? Senator Jacobs.

SENATOR JACOBS:

Thank you, Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen. Just real quick. There's one question, because we were told, basically, in caucus: Even though that this bill, as it indicates, reduces from

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

ten million to 4.3 million GRF transferred to Tourism Promotion Fund, that the overall -- whenever we -- we put this with the -- the budget that is to be presented, that there is only a reduction of about 1.7 million dollars in the Tourism dollars. Could you answer that?

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Topinka.

SENATOR TOPINKA:

It's my understanding that the reduction is -- of the Promotion Fund goes from ten million to 4.3 million. So it's -- it's significantly more than what you're suggesting.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Jacobs.

SENATOR JACOBS:

Yes. Because, you know, that's a big problem, as I see it, when we have our number one growth industry, which is Tourism, being reduced from what I understand was an overall projected level of fifteen million, and we understand that it was going to be at thirteen-five, and now we're being told that -- that the -- the Tourism is going down to 4.3 million dollars. That's a little bigger cut than I think any of us had anticipated. Do you have -- I mean, because this may only be part of the puzzle. I'm not sure, and I'm just trying to ask that question from that standpoint. And maybe Howie or someone could give me some assistance on that too. Because I understand there are two parts to this puzzle, and I don't know what this does to the Tourism money when we get to the final line item, and then -- that's what I'm concerned with.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Topinka.

SENATOR TOPINKA:

Well, this is not going to be a -- a popularity bill. Budget

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

cutting never is. I'm -- I'm not happy. I don't think any of you are going to be happy. I think I had this speech last year when I had a similar bill. I'd ask for a favorable...

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Jacobs.

SENATOR TOPINKA:

...roll call.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Jacobs.

SENATOR TOPINKA:

What?

SENATOR JACOBS:

Seriously, I am not concerned with the cuts, 'cause I understand we have to cut. But what I guess I'm trying to get to is, what is the bottom line? 'Cause many of these, I'm sure, maybe fit into that same pattern. And we have been told on this side of the aisle that when we get to the final number - and I would assume that that side of the aisle should sure as hell know, especially with the Governor being, you know, on the package - to what the bottom line is of what -- how much Tourism is going to end up being cut.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Senator Topinka.

SENATOR TOPINKA:

Senator Jacobs, it's my understanding that the bottom line is 4.3 million dollars. And Mr. President, at this time, I would ask for a favorable roll call.

PRESIDENT ROCK:

Question is, shall the Senate adopt the Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1783. Those in favor will vote Aye. Opposed will vote Nay. And the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?

130th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On that question, there are 33 Ayes, 20 Nays, 3 voting Present. The Senate does adopt the Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1783. And the bill, having received the required constitutional majority, is declared passed.

(MIDNIGHT)

