106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

Speaker McPike: "House will come to order. The Chaplain for today will be Father Larry Sepich from St. Mary's Church of Kickapoo, in Edwards, Illinois. Father Sepich is a guest of Representative Hultgren. Guests in the balcony may wish to rise and join us in the invocation."

Father Sepich: "Let us pray. God our Father and Creator, continue to bless and support those assembled here this morning and those who will join this Assembly later. Guide and direct our State Legislature, that by just and prudent laws, they may promote the well-being of all the people of this State of Illinois. You have charged us with the task of building on this earth. A home where all people may dwell in unity, liberty and justice. We pray for strength and purpose to make this branch and all branches of government accountable to the people, fulfilling roles of and responsibility. Assist them in justice, protection for the weak and the building up peace and mutual aid for all. Father, direct in us that everything we do is with Your most gracious fervor and continual help. Teach us to begin and continue and end all of our work under Your quidance. Let the light of Your divine wisdom direct the deliberations of this Assembly and let it shine forth in all the proceedings and laws framed for our rule and government, that they may tend to the preservation of peace, the promotion of happiness, industry and useful knowledge and the increase of perpetuation to us of the blessings of equal liberty. Amen."

Speaker McPike: "We will be led in the Pledge of Allegiance by Representative Piel."

Piel - et al: "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands,

106th Legislative Day

- May 18, 1988
- one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."
- Speaker McPike: "Roll Call for Attendance. Matijevich,
 Representative Matijevich."
- Matijevich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. On this side of the aisle,

 Representative Ray Christensen is excused due to illness."

 Speaker McPike: "And Representative Piel."
- Piel: "All Members are here today, Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker McPike: "Take the Roll Call, Mr. Clerk. 117 Members answering the Roll, a quorum is present. Representative Giglio in the Chair. You want to read the..."
- Speaker Giglio: "The Clerk is now going to read the Consent Calendar, Third Reading, the Bills, and then we'll vote on those Bills later on during the day. Mr. Clerk, read the Bills."
- Clerk Leone: "On the Order of Third Reading. House Bill 3662, a Bill for an Act in relationship to job referral and listing services. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3668, a Bill for an Act to amend the Environmental Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill Protection Act. 3697, a Bill for an Act to authorize disclosure of certain offenses against children. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3700, a Bill for an Act to amend the Consumer Fraud and Deceptive Business Practices Act. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3705, a Bill for an relationship to property tax delinquencies. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3718, a Bill for an Act relationship to the collection and deposit of State monies. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3719, a Bill for an Act to amend the Environmental Protection Act. Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3720, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act in relationship to State finance. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3725, a Bill for an Act to

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

amend the Illinois Historic Preservation Act. Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3738, a Bill for an Act to amend the Juvenile Court Act. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3739, a Bill for an Act to amend the Unified Code of Corrections. Third Reading of the Bill. Bill 3752, a Bill for an Act to amend the duties and powers Department of Mental Health and Developmental Disabilities. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3763. for an Act to amend the Illinois Dental Practice a Bill Act. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3770, a Bill for an Act to amend certain Acts in relationship to public health. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill for an Act to provide for the local government debt reform. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3788. Bill for an Act to amend the Uniform Code of... Commercial Code. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3799, a Act in relationship to fertilizers, pesticides and classifying wastes. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3803, a Bill for an Act to amend the Criminal Code. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3826, a Bill for an Act to amend the Mental Health and Developmental Disabilities Confidentiality Act. Third Reading of the Bill. 3828. a Bill for an Act to amend the Environmental Protection Act. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3835, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Vehicle Code. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3838, a Bill for an Act concerning band and orchestra trips. Third Reading of House Bill 3840, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act to revise the law. Third Reading of the Bill. House 3841, a Bill for an Act to amend the Wildlife Code. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3856, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act codifying the powers and duties of the Department of Mental Health. Third Reading of the

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

House Bill 3857, a Bill for an Act in relationship to community-integrated living arrangements. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3858, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act to revise contract and voucher filing requirements. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3864, a Bill for an Act to amend the Revenue Act. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3873, a Bill for an Act to amend the Hospital Licensing Act. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3879, a Bill for an Act to amend the Minority and Female Business Enterprise Act. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3880, a Bill for an Act to amend the Minority and Female Business Enterprise Act. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3898, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act create sanitary districts in certain localities. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3910, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act defining the powers and duties of governmental agencies. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3911, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Clinical Laborator (sic - Laboratory) Act. Third Reading of the House Bill 3913, a Bill for an Act to amend certain Acts in relationship to recycling waste. Third Reading the Bill. House Bill 3915, a Bill for an Act relationship to the abused and neglected of elderly Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3934, a Bill for an Act to amend certain Acts in relationship to Third Reading of the Bill. payment of costs. House Bill 3938, a Bill for an Act concerning sexual exploitation by psychotherapists. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3943, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Health Facilities Planning Act. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3949, a Bill for an Act to amend the Nursing Home Care Reform Act. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3955, a Bill for an Act to amend the Uniform Code of Corrections.

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3959, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Savings and Loans Act. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3969, a Bill for an Act to amend the Large Business Development Act. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3972, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act in relationship to corporate fiduciaries assets. Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3980, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Banking Act. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3987, a Bill for an Act in relationship to probation services fees. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3990. a Bill for an Act to amend the Uniform Commercial Code. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 3998, a Bill for an Act to create the Department of Children and Family Services. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 4009, a Bill for an Act to amend the Water Use Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 4011, a Bill for an Act in relationship to emergency management. Reading of the Bill. House Bill 4033, a Bill for an Act to encourage recycling by State agencies. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 4035, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act to establish a program to support educational programs. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 4039, a Bill for an Act to permit the Pollution Control Board to charge certain fees. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 4052, a for an Act to amend the Wildlife Code. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 4053, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Conservation Enhancement Act. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 4060, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act in relationship to safety inspections. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 4063, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 4075, a Bill for an Act to amend the Nursing Home Care Reform Act. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 4091,

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

a Bill for an Act in relationship to economic development. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 4107, a Bill for an Act to amend the Housing Authorities Act. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 4116, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Marriage and Dissolution of Marriage Act. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 4127, a Bill for an Act to amend the Life Care Facilities Act. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 4139, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act in relationship to the installation of telecommunication devices for use throughout the State. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 4145, a Bill for an Act to amend the Corridors of Opportunity and Development Act. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 4153, a Bill for an Act to amend the River Conservancy District Act. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 4172, a Bill for an Act to amend the Nursing Home Care Report Act. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 4179, a Bill for an Act to revise the law in relationship to criminal jurisprudence. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 4180, a Bill for an Act to amend the Uniform Commercial Code. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 4184, a Bill for an Act in relationship to the Illinois Fairness in Lending Act. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 4194, a Bill for an Act to amend the Environmental Protection Act. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 4112 (sic - 4212), a Bill for an Act to the Consumer Credit Counseling Corporation Act. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 4220, a Bill for an Act to enlarge the corporate limits of the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 4229, a Bill for an Act to amend the Township Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 4232, a Bill Law. for an Act to amend the Podiatric Medical Practice Act. First (sic - Third) Reading of the Bill. House Bill 4233,

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 4247, a Bill for an Act to amend the Revenue Act. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 4258, a Bill for an Act to amend the Humane Care for Animals Act. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 4279, a Bill for an Act to amend the Civil Administrative Code of Illinois. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 4280, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act in relationship to the Department of State Police. Third Reading of the Bill. House Bill 4282, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Horse Racing Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

- Speaker Giglio: "Ladies and Gentlemen, if I can have your attention. What we are going to try to do today is to move these Bills from Second Reading to Third. To try to get as many as we possibly can. And the Order of Business we're going to start with is one; County Government, then we're going to go to Administration of Justice, Business Regulation, Environment and Economic Development and five State budgets. So they're the first five categories. We'll try Second Reading and move everything to Third so we can proceed in an orderly fashion. Representative Piel."
- Piel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate you letting us know the order that we're going to be starting today. Could you go over that order one more time so we can get that in numerical sequence."
- Speaker Giglio: "Okay, the first order is County Government...

 County Government, Administration of Justice, Business

 Regulation, Environment and Economic Development and State

 Budget. Those are the first five categories."
- Piel: "Thank you, very much."
- Speaker Giglio: "However, at 10:00 o'clock, as the Speaker indicated the other day; we're going to Special Order of Business at 10:00 o'clock on taxation. Alright, on the

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

Calendar on Second Reading, under the category County Government, appears on page 5 of the Calendar appears House Bill 1820, Representative Ropp. Are you ready, Sir? Mr. Clerk, 1820, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1820 on the Order of Second Reading.

House Bill 1820, a Bill for an Act to codify the law
relating to counties. Second Reading of the Bill. There
are no Committee Amendments."

Speaker Giglio: "Are there any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #1 is being offered by Representative Ropp."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Ropp on Amendment #1."

Ropp: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill is a codification of county government law. It is some 771 pages in length. There is no change at all. It is merely codifying it and I would move to suspend House Rule 36(c) relative to the printing, so that we do not have to print a lot of copies. We have ten copies already printed and one has been given to the Republican Staff and one to the Democratic Staff. We'd like to move this Bill to Third Reading, so that giving ample time for the staff to review that."

Speaker Giglio: "Alright, does the Gentleman have leave by Attendance Roll Call? Leave is granted. Now the question is, 'Shall the House adopt Amendment #1 to House Bill 1820?' And on that question, all those in favor signify by saying 'aye', those opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And Amendment #1 to House Bill 1820 is adopted. Are there further Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk Leone: "There are no further Amendments."

Speaker Giglio: "Third Reading. Is Representative Ryder in the chamber? Is Representative Ryder in the chamber? Alright, now we'll go to the Order of Administration of Justice for the Second Readings. On that Calendar on page 5 appears

106th Legislative Day

- May 18, 1988
- House Bill 1576, Mr. Countryman. Representative Countryman. Mr. Clerk, read House Bill 1576."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1576, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Vehicle Code. Second Reading of the Bill. There are no Committee Amendments."
- Speaker Giglio: "Are there any Floor Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "There are none. Third Reading."
- Speaker Giglio: "Representative Currie in the chamber? Out of the record. Representative O'Connell, 3128, Second Reading, Criminal Code, Home Incarceration, hold, hold, out of the record. 3598, Representative McCracken. Is Representative McCracken in the chamber? 3615, Representative Daley. Mr. Clerk, read House Bill 3615."
- Clerk Leone: "On page 9 on your Calendar. House Bill 3615, a

 Bill for an Act in relationship to the offense of
 aggravated battery of senior citizens. Second Reading of
 the Bill. Amendment #1 lost previously on Second Reading."
- Speaker Giglio: "Are there further Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "There are no further Amendments."
- Speaker Giglio: "Third Reading. Representative O'Connell, are you ready on 3661, Sir? Attorney General's Investigators.

 Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3661, a Bill for an Act in relationship to the Attorney General's Investigators. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendments #1 and 2 were adopted in committee."

 Speaker Giglio: "Any Motions filed?"
- Clerk Leone: "Amendment #1 was adopted in committee and Amendment #2 was adopted on the floor. Next Amendment is Floor
- Speaker Giglio: "Representative Kubik, withdraw. Withdraw Amendment #3. Are there further Amendments?"

Amendment #3, which is offered by Representative Kubik."

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #4, is offered by Representative Kubik."

106th Legislative Day

May 18. 1988

- Speaker Giglio: "Out of the record. Are there further Amendments? Withdraw Amendment #4."
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #5, offered by Representative Kubik."
- Speaker Giglio: "Representative Kubik, on Amendment #5."
- "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Amendment #5 is offered to remove the provision that was placed in the Bill in Amendment #1, to have Peace Officer Power similar to those of the State Police. we would like to do with this Amendment is to provide the investigators for the Attorney General may exercise these powers only after the contact and in cooperation with the appropriate law enforcement agencies on a local level. We also provide that the investigators would have to be... have to have training from the Police Officers Training Board and they will of have to have had at least 5 years of experience as a sworn officer, or at least two... and two years as an investigator. The purpose of the Amendment to try to tighten up the Bill to make sure that it... we don't have conflicting powers within various State agencies and develop better cooperation between the Attorney General and local law enforcement. And I move for the adoption of the Amendment."
- Speaker Giglio: "You heard the Gentleman's Motion. Are there...
 is there any question? All those in favor of the Amendment
 signify by saying 'aye', those opposed 'nay'. In the
 opinion of the Chair... Mr. O'Connell. Representative
 O'Connell."
- O'Connell: "As the Sponsor of the Bill, I would simply concur with the Amendment. I heard a 'no' on this side of the aisle. I would recommend that everyone say 'aye'."
- Speaker Giglio: "All those in favor of the Amendment signify by saying 'aye', those opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

Chair, the 'ayes' have it and Amendment #5 is adopted. Are there further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "There are no further Amendments."

Speaker Giglio: "Third Reading. Representative O'Connell of 4098, uninsured vehicles. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "On page 12 of the Calendar, House Bill 4098, a Bill for an Act in relationship to the Criminal Code. Second Reading of the Bill. There are no Committee Amendments."

Speaker Giglio: "Are there any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #1 is being offered by Representative O'Connell."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative O'Connell."

O'Connell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Amendment #1, I would like to withdraw Amendment #1."

Speaker Giglio: "Withdraw Amendment #1. Are there further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative O'Connell."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative O'Connell."

O'Connell: "Yeah, yes, Mr. Speaker, I would ask that Amendment #2

be adopted. It provides that the... instead of requiring

that there be a causal factor in any accident that occurs,

that it simply be provided that there be involved in an

accident, so that the mental state will be that of not

having insurance rather than causing an accident.

Secondly, it provides that any passenger of the defendants

car or any occupant of the other vehicle be the necessary

parties to be injured in the accident. And I ask that the

Amendment be adopted."

Speaker Giglio: "Any discussion on the Amendment? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Pedersen."

Pedersen: "Yes, will the Representative yield?"

Speaker Giglio: "He indicates he will."

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

- Pedersen: "In simple language that everybody can understand, would you explain to me what you are trying to do with the Bill and what you're trying to do with the Amendment?"
- O'Connell: "I'm sorry, I was interrupted by someone else."
- Pedersen: "I said in simple, easy to understand language would you explain what this Bill is trying to do and what the Amendment is trying to do?"
- O'Connell: "Alright, I'll explain the Bill then I will explain the Amendment. The Bill simply provides for a... that a person who is involved in an accident, which causes injury to any other party and does not have the vehicle insurance would be charged with a Class B Misdemeanor. What the Amendment does is to provide the specifics to that, where that the driver would not have to be necessarily the cause of an accident but simply involved in an accident. The purpose for that is, is that the... the criminal penalty should attach to the fact that the driver did not have insurance. Not that the driver was fortuitously or however the cause of the accident, but that the driver was involved in an accident. We want to attach the criminal penalty to the fact that he's operating or she's operating a vehicle without insurance."
- Pedersen: "Thank you, Representative. What is the misdemeanor?

 What's involved in that penalty?"
- O'Connell: "A Class B Misdemeanor, I think is six months...

 penalty of imprisonment up to six months and a penalty of

 up to \$500.00."
- Pedersen: "Now, so what you're saying is that even though the driver is not at fault and under the Financial Responsibility Law would have no requirement to pay the damages; because he doesn't have insurance, he's subject to a misdemeanor conviction?"
- O'Connell: "Well, that is correct in the sense that if the Bill

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

does not parallel any civil penalty that may exist today, involved with the Secretary of State's Office dealing with financial responsibility. I'm not quite certain what the penalties are for an individual presently who is involved in an accident. My understanding is, is that if there is an unsatisfied judgement against an individual who is operating without insurance then that unsatisfied judgement can be the basis for the removal of his driving privileges. This Bill does not address whether you are the cause of an accident or not. The Bill is attempting to prompt everyone to obtain insurance, whether you are the cause of the accident or not. If your involved in an accident you ought to have been insured."

Pedersen: "But I thought the present law requires that... only requires that you be financially responsible, that you don't actually have to carry insurance. If you're a millionaire and you figure, well I don't need to carry an insurance policy to protect me in case of an accident then I don't have to carry insurance. A lot of people choose to be self-insured. A lot of corporations choose to be self-insured. So it seems to me that you ought to be tying this misdemeanor to the person who ends up not being financially responsible. I'm not sure that this is the right direction we're going. How would you respond to that?"

O'Connell: "Well, I'd respond to that, is that I hope I'm lucky enough to get involved in an accident with a millionaire.

I think your reasoning is faulty. Anybody that is operating a vehicle on the streets of Illinois should have insurance. And if they don't want to exercise that civil responsibility of getting insurance, then I think the State has an obligation to put its weight behind a criminal sanction for anyone who is. And that is the thrust of this

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

Bill, Representative. We understand that there is a mandatory insurance Bill; some people support it, some people oppose it. I personally support it. And I am not altogether optimistic that this General Assembly will ever pass that Bill. Failing that, I think that we ought to then provide some criminal sanctions to individuals that insurance. And are operating without as self-insurance aspect of it, I don't think that we can anticipate that the average individual who's involved in an accident out there, who is injured and injured by an uninsured driver would be fortuitous enough to be injured by a self-insured millionaire."

Pedersen: "Mr. Speaker, can I speak to the Bill?"

Speaker Giglio: "Proceed, Sir... the Amendment."

Pedersen: "The Amendment. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, what we have here is criminal sanctions on whether or not you carry insurance. The law currently provides that you be financially responsible if you're at fault in an accident. And it seems to me, that what we ought to be doing here is... is putting any criminal sanctions on the person who... who ends up not being financially responsible. So I would recommend that we not only... not approve the Amendment but oppose the Bill."

Speaker Giglio: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Terzich."

Terzich: "Yes, Representative O'Connell, are you... is this endorsed by the insurance industry or what? I mean, that you have this Amendment?"

O'Connell: "Representative..."

Terzich: "It sounds like your making all this business for the insurance industry."

O'Connell: "Representative, I don't consult with any industry as to whether they endorse. This is a product of my

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

legislative imagination and I think it... I think what it rep... what it represents is good legislative work at its best."

- Terzich: "Alright, now with regard to this legislation, then what... are you basically saying that anyone that doesn't have any insurance would be subject to this type of a penalty? And I would assume, I would assume then this would also apply to anybody that might be traveling, you know, in the State of Illinois, anybody that might be leasing an automobile, anybody that may be driving a car rental or anything of that nature that they would be subject to the same penalty?"
- O'Connell: "If they cause an accident... if they are involved in an accident. I think that the only way that you can legitimately police this, is if there is an accident that ensues."
- Terzich: "And am I correct in saying that if you... if you went and had a car rental or anything of that nature and you, you know, and you were out of State or anything that you would be subject to the same penalty... penalty if you were involved in an accident or you didn't have adequate insurance or what?"
- O'Connell: "No, I didn't say if you didn't have adequate insurance. It's driving without insurance. As to the car rentals... the car rentals are insured."
- Terzich: "Do you specifically state what type of insurance you're talking about. Is this towing insurance, or car rental insurance or health insurance or liability, collision, property damage?"
- O'Connell: "It's motor vehicle insurance."
- Terzich: "Which is what? What... what... what is considered... what's your definition of insur..."
- O'Connell: "Which is any insurance that would rectify an injured

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

party, either for damages or injuries..."

Terzich: "So, therefore you will say that they have to have liability insurance and property damage. Not necessarily medical pay or anything like that. And do you specific... do you stipulate what amounts they are suppose to have, like the minimum of twenty and forty?"

O'Connell: "No. no."

Terzich: "...hundred and two hundred thousand?"

O'Connell: "No. What I'm going after, Representative, are those people that are frivolous enough with the well-being of everybody else that will operate on the streets without any insurance."

Terzich: "But..."

O'Connell: "Same person that you and I are both trying to get off the streets."

Terzich: "Hey, I'm voting for this Amendment, but I mean..."

O'Connell: "You are."

Terzich: "But... but this... hey, you're my kind of guy. But you... this would also apply, like I said, that like if you had a car rental or anything of that nature and it would also... it would also apply to any out of State individuals as well."

O'Connell: "I'm sorry, did you say out of State?"

Terzich: "Yeah, I mean for example..."

O'Connell: "Oh absolutely. Anybody that's operating on the streets of Illinois."

Terzich: "In the State of Illinois, that's a great Amendment.

Maybe we'll adjust it to include the death penalty with it
but I support this 100 percent."

Speaker Giglio: "Further discussion? The Lady from Cook, Representative Braun."

Braun: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
Speaker Giglio: "He indicates he will."

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

- Braun: "Representative O'Connell, are there any other instances in our law in which someone is held up for a crime because they don't enter into a contract with a third party. Well, I want to know that. I mean this... this makes it a crime not to enter into a particular type of contract, a contract for insurance. And I'm just wondering if we have prec... I mean has that... is there anywhere else in the law where we do this?"
- O'Connell: "Well that's true. There are bonding requirements that are involved and... I guess the distinction... without... I'm unable to specifically point, Representative, to a specific instance."

Braun: "But not where we make it a crime... because crime."

- O'Connell: "In this instance, I think we can draw a clear distinction with every other kind of a contractual situation because it is designed for the protection of third parties. Whether individuals contracting with a third party, the Bill is aimed at the protection of third parties and I think it provides for a legitimate public policy statement to that effect."
- Braun: "No... I'm... I'm... I'm asking not a public policy question right now, Representative, we can... we can debate the public policy merits of the proposition some other time... I'm just concerned that as a matter of law, if we are not heading into uncharted waters in attaching a criminal penalty for failure to enter into a private contract. But you have to, you have to do business with someone or you are held up for a criminal sanction."
- O'Connell: "I cannot state for you at this moment, a similar situation."

Braun: "Thank you."

O'Connell: "But I would add one thing, that this is an Amendment, just as Representative Young had a Bill which I disagreed

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

with the Amendment. It was his Bill and it was his Amendment. This is my Bill and it's my Amendment. And I would ask that if there is dispute that it be done on Third Reading and give the same courtesy to me as was given to Representative Young, yesterday."

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

McCracken: "I think we defeated Representative Young's Amendment. We didn't give him the courtesy. Well maybe you've got a good point, but it sure is a bad Bill. I think, I really think it's a mistake in approaching what essentially is a civil matter in this way. I understand the desire for enforcement and I think that Representative Laurino, who's a Cosponsor has a sincere desire for that as well and that's the reason he's sponsoring the mandatory insurance Boy, I just think this is onerous. This... you know, due to a fortuitous circumstance, that is he's involved in an accident even if it's not his fault, he can go to jail for 6 months. but the guy who doesn't insurance, but isn't involved in an accident, there is no penalty, there's no civil penalty, there's nothing. now the current law is, is that you have to be financially responsible and if you are not and that is demonstrated by virtue of your failure to satisfy a judgement, then your license is suspended. And I think that's substantial enforcement tool. I think that to bring this into the criminal realm, just based on those fortuitous circumstances just is not sound public policy."

Speaker Giglio: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative Williams."
Williams: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Gentleman yield?"
Speaker Giglio: "He indicates he will."

Williams: "I may have missed part of the discussion here, but it seems to me, would the penalty apply whether or not there

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

was fault on the part of one of the parties?"

O'Connell: "I'll repeat, I think I heard the question. Would the penalty apply whether or not it is the fault..."

Williams: "Right."

O'Connell: "...Of the party?"

Williams: "Right."

O'Connell: "No, only if the party is involved in an accident.

I'll give you an example to try to express the intent of the Bill... of the Amendment. You have a driver A and driver B, both are involved in an accident. Before the adjudication as to fault, the determination would be made if either driver A or driver B did not have insurance.

Irregardless of the fault of the accident, the mental state is not getting the insurance."

Williams: "Then in other words, what you're saying is that..."

O'Connell: "I voted for Representative Young's Amendment because it was his Bill and his Amendment."

Williams: "Okay. So in other words you're saying that if I'm in an accident, say for instance, I'm a driver of a car and I don't have insurance and a guy bangs into me and he smashes me up and I go to the hospital and I'm laid up for months, at the end of these months I'm facing a criminal penalty of a misdemeanor because of the fact that I didn't have insurance at the time. Is that correct?"

O'Connell: "That's correct."

Williams: "Oh okay. And regardless, even if they could pay later on they'd still be violating the Act even if they could pay?"

O'Connell: "Sir, I didn't hear that."

Williams: "I said, even if they could pay, they would still be in violation of the Act."

O'Connell: "Well, that is correct. The Bill is not aimed at the relationship between the individual parties. The Bill is

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

aimed at the general statement of public policy that everybody that operates a vehicle should have insurance. And from a practical matter, that probably wouldn't be the effect. From a practical matter there would probably be a supervision, but the statement of the Bill is that everybody should have insurance."

Williams: "To the Amendment, I just... I do respect the Sponsors right to have the Bill in the form that he desires. However, I think that as we know, sometimes it's easier to stop it... a bad part of it here than to stop it later. And I would just like to say to the Assembly, I think that it's a bad precedent to try to create criminal penalties for, what... in effect we already have sufficient, what I would call, penalties as it regards the suspension of license and other areas. And I would hope that we seriously, if not, I don't know how this is going to go on a vote, but I believe that this is a bad Amendment. And I just don't know if we should be moving this far into the criminal area."

Speaker Giglio: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from St. Clair, Representative Stephens."

Stephens: "Madison. My conservative friends, on this side of aisle are taking some shots at Representative O'Connell's Amendment. And liberal friends on the other side of the aisle are taking a similar salvo. I'm not sure that this Amendment deserves that much criticism. But... but it's, it's not quite right, Representative O'Connell. Seriously, I think Representative Pedersen should have been there in your... with your... in your private deliberations about legislative matters. Now seriously, I think that you make a good point in that we ought to do everything we can to make sure that people get insurance to deal with the problem. However, I think if you make the penalty, and I

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

wish that you would consider doing this, make the penalty just for those people who prove after the fact that they are not financially responsible, cannot meet the financial responsibilities. Whether or not they were found at fault, I agree with you. I think when there is an incident, if they prove that they are uninsured and cannot meet the Financial Responsibility Act, then we ought to have penalties for those people. You are right... in the right direction. I disagree with that one point, and so I can not rise in support of your Amendment, but you certainly don't deserve the criticism that's coming from both sides of the aisle."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Regan."

Regan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Will the Representative leave for a question please? I know. What I have to say is not that important, nobody has to listen to it anyway. But I'm just wondering how far you would go, are you going to then next year force people to make sure they have liability insurance on their homes in case that their dog bites the next door neighbor, and there's... there's Bills involved? Is next year, is that coming down the pike?"

O'Connell: "I can't hear."

Regan: "Representative..."

Speaker Giglio: "Would you kindly give the Gentleman attention.

Representatives, would you kindly give the Gentleman attention please? There's a debate going on.

Representative Regan."

O'Connell: "Let me... let me respond to Representative Regan's point. A house doesn't go down the street, doesn't barrel down the street. We're talking about a vehicle that is in effect a lethal weapon. Now, we have a Bill which provides that if you are ticketed for going 5 miles out... miles

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

over the limit and you don't have a seat belt on, whether you're involved in an accident or not you are quilty of criminal penalty for not having a seat belt on. Now, there's... there's no intent to commit a crime for not having the seat belt on. But because we made a public policy statement that it is important that everyone that is in a vehicle or operating a vehicle wear a seat belt we would put criminal sanctions on it if you didn't. We've got to make an important public policy statement that if you aren't insured and you operate a vehicle, you better have insurance. Now I... I... I would accede to an Amendment that would provide that if you are involved in an accident and you don't have the financial responsibility to make whole the judgement that may be entered against you that that would be grounds that the penalty couldn't apply. But I think we should make some kind of a policy statement. And I realize the Bill needs work, but I think the dialogue is important."

Regan: "Well, thank you. To the Bill, it just... it is setting a precedent. Your forcing someone to purchase something. I understand that it also, maybe it should be a crime not to purchase a television set if you have one child, and maybe we could amend it that if you have two children you have to buy two television sets. But, the intent of the Bill is what everyone wants to see, and with that Amendment I think it probably will be a much better Bill, thank you."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative O'Connell to close."

O'Connell: "Well, there have been some valid suggestions and some criticisms which may or may not be valid. I would simply make the final technical point, that it is my Bill and my Amendment and if you wish to vote 'no' on the Bill that's your prerogative, but I... I'd ask for the courtesy of at least allowing the Amendment to go on the Bill."

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

- Speaker Giglio: "All those in favor of the Amendment signify by voting 'aye', those opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. On the Amendment, Representative Homer."
- "Thank you, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Homer: I'm going to vote against the Amendment, for the reason that I'm for the Bill. I voted for the Bill when it was in committee and I The Bill without the Amendment think it's a good Bill. says that an individual who causes an accident that uninsured is quilty of a misdemeanor. The Amendment would say that anybody involved in an accident, if someone's involved in an accident but didn't cause it, the issue of whether or not their insured is irrelevant. The problem is and what our constituents are opposed to are individuals driving who cause accidents and because of that their insurance... no insurance does not pay for the damages. I'm going to vote against the Amendment, hoping that it fails so that I can support the Bill on Third Reading, which I think is a good Bill."
- Speaker Giglio: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 46 voting 'yes', 59 voting 'no', 2 voting 'present'. And the Amendment fails.

 Are there further Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative O'Connell."
- Speaker Giglio: "Representative O'Connell."
- O'Connell: "Amendment #3 was offered by the Secretary of State's

 Office. It simply inserts the words 'if required', if a

 financial responsibility is required, then it would be so
 required. It's submitted by the Secretary of State."
- Speaker Giglio: "Any discussion? Hearing none, all those in favor signify by saying 'aye', those opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it and the

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

Amendment's adopted. Are there further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "There are no further Amendments."

Speaker Giglio: "Third Reading. Speaker Madigan in the Chair."

Speaker Madigan: "I want to thank the Republicans for that gracious welcome and direct their attention to page 3 of the Calendar on the Special Order of Business, a Special Order of Business on the State Income Tax. There are three Bills that appear on this Order of Business. We called this order last week, at which time there were no submittals from anyone relative to changes in the State Income Tax, and we said at that time, that we would return to this Order of Business this week. So, Mr. Clerk, what

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2968 is found on page 17 of the Calendar. It's on the Order of Third Reading."

Speaker Madigan: "Who was the Sponsor?"

is the status of House Bill 2968?"

Clerk Leone: "Representative Homer."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Homer, do you wish to call your Bill? This matter is on Third Reading. It's an Amendment to the State Income Tax. Mr. Homer."

Homer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. I'm sure there is hardly a Member in here who hasn't heard from constituents concerning this Bill or the concept at least to the Bill. And that's because statewide there are eight hundred thousand residents, who as a result of the Federal Tax Reform Act, which in part eliminated the double exemptions for senior citizens and blind individuals, had the result of loosing half of their exemptions for purposes of their State of Illinois income taxes. As a result, they are being required to pay nineteen million dollars more than they would have, had they been left in the position they were in prior to the change in the federal law that automatically affected the Illinois law. Now I know that

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

this is a year that we're concerned about loss of revenue and this Bill according to Economic and Fiscal, would have a potential result and impact of between fifteen and twenty million dollars. But I would submit to you that there are times where we simply must do what is right on behalf of our constituents. We're not creating a new program. We're simply asking by this legislation to restore our senior citizens and blind residents to the position they were with respect to their State of Illinois income taxes prior to the Federal Tax Reform Act insofar as the exemption issue is affected. I'd point out to you that all Illinois tax payers, whether they be seniors, blind or otherwise are paying more State of Illinois income taxes as a result of the changes in the federal law to the tune of one hundred fifty million dollars, because we have all lost certain deductions and exemptions we had prior to the change in the But this class of taxpayers, the senior citizens and the blind are being doubly penalized by those changes because of their loss of exemptions. And whereas the federal tax laws compensated for that loss of exemption by increasing the standard deduction. We did not take similar action in Illinois, they're still entitled to the same base level of exemption, which is one thousand a result, the loss of exemption status is λs simply meant those people are being required to pay additional State burden. That's not fair. It's not good government. It makes no sense to target senior citizens and blind people and I would certainly ask that all of you rise in resounding support to restore them to the position they were in prior to the change in federal law."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Parke."

Parke: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in support of this legislation. This is an

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

example of legislation that was introduced by myself last year and killed in subcommittee in revenue, and it's very interesting now to see it appear again in another... with another Sponsor, namely a Democratic Sponsor. So, based on the merits of the legislation, with the reform that went on with the federal tax, I see no need why the State of Illinois should have a windfall of tax revenue to it on the backs of our seniors. The Sponsor is absolutely correct on this legislation. There's no reason seniors have to carry the blunt... the brunt of this reform on their backs. I think we should vote 'yes' on this legislation."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Stephens."

Stephens: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would echo Representative Parke's remarks that sometimes that a Republican Legislator isn't as successful at getting his Bill out of a committee or subcommittee or certainly out of the Rules Committee. But on this side of the aisle, we don't let that bother when it comes to dealing with the issues. The fact of the matter is, that we support concepts and whether they Democrat sponsored or Republican sponsored, is not the importance of the matter, it's not the pride in authorship the Bill, but the concept that you support is the most important issue here. And if you think like some those... some of us on this side of the aisle, if you call yourself a conservative, I think that you ought to strongly consider supporting Representative Homer's Bill. The the matter is. that the Federal Government's actions caused a windfall tax. A tax that Illinoisans were not allowed to vote on except for Congressmen and the United States Senators. Members of this House and members of the local communities were not allowed to vote. A windfall tax that was passed onto us by people in Washington, that we should not have to bear the brunt of. This is an

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

opportunity to, in one small way that might cost a few million dollars in revenue, but one small way not to grant a tax exemption but to restore an unfair tax that was passed on to senior citizens, blind and disabled only last year. So if your against windfall taxes, if you think that you ought to stand up and vote 'yes' or 'no' on taxes, this is your chance. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Wolf."

Wolf: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Sponsor yield to a question?"

Speaker Madigan: "Sponsor yields."

Wolf: "Representative Homer, what is the effective date of your Bill?"

Homer: "Representative Wolf, the Bill provides that it will take effect on January 1 of 1989."

Wolf: "Would that or would that not apply for the taxable year 1988?"

Homer: "No. The Bill specifically says it'll apply only to tax years beginning after January 1 of '89."

Wolf: "Would there be any particular reason why it couldn't apply to 1988?"

Homer: "No, there really isn't. I would certainly have no objection if during the course of the proceedings there were so amended. Obviously it would be to late to apply to '87 since those taxes have already been paid, but January 1 of '89 was selected somewhat arbitrarily in order to allow for the Department of Revenue to establish the tax forms in a timely manner and that was the only reason. But I certainly would not oppose an effort to bring that to January 1 of '88."

Wolf: "I would think that the individuals that we are trying to assist here would not have any effect on the revenue of the State of Illinois. And I could certainly support the Bill

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

and especially so if it were to be effective for the taxable year 1988."

Homer: "It's a good suggestion."

Wolf: "Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Klemm."

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

Speaker Madigan: "The Sponsor yields."

Klemm: "Representative Homer, it seems as if we've only gone half way with this. Because it seems if we have a senior citizen who files possibly a spouse that is blind, in order for them both to get the reduction in taxes they'd have to now file separate income tax forms, rather than a joint form, which I think so many of my constituents do as a convenience. Now doesn't it seem that if a spouse is 65 also, that they should both benefit from that same reduction rather than having to go through the additional paper work on separate returns."

Homer: "Representative Klemm, it's difficult to hear. It's my understanding from the way the Bill is drafted, that if... if an individual is both over 65 and blind the individual would be entitled to two additional exemptions. And if the spouse also met with any of those criteria then those additional exemptions could all be joined on the filing of a joint return. Now I didn't understand exactly what the question..."

Klemm: "So it's your intention that the language should really read that ... that they would have those additional exemptions on the joint return. Now I've been advised that that's not what the language says and I was wondering maybe if you could clarify that. Otherwise, perhaps we need some addressing that issue in the Senate if it gets over there. Because I don't think that would be the intent and I wanted to at least clarify it. I support your legislation. I

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

didn't think for the way it was drafted it went far enough or the full intent that you had indicated earlier."

Homer: "Well I appreciate you mentioning that, Representative Klemm. That's the first instance that anyone has suggested that interpretation and certainly look at that. The intent is clearly to allow for the filing of a joint return. I can't see any sense at all in requiring filing of separate returns. It would make no sense under our flat rate system."

Klemm: "Well, I agree."

Homer: "But there is a problem there..."

Klemm: "That's not my question."

Homer: "We'll take a look at..."

Klemm: "Alright fine."

Homer: "And I appreciate you mentioning it."

Klemm: "I just wanted to clarify. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Pedersen."

Pedersen: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I think you all know how I feel about net tax increases in Illinois and how it affects jobs. All I can say to the Sponsor of this Bill, is that I commend him for moving us in the right direction and lowering the tax burden. So I would certainly promote supporting this Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Ropp."

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

Speaker Madigan: "The Sponsor yields."

Ropp: "Representative, do you know whether or not in the current budget that has been proposed by the Governor, this eighteen point three million dollars that the state has assumed to have acquire as a result of this windfall was planned for or is in the current budget for revenue?"

Homer: "Representative Ropp, the Bill provides that it would take

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

effect with the tax year beginning January 1 of '89. That would actually be a fiscal year in the offing. The revenues, the Governor's budget would have to do with the '87 and '88 revenues. So I don't believe that this issue would be involved in his current budget."

Ropp: "Well, I would assume that these monies that we consider somewhat of a windfall as a result of federal legislation would have been planned for in this fiscal year, which would mean that next year whenever this Bill goes into effect, it's going to be approximately eighteen million dollars less that the state has to deal with."

Homer: "Well, let me revise my previous answer because, as I think about it, I think I was incorrect. Since it takes effect January 1 of '89, and because the first six months of that year... Calendar year would be included in the FY '89 budget, then I would... I would think that... I would think that it... would have an impact with regard to six months of that budget. It would be a half impact."

Ropp: "Okay. So when this goes into effect and I support the idea, because I think there are those people who had received this exemption before and now it looks like we have just kind of turned the tables on them; it means then that the state's revenue then after this Bill goes into effect, will be eighteen million dollars short and that we're going to have to come up with additional revenues to replace those for which we are giving once again back tax relief. And there's probably another measure to support the need for revenue enhancement to provide for adequate funding of a lot of programs that we have in the State of Illinois. Would that be a fair assessment?"

Homer: "Well, I didn't... I was distracted and wasn't listening to each and every word as I usually do when you speak,

Representative Ropp. But if you've made an assumption here

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

and knowing you from past experience, I'm sure it has some validity to it."

Ropp: "Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. McAuliffe."

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

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. McAuliffe, I don't think that's necessary.

So there's no one else seeking recognition, the Chair can recognize Mr. Homer to close. Mr. Homer to close. Mr. Giglio, would you come to the podium? Mr. Homer."

Homer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And I appreciate the words of support that have been lent to the measure here today. What is at issue are the tax burden of eight hundred thousand Illinois residents who happen to be senior citizens and/or blind. Because of changes in the Federal Tax Reform Law, those individuals ended up losing one of their exemptions for both purposes of federal taxes and state taxes. And although the Federal Tax Law compensated those individuals by increasing the value of their standard deduction, we in Illinois did nothing. And as a result, those eight hundred thousand seniors and blind individuals are losing the benefit of the double exemptions. 2968 would simply restore those individuals to the status they had for purposes of Illinois taxes prior to the adoption of the federal changes in the tax law. right thing to do, it's something that our seniors have a right to expect from us that we do not put the burden of balancing the state's budget on their back and single them out as a class of taxpayers that should be unduly burdened.

So I would ask for your support for this measure."

Speaker Madigan: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' Those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. Mr. Ewing to explain his vote."

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

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

casting my 'yes' vote for this Bill, I think it's important to point out two things. First of all, unless we have some type of revenue increase, I don't know how we're going to afford this and I hope that the Sponsor of this measure and everybody who is voting on it today will be the first one in line to help replace these revenues so that schools and other necessary services of this state can be properly funded."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Matijevich to explain his vote."

Matijevich: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I was just going to add, I understand that the Department of Revenue got in a real tangle for a woman about 80 years old because of not being aware of this losing this double exemption, I think she owed something like either a penny or a dime. So I want to tell the Director of the Department of Revenue, if that happens again, just come over to my desk and I'll give him a dime rather than getting into all that trouble that he did. It would be a lot cheaper for all of the taxpayers."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Pedersen to explain his vote."

Pedersen: "Thank you... thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to just add this comment. And that is we should seriously look at this exemption and providing it only for those people who qualify for the circuit breaker. I am voting for the Bill, but I think there are a lot of people who are getting this break, that in my estimation do not deserve it. I think only those that are eligible for the circuit breaker should be eligible for this exemption. Thank you."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Flinn to explain his vote."

Flinn: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't want to explain my vote, and I know I can't cut off this debate, but you're holding up my press release."

Speaker Madigan: "Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question there are 117 'ayes', no one

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

voting 'no'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Special Order of Business, State Income Tax there appears House Bill 3327. The Chair recognizes Mr. Curran. Mr. Curran. Mr. Clerk, what is the status of this Bill?"

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3327 is on the Order of Second Reading.

A Bill for an Act to amend an Act in relationship to state revenues. Second Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Madigan: "Are there any Committee Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "There are no Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1 is being offered by Representative Cullerton."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Amendment would raise the Illinois state income tax for individuals from 2.5 to 3.4 percent. And for corporations from 4 to 5.44. The effect of this provision would be to raise one point four billion dollars. It would, at the same time reduce the property tax rate throughout the state by forty-four cents per hundred dollars of equalized assessed valuation. This would result in a savings of seven hundred and seventy two million dollars in property tax relief. This money would be replaced, dollar for dollar from the fund that is created through the increase in the income tax. This property tax rate could be increased through referendum. This would result overall in an extra five hundred and eleven million The Bill provides that fifty million dollars would go to the Chicago Public School System if, and only if, the Chicago Public School System in some fashion reformed itself. The remaining four hundred and sixty one million dollars would be distributed back to the school districts, but not on the current school aid formula, rather on a formula that would distribute the money back,

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

based on the equalized assessed valuation of the school district. The effect would be that the wealthier the school district the more money they would receive. goal then of this Amendment, would be to provide not more money for the running of State Government, but rather money for education. It would be an additional five hundred and eleven million dollars. It would only money to Chicago if there was a school reform and I think it would also inject the reform into the tax law itself. Since the income tax, most people I would think feel is more equitable than the property tax. It would by the way, also increase the personal exemption by five hundred And another result of this Bill would be to, through state revenue sharing by increasing the income tax, one hundred seventeen million dollars would be returned to Local Government Units..."

Speaker Madigan: "Representative Giglio in the Chair."

Cullerton: "...In the case of Chicago, this would increase the amounts by thirty five million dollars. I think when look at the Bill, you'll see that it should have support from throughout the state. For example, in the farming areas, the farmers are always in favor of lowering property taxes, that's what this Bill does. Obviously throughout the State of Illinois, all schools will get more money. you look in the suburban area, they are particularly concerned traditionally about property tax and this would have the effect of lowering their property tax they also have been concerned about the... what they perceive is the unfairness of the state aid formula. Bill would not abolish the current state aid formula, but basically say that the new money will be distributed in a fashion that would benefit them. With regard to Chicago, the effect of the increase in the tax would be to bring one

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

hundred forty-four million dollars into the Chicago School System, which should be enough to honor the contract that has been assigned as well as bring in fifty million new dollars for the reform measures which hopefully will pass. The City of Chicago will receive an extra thirty five million dollars. And of course, a concern to many people in Chicago, the property taxes would be lowered. the reasons why the Bill is a good one. The problems with the Bill, I'm afraid is that it's a compromise and at this stage of the process, people are not yet willing to show their hand to indicate what they are willing to compromise on. This is more like the type of a Bill that would be voted on at the end of the Session after long negotiations in give and take. Unfortunately when this Bill was introduced in committee, it was... and because of the fact that it's a compromise it did not receive any support. Some people are not for tax increases at all. Some people say, we shouldn't just give it to education. Other people say it just wasn't enough. So as a result it received no support in committee. Even the Sponsor of the Bill that I'm attempting to amend has indicated that he is not in favor of the Amendment. So as a result, Mr. Speaker, at this time I would withdraw the Amendment and hope that it will... it sometime in the future be debated."

Speaker Giglio: "Withdraw the Amendment. Amendment's withdrawn.
Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Cowlishaw."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Cowlishaw."

Cowlishaw: "Mr. Speaker, would you withdraw that Amendment please?"

Speaker Giglio: "Withdraw the Amendment. Mr. McCracken, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

McCracken: "What is the point of the political speech just to withdraw the Amendment? I mean is the other side of the aisle serious about this issue? He goes through a 10 minute explanation purporting to help everybody in the State of Illinois, but for some unspecified reason, pulls the Amendment out of the record. What is the point? Do you think the press is fooled by this?"

Speaker Giglio: "Representative McCracken, please address the Amendment. Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Well, I want to make a point of order. You know the guy withdrew his Amendment, but as long as Tom McCracken brought the issue up, I want to tell everybody, here's how I feel about the income tax issue. You know, have you ever watched a horse race? Have you ever watched a horse race? Well, the horse race where the horse falls down and the rider... the rider falls down."

Speaker Giglio: "Bring your remarks to a close, Mr. Matijevich.

Are there further Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #3, offered by Representative Cowlishaw."

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

Cowlishaw: "Mr. Speaker, please withdraw Amendment #3 with no speeches whatsoever."

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

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #4, offered by Representative Cowlishaw."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative... #4."

Cowlishaw: "Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Giglio: "Yes."

Cowlishaw: "Please withdraw Amendment #4."

Speaker Giglio: "Withdraw Amendment #4. Are there further Amendments?"

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

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Cowlishaw, Amendment #5."

Cowlishaw: "Please withdraw Amendment #5."

Speaker Giglio: "Withdraw Amendment #5. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #6, offered by Representative Cowlishaw."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Cowlishaw on Amendment #6."

Cowlishaw: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would appreciate it if you would withdraw Amendment #6."

Speaker Giglio: "Withdraw Amendment #6. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #7, offered by Representative Parke."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Parke."

- Parke: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would you let the record show that the Amendment #7 and #8 were inadvertently filed with my name. Please withdraw those three... or two Amendments."
- Speaker Giglio: "Withdraw Amendment #7 and Amendment #8. Are there further Amendments? Are there further Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Leone: "There are no further Amendments."
- Speaker Giglio: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, we want to make sure that the House Bill 2968 was read a third time when we proceeded to call this Bill and in its final passage.

 Would you please read 2968."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2968, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Income Tax Act. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Giglio: "Read it, Mr. Clerk, House Bill 3327."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3327, a Bill for an Act in relating...
 to amend an Act relating to state revenues. Second Reading
 of the Bill."
- Speaker Giglio: "Representative McCracken."
- McCracken: "Two questions. Is it the Chair's intent to call

 Representative Homer's Bill for a vote now? Is it the

 Chair's contention that it had been read a second time

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

previously?"

Speaker Giglio: "No... we... we voted. However, there was some technicality, I didn't think it was read into the record.

The vote was taken, however we wanted to make sure it was recorded as being read by the Clerk."

McCracken: "Okay."

Speaker Giglio: "For the record."

McCracken: "Alright, then we're moving on to Representative

Hasara's Bill on this order?"

Speaker Giglio: "Yes."

McCracken: "Thank you."

Speaker Giglio: "Alright, on this Order of Business appears House Bill 3951, Representative Hasara. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "On page 22 of the Calendar, House Bill 3951, a Bill for an Act to create the Heritage Preservation Fund. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Giglio: "The Lady from Springfield, Representative Hasara."

Hasara: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Obviously we can all see what an important Bill this is because all the press is here to record the discussion on this Bill. The gallery is full. House Bill 3951, creates a checkup on the Illinois State income tax for preservation of cultural and historic resources and heritage. It's obvious that in Illinois historic preservation is important not only to our economy, but it's also an important element to our educational system. Think one way to ensure continued emphasis on the valuable historic preservation resources we have in Illinois, is to provide a checkoff on our tax form. I encourage an 'aye' vote on this Bill."

Speaker Giglio: "Any discussion? Question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

opposed 'nay', the voting is open. This is final action.

The Gentleman from Macon, Representative Dunn."

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

I know that this is overwhelming but I think that it should be pointed out that we've had legislation here that provide checkoffs for catastrophic health insurance which have not succeeded in the General Assembly, and until we take care of catastrophic health problems, and either fund them properly through specific legislative programs or provide checkoffs for those purposes on income tax returns. We should not approve programs like this no matter how well intentioned they are. So, I would urge more 'no' votes up there."

Speaker Giglio: "Gentleman from Champaign, Representative Johnson."

"Well, I'm for this Bill. I'm not critical at all, but Johnson: I think this is as good a time as any to point out either to the Department of Revenue or maybe to my colleagues here what I consider a real oversight of our Checkoff Law in Illinois. And that is that for those things that are now on the tax return for checkoffs, you can only... you can only pay into those various funds if you get a refund. you have to pay money in at the end of the year, and you still want to contribute to this or to people who disabled, the blind, non-game wildlife and so forth; you can't do it. And the whole purpose is to provide an mechanism for funding worthy activities. So I would sure suggest, Representative Hasara, maybe when this Bill over to the Senate, it ought to be amended to provide that people, when they pay in at the end of the year can contribute as well. Because I would guess if you did some kind of a Sociol Economic Study, that the people who owe money at the end of the year are at least as likely, if not

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

perhaps more likely to contribute to these various entities or more able to contribute than those who get refunds. So I think it's a real oversight in the law, and if we really want to help those various recipients of state dollars that are checkoffs on your tax return, we ought to provide a new mechanism for funding them."

Speaker Giglio: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 108 voting 'yes', 8 voting 'no', none voting 'present', and the House 'does pass' House Bill 3951 and this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. going to go back to the Order of Chair now is Administration of Justice where we left off. And on that Order of Business on Second Reading appears House Bill 3128, Representative O'Connell. Are you ready with that Sir? 3128, out of the record. Representative McCracken, 3598. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill. Representative Currie."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3598, a Bill for an Act in relationship to health care agencies. Second Reading of the Bill.

There are no Committee Amendments."

Speaker Giglio: "Are there any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #1 is being offered by Representative McCracken."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative McCracken."

McCracken: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is an Amendment to the Power of Attorney Act and is done by agreement of the interested parties who expressed a position in the Judiciary Committee. The Chicago Bar Association came to me and asked that we draft an agreed Amendment and this is the product of that drafting. And among other things, what it seeks to do is

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

expressly specify that the Act does not authorize or approve of euthanasia or suicide and that certain other provisions not be construed to give the agent in question, created under the Act, powers which the principal would not have. As I say, it is an agreed Amendment. I'd be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Giglio: "Any discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Young."

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

Speaker Giglio: "He indicates he will."

Young: "Who... who are the parties that agreed to this Amendment?"

McCracken: "The Chicago Bar Association, Right to Life, Catholic League. We didn't move this Bill because Matt Simon came to me and asked if we could work it out. I originally did not call it in committee, because I had not yet... we have not yet come to that agreement. And Representative Sutker was involved as the Chief Sponsor of the... so, after reaching the agreement, we discharged the committee for the purpose of putting on this Amendment."

Speaker Giglio: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Sutker."

Sutker: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, last year there were three Power of Attorney Bills. They New Durable Power of Attorney Bills which were submitted by me and passed by this House. This part of the Durable Power of Attorney Bills related to health care. Representative McCracken submitted this Amendment. It has been approved by the Bar Association. It supplements and clarifies and hones the health care provisions in the Durable Power of Attorney Bill that was before us last important and significant year. Ι think it's an contribution to that Bill. It makes what I believe to be

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

an outstanding Bill and outstanding legislation better and I fully support it and urge your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Giglio: "Further discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt Amendment #1?' All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', those opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it and the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Giglio: "Third Reading. On page 13 of the Calendar appears House Bill 4125, Representative Shaw. Representative Shaw in the chamber? Representative Shaw, do you wish to have 4125 called, Sir? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 4125, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Controlled Substances Act. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee."

Speaker Giglio: "Any Motions filed?"

Clerk Leone: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Giglio: "Are there any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Shaw."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Shaw."

Shaw: "Withdraw Amendment #2."

Speaker Giglio: "Withdraw Amendment #2. Are there further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #3, offered by Representative Shaw."

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

Shaw: "Withdraw Amendment #3."

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

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #4, offered by Representative Shaw."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Shaw on Amendment #4."

Shaw: "Yeah... Yes, Amendment #4... thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Amendment #4 becomes... become the Bill and what it does,

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

it amends the Controlled Substances Act... wait a minute... oh... to create a new offense and drug induced homicide offense is committed when a person unlawfully delivers a controlled substance to another and any person dies as a result of ingesting any amount of that controlled substance. If the amount of the controlled substance delivered would render the offense a Class X... a Class 1 Felony the substance be sentenced for drug induced homicide is that for a Class X Felony, except that the minimum mandatory prison sentence is required to be 15 years."

Speaker Giglio: "Any discussion? The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative McCracken."

McCracken: "Thank you. Will the Sponsor yield for a question?" Speaker Giglio: "He indicates he will."

McCracken: "Do I read this right, Rep... Representative? Did some scurrilous defense lawyer make you take out the death penalty clause in your Bill?"

Shaw: "No. The..."

McCracken: "Is it still in there?"

Shaw: "You... beg your pardon?"

McCracken: "I say, is the death penalty provision still in there?"

Shaw: "No it's not."

McCracken: "Who made you do that? Some criminal defense lawyer?

Did you cave into the special interests?"

Shaw: "No. I... you know, I'm willing to put the death penalty back in there if you think it's constitutional."

McCracken: "Well, I say the defendant shouldn't be an organized lobbying group. Criminal defendants should not have a voice down here. So, anyone... any lobbyist listening who represents those criminal defendants, stay out of the House. We're all for your Bill."

Speaker Giglio: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Cook,

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

Representative Anthony Young."

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

Speaker Giglio: "He indicates he will."

- Young: "I'm sorry, Representative, I really couldn't hear you when you defined what the Bill still does. Could you explain it so we can hear you?"
- Shaw: "Basically, what this does is... is creating an offense, a drug induced homicide. And any person that's delivering controlled substance or cause to be delivered and a person dies, then that person would be charged with a Class X or Class 1 Felony and the bottom... sentenced to prison, the bottom would be 15 and the top would be 30."
- Young: "And did I hear you mention revoking driver's licenses in this Bill?"
- Shaw: "Well, yes... yes, that is a part of the Bill. That's right."
- Young: "Under what circumstances are we revoking driver's license?"
- Shaw: "The... if a person... oh, a person's driver's license is... would be revoked for one year. If a person is convicted of unlawful possession of more than 5 grams of controlled substance, thirty grams of cannabis. And I think that's similar to what alcohol is today, it's no different than what we're doing with drunk drivers today."
- Speaker Giglio: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from DeKalb, Representative Countryman."
- Countryman: "Thank you... thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm glad to see this Amendment changes it in some respects, because I think it brings it in constitutionally. I was offended by a Member on this side of the aisle saying that... that people don't have a right to lobby. I mean we have lobbyists all over the place down here. They lobby every... every little issue. And if defendants don't have

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

rights then our Constitution doesn't mean much and I'm frankly offended by that. I think everybody has a right to have an interest in particularly on both sides of the issue and I think it makes for better product. We see some technical problems with this Amendment. One, is the Amendment requires that the license revocation of anyone arrested for possession of drugs while driving a motor vehicle and you know, we don't know if that means while the motor vehicle is moving or if the vehicle is stopped. And that question can, you know... can exist if... does it apply when the vehicle is stopped and not... and someone not driving it? The second thing is, there's a five-vear revocation that speaks only of a second or subsequent offense for a conviction of an illegal possession of drugs. Does that mean... it doesn't mention anything driving even though that's presumably what was meant. we think that what the Sponsor's intention is good, but we still think this Amendment is technically flawed and that he ought to hold it on Second Reading and correct those technical defects."

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

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

I rise in opposition to the portion of this Amendment,
which requires revocation of driver's licenses for the
reason that the offense is described in the Amendment which
would trigger this provision, if I understand things now,
are probationable offenses. And when... when someone is
convicted of a probationable offense, in this state at the
present time, and happens to get probation, one of the
first things the probation officer, if you can find one,
will say to the person convicted is, 'Do you have a job?'
And if they happen to say, 'Yes, I'm one of the lucky

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

people that has a job.' They'll say, 'Well be sure to get yourself to work and keep that iob.' If you trigger revocation of a driver's license with this provision, that person who gets probation won't be able to go to work. They've already done something they shouldn't. They'll just be forced down the path to bigger and better crime, more and more trouble and so the end result will be worse than if this Amendment were defeated. This Amendment should be defeated because if someone gets probation and is convicted of a criminal charge on the statute books already, the punishment is adequate. If they go to the ... if they have to serve time, then that's one thing. they get probation, they should be allowed to get to work and maybe in the big city in Chicago you can ride a bus or the el and ride public transportation, but those of us down state need cars to get to work. There... it's almost nobody down state who lives close enough to employment to walk to work, so they need a car. This is a bad... bad Amendment and should be defeated."

Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Shaw to close."

The problem in this Amendment is designed to deal with drug pushers throughout our state and we know that the drug pushers take these automobiles and deliver drugs to our young people and the only... this is just one method, of trying to get at it. It would be very difficult for our drug dealer to start delivering his drugs or her drugs on a bicycle and that's why we want to remove the driver's license of these individuals who are delivering the drugs. I ask for an 'aye' vote on this Amendment."

Speaker Giglio: "The question is, 'Shall the House adopt

Amendment #4 to House Bill 20... 4125?' All those in favor

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

signify by voting 'aye', those opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 86 voting 'yes', 16 voting 'no', 7 voting 'present'. And the House does adopt Amendment #4 to House Bill 4125. Are there further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Giglio: "This Bill... there's been a request for a correctional budget impact note, so the Bill will remain on Second Reading. Representative Dunn, are you ready on 4286? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 4286, a Bill for an Act to amend the Transit... Transient Merchant Act. Second Reading of the Bill. There are no Committee Amendments."

Speaker Giglio: "Are there any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "None."

Speaker Giglio: "Third Reading. Representative Dunn, for what purpose do you seek recognition, Sir? Pardon?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #1 is being offered by Representative Dunn."

Dunn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. There's an inadvertent statement about Third Reading. Are we on Second Reading with this Bill at this time?"

Speaker Giglio: "We're on Second Reading, Sir. Second Reading,
House Bill 4286."

Dunn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Then with regard to Amendment #1,
Amendment #1 contains language which has been approved by
the Retail Merchant's Association to put this Bill in the
form that is acceptable to everybody. I'd be happy to
explain the Amendment. What it does is waive the bond...
authorizes the municipalities to waive the bond provision
if they choose to do so. I ask for adoption of Amendment

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

#1 to House Bill 4286."

Speaker Giglio: "Any discussion? Hearing none, all those in favor of the Amendment signify by saying 'aye', those opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it and Amendment #l is adopted. Are there further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Giglio: "Third Reading. Is Representative Ryder in the chamber? We're going to go to the Order of House Bills... to the Order of Banking. Representative Cowlishaw. Representative Cowlishaw in the chamber? Are you ready, Ma'am? House Bill 1305, page 5 of the Calendar, mortgage escrow accounts. Out of the record. House Bill 2525, Representative Capparelli, page 16 in the Calendar. Are you ready, Sir? Representative Capparelli, House Bill 2525, Sir. Are you ready? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill. Page 16 in the Calendar, House Bill 2525."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2525, a Bill for an Act in relationship to banks and sale of insurance. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Capparelli."

Capparelli: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 2525 amends the Banking Act of the Illinois Insurance Code. It allows state banks to own and operate a subsidiary which may act as a registered firm for the purpose of selling insurance pursuant to the Illinois Insurance Code. House Bill 2525 provides that the employees of a state bank insurance subsidiary must be a licensed... under the Illinois Insurance Code and that bank subsidiaries shall be subject to regulations of State of Illinois Insurance. Currently there are 13 states that permit banking... banking to sell insurance. The Bill contains a number of consumer protections which protect the consumer from the purchase of

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

insurance source. Employees οf а bank insurance subsidiaries are prohibited from making both the loans and insurance. Employees of bank insurance subsidiaries are prohibited from accessing any information contained in the parent bank loan files, unless directed by the customer. A consumer who has purchased insurance from a bank subsidiary shall be given a written notice that a state that they can 'op' out in five days. In other words, if they buy insurance and they take it home, they can look it over for five days, come back, 'op' it out without any charge to them. For а persons injured by this violation..."

- Speaker Giglio: "Excuse me, Representative Capparelli. Will the House give the Gentleman the attention, please. This is a very important piece of legislation and there are many Representatives that cannot hear the conversation of the Sponsor. Please give the Gentleman your attention. Mr. Capparelli, proceed."
- Capparelli: "Thank you, thank you. For persons injured by a violation of these provisions, a cause of action is established in the circuit court. Violation of the provision in this section constituted a business offense which is subject to a fine of \$5,000.00. I would ask that everyone support 2525. Yesterday, when Representative Novak was on the Floor with his Bill, people Those who opposed his Bill competitions are needed. his competition was great. This would bring competition in the state and bring down the rates so that... the rates would be lower, it would be a consumer protection for those who would want insurance. Thank you."
- Speaker Giglio: "Any discussion? The Gentleman from Madison, Representative Stephens."
- Stephens: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I don't think that we ought

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

to relate this to Representative Novak... Novak's Bill from yesterday. I think what we ought to talk about is you're down state, you live in a small town or you have small towns in your district and you want to bring some economic blithe in, then you ought to talk about putting somebody out of business. This is a way to put one small businessman a step closer to financial failure. The banks are doing alright in Illinois. The banks don't need this to be financially sound. But many people in Illinois who practice their business, many who are in the audience today, need this, need the right to sell insurance without the unfair competition of the banks. The banks don't need These people do. If you want to help close another store front in small town America, then support this Bill. But if you believe like I do, that the insurance industry at the agent level, the small town businessman and woman who's done a job to service their community to provide insurance, if you think they ought to go out of business, then support this Bill. But if you believe like I do that they offer much of the fiber that we think we stand for in down state Illinois, then you ought to stand in opposition to this Bill."

Speaker Giglio: "Will the people in the gallery please refine their conduct. The Chair will not tolerate that type of order in the House. If that continues, I would ask the people in the gallery to please leave. The Gentleman from Will, Representative Wennlund."

Wennlund: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Bill is aimed at..."

Speaker Giglio: "Excuse me, Representative Capparelli."

Capparelli: "Because I feel there's a lot of interruption at this time and the House is not getting the proper hearing on this Bill. I would like to take it out of the record for a

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

moment."

- Speaker Giglio: "Mr. Clerk, take the Bill out of the record.

 House Bill 3478, Representative DeJaegher. Is

 Representative DeJaegher in the chamber? Mr. Clerk, read
 the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "On page 19 of the Calendar, House Bill 3478, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Banking Act. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman from Rock Island, Representative DeJaeqher."
- DeJaegher: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Members of the... Members of the House. House Bill 3478 amends the Illinois Banking Act to allow state chartered banks to operate or own travel agencies. Last year an identical Bill, 576, passed in committee 21 and Third Reading 74 to 32. This... this measure has the support of the IBA and the independent community banks of Illinois and also the commissioners of banks in the State of Illinois. I vote for acceptance of House Bill 3478."
- Speaker Giglio: "Any discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Parke."
- Parke: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in opposition to this Again what we have is legislation. the financial institutions that are trying to get into someone else's pocketbook. They're talking about wanting to level... playing field, but in fact what their trying to do is offer all the services they possibly can offer. What happens when we have financial institutions in the United States that are becoming insolvent when they become insolvent they're going to take all the services that they're providing and they're all going to go down. I read in the paper recently that in Texas alone, in Texas alone, the savings... the savings and loan institutions there are

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

going to have to be bailed out in the tune of one billion, two hundred million dollars alone, just in Texas. You know, the issue that was just pulled from the docket was a Bill to sell... to have banks sell insurance. Now they want to sell travel agency business. Tomorrow they're going to want to sell legal services and they're talking about wanting a 'level playing field'. Well there's no level playing field. These huge institutions are going to take away from the small businessmen and women, the entrepreneurs, the members of the free enterprise system, those small businessmen and women who are trying to make a living who are providing services have to compete with a huge corporation, a huge conglomerate, a huge holding What you're going to do is that you're going to drive small travel agencies out of business. You're going to drive small insurance agencies out of business. This is just the beginning. This is the foot in the door. I think this is bad legislation. This is not healthy for the banks. I think they're making a big mistake on this. you to vote 'no' on this legislation, even though ask for it's well meaning. We're going to put small businessmen and women out of business."

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

Wennlund: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I guess the question is, what's next? Assume that Saturday morning at 9:00 a.m. sharp, the husband and wife pack up the four kids and the dog and it's off to the bank, the full service bank. A concierge meets the family at the entrance to the bank to determine what the family needs. Mom sends ten year old Susie to the bank's dental department for an adjustment to her braces, sends eight year old Bobby to the bank's optical department to get new

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

glasses repaired after last nights little league game. He sends six year old Ralph to the bank's shoe department a new pair of Reeboks because he left them at school the day before and he sends four year old Sammy and two year old Davy to the bank's nursery and day care center for safe keeping while mom and dad do the week's shopping. is directed by the concierge to the bank's beauty and barber salon where she's seated before a colored computer screen and while getting her hair trimmed she orders by a computer her weeks groceries through the bank's grocery food distribute... distribution center. After placing her order the bank employees deliver them to her car which she left with the doorman so he could wash the car at the bank's drive-in car wash then the family Ford gets washed while the banking is being done. Meanwhile, dad's escorted to the loan department where he's seated before a friendly loan officer. He needs a car loan to buy a new car. officer flips up his financial statement on the screen and says yes. The officer then asks him what kind of car dad says, 'Well a new Ford wagon. The family's getting bigger. A brown one.' Officer puts up the selection on the bank's auto department sales on the screen and says, 'We've got the car, it'll be delivered. And incidentally, the car needs full coverage insurance, so we're going to insure your new car for you. We'll give you a quote on the He gives him a quote and dad says, 'Well, I so if that's what I have to do'. The officer then suggests credit life, because you might not make it out the door, so then he sells him credit life insurance. The officer says, 'While we're talking about insurance, we ought to examine your home owner's insurance to determine whether or that's adequate.' So he has another loan officer in the mortgage department bring in his file and sure enough, the

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

officer says, 'Well, your home owners really isn't as complete as it should be'. Dad says, 'Well, okay, let's redo the home owner's insurance'. So they do that. officer then suggests that we take a complete look at life insurance package. And while we're doing that, all of this can be done right here at your one-stop service bank. Poor dad sweats, but he says, 'I quess so.' The officer then clears all the purchases, including the braces, the shoes, the groceries, the car loan, the credit life, the auto insurance, the new home owners, mom's hairdo, Bobby's glasses, the car wash which isn't needed any more, because the bank took his car in on trade, and deducts all of this by computer from dad's checking account, mixed up the short fall from the kid's college savings account. But, don't worry. Dashed to then gathers the family back at noon after the concierge, day of shopping and takes them all to the restaurant. There he feeds the kids and the kids all pig out and the bank deducts the cost of the lunch from what accounts left, well his IRA. But no fear, the bank's tax service department will figure out how the tax affects the family. So the family then piles into the new car and everything's fine until next week. And that's what it's coming to. This Bill will destroy the single largest employer in the State of Illinois, small business. encourage your 'no' vote on this and your 'no' vote on 2525 when that comes up. Banks belong in the banking business, not in the family business."

Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman from Will... will the gallery please conduct themselves in an orderly manner? Mr. Clerk, will you kindly go up stairs to the gallery doors please?

Doorman. Mr. Doorman, will you kindly go up to the door in the gallery and ask those people to conduct themselves in

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

an orderly manner? If not ask those people to leave and close the doors. There will be no demonstration from the people in the gallery. This is not the proper way we conduct the proceedings of the House. I would ask that you conduct yourself in an orderly manner if you care to stay and witness the proceedings of this House. The Gentleman from Will, Representative Regan."

Regan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I'll be brief. I oppose the Bill. I don't think travel agencies have any business being in the banking business and I don't think the banks have any business in the travel agency business because I feel that if you have to go in for a loan to take your Caribbean cruise you shouldn't go on it. So it's a 'no' vote."

Speaker Giglio: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from DeKalb,

Representative Countryman."

Countryman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I stand in opposition to this Bill. I think we have to look back in our history as to why we had to regulate banks and what happened in the Great Depression. All of sudden the banks now want to get out of the banking business and into everybody else's business. But I think the real problem here is a subtle coercion. That is if you're going to do business with our bank then you're going to do your total business with our bank and that is you're going to do your travel agency business. We're going to get into other Bills that may allow them to sell insurance and do everything else in the service business. Maybe some the remarks by some of the other speakers have been facetious, but I think banks ought to stick to the banking business. I think that there's plenty of money to be made there for them doing that. And I think there's plenty of an obligation to society when we entrust them with our

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

funds, when we deposit it in the bank, that they pay attention to that and that alone. And I don't think they ought to be out there trying to sell cruises, or sell insurance or do anything else. And I think the logical vote on this is a 'no' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman from McLean, Representative Ropp."

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

Speaker Giglio: "He indicates he will."

Ropp: "Representative, if this Bill becomes law does that mean that those banks that currently are operating a travel agency would no longer be in business?"

DeJaegher: "Would you... would you mind restating the question?"

Ropp: "Yeah, the question is if this Bill becomes law would those banks that currently are operating and owning a travel agency would have to get out of that business? Or are they grandfathered in?"

DeJaegher: "They're grandfathered in."

Ropp: "The next question relative to, does this Bill apply to savings and loans as well as to banks?"

DeJaegher: "No, only to banks - et al."

Ropp: "In other words, savings and loans could continue to operate travel agencies, where as this Bill would prohibit banks from providing the same kind of service?"

DeJaegher: "I didn't hear the question."

Ropp: "The question is, that banks then would be prohibited should this Bill pass from being in the travel agency business, but that... but that savings and loans would be able to provide that service, if you please, to customers in the same community?"

DeJaegher: "Mr. Speaker, because of the adverse audience, so to speak, a Bill that basically we are not dealing with as far as the insurance industry itself goes, I would like to take this out of the record for the present time."

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

Speaker Giglio: "Mr. Clerk, take the Bill out of the record. this time I would like you to welcome a former Senator and former House Member, a man who finally decided to go into the restaurant business, I believe, a former colleague, Representative Sam Maragos. Welcome Sam. Representative DeLeo, would you like to hear Senate Bill 1285? You wanted to move that Bill? Out of the record. Following the procedure that was stated earlier, we said that we would go to Second Readings on the Order of Business that was read off and the next Order of Business is Business Regulation. Second Reading appears House Bill 3790. Is Representative Levin in the chamber? Levin. 3790, Sir, would you like that Bill moved? We will now proceed to Economic and Environment. Environment and Economic Development. Page 5 the Calendar, Second Reading, Representative Representative Rea in the chamber? Mr. Clerk, House Bill Page 5 of the Calendar. Read the Bill. Sir."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1766, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act in relationship to environmental studies. Second Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Giglio: "Rep... Representative... hold on Clerk, Mr. Clerk. Representative Rea."

Clerk Leone: "There are no Committee Amendments."

Rea: "Would you please take the Bill out of the record."

Speaker Giglio: "Out of the record. How about 1769?"

Rea: "The record."

Speaker Giglio: "Out of the record. On this Order of Business appears House Bill 2555. Representative DeJaegher. Mr. Clerk, read 2555."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2555, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Development Finance Authority Act. Second Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Giglio: "While we're waiting for the Clerk, the following

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

Bills on Second Reading, the Gentlemen and the Ladies in the chamber: DeJaegher, Mautino, McPike, Rea, Currie, Richmond, Breslin, Young, Johnson and Hicks, if you want your Bills called on Second Reading we are on this Order of Business. Be prepared. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2555, there are... Amendment #1 was adopted in committee."

Speaker Giglio: "Any Motions?"

Clerk Leone: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Giglio: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Giglio: "Third Reading. Representative Mautino.

Representative Mautino in the chamber? Representative

McPike, 3462. Real Estate Transfer Document. Mr. Clerk,

read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3462, a Bill for an Act in relationship to the transfer of real property. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee."

Speaker Giglio: "Any Motions filed?"

Clerk Leone: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Giglio: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #2 is offered by Representative McPike and Hallock."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative McPike on Amendment #2 to House Bill 3462."

McPike: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #2 becomes the Bill. This is in response to a recognized problem by everyone in industry dealing with hazardous waste and dealing with the transfer of property. I would say this is an Agreed Amendment and rather than spend a lot of time explaining it on Second Reading, I'll just wait until Third Reading to explain the Bill. This Amendment has been agreed to by the banking

106th Legislative Day

- May 18, 1988
- industry, the environmentalists, the Chamber of Commerce, the Manufacturer's Association and the Illinois EPA. I move for the adoption of the Amendment."
- Speaker Giglio: "Any discussion? All those in favor of the Amendment signify by saying 'aye', those opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Are there further Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "There are no further Amendments."
- Speaker Giglio: "Third Reading. House Bill 2917, Representative Mautino. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "On page 6 of the Calendar, House Bill 2917, a Bill for an Act to amend the Environmental Protection Act.

 Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."
- Speaker Giglio: "Any Floor Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #1 is offered by Representative

 McCracken."
- Speaker Giglio: "Representative McCracken. Representative Mautino. Representative Mautino."
- Mautino: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Amendment #1 is Tom McCracken's, who certainly will give them a moment. I happen to... I happen to support the Amendment. It's a good Amendment."
- Speaker Giglio: "Do you want to explain the Amendment? Representative Mautino."
- Mautino: "Mr. Speaker, if it's agreeable with you, I know it's agreeable with the other side of the aisle. I'd be happy to present the Amendment. Since I'm supportive of the Amendment."
- Speaker Giglio: "Why don't you explain the Amendment. Since Mr. McCracken's on his way."
- Mautino: "Basically, the Amendment... basically, Amendment #1 submitted by Representative McCracken, authorizes the increase for the GO bonds by the State of Illinois by

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

\$70,000,000.00. This is the authorization provision that obtains the federal funds under the Clean Water Act which establishes that... that fund and provides a local governments can obtain loans from that fund based upon the priority list which is embodied in the original Bill. And I ask for adoption of Amendment #1 on behalf of Representative McCracken."

Speaker Giglio: "You heard the Gentleman's Motion. Any discussion? All those in favor of the Amendment signify by saying 'aye', those opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted.

Are there further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "There are no further Amendments."

Speaker Giglio: "Third Reading. Representative Levin. Is
Representative Levin in the chamber? Representative Levin,
3683, are you ready, Sir? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "On page 9 of your Calendar, House Bill 3683, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Chemical Safety Act. Second Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Giglio: "Out of the record. House Bill 3726. Go back to 3683, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3683, on page 9. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee."

Speaker Giglio: "Any Motions filed?"

Clerk Leone: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Giglio: "Are there any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #2 is offered by Representative
Levin."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Levin."

Levin: "Withdraw Amendment #2."

Speaker Giglio: "Withdraw Amendment #2. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #3 is offered by Representative Levin."

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Levin."

- Levin: "Okay, Mr. Speaker, what I would like to do is adopt Amendment #3 which represents a compromise that has been reached. There's still, however, is a technical problem with it that's been worked out. So, I'd like to adopt this Amendment and the understanding is that there will be subsequently... an additional Amendment. But Amendment #3 embodies the agreement reached with the Chamber of Commerce and the EPA and environmental groups, that I think makes this an Agreed Bill. As I say, with the understanding that there will have to be one additional Amendment to clean it which is being drafted right now."
- Speaker Giglio: "Further discussion? All those in favor of the Amendment signify by saying 'aye', those opposed 'nay'. The Representative from Cook, Representative Piel."
- Piel: Speaker. Α "Thank you, Mr. question the If you would check the Amendment, it is Parliamentarian? our opinion that the Amendment is presently out of order. Because if you'll check on lines 6 through 8, lines 11 through 15. Nothing is underlined and so... and it should be underlined to designate what is being put into the Bill. So I would request... you know, ask the Parliamentarian if he feels this is out of order, because in our opinion it is."
- Speaker Giglio: "Parliamentarian is now reading the Bill. Point is well taken, Representative Piel. Representative Levin."
- Levin: "Okay, we will just in... in doing the redraft, we'll correct that... that problem. So I withdraw Amendment #3."
- Speaker Giglio: "Withdraw Amendment #3. Are there further Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Leone: "There are no further Amendments."
- Speaker Giglio: "Third Reading. You want to move it to Third?

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

- Third Reading."
- Levin: "Yeah, with the understanding that we're going to bring it back for the technical Amendment."
- Speaker Giglio: "Third Reading, Mr. Clerk. 3726, Representative Levin. 3726, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "On page 4 of the Calendar, House Bill 3726, a Bill for an Act in relationship to certain federally subsidized housing. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee."
- Speaker Giglio: "Are there any Motions filed?"
- Clerk Leone: "No Motions filed."
- Speaker Giglio: "Are there any Floor Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "No Floor Amendments."
- Speaker Giglio: "Third Reading. Representative Rea, 3742, Sir.

 Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3742, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Code Technology Development Assistance Act. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."
- Speaker Giglio: "Are there any Floor Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "There are no Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments."
- Speaker Giglio: "There's been a fis... there's been a fiscal note requested, Representative Rea, the Bill. Representative Rea."
- Rea: "I have filed a fiscal note. There is one filed. I have a copy of it here."
- Speaker Giglio: "Fiscal note has been filed. Mr. Clerk, Third Reading. Representative Richmond. Representative Richmond, 3848. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3848, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Farm Development Act. Second Reading of the Bill.

 No Committee Amendments."
- Speaker Giglio: "Are there any Floor Amendments?"

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

Clerk Leone: "There are none."

Speaker Giglio: "Third Reading. Representative Piel."

Piel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. According to our Calendar, there has been a fiscal note request. And my question to the Clerk is, has that fiscal note been filed?"

Speaker Giglio: "Fiscal note has been filed."

Piel: "Thank you."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Breslin, 3878. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3878, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act regulating contributions by certain employers to benefit funds. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee."

Speaker Giglio: "Will the... any Motions filed?"

Clerk Leone: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Giglio: "Are there any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #2 is being offered by Representative Breslin."

Speaker Giglio: "The Lady from LaSalle, Representative Breslin on Amendment #2."

Breslin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. This Bill is a large Amendment that is offered as to meet the concerns of many in the industry and in municipalities that this Bill affects. The Bill requires larger counties in the City of Chicago to adopt and implement comprehensive solid waste management plans. The Amendment #1 gives these local governments an additional two months to prepare their plans. In addition to that we have changed the definition of recycling to specify that leaves are an example of a recyclable item. This is important, because later on in the Bill we have required that each county reach a maximum of a... of 25% as their recycling goal with a... within a certain specified period of time. So when they can include

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

leaves and yard waste in this category of recyclable items, that will help them meet their goal at a faster rate. Thirdly, we have clarified that the Illinois EPA must provide financial assistance to the City of Chicago and to counties that are subject to the planning provisions of the Act. And they will get this money through the Solid Waste Management Act Fund that we have been working on earlier. Fourthly, we have required ... we have fine tuned the provisions that require counties as part of their recycling programs to establish separate collection and composting of yard waste. Under the Amendment counties only have to provide for composting of leaves. It will... it is that once they have established the composting of leaves they will then be able to go to yard clippings... or grass clippings and will be able to do that easily. Fifth, the Bill includes a provision that would have required counties give special preference to existing recycling operations. Instead, under the Bill, we require only that they consider what is in existence at the moment. they can... can consider their current market and take into consideration the impact on those people's business. Sixth, under the Act ENR is required to help local governments establish recycling programs. We have clarified that this money can be used for capital assistance or recycling diversion credits. We have also, under the Amendment, required that we are only banning disposal of leaves that are brought to the landfill by big vacuum trucks. We are... it is easier to identify that kind of garbage when it comes into the landfill and thus be able to monitor what is... when yard waste is being dumped in landfills and making it much easier for the operator monitor. At the request of a major soft drink company, we have eliminated one of the criteria for allowing the

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

plastic can to be used in the state. This provision would have required that the plastic can meet the same recycling rate as the aluminum can. We have taken that out. But we have instead still kept the other two requirements that insure that before the plastic can is introduced in Illinois, it can be collected, processed and transported to markets economically. And finally, we have limited the penalty in the section to only one... to one fee and then allowed the Attorney General to go in and prosecute if the company or the community does not voluntarily comply with the Act. This Bill takes away the major any kind of major opposition to solid waste management planning that I have been aware of and I ask for its adoption."

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

Preston: "Would the Lady yield for questioning?"

Speaker Giglio: "She indicates she will."

Preston: "Representative Breslin, can you just tell me what the position of the Sierra Club is on your Amendment?"

Breslin: "Oh, they think it's a great idea. They're for it."

Preston: "Thank you."

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

Wennlund: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. With less than four years left to landfill... fill space in Illinois this Amendment is a positive step towards reducing the amount of solid waste generated in Illinois. It will reduce the dependence on landfills in Illinois. It's a positive step. The very first one. It'll provide for planning on a county and municipal wide basis. And will implement recycling and composting programs that are a must. With this Amendment and this Bill we can reduce substantially the amount of dependence on landfills in

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

Illinois. I urge everyone in the House to support this Amendment and to support the Bill. This deserves your 'yes' vote."

Speaker Giglio: "Further discussion? The question is, 'Shall Amendment #2 be adopted?' All those in favor... Oh I'm sorry, Representative Regan from Will."

Regan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor..."

Speaker Giglio: "She indicates she will."

Regan: "One quick question, if the cost estimate of this mandate was between 8 million and 16 million in the previous synopsis, does this Amendment change that?"

Breslin: "Yes, we don't have a new estimate, although, I will be getting it for the Senate. It is to have... it is expected to have reduced that cost estimate. But remember the money is coming out of the Solid Waste Management Planning Act. It will not be GRF money."

Regan: "One more thing, the plastic liners..."

Breslin: "Can."

Regan: "Not liners, but attachments with the cans pop are connected with plastic?"

Breslin: "Yes, the plastic holders."

Regan: "Yes, is that eliminated then?"

Breslin: "That is eliminated."

Regan: "So you took that out of the Bill?"

Breslin: "I took that out of the Bill."

Regan: "Alright, thank you very much."

Breslin: "Didn't want to, but had to."

Speaker Giglio: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Anthony Young."

Young: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Do you know what... does the City of Chicago have a position on this Bill?"

Breslin: "The city originally when the Bill was in committee opposed it, they have not come back to me with any

106th Legislative Day

- May 18, 1988
- different opinion. And I quite frankly, I have to tell you, I'm not sure they've seen the Amendment."
- Young: "Is there a whole new preemption in the Amendment?"
- Breslin: "There's... no, there is not a whole new preemption in the Amendment. But there is a requirement that the state help fund this planning and the recycle... the mandatory recycling and in the past the City of Chicago has gotten those funds up to 70% of the total funding."
- Speaker Giglio: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Cook,

 Representative Panayotovich."
- Panayotovich: "Thank you. Will the Lady answer some questions please? Representative Breslin, what's the Illinois EPA's feeling on this Bill again?"
- Breslin: "I think the EPA is in support of the Bill. They have participated in... and as ENR. I think they're in strong support of the Bill."
- Panayotovich: "And the other proponent, the Illinois

 Environmental Council and the Citizens for Better

 Environment?"
- Breslin: "They are for the Bill."
- Panayotovich: "Okay. I stand in support of this Bill. We've introduced many, many pieces of legislation in the past few years and the sentiment of 'not in my back yard' seems to be a problem all the time. Nobody wants landfills in their back yards. This is a step in the right direction and I urge an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Giglio: "Further discussion? Hearing none. All those in favor of the Amendment signifying by saying 'aye', those opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Are there further Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "There are no further Amendments."
- Speaker Giglio: "Third Reading. The Lady from LaSalle,

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

Representative Breslin."

Breslin: "Mr. Speaker, when this Bill was up on Second Reading the last time, I specifically had the Bill held on Second for the purposes of putting... offering an Amendment. It was an Agreed Amendment and as a consequence, I think the Bill can be heard on Third Reading immediately, since everyone knows the subject and knows the subject of the Amendment. If that is appropriate."

Speaker Giglio: "Mr. Clerk, has the Bill been read a Third time?

Does the Lady have leave?"

Breslin: "I don't need leave."

Speaker Giglio: "Leave is not necessary. The Order of Business that the Chair was conducting was Second Reading and now we're going back to Third. House Bill 3962, Wyvetter Younge. Out of the record. House Bill 3991, Representative Flowers. 3991. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3991, a Bill for an Act in relationship to the regulation of rivers, lakes and streams. Second Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Flowers."

Clerk Leone: "There are no Committee Amendments."

Flowers: "Mr. Speaker, would you please take that Bill out of the record?"

Speaker Giglio: "Take it out of the record, Mr. Clerk."

Flowers: "Thank you."

Speaker Giglio: "Wyvetter Younge on 4004. Would you like that one called, Ma'am? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "On page 12 of the Calendar, House Bill 4004, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act to create the Illinois Municipal Assistance Corporation. Second Reading of the Bill. There are no Committee Amendments."

Speaker Giglio: "Are there any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "None."

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

Speaker Giglio: "Third Reading. Representative Johnson, 4043, Sir. Out of the record. Representative Hicks, 4111. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 4111, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Enterprise Zone Act. Second Reading of the Bill.

There are no Committee Amendments."

Speaker Giglio: "Are there any Floor Amendments?"
Clerk Leone: "There are none."

Speaker Giglio: "Third Reading. Alright now, we just went through the Calendar on Special Order of Business in Environment and Economic Development. Second Reading. And we would like to go to the Consent Calendar. Those Bills that are on Third to be brought back to Second for the purposes of an Amendment. If we could finish this Order of Business on the Consent Calendar and then leave the Consent Calendar, adopt the Consent Calendar, and approximately two hours for those people who change their vote or whatever they want we could accept the Consent Calendar in the middle of the day. On page 5 of the Consent Calendar the yellow book, Supplemental Calendar #1 page 5 appears House Bill 4039. Representative Mays. Representative Mays. House Bill 4039, an Act permitting the Pollution Control Board to charge certain fees. Do you have an Amendment, Sir? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill. the Gentleman have leave to take the House Bill 4039 to the Order of Second Reading for the purpose of an Amendment? Hearing none. The Gentleman has leave. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #3 is being offered by Representative Kulas."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Kulas."

Kulas: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Floor Amendment #3 originally was a Bill introduced

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

by Representative Doederlein which is incorporated into House Bill 1867 which unfortunately died last year. It was one of the Omnibus Bills. All this Amendment does it... it changes the statute of limitations running on dumping of hazardous waste from the time of discovery instead of the time of the action. This Amendment is... was given to me by the Illinois State Police. And I would move for its adoption."

Speaker Giglio: "Any discussion? The Gentleman from Mays..."

Mays: "I simply rise in support of the Gentleman's Amendment and
I move for its adoption."

Speaker Giglio: "Further discussion? Hearing none. All those in favor of the Amendment signify by saying 'aye', those opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Are there further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Giglio: "Third Reading. Does the Gentleman have leave to bring the Bill back to the Order of Consent Calendar? leave is granted. And Hearing none, consideration. Hearing none, leave is granted by the Attendance Roll Call. On page 6 of the Calendar appears House Bill 4184. Representative O'Connell. Does the Gentleman have leave to return this Bill back to the Order of Second Reading for the purpose of an Amendment? Hearing none. Representative McCracken."

McCracken: "I don't know what the Amendment is, but this Bill, I think inadvertently, got on to the Consent Calendar. This apparently, this was vetoed last year as a Senate Bill. I wonder if we could just have a second to talk it over and give me a chance to talk to Representative O'Connell?"

Speaker Giglio: "Representative O'Connell."

O'Connell: "If the issue is taking over the Consent Calendar,

106th Legislative Day

- May 18, 1988
- taking it out of the Consent Calendar, I'd be happy to talk. This, however, I would like to put it on... the Amendment on and then talking about taking it off the Consent Calendar."
- Speaker Giglio: "Alright. Mr. Clerk, does the Gentleman have leave to bring the Bill back to Second for the purpose of an Amendment? Hearing none, leave is granted. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "Amendment #1 is being offered by Representative O'Connell."
- Speaker Giglio: "Representative O'Connell."
- O'Connell: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Amendment simply provides that the delays that are the subject of the Bill must be the fault of a person other than the financial institution. Or the cause of the delay must be due to someone other than the financial institutions and I would ask that it be adopted."
- Speaker Giglio: "Any discussion? The Gentleman from DuPage,

 Representative McCracken."
- McCracken: "Thank you. I see now that the commissioner of banks and trusts has apparently taken the position that if this Amendment's adopted it has no objection. And will this make it substantially different then from the Senate Bill of the previous year? Or are you familiar with that?"
- O'Connell: "I am not familiar."
- McCracken: "What does... what is the effect of the Bill as amended if this is adopted?"
- O'Connell: "Well, as amended that if there is an inordinate delay for the processing of a mortgage, I believe it's beyond 60 days, that this... if the cause is by someone other than the financial institution it does not subject the financial institution to any penalties that are under the Bill."
- McCracken: "I'm sorry, I don't follow."

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

O'Connell: "The Bill provides that the financial institution must not cause a delay beyond 60 days, without getting the approval of the applicant for the mortgage."

McCracken: "Alright."

O'Connell: "If the delay is caused by someone other than the financial institution, be it the applicant himself or a third party, then the financial institution would not be penalized because there's a delay beyond 60 days."

McCracken: "May they then withdraw if it goes beyond the commitment date at the fault of the third party?"

O'Connell: "I'm sorry..."

McCracken: "May they withdraw their commitment if... at the fault of the borrower, the delay is greater than 60 days?"

O'Connell: "Yeah."

McCracken: "If this Amendment is adopted?"

O'Connell: "It has nothing to do with withdrawing the commitment."

McCracken: "Okay, what is it then, if you can keep the fees or something, is that it?"

O'Connell: "No. If the... if the mortgage or the financial institution does not act within 60 days and the applicant is left hanging for 60 days, the Bill provides for penalties an extension of the commitment. What the Amendment does is keeps the delay that would precipitate any penalties on the onus of a third party."

McCracken: "Alright, let me suggest this. I think that this Bill is not properly on the agreed list. I'm not sure what procedures have been adopted. I think that the Amendment makes the Bill better, but still it doesn't belong on the Agreed Bill list. I don't mind calling the Bill for a debate and a vote. I'm not trying to kill it on a procedural point. But I frankly think it's just not appropriate for this list. I don't know how it got on."

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

- Speaker Giglio: "Further discussion? Mr. O'Connell."
- O'Connell: "If it's not a subject of a... the Consent Calendar.

 I'd be happy to talk to the other side of the aisle or
 whoever objects to it. If you want the Amendment on or not
 it doesn't matter to me at this stage."
- Speaker Giglio: "Further discussion? Mr. McCracken."
- McCracken: "Would it be alright with the Sponsor if we took it out of the record briefly and talked about it and then we can..."
- O'Connell: "I would ask leave just to withdraw the Amendment and let it go back to Third Reading and I'll be happy to talk about it."
- McCracken: "Alright, well then, we're going to have to object.

 We don't want it on the Consent Calendar."
- Speaker Giglio: "Well, that sure is understanding, this was a Leadership Agreed List of Bills. And if you have a problem, we'll just follow procedure, we'll take it out. Representative McCracken."
- McCracken: "The leaders defer to us on this issue, so..."
- Speaker Giglio: "Representative O'Connell."
- O'Connell: "Mr. Speaker, why don't we just go up or down on the Amendment and let it proceed normally. If there's objections to the Consent Calendar that can be taken up as soon as you act on the Amendment. Whether it goes up or down."
- Speaker Giglio: "You heard the Gentleman's Motion. All those in favor of the Amendment signify by saying 'aye', those opposed 'nay'. Roll Call, Mr. Clerk. All those in favor of the Amendment signify by voting 'aye', those opposed 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 67 voting 'yes', 48 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. And the

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "There are no further Amendments."

Speaker Giglio: "Third Reading. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Piel."

Piel: "A question of the Chair, Mr. Speaker. It was asked, you know previous to the adoption of the Amendment, to take the Bill off this Agreed Consent Calendar. Now I would renew that request that this Bill be taken off the Consent Calendar. I mean it was a situation to where Representative McCracken asked to have it taken off."

Speaker Giglio: "Be a... to conferring with the Parliamentarian,
Mr. Piel. The Bill will be taken off the Order of Consent
Calendar and put on the Special Order of Business under
banking. Alright, on this Order of Business on
Supplemental Calendar #1, Consent Calendar, are there any
other Members who wish to have their Bills returned back to
the Order of Second Reading for the purpose of an
Amendment? Representative... the Lady from LaSalle,
Representative Breslin."

Breslin: "8373, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Giglio: "What was that?"

Breslin: "8373. Excuse me, 3873. I have an Agreed Amendment filed on that Bill."

Speaker Giglio: "House Bill 83... 3873. Does the Lady have leave to bring the Bill back? Leave is granted. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #2 is being offered by Representative Breslin."

Speaker Giglio: "The Lady from LaSalle, Representative Breslin."

Breslin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is an IPAC Bill that allows for notice and a discharge planning for senior citizens who are being released from the hospital who are Medicare-Medicaid patients. The Illinois Hospital

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

Association asked for Amendments to make it more workable. This Amendment would specifically address the issue among other things, the others are fairly technical things. But the main issue is the notice requirement given to people who are being discharged. The current Bill has requires 48 hours. This Bill changes... changes it to 24 hours from the anticipated time of discharge. It's still not perfect, but I'd rather have it in this form when it goes to the Senate and see if we can make any other more suitable arrangements. So I ask for its adoption."

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

Representative Wojcik."

Wojcik: "Would the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Giglio: "She indicates she will."

Wojcik: "Representative, can you tell me when this discharge information has to be presented? How soon?"

Breslin: "Under the Amendment it has to be presented within 24 hours prior to the anticipated discharge. And that's a change. Previously it was 48 hours from the discharge. So we're trying to make it closer and more possible for hospitals to comply, but still give the senior citizens notice and time to think about it so that they can ask questions about it when they don't understand the discharge notice."

Wojcik: "Who is going to be doing this? Who's going to be handling the discharge papers?"

Breslin: "The hospital does, as they do now."

Wojcik: "Will they have to hire someone special since it's going to be a lot more paper work?"

Breslin: "No, they already have those people. And they already have those people on board. I think because of federal regulations. I contacted my own hospital before I picked up this Bill, that's St. Mary's Hospital in Streator, a

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

fairly small... I think a hundred bed hospital in downstate Illinois. They already have people on their staff who are... who will do this. And who have been doing it and will continue to do it."

Wojcik: "Could you explain the normal procedures now?"

normal procedures in the hospitals that are Breslin: "The complying with fed... with the federal law is to provide a discharge notice at some time prior to discharge. it's just before the patient leaves. The purpose of is for senior citizens to give them more time, because as you know under the Medicare DRG requirements, seniors are being discharged from hospitals sicker and quicker than... than others. As... or then previously. So this Senior Citizen Bill to give them the opportunity to know when they're going to be discharged to make appropriate arrangements and to explain more thoroughly what discharge requirements are once they get back home. that they know what they're supposed to do for instance if they need to be readmitted. That's one example."

Wojcik: "Representative, when we're talking about discharges I recall I believe that they have a pamphlet that they give to the seniors, informing them of the home health care, the visiting nurses, are you aware of any of this type of information?"

Breslin: "None has been presented to me."

Wojcik: "Alright, well I can tell you from my own personal experiences that there has been some written form telling you what you can get. I would like to speak to the Bill, Mr. Speaker. I believe the Sponsor is well intended, however, I question the paper work that would be involved. And my own personal experiences that I have found in my local hospitals working with seniors, is that they have forms prepared for them. The local municipal health nurses

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

also are called in to discuss the discharge of the patient.

And also to tell them of the visiting nurses with your hospitalization forms..."

- Speaker Giglio: "Excuse me, Representative, are you addressing the Amendment or the Bill?"
- Wojcik: "Yes, the Amendment and the Amendment. And I think that to get into a 24 hour release and get involved with discharge would only add to a lot more confusion on the patient's part. I think that we already are addressing this issue and that we should not be continuing to go into another problem. We're working quite well now and I think it should continue that way. Thank you."
- Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman from Madison, Representative Stephens."
- Stephens: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just briefly to... the idea of this discharge information sounds laudable, but that 24 notice is going to cause some Representative. I recognize you're trying to help some people but I think there might be some harm done if we... not because of the regulation on the hospital, but because of the fact that often times when people are being discharged, and especially seniors, drug regimens change, instructions change. What I find in my pharmacy is often times people bring to these... this me information sheet. What I'm afraid will happen is that if it's written one day and then the patient is discharged the next. Patients wind up with changes in directions or drug regimens that cause confusion and they wind up with a paper that says one thing but a doctor's verbal order that said something else. I think that the discharge document should be written as late as possible in the process. do. So that there's less confusion, more direct input from the people responsible for bringing all the regimens

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

together as the patient is discharged. And I have to regrettably stand in opposition to your Amendment and think that we... this whole concept ought to be further discussed here on the House Floor."

- Speaker Giglio: "Further discussion? The Lady from...

 Representative McCracken."
- "Yes, I also stand in opposition to this Amendment. You know, this is another idea which sounds good on paper, but could very well have counter veiling effects. know, we operate here under the law of unintended consequences. And we have made a conscious decision as a matter of public policy to shorten hospital stays as is medically consistent with the health of the patient. is going to have the effect of lengthening those hospital stays. And I don't believe given the status of the health of the person that there is any logic in creating or requiring the creation of this plan. When in fact it not necessarily related to the health of the patient. know, it's just another plan at odds with the underlying premise under which we all operate. Health care is expensive, we want to encourage out-patient care and short hospital stays consistent with the health of the person. This is not consistent with that policy."
- Speaker Giglio: "Further discussion? The Lady from LaSalle, Representative Breslin to close."
- Breslin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. I should remind you that this Bill was reported out of the Human Services Committee 19 to nothing. It was at that time that I agreed to work with the Hospital Association if they had any problems. I have done so and done so in good faith. This Amendment reduces the amount of time, favorable, making the Bill more favorable to the hospitals. It should be noted that the... this Bill requires simple notice of

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

release 24 hours in advance. It is... part of the Bill requires that if the senior doesn't agree with the discharge plan, they have a time to appeal. If you don't get the discharge plan until two minutes before you walk out the door, you certainly wouldn't be able to execute on your appeal rights. I think it's pretty basic to let these people make arrangements when they are being discharged from a hospital. In very short order. And I have certainly tried to do so... and to make it as short a time as possible. It doesn't say just 24 hours, it's 24 hours from the anticipated release date. I don't think I can be any more flexible. I ask that the Amendment be adopted."

Speaker Giglio: "Further discussion? Hearing none, all those in

Speaker Giglio: "Further discussion? Hearing none, all those in favor of the Amendment signify by saying 'aye', those opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?" Clerk Leone: "There are no further Amendments."

Speaker Giglio: "Third Reading. Would the attention of the Chair is to vote on the Consent Calendar at approximately 12:30. The two Bills that we just heard... are these... do we have leave to hear these Bills today for immediate consideration, so they can be placed back on the Consent Calendar, by the Attendance Roll Call? Leave... leave granted. Alright, we're going to return to the Order of Environmental and Economic Development for two Bills that were promised to be heard this morning on Third Reading. Representative Breslin's Bill 3389. Mr. Clerk, read Bill. On the Regular Calendar on page 14, 3389."

Clerk Leone: "On page 14 of the Calendar House Bill 3389,

Amendment #1 is being offered by Representative Breslin."

Speaker Giglio: "The Lady asks leave to bring the Bill back to the Order of Second Reading for the purpose of an Amendment? Does the Lady have leave? Leave is granted.

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3389, which amends the Illinois Solid

Waste Management Act. Amendment #1 is being offered by

Representative Breslin."

Speaker Giglio: "The Lady from LaSalle, Representative Breslin." Breslin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. Amendment is the product of discussions between Governor's Office, Central Management Services and the Illinois Environmental Council. It is an Agreed Amendment. House Bill 3389 is now supported by the Governor's Office and CMS. And of course the environmentalists and the recyclers. The Amendment does several things. First of the original Bill required recycling programs to be established in all state agencies. We have amended that to make it only five state buildings. The Amendments deletes provision that requires CMS to give a 10% price preference to recycled paper. CMS is now required to increase the purchase of recycled paper over an eight-year period of time. The Amendment also clarifies definition of recycled paper. Rather than requiring the state to give a price preference to re-refined oil, the Bill, under this Amendment required CMS to establish a pilot program to test this product. And last, the Bill gives ENR more time to conduct studies of what to do with scrap motor vehicle tires. It also gives ENR more time to conduct a waste production study... waste reduction study. So with this Amendment there is no opposition to the Bill from the Governor's Office or CMS or ENR. So I ask that it be adopted."

Speaker Giglio: "Any discussion? All those in favor of the Amendment signify by saying 'aye', those opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Are there further Amendments?"

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

- Clerk Leone: "There are no further Amendments."
- Speaker Giglio: "Third Reading. With leave to enter this Bill immediate consideration to hear this Bill. Leave is granted by the Attendance Roll Call. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3389, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Solid Waste Management Act. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Giglio: "The Lady from LaSalle, Representative Breslin."

 Breslin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. From the discussion of the Amendment, I think you know pretty much what this Bill does. It establish... it establishes a recycling program for waste generated by state government. It is an Agreed Bill with the Governor's Office and CMS and ENR and I recommend its passage. Thank you."
- Speaker Giglio: "Any discussion? Hearing none, all those in favor of House Bill 3389 vote 'aye', those opposed 'nay'.

 This is final action. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? The late... Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 116 voting 'yes', none voting 'no' and none voting 'present' and this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority... Representative Wennlund."
- Wennlund: "Mr. Speaker, I was distracted and unable to vote.

 Would you record my vote as a 'yes' vote, please?"
- Speaker Giglio: "Record Mr. Wennlund as voting 'aye'. There are 117 voting... 117 voting 'yes', none voting 'no' and none voting 'present'. House Bill 3389, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3878, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "On page 11 of your Calendar, House Bill 3878."
- Speaker Giglio: "This Bill, having previously read a second time... Bill is now on Third Reading. Read the Bill, Mr.

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3878, a Bill for an Act in relationship to solid waste reduction and recycling. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Giglio: "The Lady from LaSalle."

Breslin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is the Bill that we acted on earlier today, you may recall. It requires solid waste management planning on the part of the City of Chicago and all counties over one hundred thousand in population. As a part of that it requires a mandatory recycling program and the composting of leaves. The object of this is to relieve pressure on landfills. I don't know if any of you realize this, but the average person in the State of Illinois throws out over five pounds of garbage every day. Illinois currently has a hundred and forty-six permitted landfills in one incinerator. Twenty years ago or eighteen years ago we had over twelve hundred such sites. As a consequence the number of our sites are dwindling rapidly. Illinois lags behind other states in its rate of recycling, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency reports that nationally about 5 percent of solid waste is incinerated and 8 percent recycled, 4 times as much as is recycled in Illinois. is hoped that through this legislation we will be able to put Illinois back on the map and avoid crisis down the The City of Chicago and the County of Cook will run out of landfill space in four years, downstate and many places, Springfield for instance, will run out of landfill space in 9 years. So that's the object of the Bill, I move for its passage."

Speaker Giglio: "Any discussion? All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed 'nay', the voting is open.

Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

question there are 114 voting 'yes', none voting 'no', none voting 'present', House Bill 3878, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The Order of Business we're going to go to now is Business Business Regulation. Regulation. Mautino, Giorgi, Johnson. Leverenz. White. Martinez. Levin. Cullerton, Laurino. These are the Bills... Representative Mautino in the chamber? Representative Giorgi, Landscaping Architect. On page 16 of the Calendar appears House Bill 1573, Representative Giorgi. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1573, a Bill for an Act to register landscape architectures. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, this is a Bill that has been worked out with everybody concerned and all it does now is allows for the registration of landscape architects. There are no objections to the Bill at this present time and I urge the General Assembly to support in making this a law."

Speaker Giglio: "Any discussion? Hearing none, all those in favor... excuse me, the Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Hensel."

Hensel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is not necessarily a regulation Bill now, it's called a Title Bill than is it?"

Giorgi: "That's all."

Hensel: "Is that correct?"

Giorgi: "Correct, that is correct."

Hensel: "So that's why we have the agreement between all the landscape architects and the landscapers and everything."

Giorgi: "Everybody. Everybody's satisfied."

Hensel: "Okay, thank you."

Speaker Giglio: "Further discussion? Hearing none, all those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed 'nay', the voting is open. This is final action. Have all voted who

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 100 voting 'yes', 5 voting 'no', 5 voting 'present', House Bill 1573, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Johnson on House Bill 2925. Page 14 in the Calendar, Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2925, a Bill for an Act to amend the Board Registration and Safety Act. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman from DuPage... Champaign,
 Representative Johnson."
- Johnson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. This is a bipartisan Bill, Johnson, Hallock, Mautino, Currie and Tate, along with a number of others, to basically provide for an exemption for canoes and kayaks from registration and titling requirements of a Bill that we excessively passed last year. It's boop а bipartisan, supported by all the environmental groups and a This is probably one of those you've number of others. gotten a lot of constituents letters and comments on and I would ask for its favorable consideration."
- Speaker Giglio: "Any discussion? Hearing none, all those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed 'nay', the voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 108 voting 'yes', 2 voting 'no', 3 voting 'present', House Bill 2925, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Leverenz, 3527. Is Representative Leverenz in the chamber? Out of the record, Mr. Clerk. Representative White. Jesse White. Out of the record. Representative Martinez, are you ready on House Bill 3789, Sir? Out of the record. Representative Levin, 3790.

106th Legislative Day

- May 18, 1988
- Representative Braun. Representative Braun in the chamber?
 Representative Cullerton. Representative Laurino. Out of
 the record. House Bill 972, Representative Mautino. Mr.
 Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 972, a Bill for an Act to license and regulate environmental health practitioners. This Bill's been read a third time previously."
- Speaker Giglio: "Gentleman asks leave to bring this Bill back to
 the Order of Second Reading for the purpose of an
 Amendment. Gentleman have leave? Leave is granted. Any
 Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative

 Mautino."
- Speaker Giglio: "Representative Mautino."
- Mautino: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Floor Amendment #3 addresses the concerns of Representatives Hultgren and Black as it pertains to grandfathering in those individuals who are the supervisory capacity as a sanitarian and a health practitioner. It also... the response to his honey dipper question was resolved since they are registered through another agency. They are not considered in this Bill. That's what this Amendment does and I ask for its adoption."
- Speaker Giglio: "Any discussion? Hearing none, all those in favor of the Amendment signify by saying 'aye'... the Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black."
- Black: "Will the Sponsor yield?"
- Speaker Giglio: "He indicates he will."
- Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I just want to commend the Sponsor for working out some difficulties that some people back in my district were fearful of. I think he has addressed all of those difficulties. I would just like to stand in support of the Gentleman's Bill. I have heard

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

from my county health department, they are 100% in favor of the Bill and they would like me to point out that Illinois is now the largest state that does not have a mandatory competency standard for environmental health practitioners. I commend the Gentleman for working out some of the little difficulties we had with the Bill and I stand in support of it."

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

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

Speaker Giglio: "He indicates he will."

Kubik: "Representative Mautino, for a suburban boy like me, what is a honey dipper?"

Mautino: "A honey dipper is a nickname for an individual who cleans out portable restrooms and septic tanks."

Kubik: "Oh, okay. No questions. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Giglio: "Further discussion? All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', those opposed 'nay', in the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it and the Amendment's adopted.

Further Amendments?"

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

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Mautino."

Mautino: "I believe that one is a technical cleanup on some ands and buts presented to us by the reference bureau to correct mistypings and spellings."

Speaker Giglio: "Any discussion? All those in favor of the Amendment signify by saying 'aye', those opposed 'nay', in the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it and the Amendment's adopted. Are there further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Giglio: "Third Reading. The Gentleman ask that immediate consideration so this Bill could be heard. By the

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

Attendance Roll Call, does the Gentleman have leave? Leave is granted. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 972, a Bill for an Act to license and regulate environmental health practitioners. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Mautino."

Mautino: "Thank you very much, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I believe everyone is aware that this re-establishes the licensure and registration provisions of the health environment practitioners who were sunsetted back in 1981. This state is the only one that does not any longer provide the licensure and the registration. It sets up the board, it uses the exact language that was in effect in 1981. amended, it addressed the question of the grandfather clause for those already working in the field. industrial question as well, and the addressed the legislation received 59 votes when there were problems. I don't think there's any problems at all with it now and I ask for your support and favorable."

Speaker Giglio: "Any discussion? The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Hensel."

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

Speaker Giglio: "He indicates he will."

Mautino: "Grandfathered in, yes."

Hensel: "Right. That's the total number that would be registered and regulated in the state?"

Mautino: "Well, there probably would be more because colleges have graduated students in that field. At the time that they were previously covered it was about 200. I would say

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

we maybe closer than... closer probably to a thousand or better and there's also a provision for fees in the Bill to cover the cost."

Hensel: "The fees haven't been increased yet though have they by

Amendment?"

Mautino: "Pardon."

Hensel: "Have the fees been increased did you say?"

Mautino: "They have been included in the Amendment."

Hensel: "Okay. I'm just concerned of what the cost would be the fiscal impact to the state of registering and regulating approximately anywhere from 200 to a 1,000. Some of the information I have the only revenue it would generate would be about forty-four thousand dollars in four years and a four year expense would be about three hundred and fifty-seven thousand dollars at a cost to the state deficit about three hundred and thirteen thousand dollars to register that few people and I'm just wondering if the state can afford that at this time."