REPORT: TIFLDAY PAGE: 001

JUNE 30, 1992 HB-0104 CONFERENCE

HB-1352 CONFERENCE

. HB-0180 MOTION

HB-1495 RECEDE

HB-3493 CONFERENCE

HS-3504 CONFERENCE

HB-3594 CONFERENCE

HB-3594 CONFERENCE

Ho-3692 REFUSE TO RECEDE HB-3707 REFUSE TO RECEDE

H3-4070 REFUSE TO RECEDE

HB-4079 CONFERENCE

SB-0221 NON-CONCURRENCE

SB-0484 CONFERENCE

SU-0741 CONFERENCE SB-0837 CONFERENCE

SB-1490 CONFERENCE

SB-1516 CONFERENCE SB-1615 CONFERENCE SB-1665 CONFERENCE

SB-1717 CONFERENCE

SB-1768 CONFERENCE SB-1783 CONFERENCE

SB-1823 CONFERENCE

SB-1831 CONFERENCE

SB-1904 CONFERENCE

SS-1912 CONCURRENCE

SB-2048 CONFERENCE

SD-2068 CONFERENCE

SB-2075 CONFERENCE

SB-2138 CONFERENCE

SS-2176 CONFERENCE

SR-0652 ADOPTED

SR-0998 ADOPTED

SR-1335 ADOPTED

SR-1454 ADOPTED SR-1459 ADOPTED

SR-1475 ADOPTED

S6-2048 OTHER

SB-1939 NON-CONCURRENCE

SB-2057 CONFERENCE S3-2049 CONFERENCE

S8-1909 CONFERENCE

SB-1508 CONFERENCE

-SB-0911 NON-CONCURRENCE

Sp-1667 NON-CONCURRENCE

HB-4037 THIRD READING

HB-4188 CONFERENCE

Su-0062 MOTION

SB-0484 MOTION

SB-0699 MOTION

STATE OF ILLINOIS

87TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY

SENATE DAILY TRANSCRIPTION OF DEBATE INDEX

HS-1181 REFUSE TO RECEDE

HB-2166	RECEDE
HB-2750	REFUSE TO RECEDE
HB-2767	CONFERENCE
HB-2824	CONFERENCE
HB-2833	CONFERENCE
HB-2833	CONFERENCE
HB-3139	RECEDE
HB-3188	REFUSE TO RECEDE
HB-3261	REFUSE TO RECEDE
H8-3418	REFUSE TO RECEDE
HB-3440	CONFERENCE
HB-3445	CONFERENCE

PAGE PAGE PAGE

44 PAGE PAGE 43 PAGE PAGE

PAGE

PAGE

PAGE

PAGE

PAGE

PAGE

PAGE

PAGE

PAGE

PAGE

92 PAGE 167 PAGE 168 PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE

PAGE

PAGE

PAGE

PAGE

PAGE

PAGE

PAGE

PAGE

PAGE

PAGE

PAGE

PAGE

PAGE

PAGE

PAGE

PAGE

PAGE

PAGE

PAGE

PAGE PAGE

PAGE

PAGE

PAGE

PAGE

PAGE

PAGE

PAGE

PAGE

PAGE

PAGE PAGE

PAGE

AGE PAGE PAGE

PAGE

PAGE

47

99

33

159

8.2

159

170

101

35

171

112

192

84

87

113

179

33

34

161

185

102

164

134

165

103

130

10

13

Q

12 12

13

93/07/09

08:54:34

45

93

138

45

182

35

40

112

167

184

185 41

REPORT: TIFLDAY PAGE: 002

87TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY SENATE DAILY TRANSCRIPTION OF DEBATE INDEX

JUNE 30, 1992

STATE OF ILLINOIS

93/07/09

08:54:34

-SR-1476 RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	2	
SR-1477 RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	2	
SR-1478 RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	90	
SR-1479 RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	90	
SR-1480 RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	90	
SR-1481 RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	92	
SR-1482 RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	92	
SR-1483 RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	92	
SR-1484 RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	135	
HJR-0157 RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	1	
SJR-0113 CONCURRENCE	PAGE	104	
SJR-0141 ADOPTED	PAGE	14	
SJR-0159 MOTION	PAGE	108	
SJR-0159 ADOPTED	PAGE	21	
SJR-0170 ADOPTED	PAGE	24	
SJR-0180 ADOPTED	PAGE	28	
SJR-0181 ADDPTED	PAGE	29	
SUBJECT MATTER			
SENATE TO ORDER - PRESIDENT ROCK	PAGE	1	
PRAYER - THE REVEREND MICHAEL FITCH	PAGE	1	
JOURNAL - POSTPONED	PAGE	1	
MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE	PAGE	1	
EXECUTIVE SESSION - APPOINTMENTS	PAGE	2	
SENATE ARISES FROM EXECUTIVE SESSION	PAGE	9	
MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE	PAGE	88	
RECESS	PAGE	89	
SENATE RECONVENES	PAGE	89	
MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE	PAGE	90	
RECESS	PAGE	136	
SENATE RECONVENES	PAGE	136	
MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE	PAGE	136	
MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE	PAGE	183	
RECESS	PAGE	184	
SENATE RECONVENES	PAGE	184	
MIDNIGHT	PAGE	197	
		171	