Mautino: "Well, Representative Hensel, first of all I don't know exactly where you got the figures. I have seen those. Let me point out to you that in Section 6, subparagraph C it provides for fees to recompen... recompense the cost of administering the Act. The total program cost in 1981 for registering sanitarians environmental health practitioners was eighteen thousand five hundred and fifteen dollars according to the Illinois Department of Registration and Education Physician Paper dated on May 4th of 1981. on the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics inflation factor of 35%, that cost factor at this point in time would not exceed twenty-eight thousand in fiscal year '89 allowing for a 50% upward adjustment since 1981. So I think the figures are incorrect and I want to point out that what ever the cost is for administering the Act is included in

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

Section 6 subparagraph C, so I don't think there's any problem but I do disagree with the figures presented."

Hensel: "And you said this... these people were regulated but it
 was repealed in '81?"

Mautino: "Yes, Sir."

Hensel: "There must have been a good reason to repeal it then in 81 and now seven years later we're going to reinstate them, is that correct?"

Mautino: "Well what happened, Representative, is in 1980 this general... not this General Assembly but the General Assembly passed the Sunset Act. The first two agencies to be evaluated were the health sanitarians and the horse shoers, and the General Assembly acted on those first two proposals and they sunset them even though they wiped out most people who inspect business entities under the sanitarian provisions. We think it's wrong, the Department of Public Health thinks it's wrong, the health associations think it's wrong, and the local health agencies think it's wrong. And they should be registered and licensed since now college courses provide for environmental health practitioners as one of their major... major area of study."

Hensel: "No further questions."

Speaker Giglio: "Further discussion? Hearing none, all those in favor of House Bill 972 vote 'aye', those opposed 'nay', the voting is open. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 103 voting 'yes', 12 voting 'no', none 972, 'present'. House Bill having received Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Calendar appears House Bill 3714, page 21 of Representative Jesse White. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

106th Legislative Day

- May 18, 1988
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3714, page 21 on the Calendar, a Bill for an Act to amend the Condominium Property Act. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative White." White: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, yesterday we placed on this Bill Amendment 1 to the Bill and the primarily Amendment is the Bill and it does in terms providing people who corrections οf own condominiums with justice and fairness. And at this time I'd like to ask this Body to support me and pass this
- Speaker Giglio: "Any discussion? The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative McCracken."

meaningful piece of legislation."

- McCracken: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I also rise in support of the Bill. My discussions yesterday with Representative Levin on the record indicated that certain objections made to the Bill from the Chicago Bar Association had been addressed and rectified and based thereon, I support the legislation."
- Speaker Giglio: "Question is, 'Shall House Bill 3714 pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed 'nay', the voting is open, this is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. Representative Levin, are you seeking recognition, Sir?"
- Levin: "Yeah. I just wanted the record to reflect that you know, I do represent condominium associations and I wanted that to be a part of the record in terms of this Bill."
- Speaker Giglio: "On this question there are 109 voting 'yes', 2 voting 'no', 2 voting 'present' and House Bill 3714, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 15 of the Calendar appears House Bill 196, Wyvetter Younge under the Order of Environment and Economic

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

Development. House Bill 196. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 196, a Bill for an Act to amend the Metro East Sanitary District Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Giglio: "The Lady from St..."

Younge: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. May that be brought back to Second Reading for purposes of an Amendment?"

Speaker Giglio: "Does Lady have leave to bring the Bill back the to Order of Second Reading? Hearing none, leave is granted. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amend... the Bill's been read a Second time previously. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Wyvetter Younge."

Speaker Giglio: "The Lady from St. Clair."

Younge: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Amendment #2 makes the effective date of the Act immediately upon the signing into law. I move for the adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker Giglio: "Any questions? Any discussion? Hearing none, all those in favor of the Amendment signify by saying 'aye', those opposed 'nay', in the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, the Amendment's adopted. Are there further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Giglio: "No further Amendments."

Younge: "Immediate consideration of the Bill. I have leave."

Speaker Giglio: "Third Reading. The Lady ask leave for immediate consideration. Does the Lady have leave? Representative McCracken."

McCracken: "I object."

Speaker Giglio: "The Lady from St. Clair, Representative Younge.

Alright the Bill remains on Third. We took one Bill out of
the record, we'd like to return to that order, yesterday
with the agreement that we'd hear it today, so on page 21

106th Legislative Day

- May 18, 1988
- of the Calendar appears House Bill 3767, Representative McPike. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill. McPike, Ryder."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3767, a Bill for an Act pertaining to condominiums. Third Reading of the Bill."
- McPike: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Bill allows an eminent domain proceedings affecting common elements of condominium property. Allows only the condominium association need be named as defendant, individual unit owners may intervene but the condominium association would be the only one named in the suit. I move for passage of the Bill."
- Speaker Giglio: "Any discussion? All those in favor signify... the Gentleman from DuPage, Representative McCracken."
- McCracken: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We've spoken to the interested parties on this issue and I've been assured that we will consider and try to resolve the issue raised yesterday which is, what type of notice and whether banks should be joined as parties to the litigation. Repre... former Representative Shea is working on that matter and that's fine with me."
- Speaker Giglio: "Question is, 'Shall the House pass 3767?' All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed 'nay', the voting is open, this is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 114 voting 'yes', none voting 'no' and none voting 'present'. House Bill 3767, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3767, having received 115 voting 'yes', none voting 'no' and none voting 'present' has received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Shaw.

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

Representative Shaw in the chamber? House... Senate Bill 209. Page 24 of the House Calendar to repeal the Structural Engineering Act. Senate Bill. Are you ready, Mr. Shaw? Business Regulation. There are two Senate Bills, Representative McCracken. House Bill... or Senate Bill 209 and Senate Bill 566. Representative LeFlore, Senate Bill 566, are you ready, Sir? Mr. Clerk, read Senate Bill 566. It's on page 24 of the Calendar, Short Debate Third Reading."

- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 566, a Bill for an Act concerning the regulation and the practice of respiratory care. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative LeFlore."
- LeFlore: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 566 creates Respiratory Care Practice Act and it provides regulation of the practice of respiratory care by the Department of Professional Regulation. This Bill creates the respiratory care examining committee to advise the Director on the administrative enforcement of the Act. This Bill passed the Senate committee nine to one and Senate forty-five to ten and I would like to have a favorable vote on the Bill."
- Speaker Giglio: "Any discussion? The Lady from Cook, Representative Wojcik."
- Wojcik: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I noticed that this Bill is on Short

 Debate and I would like to take it off of Short Debate. I

 feel we're going to have to get into lengthy discussion on
 this."

Speaker Giglio: "Proceed."

Wojcik: "Well, I want it off of Short Debate."

Speaker Giglio: "Proceed. It's off Short Debate."

Wojcik: "It is. Thank you."

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

Speaker Giglio: "Leave the Short Debate. Take it off Short Debate. Leave is granted. The Bill will be considered as a regular Bill, the regular Calendar, the regular time, time is now. Any discussion on the Bill? Representative Hensel."

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

Speaker Giglio: "He indicates he will."

Hensel: "Are you aware of anybody that's really opposed to this Bill?"

LeFlore: "Well, I understand there was an agreement worked out with the nurses with both organizations. Now I'm not aware of anyone else being opposed to the Bill."

Hensel: "Are the hospital association opposed to it?"

LeFlore: "No one from the hospital association has said anything to me, Sir."

Hensel: "I didn't hear the answer."

LeFlore: "I said no one from the hospital's association has said anything to me. Now if they're opposed to the Bill, you know I thought... I would think it would be fair for them to come to me and converse with me about it."

Hensel: "Is this a new regulation then, that we're setting up?

It's not a continuation or a..."

LeFlore: "It's a new regulation which will establish a board of eight and it's having to do with the licenses."

Hensel: "I understand even though the hospital association may not have contacted you personally, I do understand that they are opposed to the Bill at this time. I just thought I'd mention that."

LeFlore: "Thank you."

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

Phelps: "Will the Sponsor yield, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Giglio: "He indicates he will."

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

Phelps: "Representative LeFlore, the need for this Bill, has it arisen from complaints and negligence of the... on the behalf of safety and welfare of consumers?"

LeFlore: "Not to my knowledge, Sir."

Phelps: "Did the physical respiratory therapist request this Bill themselves?"

LeFlore: "Yes they did."

Phelps: "Did they share with you they had reason to believe that there was a need for correcting some shortcomings within their own profession? Is that what they are saying by this regulation Bill?"

LeFlore: "Well, they didn't discuss that with me but I'm sure that's... hopefully that's their way of thinking."

Phelps: "Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. I respect the Sponsor fully and I know his intent is well presented but I feel that if you look at the hospitals across the state, especially as you go to rural areas, Bob, and downstate we have trouble keeping staff that's... and the hospitals even in the level of funding that can even operate. And further regulation is just going to really put a strain that these marginal hospitals that are barely operating are going to be really threatened. Cairo hospital closed down a couple of years ago in my district. We only have just one emergency room medical service room for people that covers a two county area and they have to go to Cape Girardeau, Missouri and to Kentucky to be treated and regulation like this. I would like to see that we upgrade our professions for the safety and welfare of our people, but when I look at hospitals in my district and I think throughout several parts of Illinois I don't believe we have that threat from this particular organization and profession. So on those terms, I'll have to oppose your Bill."

Speaker Giglio: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

Vermilion, Representative Black."

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

Speaker Giglio: "Indicates he will."

- Black: "Thank you. Representative, I'm sure that you have only the best of intentions under this Bill, let me ask you one particular question. Under the Regulatory Reform Act of 1979 I think it was made very clear that occupational interest groups must demonstrate the benefits of regulation exceed the cost. To the best of your knowledge, have respiratory therapists met that provision?"
- LeFlore: "My understanding is that the fees should cover the expenses of the regulation. Now my... I also understand that the fees that is generated will go to the state and the state will gain instead of losing on this."
- you very much, Representative. Black: "Thank Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, to the Bill, I'm not convinced as previous Representative has said, that respiratory therapists have indeed proven the need for this state regulation. Let me just continue with what Representative from the other side of the aisle has said. I think there seems to be a question as to the need and the impact of this Bill. Twelve hospitals, I would remind you, Ladies and Gentlemen, particularly those of you downstate, twelve hospitals across the state have closed their doors in recent years. I would suggest to you that this Bill is not an emergency, if you think it is let me ask you how many of you have heard from health care consumers back home sighting evidence and providing data that there are examples of serious abuse in the area of respiratory therapy who are already regulated and somewhat controlled by the health care industry. I would, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, suggest that this Bill is not needed.

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

would be a travesty for us to pass this Bill this year when hospitals are not now even being paid for their medicaid care. At this time, and in all due respect to the Sponsor of the Bill, who generally carries outstanding legislation,

I would urge you to vote 'no' on Senate Bill 566."

Speaker Giglio: "The Dean of the House in the Chair."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Wojcik on Senate Bill 566."

Wojcik: "Thank you, Mr. Dean. It's a pleasure to see you up there. Would the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Giorgi: "He indicates he will."

Wojcik: "Representative, could you tell me if the nurses are endorsing this Bill?"

LeFlore: "Representative, my understanding of the Bill, the nurses say they were in support. They have no disagreement on the Bill. Now, I understand there are two nurses association and they both agreed to support the Bill."

Wojcik: "They have. Okay, how about the Med Society?"

LeFlore: "Medical Society?"

Wojcik: "Right."

LeFlore: "I think the Medical Society is in support of the Bill.

They didn't say they oppose the Bill."

Wojcik: "So they might be neutral then or..."

LeFlore: "Repeat your last statement."

Wojcik: "Okay, thank you very much."

LeFlore: "Representative, I didn't understand your last statement."

Wojcik: "I said the med society then is probably neutral."

LeFlore: "Right. Exactly."

Wojcik: "Okay. Thank you."

LeFlore: "Sure."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative McCracken's lights on but I don't see him. Does he wish the floor? Representative McCracken on Senate Bill 566."

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

McCracken: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's good to have the Dean in the Chair. We... we, I also rise in opposition to the Bill. I'll tell you, you know, the necessary effect of these types of Bills is to stifle the trade. It's used as a union enforced by law, that's the only difference. And before we should take such a step we really should have demonstrated and documented very persuasively the need to protect the public health and safety by taking such an Act as this. It hasn't been documented in this case, it adds cost which is not justified in terms of better health care, there is no problem which addresses and I think we should defeat the Bill."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Parcells on Senate Bill 566."

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

Speaker Giorgi: "He indicates he will."

Parcells: "Last year the nurses were not for this Bill and this year they're neutral. Is that correct?"

LeFlore: "That's my understanding, Representative."

Parcells: "Well, if it was the public safety last year that the nurses should be written out how can we suddenly now say okay, nurses you can do this..."

LeFlore: "I cannot respond to that, Representative."

Parcells: "You do not know."

LeFlore: "I cannot..."

Parcells: "Well it would appear then there was not a big human cry from the consumer crying out, that there is not a safety factor here, if we can change the Bill to please one group then originally there wasn't a safety factor in the first place. We're barely able to pay our medicaid bills as is, and this will increase cost, Ladies and Gentlemen. This will definitely increase cost as it has in every state where respiratory therapists have been licensed. It will produce shortages. It always does. And furthermore, there

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

will be people who lose their jobs. This has a three year grandfathering clause in it but there are many people out there who have been working for two years, who are very good at what they're doing, and they will be done and finished. They will not have their jobs. I think it's a bad Bill. We will create shortages that we cannot afford at this time and I would ask for your 'no' vote."

- Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Stephens on Senate Bill 566, he's the last speaker."
- Stephens: "Just briefly, this is a bad Bill for a downstate districts. The fact of the matter is it will put people out of work who wouldn't qualify now but who are doing a good job. It's going to seriously damage downstate hospitals. We already face a problem with the medicaid problems and other problems of regulation of the industry, over regulation of the industry that's causing downstate hospitals that are right on the fringe of just keeping their doors open, if we continue along this we're going to be closing those doors. I would suggest strongly that that's not good public policy. We don't want to be doing things here in the General Assembly with the best of intentions that are really going to wind up with a negative impact both economically and socially on the people that live especially in downstate Illinois. So I urge a 'no' vote."
- Speaker Giorgi: "Representative LeFlore to close on Senate Bill 566."
- LeFlore: "Mr. Speaker... Mr. Speaker, could we take this Bill out of the record?"
- Speaker Giglio: "Take the Bill out of the record, Mr. Clerk.

 Alright. We're going to go to the Order of the Consent

 Calendar Supplemental #1 and the following Bills have been removed. House Bill 3873, 4035, House Bill 4035 and House

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

Bill 4184. Supplemental Calendar #1. The following Bills were... are removed from the Consent Calendar. House Bill 3873, House Bill 4035 and 4184. These Bills, having read Third Reading Consent Calendar, this is final action. These Bills will remain here for two hours if anybody wishes to come up and change their vote. Any discussion? Representative Hultgren."

Hultgren: "Could you repeat one more time, Mr. Speaker, which Bills were removed?"

Speaker Giglio: "House Bills 3873, House Bill 4035 and House Bill 4184. 3725 also. 3725. But there are objections filed also to House Bill 3725 and 3828, that's a total of five. 3873, 4035, 4184, 3725 and 3828, a total of five Bills. On that Motion all those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed 'nay', the voting is open. You will have until approximately 3 o'clock to turn in your sheet whether or not you want to vote 'yes' or 'no' or 'present' 'no', 'present' or shown as not voting. Have all voted who Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 117 voting 'yes', none voting 'no' and none voting 'present', these Bills have... after... we'll declare these Bills passed after we receive the changes from the Members. the Order of Insurance. The Order of Insurance, we'll take the Bills on Second Reading and then proceed to Third. that order appears House Bill 3769 on page 10 of the Calendar, Myron Olson. Representative Olson, are you ready Representative Olson, McAuliffe, Anthony 3769, Sir? Young and DeJaegher. The following Gentlemen. These Bills are on Second Reading, we'll proceed to Third and then we'll take the Bills on Third Reading on this order. are you ready, Sir? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3769, a Bill for an Act to amend the

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

State Employees Group Insurance Act. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendments #1 and 3 were adopted in committee."

Speaker Giglio: "Any Motions filed?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Giglio: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Giglio: "Third Reading. On page 10 of the Calendar appears House Bill 3810, Representative McAuliffe.

Representative McAuliffe in the chamber? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill. 3810, it's on the Order of Second Reading, page 10 of the Calendar."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3810, a Bill for an Act in relation to the regulation... registration and regulation of motor vehicles. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee."

Speaker Giglio: "Any Motions filed?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Giglio: "Are they any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Giglio: "Third Reading. House Bill 3906, Representative Anthony Young. Out of the record. Representative DeJaegher, out of the record. Representative Martinez, are you ready, Third Reading on House Bill 2143, 3152? Want these Bills called? Okay, Mr. Clerk, House Bill 2143, page 16 in the Calendar, Representative Martinez. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2143, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Insurance Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

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

Martinez: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. This
Bill, House Bill 2143, amends the Illinois Insurance Code,
provides that the prohibition against refusing to insure a

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

risk solely on the basis of the geographical location of the risk applies to both commercial and noncommercial risks."

- Speaker Giglio: "Any discussion? Hearing none, all those in favor of the... the Lady from Cook, Representative... the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Pedersen... Peterson."
- Pedersen: "Representative, when we talked about this Bill in committee we questioned whether or not there was any need for such legislation because it was already pretty much taken care of, that it's not a problem. I mean do you have actual evidence of a lot of insurance companies actually redlining, I mean do we have something specific on that?"
- Martinez: "Well, in my area the practice is general and the agency that controls this express some... they didn't seem like they were going to support it but in the end there was no objection they had... they remain neutral. That's the insurance companies that are opposed to this."
- Pedersen: "And why are they opposed to it?"
- Martinez: "Well, they claim that there is no redlining when in fact there is."
- Pedersen: "Well, when you're looking at a particular risk and you look at all the... all the physical factors and what have you that say might make a building more subject to a fire and so on, sometimes the conditions are so serious that they won't write it all. It might seem like we're talking about a geographical thing when actually we're talking about the characteristics of the risks and we do have the fair plan which enables people in those kind of situations to find a market so the question, I guess we still come down to basically whether or not there's a real need for this legislation."
- Martinez: "Well there certainly is a need as far as I'm concerned and it's geographical. I know of a lot of people in my

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

area that have been refused insurance. Now as far as the that plan, the fair plan that's a more expensive that's for people that have refused by insurance companies."

Pedersen: "Well if you're redlined, your refused."

Martinez: "Certainly."

Pedersen: "And those people don't have access to the fair plan?"

Martinez: "Oh yes they do. But why should they have to go fair plan when they can be insured by the companies. It's the same companies involved that are insuring these premises.

Except that they're... it's a state law that they have to insure."

Pedersen: "Well I guess, okay, thank you Representative. To the Bill, I think we're all against redlining. And I just question rather or not we really have a problem here that needs to be addressed. The insurance industry's very competitive and surely if you have a good risk there should be a number of insurance companies that would be interested in writing it, if it's not a good risk then we have the fair plan. So I think the options are all ready in place and I question rather we need this legislation."

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

Kubik: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Sponsor yield?"
Speaker Giglio: "He indicates he will."

Kubik: "Representative Martinez, in looking at the analysis and the Bill, could you tell me what exactly you're doing here because it looks as though the law currently says there's a prohibition against redlining. And I guess my question is, what is it that... you're adding one sentence as I see in the legislation that it would not... this Section shall apply to both commercial risk and noncommercial risks. It would appear in the law that it addresses the subject of insurance already. I was just curious why you were adding

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

that particular sentence."

Martinez: "Well the law states that insurance should be provided to everybody but that's really not the practice. I mean, it's... and in our opinion this Bill is an Act that it should make it easier for businesses in innercity areas to obtain necessary insurance."

Kubik: "Well and I would agree. We shouldn't redline it but it seems that in the law it talks about that you cannot discriminate based on specific geographic locations. But you don't really address that, you add a sentence which basically says that this section shall apply to both commercial risk and noncommercial risk. I guess what I'm asking is there a reason why we're adding that particular sentence."

Martinez: "The only answer I can give you is that the reason for this Bill, even though I believe there is law addressing it, the practice still continues."

Kubik: "No further questions, Mr. Speaker."

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

Regan: "Thank you, Speaker, Members of the House. Will the Sponsor yield? Representative, if there was an office building in Winnetka that was considered a poor risk and the insurance companies rejected that risk because it was maybe vacant a long time, an older building, would that be considered then redlining?"

Martinez: "No."

Regan: "Why not?"

Martinez: "I would consider it redlining if a certain area in that Winnetka was designated as you know."

Regan: "But there is no evidence that there is actually geographical areas as redlining. What has happened is that some areas have many older buildings that may be vacant and

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

may be considered bad risks. Those bad risk buildings go pay a higher premium. That's the normal situation. What you're Bill is inferring here is that the insurance company does not have a right to reject the risk that they feel is just a bad risk. If they had to accept every risks the premiums would sky rocket. That's what the pool is for. There is a higher premium in the pool and the reason there is, is because they are higher risk. It takes more money to pay the claims on certain buildings then it does on others. And also there is a law on redlining so they don't do redlining now and I don't see any reason why we should support this Bill."

Speaker Giglio: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Cook,

Representative Martinez to close."

Martinez: "Thank you. I would just like to say that this Bill addresses my area, it doesn't address Winnetka or any other area that's probably doesn't have the type of housing that... it's true that our housing is older but I know for a fact that there are some people, constituents of mine that have complained that they've been redlined and I know their properties and I know that they're not below their standards. It's just that... it's just that ... it's just like in car insurance, we're not suppose to have redlining in car insurance but the practice exist. It's a very real situation and very real in my area and for that reason I ask support of this Bill."

Speaker Giglio: "The question is, 'Shall the House pass House
Bill 2143?' All those in favor signify by voting 'aye',
those opposed 'nay', the voting is open. This is final
action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?
Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On
this question there are 86 voting 'yes', 28 voting 'no', 1
voting 'present'. House Bill 21... Representative LeFlore.

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

Record the Gentleman as voting 'aye'. There are now 87 voting 'yes', 28 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present' and House Bill 2143, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3152, Representative Martinez, are you ready on House Bill 3152, Sir? House Bill 3152. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3152, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Insurance Code. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Martinez on House Bill 3152."
- Martinez: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. This
 Bill, House Bill 3152 amends the Insurance Code to provide
 that no insurance company may refuse to issue home owners
 insurance to the owners or tenants of any single family
 dwelling or any dwelling with two or four units solely on
 the grounds that a space heater is being used inside the
 building."
- Speaker Giglio: "Representative Breslin in the Chair. Any discussion? The Gentleman from Will, Representative Regan."
- Regan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield for a question please? Would you go over that one more time exactly what this Bill says?"
- Martinez: "What it specifies is that no insurance company may refuse to issue home owners insurance to the owners or tenants of any single family dwelling or any dwelling with two or four units solely on the grounds that a space heater is being used inside the dwelling."
- Regan: "Do you feel that space heaters are very safe to have in a home?"
- Martinez: "I certainly do. They've been in use for many years, unfortunately in my area which is old we still use the space heaters someplace."

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

Regan: "Have you not read in the papers almost bimonthly some children dying because a space heater burns their house down."

Martinez: "You're talking about kerosene heaters, we're not talking about that, we're talking about..."

Regan: "I'm talking electric heaters too."

Martinez: "Well, then why did they sell them to begin with.

Years ago that's the way we use to have our heating provided by..."

Regan: "And we also then... I understand that gas heaters are included in this thing too. That if there's gas heaters there they have to insure that too."

Martinez: "Yeah, gas, oil and electric."

Regan: "Gas, oil and electric. So now we've got flames going inside the house. And you don't understand why the insurance company doesn't want to insure a home with a heater that's got flames flying around in it. It seems unfair to you."

Martinez: "What's that?"

Regan: "It seems unfair to you."

Martinez: "Yes, it does."

Regan: "Well, it's not unfair, it's just simply good underwriting and this is another one of those crazy Bills... got to be 'no'."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Pedersen on the question."

Pedersen: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Representative has put an Amendment on here that does at least clarify what we were concerned about in committee and so there is a definition of what a space heater is. But again when you're talking about a space heater as such, some of them are mobile, there are all kinds of them out there, underwriters lab seal or approval

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

when you buy one of these things is probably indicates a certain amount of safety when they're new. You still have the problem of use and the people and how they use them as we do in all kinds of other areas in our lives. I know that there's been a fad in recent years, a good fad I but you know we're using... a lot of people have wood burning stoves in their homes now. And initially when that began to happen there was no special problem... all of a sudden we started having fires on account of wood burning stoves. So now the insurance companies in reacting to that particular thing are sending out questionnaires and checking the safety features of installation and use before they write the risk. And so I think what we're talking about here is a one little factor in an overall underwriting process. This intervention into the market place by the Legislature saying this is the way it's going to be in Illinois and you can't do this. What it really does all of these laws have caused a ripple effect and so what happens is that if you have a space heater the insurance company to react or will react to that in some fashion. They might just stop writing homes or they might stop writing business of classification throughout the state. So and if there is a bad experience on it what really what happens and there no doubt is a bad experience but with... when you compare space heaters to furnaces and all the typical central heat what that really would mean is that all the people who have the safer heat are paying for those who don't. But the big problem with it is, is that it's anti-jobs and anti-business and so I would let... I would let the market resolve these problems. insurance company out there who will write these kind risks if they're safe. And I think that's the approach we

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

should take so I would oppose this legislation."

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

Barger: "Would the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Breslin: "He will."

Barger: "Does this mean that if this space heaters are the only source of heat or as a supplemental source of heat?"

Martinez: "The only source of heat."

Barger: "The only source of heat. I was wondering because my secretary over in the Stratton Building in the winter time uses a space heater and I was wondering if we would have to close down the Stratton Building until they installed the proper heating facilities so the girls wouldn't be so cold in the winter. But it's as... space heaters as the only source of heat would be reason for an insurance company to reject it."

Martinez: "Yes, in some cases they would."

Regan: "Okay. Thank you very much for clarifying that."

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

McNamara: "Yes, will the Sponsor yield for question?"

Speaker Breslin: "He will."

McNamara: "On these space heaters, are these the types of space heaters in the City of Chicago in the older homes that provide all of the heat and always have and sometimes they are ducted throughout the building just like a furnace would have been. Isn't that correct?"

Martinez: "Yes, they're radiant heaters."

McNamara: "They are not only radiant but they can be gas fired and also ducted heat by a fairly sophisticated space heater system. And if these were not allowed in some of those buildings then you would have to take down probably about fifty to seventy—five percent of the buildings in the area

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

because you can't put a new furnace system through that building. Is that correct?"

Martinez: "Yes, that's true."

McNamara: "And to the Bill. I think that there is a reason for this type of legislation. The reason is is that it does not question whether or not the safety of that space heater is at fault. The insurance company can still do that and judge whether that heating system is safe enough to be insured. What the Bill does do is allow something that's happening right now in many of our older cities throughout the State of Illinois that have older construction and older homes where space heaters and centrally ducted space heaters were utilized throughout this... throughout state as the main source of heat that now an insurance company can go in and for that sole purpose that it has by just a space heater in there could refuse definition insurance. I think that that is wrong. I think it is more important to determine whether that heat is a safe heat and I think this is a good Bill because it just addresses the just on the basis of it being called a space point that heater as a reason for rejection instead of doing that the insurance company can still go in and reject it because it's a nonsafe form of heat or a nonsafe heater but just as space heaters it would create a tremendous problem and I definitely support the Bill because those people have a right to be insured and many of those heaters are extremely safe."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Martinez to close."

Martinez: "In closing I would just like to say that there are safeguards here. The heaters have to be UL approved and there's room for the insurance companies to come in and either say to make corrections before they issue the insurance or not. I don't see where... why they should be

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

discriminated against just simply because they have space heaters when that's the only form of heat that they have. I urge your support for this Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 3152 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? This is final passage. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 74 voting 'aye', 39 voting 'no' and 2 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 22 appears House Bill 3902, Representative Cullerton. Out of the record. On page 22... 22 appears House Bill 3905, Representative Anthony Young. Clerk, read the Excuse me, out of the record. On page 11 appears House Bill 3906, Anthony Young. Out of the record. On page 11 appears House Bill 3908, Representative DeJaegher. Out of the record. Ladies and Gentlemen, the next Special Order of Business is Senior Citizens and the Handicapped... and the Handicapped. The first Bill appears on page 16 on your Calendar House Bill 1491, Representative DeJaegher. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1491, a Bill for an Act in relationship
to long-term care insurance. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative DeJaegher."

DeJaegher: "Thank you, Madam Chairman, Members of the General Assembly. I think right now at the present time all of you are quite familiar with 1491. I have had a whole full host of Cosponsors on this Bill. 1491 also includes Amendment 3 of course, as you're knowledgeable which was adopted yesterday carries provisos of 1491 and it also contains Senate Bill 3591. These are items that basically has structured the Bill in conformity with the insurance

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

department, the State of Illinois and move for its support."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage of House Bill 1491 and on that question, is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 1491 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no', voting is open. This is final passage. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 115 voting 'aye', none voting 'no' and 2 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 14 appears House Bill 2944, Representative Preston. Is the Gentleman in the chamber? Out of the record. On page 17 appears House Bill 3020, Representative Dunn. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3020, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Vehicle Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Dunn."

Dunn: "House Bill 3020 is a Bill to clear up a situation which fell between the cracks when we allowed discount fees for handicap people on their license plates. We allowed them to purchase license plates at a discount rate when that was done if you happen to be discount or handicapped and have ham plates you were not eligible. This would simply make those people who have ham radio operator plates and who also happen to be handicapped eligible to take advantage of that discount and I know of no opposition to this Bill at this time."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage of House Bill 3020 and on that question, is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 3020 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no', voting is open. This is final passage.

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

Have all voted who wish? Vote Representative Mulcahey 'aye'. Mr. Clerk, vote Representative Mulcahey 'aye'. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take Thank you. record. On this question there are Representative Panayotovich votes 'aye', Representative Leverenz votes 'aye'. There are 98 voting 'aye', 18 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On Second Reading on page... Representative Wojcik, for what reason do you rise?"

Wojcik: "I wanted to vote 'aye' on this and you were calling it."

Speaker Breslin: "I see. The Lady has recorded herself as voting

'no', she wishes the record to reflect that she would have

preferred to have voted 'aye'. Representative Hallock is

voted 'aye', he wants the record to reflect that he would

have preferred to vote 'no'. Representative Mays."

Mays: "Can we explain our votes at this time or..."

Speaker Breslin: "No, Sir. The Roll Call is finished."

Mays: "I'm where I want to be anyway."

Speaker Breslin: "Okay. On Second Reading on page 12 on your Calendar appears House Bill 4106, Representative Currie.

Out of the record. On the Order of Seniors and the Handicapped on page 14 on your Calendar appears House Bill 2944. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2944, a Bill for an Act to amend the Code of Civil Procedure. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Preston."

Preston: "Thank you, Madam Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 2944 amends the Code of Civil Procedure to provide for senior citizens and the setting of trial dates for seniors involved in civil litigation. What the Bill does is requires that seniors are giving a preference when a senior is seventy years of age or older

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

in the setting of a case for trial. In some counties, certainly Cook being one of them, right now it takes some six to seven years or more to get a case to trial. If a senior's a plaintiff or defendant in a civil suit that is an undue unworkable hardship for that litigant. This Bill is supported by the Chicago Bar Association, the Illinois Trial Lawyers Association, all the Senior Citizens Organizations, I know of no opposition to the Bill and I would be glad to answer any questions and I urge and solicit your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved the passage of House Bill 2944 and on that question, is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall House Bill All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no', voting is open. This is final passage. all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. this question there On are 1 voting 'no' and none voting 'present'. voting 'aye', This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, hereby declared passed. The Special Order of Business of Personnel and Pensions on page 15 on your Calendar appears House Bill 12. Representative Capparelli. Ralph Capparelli. Is the Gentleman in the chamber? Out of the On page 15 appears House Bill 253, Representative Wolf. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 253, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Pension Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Wolf. Representative Wolf."

Wolf: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. House Bill 253 is a Bill that contains a number of administrative changes strictly technical changes and it's the intent to make that a vehicle Bill for pension legislation which will wind up in a Conference Committee Report. I would ask for your

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

adoption of this House Bill 253."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved the passage of House Bill 253. On that question, is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 253 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no', voting is open. This is final passage. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 110 voting 'aye', none voting 'no' and 4 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 17 appears House Bill 2996, Representative Preston. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2996, a Bill for an Act to amend the Open Meetings Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Preston."

Preston: "Thank you very much, Madam Speaker, and I'm sorry for the delay. House Bill 2996 amends the Open Meetings Act to allow that pension board meetings may hold closed meetings when they're considering matters concerning disability or medical condition of a Member of the... of one of their employees... one of the Members or the results of a medical examination. Since this is privileged information they want to be able to keep that information privileged not open to the public when they're discussing medical conditions. That's all this Bill does."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved the passage of House Bill 2996 and on that question, is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 2996 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no', voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 109 voting 'aye', none voting 'no' and 1 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 12 on your Calendar appears House Bill 4064, Representative Berrios. This Bill is on Second Reading. Representative Berrios. Out of the record. On page 23 appears House Bill 4213, Representative Cullerton. Out of the record. On page 23 appears House Bill 424... excuse me, Representative Wolf will do House Bill 4213. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "On page 23 of the Calendar, House Bill 4213, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Pension Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Wolf."

Wolf: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Again House Bill 4213 is a Bill that is intended to be a vehicle for further pension legislation and I would move for its adoption."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman moves the passage of House Bill 4213 and on that question, is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 4213 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no', voting is open. This is final passage. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 110 voting 'aye', none voting 'no' and 5 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 23 appears House Bill 4214. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 4214, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Pension Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Wolf."

Wolf: "Thank you, once again, Madam Speaker. House Bill 4214 once again is a vehicle that will be used for further pension legislation and I would move for its adoption."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman moves the passage of House Bill

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

4214 and on that question, is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 4214 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no', voting is open. This is final passage. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 110 voting 'aye', none voting 'no' and 6 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Capparelli. Representative Capparelli, do you want your Bill called on this order? House Bill 12. Do you want your Bill called on this order? Of Pension... of Personnel and Pension, House Bill 12? Yes, Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 12, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Pension Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Capparelli."

Capparelli: "This is definitely a vehicle right now. There's nothing in the pension Bill so I ask Motion 'do pass'."

Speaker Breslin: "The Lady... the Gentleman moves for the passage of House Bill 12 and on that question, is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall House Bill'... the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Harris."

Harris: "Question of the Sponsor please, Madam Speaker."

Speaker Breslin: "Proceed."

Harris: "What does the Bill do?"

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman said it was a shell Bill."

Capparelli: "It's a shell Bill right now. We have no okay on any pensions that are developing so we're just moving along until we get some agreement with the cities on the pension Bill. So it's strictly a vehicle right now."

Harris: "Did we... did we... was this one of the Bills discussed in the Personnel and Pensions Committee?"

Capparelli: "Yeah."

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

Speaker Breslin: "Any further discussion?"

Harris: "Well to the Bill, Madam Speaker. The... to the Bill,

Madam Speaker."

Speaker Breslin: "Proceed."

Harris: "The previous Bills were indeed used as vehicle Bills which I would agree to as the Minority Spokesman of Personnel and Pensions. I don't recall House Bill 12 being discussed and unless we can get a full explanation or some indication that it's an Agreed Bill, I would urge my Members to vote 'present' or 'no'."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Wolf."

- Wolf: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Representative Harris, we have passed out several vehicle Bills. This was also discussed in committee. You might be questioning why we have the several vehicle Bills. At one time we had one large Omnibus Bill which proved rather bulky. Since then we have decided that it is best to have several vehicle Bills and to divide those up into the systems rather than one."
- Speaker Breslin: "Any further discussion? Hearing question is, 'Shall House Bill 12 pass?' All those favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 89 voting 'aye', 14 voting... 15 voting... 88 voting 'aye', 15 voting 'no' 12 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Special Order of Business under State Mandates appears House Bill 3524. It's on page 19 on your Calendar, Representative Giorgi in the Chair."
- Speaker Giorgi: "Is Representative Keane in the room? Keane on House Bill 3524. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3524, a Bill for an Act in relationship to property taxes. Third Reading of the Bill."

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Keane."

Keane: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. 3524 is a Bill that deals with previous year's E.A.V. What I plan to do with it... we've had this Bill in the past. We've had a number of them and usually they get bogged down in a Conference Committee Report, and we can't get agreement on them. Last... 1984 we came fairly close. Last two years ago, again we came close, what I intended... this Bill is moved to the have it amended. Senate, Put it into a Conference Committee Report and attempt to put out a Conference Committee Report if we can reach agreement among the different parties. I'd ask for an 'aye' vote and would be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Cowlishaw on House Bill 3524."

Cowlishaw: "Mr. Speaker, will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Giorgi: "He indicates he will."

Cowlishaw: "Representative Keane, if I understood your explanation correctly the essential element of this Bill is that it provides for property taxes to be levied on the basis of the prior years E.A.V., rather than the current years E.A.V. Is that correct?"

Keane: "That's correct. Because when the... we don't have... when the municipalities of local government levies they don't have the current E.A.V. to levy against. One of the... one of the things that we want with the... the reason that you like... or the previous years E.A.V. is looked upon favorably, is that people know exactly the evaluation against which they are levying. It cuts down on the amount of borrowing that local government would be able to do and it could speed up the whole process."

Cowlishaw: "Representative Keane, in that event, I have a very serious question for you. This applies to the funding... the property taxes for school districts only."

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

Keane: "I'm sorry..."

Cowlishaw: "For those areas of the state where there is rapid enrollment growth in the school and rapid growth in the population and of course in the value of the property within that school district. This particular Bill would be an absolute disaster as to the funding of schools. school districts that are growing and the fastest growing school district in this state is Indian Prairie District #204, which is in my district, rely heavily upon those increases in assessed evaluation. Which they predict with great accuracy, because they have had a lot of experience with that, they depend upon that to fund their schools. This kind of measure would be a dreadful disservice to school districts where the property tax values... for the property values, the population and the school enrollment is growing. Have you taken that into account?"

Keane: "That has... if it were... if there were no problems, one of the major ones which you mentioned, the Bill would have passed about 5 or 10 years ago. What we are attempt... what we have attempted to do in the past and where we've had problems in the conference committee is adjusting for situations such as one situation just... such as you have And that's one of the reasons it didn't pass. mentioned. In the past, we have not been able to... you know, year it's in Naperville, two years ago it was some other taxing bodies that had a problem. But, what I will you is that we will continue to adjust it if we don't it's not my have... intention penalize to anyone tremendously and hurt someone like that. However, it is our hope that we can get a previous years E.A.V. so that we can improve the process which would bring local government sure... assure financing and flow of funds. Your problem is, you know, this year you are saying Naperville, in the

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

past it's been other taxing bodies and for that reason we didn't pass it in the past. If we don't come up with, you know... we'll work on that and there are other problems with the Bill. That's why I say we have to go to a conference, get everybody together and try to work it out."

Cowlishaw: "Thank you, Representative Keane. Mr. Speaker, to the Bill."

Speaker Giorgi: "Proceed."

Cowlishaw: "Irrespective of how this proposal may affect any other local taxing body, I am greatly concerned about its effect upon school districts. And if there is any Member of this chamber who has any school district within his or her State Representative district that is growing, that the student enrollments are increasing even if only by slight amounts. And where also the basis for the local property tax is increasing, the only appropriate vote on this Bill is 'no'."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Didrickson on House Bill 3524." Didrickson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the You've heard several people talk on this particular Bill, I happen to represent a district that is growing. I am frequently commenting, saying that I might have one of the fastest growing State Rep. districts in the state. Be that as it is, I am a Sponsor of this Bill. And this is a Bill should move along in the process as Representative Keane has said. I happen to have school districts that support this and want this because of what they go through each year in terms of shooting in the dark when they are This will eliminate much of what we term 'balloon levying. and give them some predictability. With regards to that tax space it's a one year shot and then it's over and then it's done with. And this is certainly supported and put together by the Illinois Taxpayers Federation and I

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

underline that."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Frederick on House Bill 3524."

Frederick: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Would the Sponsor yield for a question please?" Speaker Giorgi: "He indicates he will."

Frederick: "Representative Keane, am I understanding you correctly when you say passage of this Bill finally is contingent on the fact that the negotiations will work out all the problems that you now see with the Bill?"

Keane: "We will... what has happened in the past, there were...

we couldn't resolve what we considered some major problems.

And we decided not to... not to call the Bill. I am not
going to say that we'll work out every problem. Because in
so doing, you know, the Bill will never pass, because it
could be one school district this year, and one... one on
the north side of the state next year it would be one on
the south side of the state. It depends... but we have
held it up in past simply because we couldn't resolve major
problems. And I will do that again should we not be able
to resolve it."

Frederick: "Then in the case of... what we are doing is trading off perhaps one year of reduced revenues for school districts, in the hope of achieving a more orderly process down the line. Is that correct?"

Keane: "Exactly correct."

Frederick: "Okay, well thank you very much. I support the Bill."
Keane: "Thank you."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Pedersen on House Bill 3524."

Pedersen: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I served as a Palatine
Township Assessor for 17 years. And the problem that
Representative Keane is trying to resolve here is a very
real one. And I have talked to him since I've been in
Springfield many times about how we can resolve it. I

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

think it has been mentioned already that we're talking about in effect is holding the assessment for one year. It'll be the same for two years in a row. You also have to remember that while there may be some problems, I believe probably minor problems that Representative mentioned, you'd still have to remember that, you know, the assessment is only part of the problem. That they... that the rates come from, you know, what the local taxing bodies are spending, so that there is a fluctuation and a variation of rates. I don't think that the... that the hardships are worth talking about here are really that significant in the long picture and I think that we should support this so that we can get the system, there are a lot of complaints about assessments and equalization and all I think it's important that we move in the right direction and I support this Bill."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Keane to close."

Keane: "I just ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Giorgi: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 3524 pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? On this question there are 98 'ayes', 12... 99 'ayes', 11 'nays', 4 voting 'present' and 3524, having received the Constitutional House Bill Majority, is hereby declared passed. Record Representative Wait 'no' if you can, if the ... the number now is 99 voting 'aye'... the number... Wait wanted 'no'. The total now is 99 voting 'aye', 12 voting 'no', 4 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Module Lead to Business Regulations, on page... House Calendar page 21 appears House Bill 3789, Representative Martinez. House Bill 3789, out of the record. Then page 10, House Bill 3790,

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

Representative Levin. Is Representative Levin going to... 3790, Representative Levin, out... out of the record. Representative Braun, 3792, would you like to call that Bill? House Bill 3792 on page 21 of your Calendar, Representative Braun. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill please."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3792, a Bill for an Act in relationship to the requiring foreign corporations that transacts business. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Braun on House Bill 3792."

Braun: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 3792 is a revenue generating proposal for Illinois. What it essentially does is require corporations which do business in the state to comply with the law we believe and that they will have to file a certificate of authority with the Secretary of State's Office and notify us that they are in fact doing business here. The Bill is self—enforcing in that all it does is allow for private litigants to raise the issue that a corporation has not filed its requisite certificate as a defense in a private litigation. So it will not cost us any thing to enforce, but should create and should generate money for the State of Illinois. I encourage your support for the Bill."

Speaker Giorgi: "Is there any debate? There being no request for debate, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 3792 pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? On this question there are 96 'aye', 18 voting 'no', zero voting 'present' and this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Braun on House Bill 3793, page 21 of your Calendar. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3793, a Bill for an Act to amend the Business Corporation Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Braun on House Bill 3793."

Braun: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is a companion Bill to 3792 in that it allows for amnesty for those corporations. A one year amnesty for corporations which are presently out of compliance with the law, except with regard to those that are presently involved in litigation. We think this is fair to the corporations who may not be aware of their liability to the state under current law."

Speaker Giorgi: "Is there any discussion? Representative Dunn on House Bill 3793."

Dunn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. You might as well pass this Bill because after you pass the last one you'll be here every year with an amnesty program. When the little ma and pa corporations back home find out what happened in that last Bill. So better vote for this one."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Braun, do you wish to close?"

Braun: "Just to encourage support for this good program."

Speaker Giorgi: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 3793 pass?'

All in favor signify by voting 'aye' and those opposed by voting 'nay'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Phelps, you have time to vote. You haven't closed the... your switch isn't working? No. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? On this question there are 35 'nays'... 77 'ayes', 36 'nays', 2 voting 'present' and House Bill 3793, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On this there are 78 'ayes', 36 'nays', 2 voting 'present' and this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed."

Speaker McPike: "Representative McPike in the Chair. House Bill 3896, Representative Cullerton. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3896, a Bill for an Act in relationship to the classification citation and dissemination of Illinois Statutory Law. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Mr. Speaker, I know that earlier in the day Representative McCracken was upset when I explained why I was taking a Bill out of the record. I think that I have the right to explain why I'm taking the Bill out of the record if it's appropriate. In this case this Bill... I was asked by Representative Daniels to hold off on calling the Bill. I would like to do... I would like to accommodate him, so I will take it out for now, but I would like to definitely go to this Bill today at some time. And I would appreciate if he would contact me so that we can call the Bill today. But for now I'll take it out of the record with that explanation."

Speaker McPike: "Out of the record. House Bill 3900, Representative Laurino. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3900, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Vehicle Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Laurino."

Laurino: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Obviously you know that this Bill is not new, nor is the concept unique. But I believe it's necessary. Thirty-nine other states have some concept of this legislation enacted already. I believe that the Bill that we've got before us today is the finest one that we've introduced in the Illinois Legislature since I've been introducing it. There are approximately over 2 million of the seven million vehicles registered in Illinois that are uninsured. The Department of Insurance reports that 26 percent statewide of the passenger cars are uninsured. The Department of Transportation confirms that over 60,000

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

uninsured drivers are involved in accidents every year. Nine out of ten people in the State of Illinois request some type of insurance to absolve this problem, catastrophe. Some of the improvements that have been put into the Bill is that we will now suspend the vehicle registration rather than driver's licenses. The change allows the program to be administered by one department. Therefore cutting the cost by almost a half a million dollars. The startup cost would be approximately \$900,000. The reinstatement fees added to the Bill will generate two and a half million, therefore there will be no cost to the state whatsoever. Drivers will have to carry insurance cards and display them to police officers upon request. A driver who fails to or refuses to do so is guilty of driving uninsured and subject to a minimum of a \$500 fine. If the driver already is suspended for driving uninsured the minimum fine is \$1,000. The reason for that is because it cost less than \$500 semi-annually to have this type of insurance. So consequently the fine should be a little greater to act as a deterrent. Some people will probably be tempted to display invalid or counterfeit insurance cards or make or sell such cards. Displaying an invalid card will be a traffic offense, punishable as a Class A Misdemeanor. Making or selling counterfeit cards will be a Class... Criminal Class I Felony Offense. Class IV Felony, The Bill places responsibility for insurance excuse me. upon the owner of the vehicle. In addition, any fines imposed by a court, the registration of a vehicle involved in any of the above traffic violations will be suspended. If there are any questions I'd be happy to answer any of them."

Speaker McPike: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage of House Bill 3900. And on that, the Gentleman from Cook,

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

Representative Pedersen."

Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Pedersen: "Thank you, Mr. House. What proposal will substantially increase the cost a product that you will have to buy, that will increase state spending and your taxes, and doesn't really work? Compulsory car insurance. It's always kind of mystified me why in the public mind that you look on big companies like insurance companies who are... will be delighted if the... if the Government would pass a law forcing people to buy their product. And yet when it comes to compulsory car insurance the insurance companies say, 'Well you know we don't want you to force them to buy our products'. truism that we all understand maybe we should that's a think a little bit about this and wonder why they're opposed to it. The reason they're opposed to it, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, is that it doesn't work. responsible driver will continue to pay for uninsured motorist coverage. The responsible driver... what bugs me most of all about uninsured motorists is when he has to pay a deductible on his collision insurance. Now look, what are we talking about? We're talking about a couple hundred dollars and he don't blame him for being riled. Ι feel the same way. But the point is, how many times in your adult life time are you going to have to come up with that \$200. Maybe not at all. Maybe once. your insurance premiums are going to go up and your taxes are going to go up and you're going to pay that every... every year of your life. So all I'm saying, Ladies and Gentlemen, is that what we should be doing is not trying to pass a law when you have only \$64,000 dollars... drivers each year who don't have insurance and they're in an accident. A third of those take care of the problem. And yet we're trying to put a law in that addresses 8

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

million drivers. It's inconvenient, you're going to have to have a little white card, make sure you're covered. So what we really should be doing is concentrating on those who don't have insurance, that have no nonsense about it, treat them the same way we do DUI and take their driver's license away from them if they... if they're not financially responsible. That will work, so I urge a 'no' vote on this... this attempt to increase the bureaucracy and increase the cost of all our insurance premiums from now into the future, many years."

Speaker McPike: "Further discussion? Representative Parke."

Parke: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, here we go again. Mandatory car insurance, it's an issue for those of us who have been around, comes up every year. We have to address the issue. Pretty much all of you know how you're going to vote on it. And you are basing your votes on the surveys that you have seen, on the surveys you've been told, and the surveys say, 'Do you think you want people who are driving without insurance to have insurance?' And most people, 90 percent of the people will say yes. We don't want some bum driving a car and hitting us without insurance. We want to make them pay. But quite frankly we have on the books a law that protects those people from uninsured motorists and if it was enforced properly and I'm not saying it isn't, but if was enforced better and we had more people to enforce it we would get better results. We do not need mandatory car insurance, because of the simple reason, when you have mandatory car insurance you take all the people that are in the pools, that are the bad drivers or have no insurance and you throw them in the same pools of insurance that you and I have to buy our insurance. You know there should have been a subsequent question to all the surveys that you

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

have given and you've heard about. That question should would you want everybody to have mandatory car insurance? Are you willing to pay an additional 25 percent on your car insurance premiums? Because that's how... what will happen. Easily we could have an increase in the premiums of our car insurance to those citizens that we're trying to protect. We're told this is a consumer the consumers are you and I and the citizens that we represent, the good taxpayers. And you're going to cost them more for their insurance. And you're going to discourage some of them, some of those low income people are people that are on fixed incomes who now have to turn around and pay an increased premium on their insurance premium on top of that. And then sometimes they end up having to make a decision, and that decision is, do I pay my car insurance premiums or do I put bread and butter on the table for my kids? And in California when they went to mandatory car insurance, instead of having a decrease on insurance... on uninsured motorists, they had an increase after the legislation passed. I would bet you to say that the people who do not drive with car insurance now, will probably not drive with it in the future. You will still have to keep uninsured motorist, because of the tens of thousands of motorists in the City of Chicago and in suburban areas, and the rural areas of Illinois who still will not get car insurance. And you say, 'Well we'll their licenses away.' They're still going to drive without licenses and you know that. This is not going to accomplish anything. Now this is just a political issue for some people. They're saying that we want to pass it because this is what the people want. I think it's time to do what's right for the people of Illinois, enforce the current laws we have on the books, don't shove down a Bill

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

that is not going to solve the problem. And it's just going to cost the good people of Illinois more money. And I think we review this Bill every year, I think it's a bad Bill, it's still a bad Bill and for good consciousness for what is right, you should vote 'no' on this Bill."

"The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Huff." Huff: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the rise House. Ι to support my esteemed colleague Representative Parke on the other side of the aisle is absolutely correct. I remember, Ladies and Gentlemen, reading the French history that episode where Queen Theresa asked the citizens to eat cake and I never understood why the people got so upset over what seemed to be a reasonable suggestion. But when you realize during that time, Ladies and Gentlemen, that they couldn't even make bread which only required dough and water, how are they going to make a cake that required butter, eggs, milk. It was beyond ability to cope and you all know what happened. will have the same historical effect, it's mandating something for the citizens to do that is beyond their ability to cope. People like the French people 200 years ago, it wasn't because they wasn't hungry, it wasn't because some could make cakes and some couldn't. Ιt they didn't have the ingredients. And the same because exists today. It's not because а motorist irresponsible. Don't want his property protected. It's because he can't afford it. It's as simple as that, and to impose this mandate on them I guarantee you will have the same historical effect of the French Revolution. Let's not give Madam... which is the Sponsor, an opportunity to prove This is a bad Bill, it should be voted that I'm right. down in the name of history if nothing else."

Speaker Breslin: "Ladies and Gentlemen, let me make two brief

106th Legislative Day

May 18. 1988

introductions of former Members. Representative Dick Hart and Representative Paul Stone. Welcome back Gentlemen. Dick Hart and Paul Stone down here. Representative McAuliffe on the question."

McAuliffe: "Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. this is my 16th year down here and every year we pass this Bill out of the House. We've never been able to pass it out of the Senate. I think perhaps this is the year we can pass it in the House and in the Senate. One of the previous speakers said, many people can't afford automobile insurance, well I'd suggest that if you can't afford to have automobile insurance you really can't afford to drive a car. In Chicago recently there was a bad accident at a school where a woman was killed and two or three children were injured. The woman that was driving the car that had the accident had no insurance and now there's no money to pay the hospital bills or the these people who were hurt and killed. So my suggestion is if you don't... if you can't afford to buy automobile insurance, you shouldn't be able to drive a car. know if you surveyed your district you know that this is the one issue that everybody agrees on. I've done a survey ten or twelve years in a row, as always it comes back 90 percent of the people in our districts back home favor this Bill. Now if we're here to do what the public wants what our constituents want. I think that 90 percent of us ought to vote for this Bill and we ought to send it over to the Senate with a big margin."

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

Shaw: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. What I... this Bill has been around as long as the Sponsor... as long as the Sponsor.

And I respect the Sponsor of this Bill. His intentions is probably well intended, but what the Sponsor is not telling

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

the people who's addressing this Bill, that's for this Bill, is not telling you is that those of us who live in certain zip codes around this state already... already pay high premiums. Already pay high premiums. And what this Bill will do to the other people of this state will... be paying those high premiums. And I hope, I would hope that you was listening to Representative Parke. he said and he's correct everybody knows that the insurance company... the insurance rates is going up as a result of this piece of legislation. This is a political piece of legislation, somebody's trying to get elected to public office at the public's expense. We should not pass this Bill, we should not pass this piece of legislation. You can go back... what are you going to tell your people in your district if you pass this legislation two years from now when the rates skyrocket? What are you going to tell And that the people of this state should ask them then? that question. For anybody who votes for this legislation two years from now after the insurance companies go up on the rates, like they have done on me and my zip code, they're going to do that in your zip code. Now you have a competitive market out there. What the Sponsor of this legislation forgets to tell you, it hasn't worked anywhere if it's been tried. In New York one of the... probably the worst in the nation, you're trying to pass it here and they're trying to pass it here because it seemed like the thing to do. It's a good political issue. people will be running for Governor on this particular piece of legislation. I don't think that should be. I don't think that you should run for Governor and mislead the people, telling the people you're giving them a panacea. That's what this is a panacea. It will not mean anything other than your insurance rates are going up. And

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

I urge the Members of this Body to defeat this Bill."

- Speaker Breslin: "Ladies and Gentlemen, there are now 15 people seeking recognition on this Bill so please try not to be repetitive. The next speaker is the Lady from Cook, Representative Didrickson."
- "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Members of the House. Didrickson: This Bill has been around for a number of years and I've only been down here about six years. And when I first came down here I voted against it and I went back to my district and the people back in my district quickly told me that this is simply an issue of fairness. They wanted mandatory insurance, they felt that it was the responsibility of carrying a driver's license and getting behind the wheel. I will remind all of you that there are 39 states who already have mandatory car insurance. And we already know that immediately half of them conform. We right now have in the State of Illinois two million uninsured motorists. If you cut that in half you automatically have one million insured motorists on the road. It's an issue of fairness. It's an issue that the people of the State of Illinois repeatedly tell us they are for. The 'aye' vote is the right vote."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Terzich."
- Terzich: "Yes, I'd like to ask the Sponsor a couple questions if he would yield?"
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Laurino, will answer to your questions."
- Terzich: "Representative Laurino, on the mandatory insurance is the intent of the mandatory insurance to insure the vehicle or to... who's... what is it? Is it a vehicle registration mandatory or is it a driver?"
- Laurino: "Well, it's probably a combination of both. They are

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

- pulling the registration if the driver does not have insurance."
- Terzich: "Madam Speaker, I can't really hear. It is extremely loud in here."
- Laurino: "In order to enforce it they're pulling the registration on the car, but the driver must carry the insurance."
- Terzich: "So therefore, what you are saying is that the vehicle is to be registered is that correct?"
- Laurino: "The vehicle has to be registered anyway."
- Terzich: "Registered and then he has to show that the vehicle is basically insured. Is that correct?"
- Laurino: "He has to determine on his application that he does have insurance by name."
- Terzich: "No, I mean this could be a... are there any vehicles that will be registered with the State of Illinois that will be excluded from this legislation? I mean for example; taxicabs, car rentals, trucks, squad cars, fire engines, bicycles, motorcycles, is there any registered vehicle in the State of Illinois that would be excluded from having insurance?"
- Laurino: "You're talking about first division vehicles, in attempting to have the coverage for first division vehicles, Representative."

Terzich: "What is a first division vehicle?"

Laurino: "Passenger cars..."

- Terzich: "Then does that mean that anybody that rents an automobile for example; from Avis or Hertz or anybody would also have to have some identification card such as if they were out of town or were... I mean how would that happen? That would be a Class I vehicle, how would they do that? Would they have to have mandatory insurance?"
- Laurino: "Rental cars are exempted because they are carrying the insurance at the moment right now."

106th Legislative Day May 18, 1988

Terzich: "How do you know that?"

Laurino: "Because they have to already."

Terzich: "Well don't they... no, I mean don't they have to...

everybody's supposed to carry insurance now, so what proof
do they have that they have insurance? And if they do,
what insurance do they have? I don't know of a car rental
that has any type of insurance that they make you take out
insurance. So what insurance does a car rental have?"

Laurino: "They're covered under a group plan that I'm sure that
they initiate themselves and if for one reason or other,
they get sued I'm sure that they would then go after the
driver if he does not have insurance."

Terzich: "What... could you give me... or just tell me what type of insurance does an auto rental agency have if I rent a car from Avis or Hertz or anybody, what insurance do I have on that automobile? What insurance does the rental agency provide me when I'm operating that vehicle?"

Laurino: "I think you're belaboring the point. The rental car companies are required right now to show proof of insurance to the Secretary of State's Office."

Terzich: "What is that insurance? Is that my..."

Laurino: "You're an insurance broker you should know."

Terzich: "Well, I'm asking you. No I really don't know, but why
do they ask people to take out insurance when they rent a
car if they already provide insurance?"

Laurino: "Bob, they cover... they're covered under a state statute right now and it's a higher coverage than what we are attempting to put into the effect for uninsured motorists."

Terzich: "Could you tell me what that coverage is, just give me an example... what... tell me just give an example of what that coverage is?"

Laurino: "No, I don't have..."

106th Legislative Day

- May 18, 1988
- Terzich: "What does Hertz rent-a-car have for insurance when people rent a car?"
- Laurino: "It's a higher coverage that we are attempting to put..."
- Terzich: "Just give me an exam... tell me what it is. Is it property damage? Is it liability? Is it medical pay? What insurance does a rental car agency have when they rent out a car to me? I don't have an idea what it is. What is... give me a minimum limit don't even give me the higher limit. Tell me what do they provide."
- Laurino: "I don't think... I think you're belaboring a point that
 I've already answered a question and I wish you'd go on to
 another question."
- Terzich: "Well, you didn't answer the question."
- Laurino: "Otherwise... I have answered your question to the best of my ability. I've answered your question and I think that's enough."
- Terzich: "So, you're telling me that the automobile insures everybody who rents the car is automatically covered because somebody said that you're supposed to have coverage and even though that they're going to be a registered vehicle in the State of Illinois, that the Secretary of State is not going to have a verification that they have a minimum liability coverage for those drivers. Is that correct?"
- Laurino: "What I told you was the rental car companies are covered under the statute."
- Terzich: "And what is that?"
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Terzich, your five minutes are up. Bring your remarks to a close please."
- Terzich: "Well, again, you know this Bill of which for political reasons, Bob Terzich is going to vote for it, but it's really a terrible Bill. They're excluding a number of

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

vehicles, they don't provide for the insurance, they don't provide for the check and certainly it's going to be another inoperable Bill that's going to go through this here House. And unfortunately I'm going to support it."

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

The timer is on."

Parcells: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I came down here just four years ago and one of the first Bills that appeared in the Insurance Committee was mandatory insurance. I didn't know anything about it, I had no preconceived notion so I studied it very hard, kept about a six inch file on it. And what I discovered is all those states that have it, it doesn't work. It's either very, very expensive, much more expensive than it is right here in Illinois. Or the people buy it and then drop it. It doesn't work, I can affirm that. And that was a different Bill than this. This Bill is even worse. you all aware that if you loan your car to say one of these pages or some friend in the neighborhood, that that person must also have a card. You have to have a card for your car and so does that other person. There are two cards necessary. Now if that person doesn't have their card with them, you and that other person have to take a day off work to go down and prove that you had cards. And let's hope that other person does have a card. So it's a We're trying to mandate everything in this state. We should cut that out, we have a perfectly good law on the books right now. The Safety Responsibility Law. Let's enforce that law, let's vote 'no' on this Bill."

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

Young, A.: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?" Speaker Breslin: "He will."

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

Young, A.: "Who determines the fine under this Bill, Representative?"

Laurino: "Judge."

Young, A.: "What's the limit on the amount that can be fined?"

Laurino: "The first offense is up to \$500 and the second offense is \$1.000."

Young, A.: "Is that up to \$500 or is that a mandates a fine of not less than \$500 is what I read?"

Laurino: "It's not less than \$500."

Young, A.: "So if it's not less than \$500 how much could the fine be?"

Laurino: "I think that would be to the Judge's discretion. But I would take into consideration the fact that they would use very good judgement. They're prudent, you're an attorney, you should know that."

Young, A.: "So, there's no limit to the amount of fine that can be imposed under this Bill is there, Representative?"

Laurino: "No, but the implication is that it should be \$500 for the first offense."

Young, A.: "To the Bill, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House."

Speaker Breslin: "Proceed."

Young, A.: "I'd like to point out first of all, we're passing legislation here with no limit. Even for a first offense, there's a minimum of \$500, but there's absolutely no limit to the amount of fine that could be charged under this Bill. I think it's irresponsible for this House to consider legislation where we have no limit to a fine under first offense. I'd also like to point out that unlike the other mandatory insurance Bills that we have seen, this one will provide possible fines and suspensions to people who actually have insurance. There's a random sampling provision in this Bill where for whatever reason you don't

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

send back to the Secretary of State the sample he sends to you, your license can be suspended and in fact you could be fined. If someone is driving your car and they may have insurance, but don't have their card, your vehicle could be... your license suspended and that person could be fined. This is a bad Bill, it's a discriminatory Bill and worst of all we're setting unknown limits. We might be fined houses, cars, children. This is a bad Bill, I hope you defeat it."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Coles, Representative Weaver."

Weaver: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I think it might do us well to look at the other side of the equation. Until you've had a family member or a friend who's been injured or had property damaged by an uninsured motorist, you don't really understand why we need Bill like this. My sister was involved in automobile accident a couple years ago and has suffered considerable physical disability, not to mention about \$14,000 in medical bills. As a result, she and her husband had to file bankruptcy. Basically because the accident was caused by an uninsured motorist and I think anything that we can do to improve the possibility of people being able to recover for injuries that they did not cause is going to benefit us all. We, in this state put licensed drivers on the road, we allow vehicles on the road and we have a responsibility to make sure that those vehicles insured. We absolutely have to get this Bill passed out of here. Thank you."

Speaker Breslin: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Davis."

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

Speaker Breslin: "He will."

Davis: "Representative, are you aware of the fact that a student

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

from my district, who's working part—time and needs his car to get to work will be paying twice as much insurance many times as a student from another zip code, merely because of the zip code he lives in? Are you aware of that, Representative?"

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Laurino."

Laurino: "What was your question?"

Davis: "I said, do you know or are you aware of the fact that say if a student from my district was working part—time and needed his car to go to work, are you aware of the fact that the insurance for this student from my district might be twice as much as the insurance would be twice as much for the student from my district as your district because of his zip code?"

Laurino: "Well, you know, that has nothing to do with this Bill."

Davis: "It has nothing to do with this Bill?"

Laurino: "Because... do you want me to finish... may I complete my answer?"

Davis: "But what it has to do, it has everything to do with this Bill, for the simple reason until the insurance industry stops increasing the cost of insurance which is redlining dependent upon the neighborhood that you live in, I cannot support this unjust Bill. Anybody who is under delusion that this Bill will serve to help if you are in an accident, because your hit by someone who doesn't have insurance, this Bill is not going to say that that person has insurance. All this Bill is going to do is give a criminal penalty to the person for not having it. certainly is not going to increase the number of people who do have it. I think we're putting the cart before the I think we need to at first deal with equity and parity in reference to the cost of insurance across this state, and then talk about mandatory insurance. And I urge

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

a 'no' vote."

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

McCracken: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise in support of this And I'll tell you I didn't start that way. When I Bill. first came down here I was opposed to it too, because I thought uninsured motorist coverage was adequate to address the problem. But, I don't feel that way anymore, and I look upon this Bill as merely a logical extension of what is already the Safety Responsibility Law of Illinois. Except we don't have to wait to have a car accident in order to enforce it. Rather than having to wait until someone gets in an accident without insurance and then allowing them to drive only if he then gets insurance it's seems to me is only half a solution. What we should be doing is telling the people of Illinois that they can be on the road safely, they can take some comfort in knowing that we enforce a requirement of insurance for all drivers. Now uninsured motorist coverage still has some utility. It isn't something that we can do away with unfortunately, because we're never going to have perfect compliance. But this puts the responsibility for the cost of the insurance where it belongs, with the user. You spread the pool, the pool of insured drivers will grow. There is no fact to the assumption that certain drivers not having insurance now are inherently a worse risk than the motorist generally. It's not necessarily the case, we get a larger pool, require insurance before the first accident not after as under current law. We should vote for this Bill and move it out."

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

DeLeo: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Members of the House. I, as a

Cosponsor of House Bill 3900 also rise in support of this

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

Bill. There's been some drastic, drastic improvements in this Bill over the last four or five years. This Bill, to Representative Terzich's question, this Bill suspends vehicle registrations rather than the driver's The change allows the program to be administered This Bill will more than pay for by the department. itself, this Bill has been fair, it's been in 39 states. Let's not be the last state in the United States to put this into action. Let's move forward with this. This Bill alone will take a million uninsured motorists off the road in Illinois. I, as a car owner, as a paying insurance in the State of Illinois, I'm tired of paying for uninsured motorists. Let's get this Bill over into the Senate, let's get it passed. I urge an 'aye' vote on this Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from St. Clair, Representative Flinn."

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

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman moves the previous question, perhaps those who are still seeking recognition would like to explain their vote. The question is, 'Shall the main question be put?' All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it and the main question is put. Representative Laurino to close."

Laurino: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. I neglected in my opening statement to tell you who supports this piece of legislation outside of the average every day man and woman. Some of the organization's support are the concerned insurance brokers of Illinois, the independent insurance agents of Illinois, the Illinois Association of Retarded Citizens of Illinois, the Illinois Association of Rehabilitation Facilities, the Illinois Coalition of Persons with Disabilities, the Illinois Paramedics

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

Association, the Illinois Retired Teachers Association, the Professional Insurance Agents and Brokers Association and Mothers Against Drunk Driving. I urge with necessity the fact that this legislation be passed and sent to the Senate with an overwhelming majority so we can show that we're really serious about having something like this put on the books. Thank you."

Speaker Breslin: "We are going to go to the Roll Call on this

Bill. Before we do that I'd like to recognize

Representative Richmond for a special introduction.

Representative Richmond."

Richmond: "Thank you, Madam Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is something I rarely do, but I am pleased to make a brief introduction of some people who most of you have in one way or another in your various districts have some contact with. This is the lay citizens volunteers, the presidents representing over 500,000 Illinois public university alumni. They are in the Speaker's gallery. Will you please stand?"

Speaker Breslin: "Welcome."

Richmond: "Thank you."

Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 3900 pass?'

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

Voting is open. Representative Ronan, one minute to explain your vote."

Ronan: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Members of the House. It doesn't look like we need to explain my vote, because a good piece of legislation is going to go to the Senate, it's long overdue. I'll tell you I polled my district a number of times on different issues and the number one issue that impacts the people of the northwest side and southwest side and suburban Cook County is the issue of mandatory auto insurance. It's good that there's going to

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

be 80 votes on this fine Bill."

- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Winnebago, Representative Hallock, one minute to explain your vote."
- Hallock: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Members of the House. I also rise in support of this Bill. I find it very appalling that 25 percent of the people that are driving cars in our state don't have insurance. People of our state have a right to assume that everybody that's on the road does have insurance. This Bill will guarantee that. It's a good Bill and I urge you to vote 'yes'."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative O'Connell, one minute to explain your vote."
- O'Connell: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I think it's very important to note that under our system of laws driving a motor vehicle on our streets is not a right. It's a privilege. It's a privilege that is just as much warranted a drivers... that a driver's license is warranted as is motor vehicle insurance. This Bill will be a protectorate of the millions of citizens out there that each year are confronted by drivers without insurance. I think this Sponsor should be commended for his efforts in the past decade and hopefully this year the mandatory auto insurance will become law."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from McLean, Representative Ropp, one minute to explain your vote."
- Ropp: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Members of the House. Of all the Bills that we've ever heard that are extremely good, I have never seen them always..."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Ropp."
- Ropp: "All those Bills that are supposedly very bad, I've never seen them quite as bad as they really say. This Bill certainly in my judgement is a good compromise of an issue that a majority of the people of the state feel is needed.

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

The Bill does since sunset in four years. It gives us an opportunity to deal with this serious situation to make some adjustments and if as some have indicated it doesn't work in other states we will in fact have had that amount of time after four years to analyze it and appraise it. I think it's a good piece of legislation. It's one that the majority of the people of the state need. And it does provide that assurance of our citizens that we do have liability insurance in the State of Illinois."

- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Panayotovich, one minute to explain your vote."
- Panayotovich: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. In rising in support of this legislation as Representative Laurino said many things about it, 39 states have some form of mandatory insurance and have not rescinded it. We are saying now that the 60,000 average automobile drivers, uninsured drivers who are involved in accidents every year, 60,000 uninsured drivers are involved in accidents every year we are saying they now need insurance. There should be more 'aye' votes up there and I encourage it."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from Cook... the Lady from Cook,

 Representative Wojcik, one minute to explain your vote."
- Wojcik: "Yes. Yes, Madam Speaker and Members of the House, I have always been against mandatory insurance because I'm against mandated issues coming from the governmental area. However, I think that we have to be open, there are far, far too many uninsured motorists on the roads today. And I think that this and with the understanding that there is going to be a sunset we should try it. I think for all those who have suffered a great disturbance and mishap in their lives because of uninsured motorists we should help them now. This is our time to look at it, see what's going to happen, and I'm happy to vote for it."

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from St. Clair, Representative Stephens."
- Stephens: "Just to clear the record, Representative Shaw said that some of us will use this in our run for the Governorship and I want it to go on record, I'm not going to use this issue. I'm voting green, but when I run for Governor I'm not going to make people responsible to voting for me just because of this vote. Thank you."
- Speaker Breslin: "Any further discussion? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 88... 89 voting 'aye', 22 voting 'no' and 5 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 23 appears House Bill 4027, Representative Cullerton. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 4027, a Bill for an Act to provide for the certification of real estate appraisers. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Cullerton."
- Cullerton: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Madam Speaker, this Bill was on Consent Calendar. I understood that there was some potential opposition to it. It involves the licensing of certified real estate appraisers. The negotiations have been ongoing with regards to the Bill with the Illinois Association of Realtors as well as the department. And at this time I would ask that we pass this Bill over to the Senate as these negotiations continue so we keep the issue alive. And I'd be happy to answer any questions, but that's basically the position that the department has taken as well as the Illinois Association of Realtors."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage of House Bill 4027. And on that question, is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall House

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

Bill 4027 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 47 voting 'aye', 48 voting 'no' and 21 voting 'present' and the Bill fails. On the Special Order of Business Local Initiatives on page 14 of your Calendar appears House Bill 3085, Representative Cullerton. Clerk, read the Bill. 3085."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3085, a Bill for an Act in relation to the improvement of Chicago Park Districts. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Thank you, Madam Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Bill amends the Chicago Park District Act. It provides that the General Superintendent, the Secretary and the Treasurer all will serve at the pleasure of the Commissioners rather than have a statutory four year term. This has been agreed to by the board of the park district as well as the Executive Director, Mr. Madison who now has a contract with the board. I would appreciate a favorable vote. And be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved the passage of House Bill 3085 and on that question, is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 3085 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. This is final passage. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 107 voting 'aye', 2 voting 'no' and 5 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 17 appears House Bill 3087, Representative Terzich. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3087, a Bill for an Act to create

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

sanitary districts. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Terzich."

Terzich: "Yes, Madam Speaker, this amends the Sanitary District Act to increase the allowable term of leases of property no longer needed for corporate purposes from 50 to 90 years. Under the existing law the district awards leases to the highest competitive bidders, the rents are adjusted every ten years and this is also to be used for the economic development of the southwest community. And also to... for people who lease land has to pay taxes to the municipality which will increase the tax revenue. And I'd appreciate your support."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved the passage of House Bill 3087 on that question, is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 3087 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. This is final passage. Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative O'Connell, one minute to explain your vote."

O'Connell: "Madam Speaker, the impetus for this particular piece of legislation was the attempt by areas particularly on the Southwest Cook County to develop areas that are presently owned by the M.S.D. These are areas that would be created to add a cultural centers on the Southwest Cook County. It is referred to as a renaissance area. And Representative Barnes I thought was also privy to this legislation that was requested by various mayors on the Southwest Cook County. The current statutory requirements limit sanitary district leases to 50 years, by extending it to 99 years it would..."

Speaker Breslin: "Bring your remarks to a close, Sir."

O'Connell: "This would add to the 10 year to 99 years and would enable these communities including Palos Heights to develop

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

this land."

- Speaker Breslin: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there 23 voting 'aye', 61 voting 'no' and 27 voting 'present' and the Bill fails. On page 7 appears House Bill 3132, Representative Cullerton. This Bill is on Second Reading. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3132, a Bill for an Act to amend the Liquor Control Act. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee."
- Speaker Breslin: "Any Motions or Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed. Floor Amendment #2... Floor

 Amendment #2, offered by Representative Cullerton."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Cullerton on Amendment #2."
- Cullerton: "I would ask leave to withdraw Amendment #2 please."
- Speaker Breslin: "Withdraw Amendment #2. Any further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative
 McGann."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative McGann."
- McGann: "Madam Speaker, withdraw Amendment #3."
- Speaker Breslin: "Withdraw #3. Any further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #4, offered by Representative

 Cullerton."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Cullerton."
- Cullerton: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. This Amendment amends the Liquor Control Act. It would allow liquor sales at the Illinois State Museum and the Dickson Mounds Museum. I would be happy to answer any questions. I would appreciate your support."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman moves for the passage of House
 Bill 3132 and on that question, the Gentleman from Cook,
 Representative Leverenz."

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

Leverenz: "The Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Breslin: "He will."

- Leverenz: "Where did you say that this would... does your Amendment here provide that somewhere that doesn't sell liquor now will be able to sell liquor should it become law?"
- Cullerton: "That is correct. The two places would be allowed to sell liquor, the Illinois State Museum which is I believe right across the street and the Dickson Mounds Museum, I'm not really quite certain where the Dickson Mounds Museum is. But, maybe somebody here... it's in Fulton County? I'm told it's in Fulton County. I'm not really sure where Fulton County is to tell you the truth, but..."
- Leverenz: "This is Amendment #4 is it identical basically to Amendment #2 which was Hasara's?"
- Cullerton: "No, the Bill... the Amendment was a subject matter of a Bill that Representative Hasara sponsored which I think got caught up in the Rules Committee. Isn't that right, Representative Hasara? So, what I'm doing is I'm doing is I'm accommodating Representative Hasara by... and the department by providing this Amendment for deliberation."
- Leverenz: "Is for example, they're selling lunches out there under the... on the patio or something, is... they'll also be able to sell beer and wine out there? Is that correct should this become law?"
- Cullerton: "Well the Illinois State Museum is a building and this would, I believe, allow for the dispensing of liquor within that building, very similar to the Willard Ice Arena... no not the Willard Ice Arena, the Willard Ice Building which we passed the law a couple years ago so it shall allow for receptions to be held there with liquor to be served."
- Leverenz: "You had it right the first time. It is an arena.

 Thank you."

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

Speaker Breslin: "The Lady from Sangamon, Representative Hasara." Hasara: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I want to make sure that everyone understands exactly what this Amendment does. There will be no liquor sold at the museum. There will not be liquor sold at the lunch stand. This... the purpose of this Bill is to permit not-for-profit organizations to hold fund raisers in public buildings. At the present time the Willard Ice Building, the D.O.T. Building are permitted to serve liquor at receptions. I recently attended a function that the Heart Association here had at the D.O.T. Building in which the Heart Association was able to raise \$10,000. This is a well regulated Bill in that the director of the museum will accept an application from a group and the director has the authority, and only the director, to determine whether a group can hold a reception. buy a \$10 fund raising ticket to an event, evidently under the law, you are buying liquor. And that is the reason the word 'sell' got in the Bill and it created a lot misunderstanding about what the Bill does. And so I think it is important to explain that the purpose of this Bill is to do what is already being done in most public buildings, least in Springfield, and that is permit organizations to raise money. Now you could argue that they should not be able to do this, but I think we all realize from our own fund raisers that you cannot raise as much money if you're selling tickets to an event where wine and beer is not sold. So, whether we like it or not, that is... that is a fact of life."

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

Matijevich: "Madam Speaker, I only rise to introduce one of my

best friends that I've ever served with, now an Appellate

Judge and he came about that close to becoming Speaker of

106th Legislative Day

- May 18, 1988
- the House, but he opted to become Appellate Judge. Toby Berry is sitting right here. Tobias Berry."
- Speaker Breslin: "Welcome. Is there any further discussion?

 Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall Amendment #4 be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it and the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #5, offered by Representative
 Mautino."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Mautino."
- Mautino: "Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. Amendment #5 is at the request of the Urban Counties Councils and county board people where a forest preserve district is embodied in two or more cities in unincorporated areas. This Amendment says that only the county will provide the licensure for products being sold in those areas rather than the individual having to go to two or three cities if they are going to have a function in the forest preserve and I ask for your support on this Amendment."
- Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #5 be adopted?' Is there any discussion? Hearing none... you should change it on the board, Mr. Clerk, it's Amendment #5. The question is, 'Shall Amendment #5 be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it and the Amendment's adopted. Any further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. On page 18 appears House Bill 3260, Representative DeLeo. This Bill is on Third Reading. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3260, a Bill for an Act in relation to guaranteed home equity..."
- Speaker Breslin: "Out of the record. On page 18 appears House

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

Bill 3309, Representative Terzich. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3309, a Bill for an Act to create sanitary districts. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Terzich."

Terzich: "Yes, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Bill amends the Act in relation to the district to eliminate the terminal date of December 31, 1991 for the issuance of bonds and replacement to 1996. In order continue the capital development properly plan and improvement program, both from an engineering and financial perspective, it is essential that the district be assured that we'll be able to continue to fund the programs after December 31, 1991. At the present time that the projects include the building of sewers on the South and Southwest side, Northwest suburbs and throughout the community and to continue the tarp program in a phase 2 under the flood control. At the present time that bonding limit is at 1.3 billion dollars and it has been controlled at 740 million dollars. I'd appreciate your support."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved the passage of House Bill 3309 and on that question, is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall Amendment 3... shall House Bill 3309 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. The Gentleman from Madison, Representative McPike, one minute to explain your vote."

McPike: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. There's a little bit of noise on the floor. We couldn't understand the explanation from the Sponsor. Perhaps the Sponsor could explain his vote and brief us on this, Representative Terzich, if you would?"

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Terzich, one minute to explain

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

your vote."

Terzich: "Yes, at the present time the district who is in charge for the improvements throughout the suburban... not Chicago, but the metropolitan area in order to properly plan and continue the capital development improvement programs. both from engineering and financial an perspective, it is necessary that they extend and continue the terminal date of the bonding. At the present time it's December 31, 1991. This simply will extend it to 1996 so that they can continue the projects that they have which includes the tarp projects which is for the flood control out in the Northwest Cook County area. It also includes the building of sewers in treatment plants in the area. Now without this is funded approximately 75 percent by the Federal Funding and it is imperative that these programs be continued. At the present time that the bonding..."

Speaker Breslin: "Proceed, Sir. Bring your remarks to a close."

Terzich: "At the present time the bonding limit is 1.3 billion dollars and they are only at 740 million dollars. This does not provide for any type of tax increase, all it does is simply allows them up until the terminal date of 1996 to extend the bonding privileges."

Speaker Breslin: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 48 voting 'aye', 57 voting 'no' and 5 voting 'present'. Representative Terzich asked for postponed consideration. It will be placed on the Order of Postponed Consideration. On page... on page 18 appears House Bill 3380, Representative Flowers. Clerk, read the Bill. 3350."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3350, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Flowers."

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

- Flowers: "Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House
 Bill 3350 will make the General State Aid spe... it amends
 the School Code. And it carries forward for each Calendar
 year after Calendar year 1988 the same procedures as
 existed with respect to Calendar year 1987 when the Chicago
 Board of Education building tax rate extensions was made at
 the maximum rate at which its board was authorized to levy
 for the fiscal year of the boards beginning in each
 Calendar year. And I move for the passage of House Bill
 3350."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Lady moves for the passage of House Bill 3350 and on that question, is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 3350... the question is, 'Shall House Bill 3350 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 30 voting 'aye'... 31 voting 'aye', 71 voting 'no', 8 voting 'present' and the Bill fails. Representative Flowers, for what reason do you rise?"
- Flowers: "Madam Speaker, I would like to take the Bill out of the record please."
- Speaker Breslin: "You can't take the Bill out of the record once you've proceeded to a Roll Call. The next Bill is on page 19 on your Calendar House Bill 3367, Representative Flowers. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3367, a Bill for an Act concerning education. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Flowers."
- Flowers: "Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House
 Bill 3367 increases the property tax rate for the building
 purposes by the difference between .137 percent and the

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

rate of taxes extended in current Calendar year to pay operational and maintenance expenses on the building leased from the public building commission. And I would urge an 'aye' vote for House Bill 3367."

Speaker Breslin: "The Lady has moved for the passage of House
Bill 3367 and on that question, the Gentleman from
Winnebago, Representative Hallock."

Hallock: "I would just say she can take this one out of the
 record if she wants?"

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Flowers."

Flowers: "I think I'll take his advice."

Speaker Breslin: "Out of the record. On page 19 appears House Bill 3368, Representative Braun. Representative Braun, this Bill is on Third Reading. Clerk, read the Bill. Out of the record. On page 8 appears House Bill 3436, Representative Cullerton. Where is the Gentleman? Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3436, a Bill for an Act to amend the Liquor Control Act. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Any Floor Amendments? Out of the record. Ladies and Gentlemen, we are now cutting off the time for the change of votes on the Consent Calendar, so please bring your voting... your change of votes to the well right now. We will entertain no further change of votes. those votes to the well now if they have not been turned in. No more time, this is it. Get it to the well. more? Anybody else have any more change of votes? Get them into the Clerk right now. Okay, does everybody have their change of vote form in? Okay, we'll proceed now on Special Order of Business dealing with Local The next Bill appears on page 9 on your Initiatives. Calendar, House Bill 3584, Representative Madigan.

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

- read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3584, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act to revise the law in relation to Clerks of Courts.

 Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."
- Speaker Breslin: "Any Floor Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative
 McCracken."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative McCracken withdraws Amendment #1. Are there any further Amendments? Representative McCracken indicates he withdraws all of the McCracken sponsored Amendments. Withdraw those Amendments."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #1, McCracken. Amendment #2,
 McCracken. Amendment #3, offered by Representative Parke
 and McCracken, withdraw. And Amendment #4, Parke and
 McCracken, withdrawn. No further Amendments."
- Speaker Breslin: "No further Amendments. Third Reading. On page... on page 20 appears House Bill 3678, Representative Terzich. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3678, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act to create sanitary districts. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Terzich."
- Terzich: "Yes, Madam Speaker, this is another one that you should take a good look at I'm sure. But the proposed Amendment to Chapter 42 actually achieves an economy efficiency and equity in the Civil Service Examination process at the district. What the Bill does is simply lengthens the posting time of eligible lists from two to three years from the current six month to two year times. And would save approximately \$103,000 annually and the examination development in administration cost. One of the problems is that the cost to develop these tests are quite substantial. What this does is simply extend a list from... from two

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

years to three years. It's an economy move and it also prevents anything from happening by the fact that they cannot take the list down or alter it. And I would move for its adoption."

- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman moves for the passage of House Bill 3678 and on that question, is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 3678 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? This is final passage. Representative Terzich, one minute to explain vote."
- Terzich: "You know. This is one of the better ones. It amends the Civil Service Code to provide some protection for applicants for jobs. And also is an economy move, I'm sure that your people of your district will appreciate your attention to your economy and government by voting 'no' on this Bill."
- Speaker Breslin: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 26... 27 voting 'aye', 68 voting 'no', 13 voting 'present'. This Bill fails. On Page 11 appears House Bill 3917, Representative McPike. Clerk, read the Bill. 3917. It's on page 11 on your Calendar. The rest of these Bills are on Second Reading, Ladies and Gentlemen."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3917, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the School Code. Second Reading of the Bill.

 No Committee Amendments."
- Speaker Breslin: "Any Floor Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative

 McPike."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative McPike."

McPike: "Withdraw. Withdraw Amendment #1."

Speaker Breslin: "Withdraw the Amendment. Any further

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

Amendments?"

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

McPike."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative McPike."

- McPike: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Floor Amendment #2 allows the Chicago Board of Education to issue twenty million dollars in bonds for the eventual purchase of this school. It's anticipated that it would be built with private funds and would be leased by the Chicago Board and after ten years there will be a balloon note that the Chicago Board will pay off. And the purpose of this is to allow them to do that. I move for the adoption of the Amendment."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman moves the adoption of Amendment 2 to House Bill 3917. On that question, is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall Amendment 2 be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it and the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. On page 11, appears House Bill 3918, Speaker Madigan. Who's handling that Bill?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3918, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act in relation to various county officers. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."
- Speaker Breslin: "Any Motions or Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Cullerton."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Cullerton."
- Cullerton: "Madam Speaker, we have an Amendment that we're drafting, it's not ready yet. I'd like to take it out of the record."

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

Speaker Breslin: "Out of the record. On page 22 appears House Bill 3988, Representative Cullerton. This Bill is on Third Reading. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3988, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act in relation to the creation of Management of Forest Preserve District. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Madam Speaker, if I take a Bill out of the record do

I have to explain why I am taking it out of the record?"

Speaker Breslin: "No."

Cullerton: "I don't?"

Speaker Breslin: "No."

Cullerton: "Is it polite?"

Speaker Breslin: "Is it polite?"

Cullerton: "Yes."

Speaker Breslin: "No."

Cullerton: "Okay, I'll just take it out of the record then."

Speaker Breslin: "Out of the record. The next Bill appears on page 12 on your Calendar, House Bill 4068, Representative McPike. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 4068, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act authorizing the appointment of commissioners. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Any Floor Amendments?"

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

Speaker Breslin: "Representative McPike."

McPike: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #1 is to clarify the intent of the Bill. It says you cannot be eligible for appointment to bistate if after the appointment there would be more than 3 Commissioners of the that person's political party appointed by the Governor. I move for the adoption of the

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

Amendment."

- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentlemen has moved the adoption of Amendment #1 to House Bill 4068. On that question, the Gentleman from DuPage, Representative McCracken."
- McCracken: "Although the Amendment in effect becomes the Bill and
 I suppose Third Reading is a time to consider it. I want
 everyone to know now this is an unnecessary political Bill.
 We shouldn't be for it, we shouldn't be for the Amendment.
 Right now the Bistate Commission has 5 members, each from
 Illinois and Missouri. The Governor appoints those from
 Illinois..."
- Speaker Breslin: "Mr. McCracken, it is completely inappropriate to speak to the Bill on Third Reading. This is an Amendment."
- McCracken: "I'm speaking... I'm speaking to the Amendment. If
 you look at the Amendment it requires that only 3 be from
 one political party."
- Speaker Breslin: "Proceed."
- McCracken: "And right now the status is that all 5 are appointed by the Governor. Five from each state. There's no reason to change it, there's no demonstration of any problem in existance other than maybe some political egos are bruised.

 No reason to change the law in this regard."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from St. Clair... or Madison, Representative Stephens."
- Stephens: "I was in committee when this Bill was discussed. And Representative, as the Sponsor of the Amendment said that or least implied that the Governor, by choosing all five they wind up being political appointments, and that in deed they... the members of the Bistate Commission are Republicans. When I came here in 1985, an opening came on Bistate, and it is my recollection that Governor Thompson with the approval of the Senate appointed a Democrat. And

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

that Pat Watkins, who sits on that Commission is a registered Democrat and has been all her life. The most recent appointment happened to have been a Republican, appointed by the Governor, the Senate did not take action fifty days past and he... and the appointment was confirmed because of lack of action by the Senate. The Amendment is unnecessary, it's an insult to Governor Thompson, he has been very fair and equitable in trying to get good qualified people from the Metro-East area to serve in this Commission, the Bistate Commissioners from Illinois have done an outstandingly good job. And I think this is unfair interference."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Klemm."

Klemm: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. You know every time we change this I think we politicize it. Right now we've got 5 people that are appointed in a bipartisan effort for people that are... that have the qualifications. have the expertise, have the desire to serve. And when we start changing it, and putting it in a political boundaries all the time, or political requirements, it seems like now we actually, probably demand the whole process of working together to help Illinois. We end up starting to say it has to be this party or that party, and wouldn't it be refreshing if we leave things sometimes by conscientious men and women who want to serve their district or commission, or their area, because they'd like to do a always have to put down political decent job. Do we configurations and considerations at everything we do. I think it's been working well, we in the committee felt that it had been and therefore I oppose the legislation."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative McPike, to close."

McPike: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I would be glad to debate

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

this Bill on Third Reading. I think it should be debated on Third Reading. I'd just like the Amendment adopted so that we have a chance to do that. It does require that some Democrats be appointed to Bistate Board. The last 12 years, the Governor has seen fit to appoint Republicans. We're not asking him to appoint 3 Democrats and 2 Republicans, or asking him to appoint 3 Republicans and 2 Democrats. We have the votes on this side of the aisle to make it 3 Democrats and 2 Republicans. But that was not the intent. I just simply move for the adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #1 be adopted?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 64 voting 'aye', 46 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present' and the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "There are no further Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. On page 13 appears House Bill 4251, Representative Flinn. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 4251, a Bill for an Act to amend the Mobile Home Relocal Services Tax Act. Second Reading of the Bill. There are no Committee Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #1 is being offered by Representative Monroe Flinn."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Flinn."

Flinn: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. All the Amendment does is combine 4252 and 4253 with 4251. It saves paperwork, and I ask for the adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Amendment #1 to House Bill 4251. Is there any discussion?

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall Amendment #1 be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it and the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "There are no further Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. On page 13 appears House Bill 4254, Representative Flinn. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 4254, a Bill for an Act to amend the Animal Control Tax. Second Reading of the Bill. There are no Committee Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Are there any Motions or Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #1 is being offered by Representative Flinn."

Speaker Breslin: "Who's the Sponsor, Mr. Clerk? Representative Flinn."

Flinn: "Withdraw Amendment #1."

Speaker Breslin: "Withdraw #1. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Flinn."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Flinn."

Flinn: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Amendment #2 was creating a problem for Winnebago County and some of the other counties, so what we've done is reduced the Bill by population sizes to apply only to Madison and St. Claire Counties. I move for the adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved the Adoption of Amendment #2 to House Bill 4254. On that question, is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall Amendment #2 be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

- Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. On page 13 appears House Bill 4255, Representative Flinn. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 4255, a Bill for an Act to amend the Downstate County Working Cash Fund Act. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Any Motions or Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #1 is being offered by Representative Churchill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Churchill."

- Churchill: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Floor Amendment #1 changes one word from 'grounds' to 'facilities' to allow in the creation of subdivisions for contractors to provide funding for facilities. In other words, buildings and things that are placed on the land rather than just providing for the grounds which would be the land. It's a one word change, but there are some people who have interpreted it so the contributions could not be made to help build facilities."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Gentlemen has moved for the adoption of Amendment #1 to House Bill 4255. On that question, is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall Amendment #1 be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it and the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #2, offered by Representative William Peterson."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Peterson."

Peterson: "Madam Speaker, withdraw Amendment #2."

Speaker Breslin: "Withdraw 2. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative William Peterson."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Peterson."

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

Peterson: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Amendment #3 to House Bill 4255 would allow the collar counties to lapse appropriated funds for 90 days rather than 30 days at the close of fiscal year. This would affect the counties of DuPage Lake, McHenry and Will Counties. This would let the counties have that extra time to pay the vendors which Bills come in after the fiscal year. I ask for your support of Amendment #3 to House Bill 4255."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved the adoption of Amendment #3 to House Bill 4255, and on that question, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Cullerton. Mr. Clerk, was Amendment #1 adopted on this Bill? Yes, Amendment #1 was adopted, Amendment #2 was withdrawn. Any further discussion? The question is, 'Shall Amendment #3 be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it and the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "There are no further Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. On page 13 appears House Bill 4256, Representative Keane. Jim Keane, is the Gentleman in the chamber? Out of the record. House Bill... on page 13 appears House Bill 4257, Representative Flinn. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 4257, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Vehicle Code. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Any Motions or Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. Representative Keane has returned to the chamber. We'll go back to House Bill 4256 on page 13 on the Calendar. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 4256, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Municipal Code. Second Reading of the Bill."

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

Speaker Breslin: "Any Motions or Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "There are no Motions or Amendments filed."

- Speaker Breslin: "Third Reading. Representative Keane, are you seeking recognition? Going to the Special Order of Business of State and Local Government, the first Bill is House Bill 1729, Representative Hasara. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "On page 14 on your Calendar, House Bill 1729, a

 Bill for an Act to amend an Act to provide for a system of
 probation. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Hasara."

- Hasara: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. House Bill 1729 is an initiative that has arisen out of meetings by the Citizens Assembly on Women. And the purpose of the Bill is to define residential alternative sentencing programs that would include programs particularly aimed at mother/child unification, that would provide expanded sentencing options for less serious felony offenders. It does not mandate anything but it does open up the options that the court may use for alternative sentencing."
- Speaker Breslin: "The Lady has moved for the passage of House Bill 1729, and on that question, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Cullerton."
- Cullerton: "Yes, as I understand the Bill, it provides that if someone is has been convicted of a felony that under this Bill this would allow for a court to sentence someone to a residential alternative program."
- Hasara: "Okay, first of all, there was a year long... or a study completed as a result of a Resolution that we passed last year that the Administrative Office of the Courts provided everyone on the Committee with a copy of the report that showed how this is worked in other states across our country. This Bill would simply provide that the Supreme

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

Court could give grants to local programs that could be funded through the court that could provide alternative sentencing. It is not an option necessarily at this time. At least it is not clearly defined in the statute."

Cullerton: "Alright, well... my... I'm in I believe I'm in favor of the Bill. I just wanted to find out which crimes would... involved..."

Hasara: "This Bill does not speak to specific crimes."

Cullerton: "I know the Bill doesn't, but the Bill applies to specific crimes. There are certain crimes that you cannot get this treatment for an others that you can. That's what I am trying to figure out."

Hasara: "Okay..."

Cullerton: "Well it says in the Section 1 of the current law says it's an Act providing for a system of probation for the appointment and compensation of probation officers and authorizing the suspension of final judgement in the imposition of sentence upon persons found guilty of certain defined crimes and offenses. And legalizing their ultimate discharge without punishment. And I just wanted to know if you know which crimes it applied to. So for example, does it apply to residential burglary?"

Hasara: "Okay, I do not believe that those crimes have been identified. I think this simply opens up the discussion for those crimes to be identified, because, as the Bill now talks about alternative plans and there are already several in the Bill. This simply adds residential alternative sentencing program to the... to the Bill that already has several programs in it."

Cullerton: "But obviously it applies to some people and not to others and you just don't know which crimes it applies to.

I mean residential burglary is non-probational, so I assume it doesn't apply to residential burglars."

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

Hasara: "That's... That's..."

Cullerton: "Does it apply to every crime that's probational, possibly?"

Hasara: "I believe that it could do that yes."

Cullerton: "And what this would provide is that someone could be sentenced to stay in their home?"

Hasara: "They could be yes. And as you know, Representative, intensive probation is already being studied and in fact tried in the State of Illinois."

Cullerton: "Okay, thank you."

Hasara: "If... if I might make mention of the recent CBS television program that was filmed at Dwight that showed and pointed out the problems of reuniting the mothers at Dwight with their children when they do get out."

Cullerton: "I'm... I'm for the Bill. I would just tell you that hopefully we'll get the chance to debate the issue of residential burglary and whether or not that should be probational..."

Hasara: "Now I..."

Cullerton: "Whether or not we should change your Senator's Bill that we passed a number of years ago."

Hasara: "Now I get you, Representative. Thank you."

Cullerton: "Thank you."

Speaker Breslin: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 1729 pass?'

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

Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? This is final passage. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 113 voting 'aye', none voting 'no' and none voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2422, Representative Levin. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Levin: "On page 16 of the Calendar, House Bill 2422, a Bill

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

for an Act to amend the Condominium Property Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Levin."

Levin: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the As is my practice with respect to condominium legislation. I would like the record to show that I associated with a law firm that does represent us as a Condominium Associations. House Bill 2422, is identical to Senate Bill 527 from last year which just never quite made it to the Governor's desk. It deals with one subject and one subject only. When a condominium unit after a foreclosure sale... when you should start paying assessments to the Association. This is a compromise, that worked out with the mortgage bankers, with the associations, with the Chicago Bar Association and all of the groups and is supported by everybody."

Speaker Breslin: "The Gentleman has moved the passage of House Bill 2422. On that question, is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 2422 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. This is final passage. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, On this question there are 113 voting take the record. 'aye', none voting 'no' and 1 voting 'present'. This Bill. having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 16 appears House Bill 2922, Representative Martinez. Out of the record. On page 3 appears House Bill 3007, Representative Curran. This Bill is on Second Reading. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "On page 3 of the Calendar, House Bill 3007, a Bill for an Act to amend the Civil Administrative Code of Illinois. Second Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Breslin: "Are there any Amendments filed?"

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #1 is being offered by Representative McCracken."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative McCracken. Representative McCracken. Representative Curran, what is your pleasure on this Amendment? The Gentleman who's offering the Amendment is not in the chamber."
- Curran: "Madam Speaker, in deference to the Sponsor of the
 Amendment, even though I think I will oppose the Amendment,
 I would like to take this Bill out of the record at this
 time."
- Speaker Breslin: "Out of the record. Representative Cowlishaw is recognized for an introduction. A special introduction."
- Cowlishaw: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I am particularly grateful to be recognized on a matter of personal privilege. We have a page on our side of the aisle today, who may well be the oldest page in the history of the Illinois House Representatives. And I do not say that unkindly. His name Alfred Ruben and he lives in Naperville. I have known Al Ruben for many years, and I want you to know why he happens to be here today. He and I both believe in a place called Little Friend School in Naperville, which provides excellent educational programs for severely retarded children and young adults. As part of a benefit auction for Little Friends, Mr. Ruben was the high bidder for the right to come here for one day and be a page. He gave over to Little Friend School four hundred and seventy-five dollars in order to come here today. But mostly to benefit that school. And he tells me every tip he makes today will be donated to Little Friends School. So please generous."
- Speaker Breslin: "Representative Tate, for what reason do you seek recognition?"

Tate: "Thank you."

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

Speaker Breslin: "Why do you seek recognition, Sir?"

Tate: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, I just have a very brief announcement. I know there's not... there's a lot of people on the floor that are interested in the Chicago White Sox, however, right now the St. Louis Cardinals and Chicago Cubs are battling for third place. And I've thought a lot of people would be interested to know that St. Louis is currently winning 4 to 1 in the bottom of the 8th."

Speaker Breslin: "On the Special Order of Business dealing with State and Local Government, on page 17 appears House Bill 3030, Representative Frederick. Clerk, read the Bill. Out of the record. On page 7 appears House Bill 3091, Representative Hicks. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3091, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Vehicle Code. Second Reading of the Bill.

Amendment #1 was offered in committee."

Speaker Breslin: "Any Motions filed?"

Clerk Leone: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Breslin: "Any Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #2 is being offered by Representative Hicks."

Speaker Breslin: "Representative Hicks."

Hicks: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Floor Amendment #2 simply states that all vehicles in the State of Illinois regardless of what type of vehicles they are, will be allowed on those rural interstate highways to travel at 65 m.p.h. This took care of the concerns of DOT and several other agencies that had a concern about particular types of vehicles on the interstates. I'd be happy to try to answer any questions?"

Speaker McPike: "Gentleman moves for the adoption of Amendment,

on that Representative Countryman."

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

Countryman: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker McPike: "Yes, he will."

- Countryman: "Representative, I'm sorry if I... If I didn't quite hear you, but did you say every vehicle then would be able to go 65, including a car pulling a trailer and everything?"
- Hicks: "Yes, Sir, that would be correct. Initially we tried it with the Committee Amendment #1 to limit some certain types of vehicles, but because of problems with DOT and everyone else concerned in doing that, we tried to take care of those concerns and now all vehicles, those towing a, for example, a boat or a motor home, they would all be traveling at the same rate of speed which is ideally what is supposedly the safest measure of speed here in Illinois."
- Countryman: "Alright, so this... it makes all vehicles in 65 m.p.h. where otherwise permitted, is that correct?"
- Hicks: "Yes, Sir, wherever it would be permitted. On those ruler interstate highways that currently cars are allowed to go 65, all other vehicles would be allowed to go at the same speed."
- Countryman: "Well I don't support it, but it's your Bill. I'll let you do what you want to with it."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative McPike in the Chair. Further discussion? Being none, the question is, 'Shall the Amendment be adopted?' All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "There are no further Amendments."
- Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. House Bill 3104, Representative Breslin. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "On Page 17 of the Calendar, House Bill 3104, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act to... for state collection of

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

certain locally imposed taxes. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Breslin."

- Breslin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentleman. This
 Bill would require home rule units to file ordinances of
 local tax sales with the Illinois Department of Revenue.

 Currently there is no central clearing house for such
 information and it must be tabulated on a hit and miss
 basis. This Bill has been amended so that this is all this
 Bill does at this time. I ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker McPike: "Is there any discussion? Being none, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 3184 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. That's 3104. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this Bill there are 111 'ayes', 1 'no', none voting 'present'. House Bill 3104, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3105, read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "On page 14 of your Calendar, House Bill 3105, a
 Bill for an Act to amend the Civil Administrative Code.
 Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Breslin."

Breslin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. This Bill calls for an informal hearing for tax disputes, with the Illinois Department of Revenue. This legislation would allow a new step in the process where a taxpayer could appeal a decision without having legal representation present. You will remember when the Illinois Retail Merchants Association brought this issue to light a few months ago noting that before they can appear before the Internal Revenue Service, they must take with them a lawyer. In previous circumstances they were able to appear in an informal matter merely with an accountant. Under the new procedures they are required to have a lawyer. This

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

provides for a informal procedure which we believe will expedite the case and benefit the taxpayer. I ask for favorable consideration."

- Speaker McPike: "Any discussion? Representative Frederick."
- Frederick: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Will the Sponsor yield for a question?"
- Speaker McPike: "Yes, she will."
- Frederick: "Can you tell me, Representative Breslin, what the price tag for these informal reviews will be for the Department?"
- Breslin: "The Department has not indicated, there is not a fiscal note filed on the Bill, but the Department has indicated that they are opposed to the Bill because it will cost money. Exactly how much, we have not filed?"
- Frederick: "Actually, what I really believe, if this is mandated to the Department, will it not slow down the review process they already have on the books, and they already follow. Will this not in effect be more of a negative as far as the taxpayers are concerned, then the system we have under the present, at the present time."
- Breslin: "The hope is that that will not take place. The

 Department of Revenue believes that that will be the case,
 and that is the reason that they oppose the Bill, and they
 think it will be more costly. It's my view that an
 informal hearing used in an arbitration setting ought to
 expedite these hearings and ought to treat the consumer,
 the taxpayer more fairly."
- Frederick: "Well granted, it may be fair to the taxpayer, but
 what I'm hearing from the Department is, they do not have
 the money to follow this mandate and for that reason, I
 think I would advise the people on our side of the aisle to
 vote 'no' or 'present' at this time."
- Speaker McPike: "Further discussion? Representative Breslin to

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

close."

Breslin: "Just ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker McPike: "Question is, 'Shall House Bill 3105 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. Representative Martinez, 'aye'. On this Bill there are 95 'ayes', l 'no' and 15 voting 'present'. House Bill 3105, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3124, Representative Ewing. Representative Ewing here? Representative Ewing. Out of the record. House Bill 3222, Representative Tate. Mr. Tate, would you give the Chair some indication that... the Chair takes that that's some indication that he would like to have his Bill called. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3322 (sic - 3222), a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Purchasing Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Tate."

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

This Bill passed out of the State Government Committee 16
to 1. We debated the Bill briefly here a few weeks ago.

It amends the Illinois Purchasing Act, essentially requires
all state agencies to impose a performance standards for
successful contractors. I move for its approval."

Speaker McPike: "Is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Young."

Young: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, will the Sponsor yield?"

Tate: "Yeah."

Young: "Have there been any changes in the Bill, Representative, since it was defeated in the House a couple of days ago?"

Tate: "It wasn't defeated, it's just been delayed, a major change
 it's probably two weeks worth of a better Bill."

Young: "To the Bill, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

House, this Bill doesn't have any guidelines at all set up, and it provides for all the departments of the state to adopt either IDOT and the Capital Development Board Guidelines for projects. It doesn't make any provisions for when IDOT and the Capital Development Board have different guidelines and I hope you remember the debate from a couple of days ago, because the Bill hasn't changed since then."

- Speaker McPike: "Further discussion? Representative Tate to close."
- Tate: "Well as I explained a couple of weeks ago, this Bill just came a few votes passing a few weeks ago. I think there are a few people off the floor. And if you will look closely at this Bill, all it essentially says is that it requires an agreement or a contract between state agencies for Capitol Projects and simply as for a commencement date and a completion date. And I move for its approval."
- Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill... shall House
 Bill 3222 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote
 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Clerk
 will take the record. On this Bill there are 50 'ayes', 57
 'nos', 5 voting 'present'. This Bill, having failed to
 receive a... Representative Parke, did you want to speak?"
- Parke: "Not on this issue, but when your done I would like to inquire of the Chair please."
- Speaker McPike: "This Bill, having failed to receive the Constitutional Majority, it is hereby declared lost. Representative Parke."
- Parke: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have an inquiry. I've noticed that there's a House Calendar Supplemental to Senate Bills First Reading, that has been sitting on the Senate... I mean on the House Democratic side for about 2 hours and none of us seem to have this, and I'd like to know if we

106th Legislative Day

- May 18, 1988
- can track it down so that we have the same information on both sides of the aisle as we... as the Democrats do."
- Speaker McPike: "Would the Republican Page in charge of the Republican side of the aisle, please see Representative Parke."
- Parke: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker McPike: "House Bill 3124, Representative Ewing. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3124, on page 18 of the Calendar. House
 Bill 3124, a Bill for an Act to amend the Environmental
 Protection Act. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Ewing."
- Ewing: "Mr. Chairman, there are a couple Amendments that have filed to this. I'd like to ask permission to take the Bill back to Second Reading."
- Speaker McPike: "The Gentleman ask leave to return the Bill to Second Reading for purposes of an Amendment. Are there any objections? Hearing none, the Bill will be returned to Second Reading. Mr. Clerk, are there any Amendments filed?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #2 is being offered by Representatives Black and Weaver."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Black."
- Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. And I appreciate the Sponsor taking this Bill back. Amendment #2 simply amends the size of the city that could take advantage of this Bill. The Bill says five thousand or less, Amendment #2 simply says cities of twelve thousand or less. I would urge favorable consideration of Amendment #2."
- Speaker McPike: "Is there any discussion? Being none, the question is, 'Shall this Amendment be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no', the 'ayes' have it and the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

- Clerk Leone: "Amendment #3 is being offered by Representative

 McCracken."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative McCracken withdraws Amendment #3.

 Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "There are no further Amendments."
- Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. Gentleman ask leave to waive the appropriate rules so that this Bill could be heard at this time. Out of the record. Representative Ewing."
- Ewing: "I'd like to leave the Bill on Third."
- Speaker McPike: "Fine, the Bill will remain on Third Reading.

 House Bill 3267, Representative DeJaegher. Read the Bill,

 Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "On page 18 on your Calendar, House Bill 3267, a

 Bill for an Act to amend the Uniform Code of Corrections.

 Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative DeJaegher."
- DeJaegher: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the General Assembly. House Bill 3267 amends a Code of Corrections, the Department of Corrections to reimburse requires counties with less than eighty thousand inhabitants for each person sentenced to a term of imprisonment in the county jail, provides that such reimbursement shall be at the rate of forty dollars per day for each day served over I think what we have to realize thirty days. importance of this legislation. I think all of us realize that what the demise of revenue sharing that the counties of eighty thousand or less are having severe financial problems. Especially with the mandates that we have imposed upon these counties it's very difficult for them to meet their expenses. And for that reason, I move for support of House Bill 3267."
- Speaker McPike: "Is there any discussion? Representative...

 Gentleman from Lake, Representative Peterson."

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

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

Speaker McPike: "He indicates he will."

Peterson: "Representative, is this a change from a previous regulation and if it is when did that regulation or statute get changed?"

DeJaegher: "That... that was implemented in 1983."

Peterson: "Do you know why it was implemented in 1983?"

DeJaegher: "Well basically in 1983 the state was having severe problems finding enough room for their inmates. And this is what they imposed upon these respected counties. Now with the advent our basically construction of the prison facilities that we have. I don't think it's that necessary and if we do use those facilities. I think that these counties should be reimbursed for their activities."

Peterson: "Do you have an idea of what the cost will be to the state?"

DeJaegher: "There's been a financial note accompanying this Bill and I don't have it with me but without a doubt, being your speaking regarding this Bill I think that you probably had that in your hands and your more knowledgeable than I am."

Peterson: "No, I don't have it in hand but I have an amount of somewhere around three to four million dollars."

DeJaegher: "I... I think it's a little excessive Bill, I think it's about two and a half million dollars."

Peterson: "Okay."

DeJaegher: "Two point five to be exact."

Peterson: "Alright, do you think that the state is in better condition now than it was in 1983 as far as absorbing these extra costs?"

DeJaegher: "Well, I think what we have done, as Legislators has mandated these counties to provide additional services that basically when revenue sharing was there they was able to handle these additional costs. But that's no longer the

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

case of point."

Peterson: "Mr. Speaker."

DeJaegher: "Now we're only talking about the counties with less than eighty thousand inhabitants."

Peterson: "Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. I think the Representative is certainly on the right track with this legislation, I think it's a matter of having the funds to implement this change in the law. And I think at this time the state does not have the funds to implement this legislation, I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker McPike: "Further discussion? Representative Dunn."

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

The only thing wrong with this Bill is that it should be state wide in its application. We at the State of Illinois mandate counties all across the state to accept Department of Corrections people and don't pay for it. So I'm going to vote green for this Bill and just wish it would apply statewide instead of as it now provides, I understand it has a lower fiscal impact the way it is but the mandate is statewide, this Bill ought to be statewide."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Mays."

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

Speaker McPike: "Yes he will."

Mays: "Who's suppose to pay the counties? What budget is this suppose to go through?"

DeJaegher: "Department of Corrections."

Mays: "To your knowledge, did we allow for this in the department's budget when it passed the House last week?"

DeJaegher: "Not that I'm knowledgeable of."

Mays: "Did... so you're not aware of any dollars in Corrections

Budget to afford this payment, is that correct?"

DeJaegher: "There's no specific line item pertaining to this

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

cause."

"Okay, well to the Bill. I think the Gentleman's got a Mays: point here, there's something that maybe we should be paying for but the fact of the matter is, we had to to find the money to open for six months scramble biannus... a work release area down in Southern Illinois, we had to scramble to open for six months, another hundred and thirty-eight beds at Dixon. I think the total price on those two items were about a million-two. Anybody that's familiar with Correction's Budget would understand that we're not even funding probation to any degree at all. There's a lot of things that we probably ought to be doing in the Department of Corrections Budget, but frankly we've had to prioritize and we just can't afford to do. And I think that's the situation we're facing in this case, so my intent would be to vote 'present' on this Bill."

Speaker McPike: "On further discussion, Representative Hartke."

Hartke: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I stand in support of this legislation. It seems that in 1983, when the state did not have the room for prisoners, they dumped this responsibility on those counties. At that time, the counties enjoyed revenue sharing, and you know that's the thing of the past. And I think now it's up to the state to accept those prisoners and to take that responsibility away from those counties. The counties can't afford it, we're saying to the counties, you keep the prisoners it's your responsibility. I don't think it is, I think we ought to take that responsibility away and house those prisoners in state prisons rather than county jails."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Phelps."

Phelps: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the
House. I rise in support of this Bill, because I believe
Representative DeJaegher has given a sincere interest to

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

what the Legislature has turned a cold heart to and I think that when we look past 1983 and beyond, we see that the tactics of this Legislature through the auspices of the Governor to the strategy has come about like a hot potato. That when we have a lack of funds, or something that we want do not want to fund then we shift it to another bureaucracv or another level of government such counties. But what's happened the county level is two They've lost their resources of things simultaneously. revenues such as federal reduced revenue sharing and other means of loss of taxation and their tax base and at the same time having to absorb new mandates that we have put on them. Now the Governor has come back each year since then and asked us, this Body, to support bonding to build new prisons. At the same time, turn their back upon the counties, who say we do not have the money to build new jails that your forcing on us and to house prisoners you have turned away from the prisons that we are building all over the state. So I believe we're out of excuses saying the funds are not available. Let's let authorization language go into law and then when we can fund it. Let's do it."

Speaker McPike: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative Young."

Young: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker McPike: "Yes, he will."

Young: "Does this apply to every county in the state?"

DeJaegher: "I didn't hear the question, Anthony."

Young: "I said, does this apply to every county in the state?"

DeJaeqher: "No, just counties with less than 80,000 population."

Young: "I think the idea is good, but I think it should apply

statewide."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Johnson."

Johnson: "For the first time this year and by the 42nd time in my

106th Legislative Day

- May 18, 1988
- 42 years of life, the Cardinals have moved ahead of the Cubs in the standings with a 4 to 1 win."
- Speaker McPike: "Did Representative Countryman hear you? No further discussion, Representative DeJaegher to close."
- DeJaegher: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To those of you especially that represent counties of eighty thousand dollars less.

 Surely you must realize that these counties are in financial problems. I think we've debated this... this Bill, we discussed this Bill, hoping that you'll support of House Bill 3267."
- Speaker McPike: "Question is, 'Shall House Bill 3267 pass?' All in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this Bill there is 63 'ayes', 35 'nos', 17 voting 'present'. Representative McCracken."
- Speaker McPike: "Verification. Gentleman has asked for a verification. Representative DeJaegher asked for a Poll of the Absentees."
- Clerk Leone: "A Poll of those not voting. Representative Levin and Martinez. No further."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Jessie White would like to vote 'aye'. Representative Ellis Levin would like to vote 'aye'. Representative Saltsman, Representative McCracken. Representative Saltsman would like to be verified and so would Representative Dunn. Representative Steczo would like to be verified, he's right there in the middle aisle. Anyone else before we start, Representative Breslin. Representative Currie, Representative... does anyone else verified? be Representative Monroe Flinn. want to Representative Richmond. Now Representative LeFlore would like to vote 'aye'. Representative Young would like to vote 'aye' and Representative Morrow would like to vote 'aye'. Representative McCracken would like to withdraw the

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

request for verification. On this Bill there are 68 'ayes', 35 'nos', 13 voting 'present'. House Bill 3267, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3273, Representative Hannig. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3273 on page 14 of the Calendar, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act relating to fire protection.

Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Hannig."

Hannig: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Two years ago we put this provision into the law as a temporary way of dealing with the problem in the rural areas. In some of the rural areas that I represent there are no protection districts assigned to that land. And in some cases individuals, farmers in particular ask that they have an opportunity to be served by a fire protection district. So we pass legislation last year... or two years ago saying land owner requested they could ask the fire marshall to assign them to a district, and in return they would pay that district the same as if they belonged in that district based on the property taxes that people in That way fire protection would be the district do pay. given to those individuals in the rural areas that needed it, but we would not require everyone to belong to a district if they chose not to. So it's a very voluntary system, it has worked very well in the trial period that we have had it on the books, and this Bill simply extends that method forever and gives us the opportunity to allow this to continue. So it's a... it's a Bill that came out of committee unanimously, it was on Short Debate, and I would ask for your 'yes' vote."

Speaker McPike: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage of the Bill. And on that, the Gentleman from St. Clair,

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

Representative Stephens."

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

Speaker McPike: "Yes."

Stephens: "Representative Hannig, yesterday or the day before in the... in St. Clair County, might have been... well maybe it was Madison County, right along that border there. There was a five acre fire, rubbish, shacks, shanties, some old houses, piles of garbage, just this, that and the other caught on fire and burned out of control of five acres while at least four fire departments claimed that it was not their area. Would this Bill remedy situations like that?"

Hannig: "Well, Representative, it could. It would not mandate that every parcel of land be put in a fire protection district. But it would if you requested allow the fire marshall to assign you to a district. So if that individual had requested the fire protection, the fire marshall would have assigned him to a district, he would have paid his property taxes if he belonged, and then he would have had... he would have had the protection. And I might add that the fire protection people support this Bill and they actually have drafted it."

Stephens: "I think you've got a good idea. I rise in support."

Speaker McPike: "Further discussion? Representative Hannig, to close."

Hannig: "I would just ask for a 'yes' vote."

Speaker McPike: "Question is, 'Shall House Bill 3273 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this Bill there are 115 'ayes', no 'nays', none voting 'present'. House Bill 3273, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page 22 of the Calendar, House Bill 3890, Representative

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

Turner. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3890, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act to create the Illinois Affordable Housing Program. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Turner."

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

Speaker McPike: "Excuse me, excuse me. Some of the guests in the balcony may be visiting Springfield for the first time. We do not allow demonstrations in this hall. If we have demonstrations, the doorman will clear the balcony and lock the doors. Proceed."

Turner: "3890 is a Bill, well I should back up by giving a little background. You may have remembered when this Session first started, that Speaker Madigan mentioned that housing was an issue that we were going to discuss in the State of Illinois this year. To that end, he created the Select Committee on Housing in which I'm the Chairman and Representative James Kirkland is the Vice—Chairman. We've often referred to that committee as Housing One On One because it's a very complicated issue. In Illinois we're facing a crisis of both housing availability and housing affordability. Each year the amount of new and rehab housing face... fails to replace the normal amounts of housing that's lost throughout this state. As a result, 30 percent of Illinois households who were..."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Turner."

Turner: "Yes."

Speaker McPike: "I wonder if the Gentleman could have some order here. Proceed, Sir."

Turner: "As a result, 30 percent of Illinois households who were potential new homeowners in 1970 could not afford to buy new homes in 1980. And more than forty-five thousand

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

Illinois citizens have no homes at all. The budget for the Department of Housing and Urban Development has fallen from thirty-five billion in 1980 to fourteen billion in 1987. And Illinois share οf have these funds decreased commensurably. To that end, there has been a number of groups meeting over the last year to come up with what we have before you today, the Illinois Affordable Housing Trust Fund Bill. This Bill was designed to address the affording housing crisis here in Illinois. The program will provide low or no interest loans primarily for purchase, construction or rehab of both single-family and multi-family properties. It creates the housing trust fund capitalized by a modest increase. Twenty-five percent... twenty-five cents per five hundred dollars evaluation in This will generate the State Real Estate Transfer Tax. thirteen million dollars annually and will average another twelve million in government dollars, up to fifty million from private sources. The coalition that has been meeting for the last year came up with this Bill, and this establishes an eleven member Affordable Housing Advisory Commission. It consists of the Director from the Illinois Housing Development Authority, the Director for the Department of Commerce and Community Affairs and nine other members to be appointed by the Governor and approved by the Senate. These members will receive no compensation, purpose will be to study the need additional affordable housing, making recommendations to the General Assembly for future legislation, regarding affordable housing. They will review the development and policy procedures for the Administration of this program and encourage collaboration between federal and state agencies, local government and the private sector in the development of affordable housing for low and very

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

income households. Monitoring and evaluating the allocation of the Illinois Affordable Housing Trust Fund. I'd be glad to ask any questions that anyone may have on this Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Is there any discussion? Representative McCracken."

McCracken: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill would double the State Transfer Tax and rather than leave it in GRF for our appropriation on an annual basis. For... causes as we see fit on an annual basis, would essentially create dedicated fund, half of which would go toward the making of mortgages or rehabilitation for the housing as envisioned by the Sponsor of the Bill. In the first year, or it... it would double the current tax and it would have collected that tax thirteen million dollars in 1988. Now that's going to be thirteen million dollars as soon as we... if we enacted this Bill and for its first annual effect. would be a total of twenty-six million dollars, thirteen of which would have otherwise have gone to the General Revenue Now that's thirteen million dollars that I think Fund. should be appropriated by this Body on an annual basis, rather than to a single dedicated use. There are many many worthy things that are important to this state and to retain the money in the General Revenue Fund has to be a top priority. We're talking about two hundred and twenty six communities that are unable to build the most infrastructure to keep their citizens in clean water. Those communities are going to hit deadlines in July 1988 and fines from the Federal EPA and we aren't doing anything to help them. That's just one example of the loss of this money by sending it to a dedicated fund. Not only does it double the tax but we lose the use of all the money that otherwise would have gone to the General Revenue Fund.

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

I know the Gentleman has worked hard and a good cause with the various agencies. I don't believe their supporting it however, I think the author of the Bill worked with them on language. I respectfully rise in opposition."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Williams."

Williams: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker McPike: "Yes, he will."

implemented."

Williams: "Is there any such program like this that exists any place else besides the proposal that you have here today?" Turner: "Well, in the City of Chicago, we're working on a program right now with churches, because the ministers in the Chicagoland area realize that the state has been lacking in terms of this responsibility regarding housing. So to that end, they have created what is referred to as the Isaiah in the City of Chicago, where the churches have each contributed in my particular area, they have contributed thousand dollars a piece towards a trust fund. also approached the Lutheran... Synod Episcopal and as well as the Arch Diocese of the City of Chicago to try to leverage those funds to make housing available. But to answer your question, no I think that our example is a very small one and basically this is grass roots people saying the state is very slow, housing must be addressed. It is a number one issue in this state. I beg to differ with the last speaker regarding housing in terms of it going to the General Revenue Fund. We do Illinois Housing Development Authority. They are not building housing that is affordable in the State of Illinois. We need to create an agency that will do just that. I think that this is a modest step. They were willing to come to the table and meet with DCCA and others and I would certainly encourage that this

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

Williams: "Thank you for that very well thought out and explained answer. To the Bill, I rise in support of House Bill 3890. believe that the question of affordable housing here in Illinois is one that we as a Body must begin to at least and to look at and take a... seriously this opportunity to be able to create some form of leverage individuals who wish to create this sort of housing needs and the problems that we exist ... that exist here in this state. If we don't begin to take this question very seriously, the concept or the problems that exist with the homeless, the concept or the problems that exist with the poor, the problems that exist throughout this state will continue and we'll be faced with even greater problems in the future. I believe that the last speaker was wrong in the fact that there was no real opposition from at least when they came to the committee, the various agencies were involved, that had expressed what we called a mild sense of monitoring but I do not recall having any out and out opposition to the Bill. So I would urge that each of our Members do support this worthy cause and we go on with the business of making life a little better for the citizens of this state."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Breslin."

Breslin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in support of this Bill. The questions you have to ask yourselves are, can we afford to have homelessness in Illinois? Can we afford to have couch people? Can we afford to have bench people? Can we afford to have great people? Can we afford to have box people? Not people who live in boxcars on railroad areas, but people who live in cardboard boxes in our parks throughout this state and throughout this Nation. If you have been following the issue of homelessness, you know that the

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

highest growth in homelessness in this Nation has been in the area of children and senior citizens. You know ago, the homeless was always considered the drug... the drug addict, the alcohol... the alcoholic, the mentally retarded, the mentally ill. They still exist as the homeless in this society. But they are only half of the homeless people in this Nation. The growth, the fastest growing number, I repeat are children and senior citizens. experienced this change? We've Why, why have we experienced it for a number of reasons. Number one, there has been a major change on the national level in the amount of funding for low income housing. In 1981, when President Regan took over, he decided that the issue of providing low income housing ought to rest with the states. consequence, since the beginning of his administration, the number of dollars spent for low income housing has dropped 75 percent. It has dropped from thirty billion dollars in 1980 to 7.3 billion dollars. Add to that the fact that all of that housing that was built under the Nixon and Kennedy Administration is going to have their restrictions run out. But that means that those units that we have been using are soon to be taken off the market as low income housing and will soon have the rent raised and those people The Federal General Accounting thrown out on the streets. Office of this Nation has noted that we will lose at a minimum two hundred and forty thousand low income units 1995 and perhaps as many as one million. In addition to that, we will lose another eight hundred thousand units the year 2000. What we debate here today, Ladies and Gentlemen, is a paltry start. Twenty five million dollars to start us on the road. That we should have started in 1981 because we knew the Federal Government was throwing this responsibility back on the states. The State of New

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

York, by the way, Ladies and Gentlemen, have started. State of New York, not just the state, let me quote just the figures from New York City. New York City last year, spent five hundred million dollars for low income units in that city. Would you believe that was just a drop in the for New York City, because their estimated need is twelve point five billion. Massachusetts spent hundred and forty three million dollars since '83. they still have a long waiting list and three hundred thousand and three thousand rather homeless, left in that state. Illinois hasn't even started. This is a start. realize that the realtors of this state are opposed to this of the tax. suggest to you, hecause I Ladies and Gentlemen, that number one, it is a small tax. Number two, it is a tax that our citizens pay once maybe twice at most, three times in their life because they don't buy a home, usually more than three times in their National statistics show that homelessness is the second most important problem on a national level next to our budget. It also shows that the majority of Illinois citizens and Americans are embarrassed by homelessness in this Nation. We have to begin, I urge that we begin now by voting for this Bill. Thank you."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Brunsvold."

Brunsvold: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, will the Gentleman yield?" Speaker McPike: "He will."

Brunsvold: "Representative Turner, twenty five million was the amount quoted of the state funds needed?"

Turner: "Yes, Representative, actually it's thirteen million dollars would be raised from the tax and that other twelve million dollars was going to be matched from the Illinois Department... Illinois IDA... Illinois Housing Development Authority and DCCA. It would be a combination of funds

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

from CDBG Grants, the Illinois UDAG, the EDAG. So there would be other federal and state funds that would match that would come up to... make it a total of twenty—five million dollars."

Brunsvold: "Are there any GRF monies?"

Turner: "No GRF monies. And the fact that they called this a tax, it is not a tax, it is more or less, I would call it a users fee. It's a fee and it's only going to be assessed to those people who are selling real estate. And most of us who have purchased home ten, twelve years ago, those real estate has increased in value. So it's not like their actually losing anything in terms of the sale of their home. So this user fee is the fee that would generate the twelve million dollars."

Brunsvold: "Thank you, Representative."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of Representative Breslin gave a magnificant speech about the need for this legislation. I would just like to speak to the tax portion of it. Because very often we pass legislation around here and people say, well where are you going to get the money? Where are you going to get the money? This isn't a responsible Bill because there's no funding source. But this particular Bill has a This is probably the most responsible new program that we have passed or considered in the General Assembly for years. This is a very very responsible Bill. The second point I'd like to make about the tax or the fee is that it is a very appropriate one. It is very close to what Representative Turner suggested as a user fee. talking about building up an affordable housing trust fund. A housing trust fund so it is appropriate that the monies come from that sector and are recycled through that sector.

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

This is money that's coming from housing that's being returned to housing. It is appropriate method of funding. This is a responsible Bill with an appropriate method of funding and I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Turner to close."

you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the Turner: "Thank Assembly. This is probably the most important Bill we are going to vote on today. I would say this Session, but I know there are others who would disagree with me on it. To address the long-term need of housing in this state if passed this Bill out of here today, we will be the eighth state which has a Housing Trust Fund. I think it's very important that we do so. This twenty-five million that we're discussing is less than one percent of our state budget. So it's not a lot of money. It addresses a need that's very real. Housing needed in Illinois is a It will not disappear this year or next continuing one. year, it only gets worse. And I ask for your favorable Roll Call... favorable support of what I consider a small step in addressing a very important need in this state. Thank you."

Speaker McPike: "Question is, 'Shall House Bill 3890 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Representative Young to explain his vote."

Young: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would just urge a few more green votes. And in response to the one speaker who spoke against this Bill regarding a dedicated fund, if we can't have a dedicated fund for housing and for the homeless, alright we called just the other day we passed reappropriations of two billion dollars for roads in this state and we can't have, what, thirteen million for the homeless."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Dunn to explain his vote."

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

Dunn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Sometimes you think you come here to be of help and helping is not always easy. We have friends who are opposed to this legislation. But the people who need help as much as anybody, this particular time and this day and this state, this community, your community and my community, are the people who have no home, no place to go when the day is over. This is a small step that we can take to show them that we do care. The Government is not all bad and it is part good and give them hope and send a signal to all of our citizens that we are sensitive to their needs and I would urge enough 'aye' votes up here to put this Bill over the top."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Davis to explain her vote."

Davis: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think sometimes when we think of the comfortable condition that we exist in and we wish that for many many others, and I think this Bill gives us an opportunity to show many of those constituents that we do care, we do have concern and this is a statewide program. It isn't a program that just helps Chicago, it helps the entire state. Thank you, Sir."

Speaker McPike: "Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. Representative Turner."

Turner: "Can we poll the Absentees?"

Speaker McPike: "Yes. Mr. Clerk, poll the Absentees."

Clerk O'Brien: "A Poll of those not voting, Laurino and Panayotovich."

Turner: "Mr. Speaker."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Homer."

Homer: "Mr. Speaker, would you please record me as 'aye'."

Speaker McPike: "Homer votes 'aye'. Representative Capparelli votes 'no'. Representative Capparelli votes 'no'. Representative Terzich votes from 'aye' to 'no'.

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

Representative Farley votes 'aye'. Representative Farley, you were already 'aye'. Oh you want to change it to 'no', I'm sorry. Representative Farley from 'aye' to 'no'. Does anyone else wish to change their vote? Representative Turner, would you like to place this Bill on postponed consideration?"

- Turner: "Mr. Speaker, regretfully we will postpone this issue, but its time has come and the state will have to deal with it at some point, but I will put this Bill on postponed consideration."
- Speaker McPike: "This Bill, having 57 'ayes', 44 'nos', 14 voting 'present' and the Gentleman asks leave to put the Bill on postponed consideration. Gentleman has leave, goes on postponed. House Bill 3349, Representative Flowers. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3349, a Bill for an Act relating to the discharge of certain state policy making officers.

 Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Flowers."
- Flowers: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House,
 House Bill 3349 provides that a policy making officer of a
 state agency shall be discharged from state employment when
 there is a judgement rendered against such officer for
 violating employees rights guaranteed under the 1st and
 14th Amendment to the Constitution. Where an award of
 punitive damages has been made against the officer or where
 there is a finding of willful and wanton conduct by the
 officer. And I urge for the passage of House Bill 3349."

Speaker McPike: "Is there any discussion? Representative Ropp."
Ropp: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
Speaker McPike: "Yes she will."

Ropp: "Representative, are you stating by this that the officer would be discharged just for being charged with a

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

particular offense without having any due process?"

Flowers: "No, Sir. After due process have been... after they've gone through due process and if the officer has... if there has been findings that he has violated the employees rights then he shall be discharged."

Ropp: "If in fact... does the Bill..."

Flowers: "After... in the Bill, on line 13 it says, 'After an opportunity to be heard in his own defense'."

Ropp: "Does it establish in the Bill the procedure by which a hearing shall be conducted in order to determine whether or not there has been a violation?"

Flowers: "Yes, Sir."

Ropp: "Does it describe in the Bill a certain period of time from the charge... what is that time?"

Flowers: "It does... in Section 11, it speaks about the hearing and it also refers to the fact of 30 days if... it speaks about 30 days for the hearing."

Ropp: "Within a 30 day period the hearing must take place, is that what you think?"

Flowers: "Yes."

Ropp: "Okay, thank you."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Klemm."

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

Speaker McPike: "Yes she will."

Klemm: "Representative, what happens if somebody inadvertently does something, is found guilty, feels very badly about it, does that person then immediately lose their job?"

Flowers: "No, it's not that easy. After... if you just make a mistake, but I don't understand how one can make a mistake in such a manner whereas if that hearing officer would be necessary or either disciplinary charges would be necessary. It's one thing to make a mistake and apologize to the employee about it. But, it's another..."

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

- Klemm: "Well, you can make a mistake and apologize but the employee still wants to adjudicate it, you're found guilty. You admit your guilt and say that hey you know, I didn't read that regulation, I apologize for it and you discharge that employee. I mean would we... isn't that a little bit overreacting in some cases like that?"
- Flowers: "It's not necessary that there may be a finding of willful or wanton against the employer. It's not necessary that that will be the case. But unfortunately too many times there are cases that employers take it upon themselves to think that this is their private domain and they can..."
- Klemm: "Well I understand that... and that's not the problem. I just think it needs some safeguards and I mentioned this in Executive Committee when you came to it that I think you need some safeguards, that your not going to end up having somebody lose their job that's a valuable employee that perhaps was unintentional but obviously did violate it. And we would lose good state employees for that. And I'm just cautioning you on that anyhow."
- Flowers: "I think safeguards are set up in the legislation as far as Department of Human Rights is concerned anyway. So they will follow the same guidelines."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Flowers to close."
- Flowers: "Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would truly urge..."
- Speaker McPike: "Excuse me, excuse me, Mr. (sic Ms.) Flowers."
- Flowers: "Mr. Speaker, please forgive me. There's a difference.

 Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would

 urge for the passage of House Bill 3349."
- Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 3349 pass?'

 All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted? Representative McNamara to explain his vote."

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

McNamara: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just to explain my vote on it. There's... it seems strange here because this is a judgemental factor. A judgement has been entered against somebody for doing... for committing an offense and with that judgement has been entered then it has gone through all of the prerequisite procedures and has violated both the laws of this state and the laws of the employment then he should be discharged. I think this is a common sense thing and I would urge more green votes on there."

Speaker McPike: "Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. I'm sorry, Representative Shaw. Did we close the voting? We closed the voting, Representative Shaw. I'm sorry, you just didn't have your light on in time."

Shaw: "Yeah, I had it on."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Flowers asked for a Poll of the Absentees."

Clerk O'Brien: "Poll of those not voting: Berrios. Bugielski.

Capparelli. Krska. Lang. Martinez. Preston. And
Terzich. No further."

McPike: "Representative Brunsvold changes from 'no' to 'aye'. Does anyone else like to change their vote? Representative Krska, Representative Krska, did you wish Representative Krska, 'aye'. Representative Representative Bugielski, 'aye'. Representative Representative Martinez, 'aye'. Lang, 'aye'. On this Bill. there are 60... Representative Preston, 'aye'. Hartke, 'aye'. Representative Hartke, 'aye'. Representative Flowers, you can turn off your switch. On this Bill, there are 64 'ayes', 49 'nos', 2 voting 'present'. House Bill 3349, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3354, Representative Breslin. Read the Bill, Mr.

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3354, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Vehicle Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Breslin."

Breslin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen, in 1986 this Legislature adopted by reference the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Regulations. As a consequence when the United States Department of Transportation promulgated new regulations, we found that several people who are truck drivers in the State of Illinois who were at that time were eliminated from their jobs because they were unable to meet the new medical examination requirements set forth under the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Regulation. Because of the hardship that this has created for individual citizens, this Bill has been introduced to grandfather those people It does not allow new people who do not meet the medical qualifications to take the exam and pass the exam and operate a motor carrier in this state. It only grandfathers in those people who were currently qualified prior to the time that the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Regulations were adopted. It should be noted... I would ask for a favorable Roll Call, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker McPike: "Is there any discussion? Representative Parcells."

Parcells: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Sponsor yield?" Speaker McPike: "Yes she will."

Parcells: "Representative, it's my understanding that if there was any financial loss to us from the Federal Government that you are considering holding the Bill. Have you heard from them that there is no law?"

Breslin: "We have not heard from the Federal Government yet. And the department has indicated that they are agreeable to the Bill moving until they hear from the Federal Government.

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

I've also accepted a... an Amendment from the department that tightens the Bill considerably to their satisfaction."

Parcells: "It's my understanding they still oppose the Bill though, is that not correct?"

Breslin: "They told me that they would wait until they heard from the Federal Government."

Parcells: "Thank you. To the Bill. Actually, Ladies the loss of 45 or 50 million dollars is a very large consideration here. We had an Amendment yesterday that people wouldn't vote for because it would mean a loss of money. But I think more importantly here is the safety on the highway of those driving. Both the safety of the drivers who may sight in only one eye or be diabetic well as the safety of those around them. This gives these people the right to drive an 18 wheeler right down Dan Ryan and if they should have a diabetic coma or if their one eye happens to blink at the wrong they could cause an time enormous accident. I feel very sorry that these people lost their jobs because of the Federal Regulations. the Federal Regulations were put into effect for a very good reason. It is not safe to have these drivers on the road. I certainly hope that they will find other jobs, but for their own safety and for the safety of those other drivers on the road, I would urge your 'no' vote on Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Weaver."

Weaver: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the Assembly, I have the greatest amount of respect for these Sponsors on this Bill. As a matter of fact, one of them sits about two seats down from me. But we have to pay particular attention to the safety of the other drivers on the road in this state, because of the allowances that this Bill would provide one eye drivers who are going to be

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

severely lacking in depth perception. If you don't have vision in both eyes you have virtually limited and very limited depth perception. Depth perception behind the wheel of an 18 wheeler going down the road, 80,000 pounds fully loaded, is like leaving a loaded gun on the table. It's going to not only cost us money, a great potential of costing us money, but it could cost us even greater damage and that is the lives of the other drivers on the road. think we really need to find out what the final results are going to be in terms of DOT and the Federal Regulations before we pass this out. And I commend the Sponsor for wanting to try and take care of people who are out of work or may face the possibility of being out of work. think we may be moving a little bit to fast on this issue. And I think we need to at least vote 'present' Thank you."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Black."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in support of Representative Breslin's Bill obviously. Been some good comments made, but I'd like to focus your attention on one thing. We're addressing a group of people who for perhaps 35 years were adjudicated and judged safe to drive a vehicle. In this case an over then by wave of a magic wand, by the road truck. And someone in the Federal Government, viola, they are no safe to drive and they are out of work. Now I have heard from people in my district and I dare say you will hear from people in your district. If you cannot support this Bill when the Sponsor has already indicated she will not move it if were going to lose 30 or 40 million dollars from the Fed's, but if you cannot support this Bill you go back home and look into your constituents eyes or eye as the case may be and tell that individual that while

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

you could drive a month ago or a year ago because of some action by the Federal Government you have had an exemplary driving record for 35 years. But now you can't drive that truck anymore and you're out of work. We talk about money, now if you want to put more people on the unemployment roles and on the welfare roles then vote against it or vote 'present'. If you want to keep people working vote 'aye'."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Hasara."

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

Speaker McPike: "Yes she will."

Hasara: "I'd like to ask you, is July 29, '86 the date of the Federal Law?"

Breslin: "Yes it is."

Hasara: "Okay, thank you. I also stand in support of this Bill, however the constituent that contacted me became disabled after that date. So unfortunately he will not qualify under this, but has been driving and working and is going to lose his job because of the Federal Law... thank you."

Speaker McPike: "Excuse me, excuse me, would the Doorkeeper please get Judge Greiman off the podium? Proceed, Representative Hasara."

Hasara: "That's fine, my question was answered. Thank you."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Hicks."

Hicks: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm glad to hear Representative Black get up as a Sponsor on this Bill even though his seatmate's a little bit off base here I think. I'd like to just give you a little bit of an example of what this Bill actually did. I have a constituent who contacted me about this Bill and the Korean War he lost an eye, and came back to Illinois, came back to my area of the state and went to work driving a truck and now he's driven a truck for 35 years. He's now 57 years old. Under this legislation if we don't pass this legislation, he's going to lose his job.

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

Now he didn't call me, but his employer called me on the phone and said this is a man who has been working for me for 35 years and I can't afford to lose him. I need him. I think we ought to pass this legislation. It's good legislation. I commend the Gentleman for speaking in behalf of it."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Breslin to close."

Breslin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. I think it should be noted that the cos... the possible cost that I have ever heard the Department of Transportation note of loss of Federal Funds under this Bill is 2.3 million, Representative Parcells. Not 45 or 50 million. I haven't heard anybody exaggerate to the amount to that extent. addition to which there is no indication that it is true that we will lose that money. As to the safety factors I think it should be noted as Representative Hicks has pointed out the Bill is narrowly drawn at the request of the Department of Transportation that a person with record of accidents could... would not be allowed to requalify for this license. So that... I think that that takes care of that issue. I've the same kind of constituent that Representative Hicks has. This man has a perfect driving record. He is in his fifties, he is within five years of claiming his pension. He lives in an area that has 14 1/2 percent unemployment. I want to tell you that that man is not going to get re-employed anywhere in our area at his age. He has one eye, he has a perfect driving record and I it is completely inappropriate of the Government or this State Government or any Government take away his job and take away his pension. That is the purpose of this legislation. I believe it is within the power of the Secretary of State to issue waivers. Secretary of State has not taken the lead to do that. He

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

could do so on a case by case basis. As a consequence there is considerable discrimination against the handicapped under the current law. And I think we should pass this Bill. Thank you."

- Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 3354 pass?'

 All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this Bill there are 84 'ayes', 23 'nos', 1 voting 'present'. House Bill 3354, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3420, Representative Black. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3420, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Lottery Law. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Black."
- Black: "Mr. Speaker, with your permission and leave I need to take this Bill back to Second Reading."
- Speaker McPike: "The Gentleman asks leave to return the Bill to Second Reading for purposes of an Amendment. Does the Gentleman have leave? He does. Return the Bill to Second Reading."
- Black: "Thank you very much."
- Speaker McPike: "Mr. Clerk, are there any Amendments?

 Representative Black."
- Black: "Mr. Speaker, I believe Floor Amendment #2 which was offered by Representative Davis in subsequent conversations with her, she has agreed to remove that Amendment and allow us to try and move the Bill."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Davis."
- Davis: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, we withdraw our Amendment."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Davis moves to table Amendment #2. Question is, 'Shall Amendment #2 be tabled?' All in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes'

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

have it and the Amendment's tabled. Third Reading. Third Reading. Representative Black, would you like to call the Bill?"

Black: "Yes I would, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker McPike: "Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3420, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of the Illinois Lottery Law. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Black."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 3420 would authorize the Lottery Control Board to designate hearing officers. That's simply reinstating language that was in the original Act when it was under the Department of Revenue. There will be no new hires, they already have those people, they are doing that. We just want to clear that language up. It also would allow the trustee or beneficiary of a revokable living trust to get the proceeds of a lottery winner's winnings. And we think that that certainly would be beneficial. I know of no opposition of the Bill as it currently exists. I would ask your support of House Bill 3420."

Speaker McPike: "Is there any discussion? Question is, 'Shall House Bill 3420 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this Bill there are 110 'ayes', no 'nays', 1 voting 'present'. House Bill 3420, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3447, Representative Olson. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3447, a Bill for an Act to amend the

State Printing Contracts Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Olson."

Olson, R.: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

Bill would amend the State Printing Contracts Act by raising the threshold for solicitation of bids for special printing from \$1,500 to \$2,500 dollars. This legislation is suggested by Central Management Services and is proposed to allow for inflation in wages, materials and production costs that have incurred since the law was originally passed, which was in April of 1967, 21 years ago. I'd answer any questions."

Speaker McPike: "Is there any discussion? Being none, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this Bill there are 111 'ayes', 2 'nos', none voting 'present'. House Bill 3447, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Consent Calendar, these Bills were voted on earlier and the Members of the House were afforded an opportunity to turn in individual sheets changing votes. These Bills, having received the Constitutional Majority, are hereby declared passed. If any Member would like to see the Roll Call on a particular Bill, they're available at the Clerk's desk, and I believe Representative McCracken and Representative Cullerton have copies of the Roll Calls. I take that back, not Cullerton, he didn't get one, McCracken got one. House Bill 3468, Representative Didrickson. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3468, a Bill for an Act to amend the Minority and Female Business Enterprise Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Didrickson."

Didrickson: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, House Bill 3468 seeks to clarify the original intent of the Minority,

Female Business Enterprise Act. And stipulates that 50 percent of such contracts shall go to minorities and 50

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

percent to females."

- Speaker McPike: "Is there any discussion? Being none, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 3468 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted? Have all voted? Who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this Bill there are 106 'ayes', 1 'no' and 3 voting 'present'. House Bill 3468, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3548, Representative Wojcik. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3548, a Bill for an Act to amend the

 Environmental Protection Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

 Speaker McPike: "Representative Wojcik."
- Wojcik: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, House Bill 3548 amends the Environmental Protection Act to direct the Pollution Control Board to adopt rules substantially identical to certain Federal Regulations published under the Federal Safe Drinking Water Act. It also allows the board to consolidate its promulgation of such rules into a single rule making. This would be effective immediately."
- Speaker McPike: "Is there any discussion? Any discussion? Being none, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 3548 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted? voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On Have all this Bill there are 106 'ayes', no 'nays', 5 voting 'present'. House Bill 3548, having received Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Bill 3549, Representative Tate. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3549, a Bill for an Act to amend Sections of an Act in relation to natural resources, research, data collection and environmental studies. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Tate."

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Tate: House Bill 3549 requires the Department of Energy and Natural Resources to study the feasibility of Illinois corn products to develop biodegradable plastic. It essentially would have the department report to the General Assembly by January 1, 1990. And I think most of the Members if they've been following the issue biodegradable plastics there have been several breakthroughs in technology in recent months. We have some Illinois companies that have taken a very active interest in this and certainly one that. that as good environmentalist all of us would be very pleased to see progress on this front. It's one that could have very significant implications to our corn users and get some of out of the grain bins throughout the State of So I encourage the adoption of this... I encourage a favorable Roll on this and I ask for your 'aye' vote."

Speaker McPike: "Is there any discussion? Question is, 'Shall House Bill 35... Representative Klemm."

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

Speaker McPike: "Yes."

Klemm: "You know there's a company already doing this. So it must be feasible to make it. Is that right?"

Tate: "The... there are companies in Illinois, there is one company in Illinois that has currently done some research on it..."

Klemm: "Do we need more research if it's already in the marketplace?"

Tate: "Yes."

Klemm: "Does the money come from General Revenue Funds?"

Tate: "Yes, we do need... the University of Illinois has been actively engaged in it. There's a couple of factors

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

involved in it, number one is the amount of corn used in a products, the shelf time, the survival life span time of the product and the variable uses of the product, quite frankly."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Saltsman."

Saltsman: "Yes, would the Sponsor yield please?"

Speaker McPike: "Yes he will."

Saltsman: "Yes, Representative Tate, is this primarily a Bill to help Archer Daniels Midland, A.D.M.?"

"Not necessarily, as a matter of fact, I had introduced Tate: this Bill prior to A.D.M.'s purchase of a company which was I think they recently purchased the company that is currently doing some experimentation on this issue and that was the purchase of that company was about two weeks ago. introduced this Bill way back in the fall. My primarily concern... my primary concern quite frankly is I think Illinois Government should be taking a leadership role in finding ways to use Illinois corn. And certainly from all of us in downstate Illinois our grain bins are full of corn right now. Anything that we can do to provide for alternative uses and raise the price of corn would benefit all of our constituents and certainly help our local economies."

Saltsman: "Yes, well I want to go on record, I'm going to vote for this Bill. But if it was entirely for A.D.M., I'd be opposing it because they've got the worst safety record in the State of Illinois. About every 3 months they have somebody killed in one of their factories. This company here... if we're going to help them we've got to have them help themselves. And I hope that this goes for somebody else besides A.D.M., due to the fact that they don't care too much about their employers or the safety of the citizens of Illinois."

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

Speaker McPike: "Representative Tate to close."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Tate: Again House Bill 3549 should give the Members of this chamber an opportunity to say, thank you to the Illinois corn growers. This Bill... if the proper research and study is done on this issue and if we determine that biodegradable plastics are feasible in this state, it will be, I think a major breakthrough for the corn growers of So, I encourage everyone to take a very this state. serious look at this, certainly biodegradable plastics are... has very significant implications to the issue of solid waste uses. And what we're going to do with our landfills in the state anyway we can reduce waste is going to be a positive factor on our economy. I encourage an 'aye' vote."

Speaker McPike: "Question is, 'Shall House Bill 3549 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this Bill there are 113 'ayes', no 'navs', l voting House Bill 3549, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3550, Representative Petka. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3550, a Bill for an Act in relation to land conveyances by the Department of Conservation. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Petka."

Petka: "Mr. Speaker, with leave of the House I'd like to have this Bill taken off of Third and returned to Second, because Representative Homer the last time this Bill was up, had made a request that there be an appraisal since it involves a conveyance of property. And the best of my knowledge that appraisal has not been done."

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

Speaker McPike: "The Gentleman asks leave to return the Bill to Second Reading. Does he have leave? Leave. Bill's on Second Reading. You want to leave it there, right?"

Petka: "Yes."

Speaker McPike: "Thank you, Sir. House Bill 3582, Representative Didrickson. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3582, a Bill for an Act to amend the Minority and Female Business Enterprise Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Didrickson."

Didrickson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. House
Bill 3582 seeks to amend the Minority Female Business
Enterprise Act by extending the term of the Act through
September 6, 1994. It is felt that additional time is
needed to evaluate whether or not the Act is achieving its
objectives."

Speaker McPike: "Any discussion? Representative Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker McPike: "Yes she will."

Cullerton: "Did you just say and represent to us that this Bill would repeal... would extend a repeal to September 6, 1994?"

Didrickson: "Correct."

Cullerton: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the Bill clearly says September 7, 1984... 1994. September 7 not September 6, it's a... I hope it's not an intentional misrepresentation."

Didrickson: "I hope... Representative Cullerton..."

Cullerton: "But, I think that it's obvious that the Sponsor should be reading her own Bill better than the staff."

Didrickson: "Representative Cullerton, I hope it wasn't a minority or female who put together this analysis from C.M.S. I was reading, unfortunately, the analysis versus

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

the Bill. You are absolutely correct. I'll bet it was a male who put that together though."

Cullerton: "Ah, ah. Well I want to know which one is it?

September 7th?"

Didrickson: "You're correct, September 7th."

Cullerton: "Okay, it's an extra day."

Didrickson: "There ya go."

Speaker McPike: "Question is, 'Shall House Bill 3582 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Representative Granberg, 'aye'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. Take the record. On this Bill there are 111 'ayes', 2 'nos', 3 voting 'present'. House Bill 3582, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3612, Representative Matijevich. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3612, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Public Aid Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 3612 would amend the Public Aid Code to extend medicaid coverage to children between the ages of 1 and 5 with family incomes below the Federal poverty level in accordance with the federal options allowed under the sixth Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act. The Bill is offered because we are facing a critical crisis in terms of access to health for children in needy working families. We have programs that provide medical help for the poorest of But we do little for the family with a meager paycheck. The family which is struggling to stay off of the welfare roles in Illinois. In our state 45,000 poor children have no medical or private insurance coverage. The working poor often must go without basic preventive or maintenance health care. Ordinary medical checkups, dental

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

appointments, immunizations and other preventive health care measures are impossible for these families. This Bill is a Bill that saves lives. It actually saves dollars in spite of what you will hear, because everyone who is expert in the field attest to the fact that dollars spent in early childhood to protect health will save many more dollars later. And actually will keep families off of welfare roles. I commend this Bill to you and ask for your favorable support."

- Speaker McPike: "Is there any discussion? Representative Stephens."
- Stephens: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I wonder if the Gentleman would yield for a couple of questions quickly please? The... have you got estimates on how much this is going to cost? I know you said it's going to save money, but do you have any official estimates as to the cost of the program?"
- Matijevich: "The cost... the program... it is a fiscal note that has been attached, the economic and fiscal commissions February 1988 report estimated total cost of coverage for the proposals included in 3612 which go into effect 1-1-89 is 4.2 million annually."
- Stephens: "You recommend that this is going to save money and it's easy to say, well, we'll spend 4.2 and then give a philosophical argument as to how it's going to save money, do you have any official estimates as to the amount to be saved as you say?"
- Matijevich: "Well first of all, 50 percent of this is reimbursable from the Federal Government."
- Stephens: "Well that's not a savings that's just a further spending of tax money."
- Matijevich: "So... so it's not the total amount that's in the fiscal report, but I think we've got to believe in the

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

experts that we have in the field. Not only that, I don't think it's a matter of..."

Stephens: "Do we have an estimate, John, as to how much it's going to save, yes or no?"

Matijevich: "Well, I recall that somebody in committee, I'm not sure if they said it in committee or if it was somebody just sitting next to me that said for every dollar that is spent, you're saving five dollars. Now that's..."

Stephens: "If that were true in America today we would be saving billions of dollars in the Department of Public Aid."

Matijevich "Well..."

Stephens: "The fact of the matter is that we continue to spend more money in Public Aid every year..."

Matijevich: "Well... wait a minute... you asked me a... you asked me a question, I haven't answered it."

Stephens: "You said five dollars and I will..."

Matijevich: "Because you said it was a matter of philosophy. It is more than that. Because it is a matter of..."

Stephens: "Okay, what is the amount?"

Matijevich: "It... wait I didn't finish the question."

Stephens: "My question was, what is the amount it will save?"

Matijevich: "I know what your question is and I... we've got a right to answer it. My answer is that it is more."

Stephens: "The question is, what is the amount?"

Matijevich: "Can you... can I answer it?"

Stephens: "If you'll tell me the amount, yes?"

Matijevich: "The amount of what?"

Stephens: "The amount of dollars that we'll save, and your not telling me how many dollars it will save."

Matijevich: "I just said that a so called expert said that every time you spend a dollar you are saving five. So you know, get your computer out. But I didn't finish answering the question, because my answer is it's a matter of... it's a

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

matter more than philosophy. I think it's a matter of common sense, because common sense..."

- Stephens: "Well thank you, John, I appreciate your advise on common sense..."
- Matijevich: "Well you like to ask questions but you don't like answers."
- Stephens: "I asked a dollar amount and you're not able to give it to me, Sir, and I appreciate your meager attempt."
- Matijevich: "I noticed that, but you in your question..."
- Speaker McPike: "Excuse me, Rep... Representative Stephens...

 Representative Stephens. Representative Matijevich, would

 you answer the question please? Turn on Representative

 Matijevich."
- Matijevich: "Yes, you know, I'd like to respond to... you know, when somebody ask... I ask a question, I like an answer. And that's the... that's the beauty of this procedure, because that way you get both sides. You don't get a a side because part of his question he said it's a matter of philosophy. I think it's a matter of common because if we have common sense we know that by sense. giving immunizations, by giving dental care, by giving health care at a young age, we are saving dollars later and maybe saving lives. I don't know what your life is worth, but I think a life is worth a lot of money. What is your life worth, that's a rhetorical question? But you ought to think about that once in a while. What is your life worth? You know, here we are in the most developed country in the whole world and we can't protect lives. That's my answer to his question."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Stephens."
- Stephens: "I just wondered if he... I forgot what question I asked."
- Speaker McPike: "Did you want him to answer it again?"

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

Stephens: "The Economic and Fiscal Commission did a study on the implementation of expanded coverage for pregnant women. I would want to ask you what the study recommended, I'm... I'm afraid that I'd get another long answer as to your philosophy about if we spend a dollar we're going to get five dollars back. Now I would suggest that the more money we spend in areas that you seem to want concentrate are not getting returns on the dollar. The Department of Public Aid's budget continues to climb and one of the reasons is we just try to keep looking for people that we can say, listen if you'll continue to vote us, if you'll continue to be my poor constituency, if you'll continue to be shackled by Public Aid programs, then I'll keep handing you out pieces of crumbs and keep your children poor and keep you where you are. We don't believe We believe that you ought to have programs that really mean reform and that really cause return on the That make people wind up earning a living when dollar. they grow up and not keeping them in the shackles of Public Aid. I suggest that you take another look at this, Representative. I suggest that you're not saving money. I suggest that you're spending money on another Public Aid program that the State of Illinois cannot afford. We can't buy books and pencils and chalk for our children who have a chance to become educated and get out of poverty. But you take that money away from them and waste it on want to another dead end program. It's not right."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Woicik."

Wojcik: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Sponsor yield for a few questions?"

Speaker McPike: "Yes."

Wojcik: "Representative, are you aware of the program that we started last year is not even working yet?"

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

Matijevich: "Yes."

Wojcik: "Are you also aware that we are going to give a hundred percent of the federal poverty level in an effort to reduce the infantality moral rate in July?"

Matijevich: "That's correct, that's for up to one year old."

Wojcik: "Alright, do you also know that the Economic and Fiscal Commission did do a study and they estimate that it's going to cost approximately 4.2 million annually to handle this program?"

Matijevich: "Yes, we just got through that and those are reimbursable dollars."

Wojcik: "And, Representative, you stated that it was five dollars per child, it's three dollars per child."

Matijevich: "I was talking about savings."

Wojcik: "Yes."

Matijevich: "Well then, hey, did Representative Stephens just hear you? I hope he heard you. Okay I'll admit error you save for every dollar you spend, you save three. You hear that, Representative Stephens? It came on your side of the aisle. Now if that's not saving money..."

Wojcik: "I... Repre... Representative, that's on paper. That's not verified. Also, Representative, I'd like to know if you have substantial evidence to demonstrate the cost savings? Do you have statistics? What type of numbers do you have?"

Matijevich: "When the Congress authorized the program that is presently in effect, it had studies and I think the presumption is, because of Congress's action that we do have savings. You know, that ought to be a presumption because of the fact that we are going to save health dollars later in health care. That... I think that's a given."

Wojcik: "And you still think that it's a savings, knowing that

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

beginning July 1 of this year the Department of Public Aid will be providing medical coverage for women and children up to age 1 who are at 100 percent of the federal poverty level. You think that's savings?"

Matijevich: "Yeah, we're sure there's going to be a savings there and we are extending that program. That's what this is all about."

Wojcik: "Spending to the tune of 4.2 million annually. To the Bill, Mr. Speaker. I think that the concept is well intended, however we already have a program that we are not even using right now. We're going to be going at a 100 percent as of July 1. It's a costly project, we're not even paying our bills today. And now we're talking about a 4.2 million project. We can't afford to pay for the homeless, everything that we've talked about today is costing millions of dollars. I think we should wait and see what's going to happen and see what the Federal Government is going to do and I would say that this is a bad Bill and I ask that it be defeated. Thank you."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Mautino."

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

Speaker McPike: "Yes he will."

Mautino: "Representative, how does this program dove tail with the A.M.I. or MANG program?"

Matijevich: "This is an extension of those programs. This program is for the working poor, Representative."

Mautino: "Well my question is this, what you're trying to do is laudable, but if we do not address the spend down provisions under the aid to Medically Indigent or the MANG program which is now almost at the 50 percent level, we won't accomplish much. For example if your household income is \$800 the A.M.I. and MANG programs say you have to spend \$400 of it as a spend down before you get any

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

- assistance. How does this Bill address that spend down so people can use it for the health care for the individuals in their family?"
- Matijevich: "Well the reason for this is because many who are the working poor can't meet this spend down requirement. So this is an extension of that so that they can get some assistance that is needed, without the spend down... without the spend down."
- Mautino: "But if you... but I'm saying is those same people if they don't meet the spend down requirements, they can't get the health care no matter what we do with this Bill."
- Matijevich: "Yes they can, because this is... oh, I'm sorry...

 this essentially overcomes the spend down provision so they
 do... they can get into the program."
- Mautino: "Then somebody give me the example of what this... let me give you that example of a \$800 income for the family and the spend down currently is \$400 bucks. Now, tell me what that changes with implementation of this Bill. I want to know how the \$400 gets reduced."
- Matijevich: "I think you're getting the answer from... you're not getting the answer from her. My staff tells me that the person will not have to meet the \$400 spend down to meet this program. I think you're getting it now."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Curran."
- Curran: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. A lot has been made of a question regarding where these figures have come from and I'd like to shed a little light on that for you, because I think it's important. Many of the figures that you have heard bandied about whether it's 5 to 1 or 3 dollars to 1 return on investment. Those figures have come from a group called the Committee on Economic Development. The Committee on Economic Development is not a bunch of goody two shoes liberals.

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

The Committee on Economic Development has a group of people at its helm and let me just read you some of the names. because these are the people who have come up with the figures that we will save \$3.38 for example on pre-natal care. S2 dollars in the first year for immunization programs and \$10 over the life of a child who is immunized Let me read you the names of some of the people, Edmund Fitzgerald, Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Northern Telecom Limited. This is one of the flaming liberals that came up with this concept. Owen Butler, retired Chairman Procter & Gamble, another flaming liberal. William Edgerly, Chairman, State Street Bank & Company, another flaming liberal. The point is, Ladies and Gentlemen, that this list goes on for about 200 Chief Executive Officers around this country who have determined that the things that are pertaining in this Bill will not only be good for human interest, but also good for economic development. Because it's good for the fiscal health of this state. And I think we ought to understand when bantering about whether it's 3 to 1 or 5 to 1 or 2 to 1. That the kind of figures that are presented are significant figures that have been studied carefully by Chief Executive Officers around this country who have composed a group called the Committee for Economic Development and they have come up with these numbers. And I think you ought to adhere to them, because they're very solid figures."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Tate."

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

Very simply put, regardless of the great debate over how

much money this... this Bill would cost. The fact of the

matter is this Bill would cost additional money. I

certainly agree that the extended coverage is probably a

good program and one that under normal fiscal times it

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

would be a good program to have. But, this chamber has already sat here and debated the issue of the payment cycle in Public Aid, there's a good possibility the Governor may veto that Bill and we may be back in here this week or next week or the week after that trying to explain to our nursing homes and our hospitals and our doctors and our dentists and our other providers throughout the State of Illinois, how we're going to correct the payment cycle in this state? Yet what we're going to do right here is add a new program, a new coverage to Public Aid. When we can't already pay the bills that we already have. Now, hey, I'll be the first one to stand up and say on the merits of this issue, it's probably a good program and it's a program that should probably have. But each and every one of us in this room have been trying to respond to letters here recently, calls here recently about what are we going to do about a 60 and a 70 day payment cycle? Now it's going to boil down to this folks, we're either going to have to put our money where our mouth is when it comes to putting spending money for kids in this state. We're going to have to put our money where our mouth is when it comes to paying back our bills to the hospitals of this state, to the nursing homes in this state. Now if you got to put your money where your mouth is for a new program in this state, want you to go back home and tell all those school kids and all those hospitals and all those nursing homes is 4 or 5 million bucks, is... this that was a good program, but we just... we had to do this first in front of those other programs in this state. So I want... I want each and every one of us to think very cautiously when we make this vote and, Speaker, if this vote is reasonable... reasonably close I'm going to ask for a verification on this Roll Call because I think this is probably one of the

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

most important issues that we're going to debate on where the priorities of this General Assembly is. Thank you."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. House 3612 is common sense and it's sound bipartisan Bill philosophy. One of the opponents suggests that we wait to find out what the Fed's will do. The fact of course is the Fed's have already acted in a bipartisan fashion. Federal Government created this program because the Federal Government understands that programs like this will save all of us money in the long run. One of the principal Sponsors of this program at the Federal level was one of our own Illinois Congressman, Republican Representative Henry Hyde. President Reagan signed this legislation. would urge the Members of this chamber to consider the Bill on its merits, to consider it free of partisan political Because partisan differences have no... no in a discussion that is concerned with bringing up healthy Illinois babies. This is good legislation, it is not expensive legislation, it is a sound program to protect our children. And I hope you will vote 'yes' with me."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Regan."

Regan: "Move the previous question please."

Speaker McPike: "That's not necessary, you're the last person with their light on. Representative Matijevich to close."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, let me quote what our own Department of Public Health says about the issues that we have just discussed. The Department of Public Health says, excess morbidity and mortality are problems for low income infants and young children. Children are frequently uninsured and do not receive preventive health care which can prevent many disabling conditions later in life. These children do not

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

get medical care until health problems become advanced and treatment is more expensive and less effective. That's our own Department of Public Health, that's their quotation, not mine. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, somebody talked about what are we going to tell the school kids? Ladies and Gentlemen, I'm talking about kids that are going to be little school kids. I'm talking about kids one-fifth of our young children live in poverty. One-fifth οf our children live the American dream. One-fifth of our children in poverty dream like you did, that vou are going to live a healthy, productive, satisfying life. One-fifth of our young children in poverty want to get the best of economic conditions later in life. That dream is an empty dream, it's an unfulfilled dream if they can't live a healthy life. Now this is not a new innovative program. It is in place, we think that a program that is going to save lives. You know, yesterday I was at my desk, Representative Giorgi has clippings from every conceivable newspaper and I read an article in the 'Wallstreet Journal' that compared our health system to the State of Canada, our neighbors to the North. They don't have this problem, imagine that. don't have this problem because they take care of the health care of their citizens. I think it's the least that we in America, we in Illinois can do. I think that we owe to our children and I have to tell my school kids, all kids, that Public Health is a high priority to me. I think something's wrong with Illinois when we're going to place prisons above kids, healthy kids. And I'm going to vote for the kids and their health and I urge you to do so too." Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 3612 pass?' in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all

voted? Have all voted who wish?

Clerk will take the

106th Legislative Day

- May 18, 1988
- record. Representative Mulcahey votes 'aye'. On this Bill there are 62 'ayes', 43 'nos', 10 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the... Representative Tate."
- Tate: "Yeah, Speaker, I asked during the debate in the event that this be close, I'd like to verify it and I think that this is relatively close enough. I would like to request a verification."
- Speaker McPike: "Well it's got two more votes than what it needs.

 It's not that close."
- Tate: "I should have defined it more, you're right."
- Speaker McPike: "It's not that close. Well if you persist.

 Representative Turner would like to be verified and

 Representative Dunn would like to be verified. Okay. And

 Representative O'Connell and Representative Levin. And

 Representative Lang up front would like to be verified.

 And Representative Braun, they're in a meeting in the

 Speaker's Office. Representative Braun would like to be

 verified. Representative Tony Young, Representative

 LeFlore, Representative Rice, Representative Martinez...

 yes."
- Tate: "Speaker, Speaker, I don't mind giving the entire chamber a leave to be verified, however before we start the verification would you be kind enough at least to... you just rattled off fifteen names, be kind enough to announce the names that you just... that I just granted leave to."
- Speaker McPike: "Yes, we've written down the names.

 Representative Davis."
- Tate: "I will cooperate in good spirit."
- Speaker McPike: "Wait a minute, one at a time. Mr. Tate, if
 you'll listen to the rest of these. Representative Jones,
 Representative Flowers, Representative Berrios and
 Representative Daley, Representative Huff and
 Representative Kulas. All these people have been walked

106th Legislative Day

- May 18, 1988
- out and they're here in the Speaker's Office. Davis, Representative Davis, Representative Keane. Representative Cowlishaw."
- Cowlishaw: "Mr. Speaker, would you please record my vote as 'yes'."
- Speaker McPike: "Yes, Representative Cowlishaw would like to vote 'yes'. Thank you, Representative Cowlishaw.

 Representative Flinn, Representative Flinn would like to vote 'aye'. Representative O'Connell would like to be verified. We're up to 64, Representative Tate."
- Tate: "We're getting there. Are all these new Members of the Black Caucus?"
- Speaker McPike: "There's a meeting on the school district reorganization."
- Tate: "Okay."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Rice, you were verified.

 Representative Tate, do you persist on your verification?

 Mr. Clerk, Poll the Absentees."
- Clerk Leone: "Representative Bugielski. Is the only Member who is not voting."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Bugielski. Is Representative Bugielski in the chamber? Proceed with the verification, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "The Poll of those voting in the affirmative: Bowman. Berrios. Braun. Breslin. Countryman. Cowlishaw. Cullerton. Curran. Currie. Daley. Davis. DeJaegher. DeLeo. Didrickson. Dunn. Farley. Flowers. Gialio. Giorgi. Granberg. Hannig, Hartke, Homer. Huff. Jones. Krska. Keane. Kulas. Lang. LeFlore. Levin. Laurino. Leverenz. Martinez. Matijevich. Mautino. McGann. McNamara. McPike. Morrow. Mulcahey. O'Connell. William Peterson. Phelps. Preston. Rea. Rice. Richmond. Ronan. Saltsman. Satterthwaite.

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

Shaw. Steczo. Stern. Sutker. Turner. Van Duyne. White. Williams. Wolf. Anthony Young. Wyvetter Younge.

And Mr. Speaker."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Peterson."

Peterson: "Mr. Speaker, how am I recorded?"

Speaker McPike: "Recorded as 'aye'."

Peterson: "Change my vote to 'no'."

Speaker McPike: "Change Representative Peterson from 'aye' to 'no'. Questions of the affirmative, Mr. Tate?"

Tate: "Representative Flinn?"

Speaker McPike: "Pardon me."

Tate: "Oh, I see Monroe. Okay, Representative White?"

Speaker McPike: "Representative White is in his chair."

Tate: "Oh, I see White okay. Oh okay, well give me Representative McGann?"

Speaker McPike: "Representative McGann. Representative McGann.

Representative McGann. Is the Gentleman in the chamber?

He's in the Speaker's Office, he's on his way out now.

I'll take him off or put him back on. It doesn't make any difference. Representative McGann."

Tate: "I'll ask some more questions while you're... why don't you take him off and just put him back on?"

Speaker McPike: "Alright, remove Representative McGann from the Roll Call."

Tate: "Representative DeLeo?"

Speaker McPike: "Representative... Representative McGann has returned. Return him to the Roll Call. Representative DeLeo."

Tate: "Representative DeLeo?"

Speaker McPike: "Representative DeLeo. Is Representative DeLeo in the chamber? Remove him from the Roll Call."

Tate: "Representative Laurino?"

Speaker McPike: "Representative Laurino... Representative...

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

excuse me, Representative Deuchler, for what reason do you rise? Yes, change Representative Deuchler from 'no' to 'aye'. Thank you, Representative Deuchler. Representative, what was the last one you called?"

Tate: "Laurino?"

Speaker McPike: "Laurino. Is Representative Laurino in the chamber? Representative Laurino. Representative Laurino, remove him from the Roll Call."

Tate: "Representative Steczo?"

Speaker McPike: "Representative Steczo's in his chair."

Tate: "Representative Cowlishaw?"

Speaker McPike: "Representative Cowlishaw. Representative Cowlishaw voted in person and then she took a walk.

Representative Cowlishaw. Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Point of order, if she voted orally while the verification is in order that vote counts. She's verified.

That vote counts. That has always been the practice."

Speaker McPike: "Parliamentarian tells me that you are correct,

Mr. Matijevich. Proceed, Mr. Tate."

Tate: "What was the ruling... did we take... we took Laurino off, right?"

Speaker McPike: "Representative Laurino was removed.

Representative Cowlishaw..."

Tate: "Yeah, alright. Representative Rea?"

Speaker McPike: "Representative Rea. Representative Rea. There he is in the center of the aisle."

Tate: "Representative Richmond?"

Speaker McPike: "Representative Richmond's in his seat."

Tate: "Representative Ronan?"

Speaker McPike: "Pardon? Who?"

Tate: "Ronan, Ronan?"

Speaker McPike: "Representative Ronan. Representative Ronan. Remove Representative Ronan from the Roll Call."

106th Legislative Day May 18, 1988

Tate: "Representative Farley?"

Speaker McPike: "Representative Farley is right here."

Tate: "Representative Krska?"

Speaker McPike: "Representative Krska. Right here."

Tate: "Okay, Representative Hicks?"

Speaker McPike: "Representative Hicks voted 'no'. Is

Representative Hicks here? Yeah, he's here."

Tate: "I'm sorry. Representative Didrickson?"

Speaker McPike: "Representative Didrickson. Representative Ronan has returned, return Representative Ronan to the Roll Call. Representative Didrickson, is the Lady here? Remove her from the Roll Call. Any further? Representative Tate, do you have any further?"

Tate: "Yes, Representative Countryman, Countryman?"

Speaker McPike: "Representative Countryman is not voting. Take that back, Representative Countryman is voting 'aye'. Mr. Countryman here? Remove Representative Countryman. Representative Deuchler, you rose earlier and voted 'aye', did you wish to..."

Deuchler: "'Present' please."

Speaker McPike: "Pardon me."

Deuchler: "'Present' please."

Speaker McPike: "From 'aye' to 'present'?"

Deuchler: "Please."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Deuchler votes 'present'.

Representative Capparelli votes 'aye', from 'present' to 'aye'. Mr. Tate, anything further?"

Tate: "Well... if the..."

Speaker McPike: "Don't be dilatory."

Tate: "And I will not, Speaker, I have tried to accommodate your side of the aisle in terms of granting leave to at least a dozen Members and I would just like to make sure that I have a confirmation. I have Representative Flinn, White...

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

Shaw, Richmond, Giglio, Farley, Leverenz, Ronan, Huff, Morrow, Anthony Young, Braun and Saltsman are... all those people been granted leave. Is that correct?"

Speaker McPike: "Yes. Yes."

Tate: "Okay."

Speaker McPike: "Except for Saltsman, he didn't."

Tate: "Okay, in that event is Representative Mautino, I mean..."

Speaker McPike: "He's in his seat."

Tate: "He is? Okay, okay."

Speaker McPike: "Anything further?"

Tate: "Representative Giglio?"

Speaker McPike: "Representative Giglio's on your list."

Tate: "Oh."

Speaker McPike: "Nothing further. Mr. Tate, anything further?"

Tate: "Well... uh..."

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Tate, you're being dilatory."

Tate: "I... I'm trying to accommodate a variety of interests in this process. Representative... Representative O'Connell?"

Speaker McPike: "He's here and he was given leave. Now, Mr. Tate, you are being dilatory. Now do you have anything further? Nothing further. On this Bill there are 60 'ayes', 43 'nos', 9 voting 'present'. House Bill 3612, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "My aid, Representative Cullerton said I should move having voted on the prevailing side to reconsider vote by which it has passed."

Speaker McPike: "Gentleman moves to reconsider the vote by which this Bill passed. Representative Cullerton moves that that lays on the table. All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Motion carries. On Special Order of Banking, there's House Bill 1305, Representative Cowlishaw. Out of the record. House Bill 2525,

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

Representative Capparelli. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "On page 16 on the Calendar, House Bill 2525, a Bill for an Act in relationship to Banks and Sale of Insurance.

Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Capparelli."

Capparelli: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill was called earlier, House Bill 2525 is the Bill that allows banks sell insurance. I won't belabor the issue to any extent as to other than saying that is a consumer issue. A recent Consumer Federation of America study concluded the allowing banks to sell insurance would benefit consumers bv providing consumers with an additional cost affectiveness. Before they were... earlier this morning they were saying that this Bill would hurt the insurance sales, salesmen out the small man. But in recent study by there. Legislative Research Commission they found that there was no respondent, thought competition from banks was a strong factor in the decrease of any state that has the 13. There are 13 states now that do sell insurance. I would ask that each of you consider this Bill as a consumer issue for the people who want it in your districts. And I... sure that if you find that you can vote 'aye' for it."

Ropp: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. It's been stated that this Bill would allow for additional competition. It's been brought to my attention that already in the State of Illinois there are 70,000 life insurance agents already selling insurance in the state and certainly that ought to be sufficient for competition without opening it up any further."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Countryman."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Ropp on the Bill."

Countryman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I stand in opposition to this Bill. You know the arguments being made that you

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

can... you can take out some provisions of this by the consumer Amendments that are on here. But there's a subtle coercion by a bank selling insurance. The bank is making the loan and that person who's getting that loan, whether or not anything is set feels compelled to purchase these other services from the bank. And I think that that's the real point. It's a subtle coercion, maybe one that's never said, maybe one that's never actionable under the Bill, but it's there. It exists. And we deal with practices like redlining and other sorts of practices. But those of us here know the realities of ordinary life and we know that subtle coercion exists. And for that reason alone we ought to vote 'no' and against this Bill. Thank you."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Regan."

Regan: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Members of the House. Speaker. I'd like to tell you just a short story, story what happened to me back in the early 60's when I got involved in selling this beautiful product called life insurance. A bank in the town had a brother-in-law he put in business right next door with an insurance agency. Wasn't in the bank. Wasn't allowed to be in the bank. T + was next door to the bank. Every time a person came in for a mortgage they were asked to go check out their insurance qualifications around the corner, there's one right the corner. That man would say we need mortgage insurance, the mortgage insurance he would sell them would be of the permanent nature which is 8 times more expensive than regular mortgage term insurance. They tack it on to the mortgage premium, the mortgage payment, it would be equal to in these cases half of the mortgage payment. Because there were small \$10,000 homes at that time. I fought this bank for 10 years replacing those policies, those people could not afford. But bought it because they thought they

106th Legislative Day

May 18. 1988

couldn't get the mortgage unless they did. That kind of thing I hope won't go on. But, that kind of thing I know will go on. That subtle inference is always going to be there. Banks don't deserve to sell insurance. Insurance companies shouldn't be involved in the banking business. The two should be separate and I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker McPike: "Representative DeLeo."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. DeLeo: Bill 2525 is not a new idea. Allowing banks to insurance has been... has... banks have been selling prior to 1900. Recently Iowa insurance and Nebraska their statutes to allow state charter banks revised engaging in selling insurance. Savings and loans sell insurance, credit unions, finance companies, retail stores, national banks in towns under 5,000. dealers, insurance companies. It's a very good consumer Bill, I urge a 'yes' vote on House Bill 2525."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Parke."

Parke: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. We've all been lobbied on this legislation today and throughout the last month. But one fact remains clear, Bill that is against insurance this Bill is not a companies. This Bill is against the insurance agent. large banks against the small independent businessmen and women who are running a small they themselves are small brokers. If you put agency or them on the marketplace with the big institutions that provide a big market, you're going to drive those small businessmen and women out of the market. Then you're not going to have competition. This is not a consumer issue. This is an anticonsumer, because once you take competition out of the marketplace you no longer have competition, because those people now can start generating a higher

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

rates, because no ones going to come in there and try and beat them out of the rates that their offering. You know, one of things that we talk about is right now banks sell credit life. And they get a large commission on it. we have seen throughout Illinois that those banks that sell credit life are charging a very, very high rate, because they can get away with it. We do not want continue to be able to sell high product lines, like credit life, once the small businessmen and women is out of it. You know, both banks and insurance agents buy the product from an insurance company. So, therefore, you're not having competition. They're both buying it from same insurance company. Currently we are seeing the banking industry, as a whole, having major problems over the United States. Whether it's the savings and loans or it's regular banks or whatever, in Texas alone we have seen that right now they're estimating to bail out savings and loans, in Texas alone, is going to be a \$1,200,000,000.00. Just in one state. It's very unsound us to start tying together two major financial institutions, both banking and insurance, and bringing them closer together, because when one goes under and is having major problems, at least there's least... or another area that we can look to for financial You tie them together and we all go down. And it was pointed out earlier that... that banks were insurance around the 1900's and that... that's not a new idea. Well let me remind you, because banks were so heavily involved in everything we had a Great Depression. And because we had a depression they pulled banks out of a lot of the businesses saying it's not healthy to have banks in it. And because they were involved we ended up having a Now I'm not to say that if banks got into depression.

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

insurance that we would have a depression, but quite frankly, I think that's a prime example of what happened when banks got over extended, got themselves involved in too many programs. I think this is a bad piece of legislation. I think that you're going to end up having many agents going out of business. We're not going to have competition. This is an antismall businessmen and women's Bill, and I think that we should all vote 'no' on it."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Peterson."

Peterson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of House. At the federal level for over one hundred years, they have been trying to find the right language that would keep banks from coercing buyers of insurance so that could go into the insurance business. They have never been able to find that language and they're not doing it today. What we're talking about is a consumer legislation. Everybody knows that the insurance field at this time is extremely competitive. When you introduce a sales person who has the leverage of credit that changes the playing field and lends itself to buying a product for other reasons than cost, good service, good policies and so on. We know that here in Illinois in the credit life that there have been abuses. And that there have been... that the Department of Insurance have been asking them to reduce their rates, because they've got a captive... a captive when they're... when they're offering that audience. coverage. So what we're really talking about here is something that isn't consumer oriented at all. It will lend itself to higher cost, because the people who are buying it don't have an option. Now there are a bunch of people are also talking about a level playing field. Financial institutions are talking about a level playing field. But they're talking about each other. And people

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

are assuming there's no coercion going on today with savings and loans and so on. I hear a lot of comments that there's subtle coercion going on there too. But home owner's policies are a lot different than the commercial loans and the commercial policies that are involved in what will happen if this Bill pass... passes. You're talking... if you're talking a home owner's policy, the premiums are small. And the truth is the buyer of that policy can get out once he gets his money, but he's got a thirty-year So it's time consuming, it's wasteful, but they can get around him. But if you have a businessman who has to go in regularly to renew his credit for his inventory and what have you, he has constant pressure against him, and to buy the insurance. They have access to him, on almost a perpetual basis. And there's one last thing too, hear a lot of people over the years talking about concentrations of power. I mean some of the more... the more people who exaggerate a little more will say things like the princes of privilege and the barons of Wall Street. What we're really talking to... about here is helping the big get bigger. And I think this is an area that we have to study very carefully, before we enhance that kind of concentration of power, in the long run. We have a very competitive system now. The service and policies are excellent. And we shouldn't really change the rules of the game for frivolous reasons. I urge a 'no' vote on this Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Breslin."

Breslin: "Will the Sponsor yield for some questions please?

Questions? I am particularly concerned about the protections available to the consumer under this Act."

Speaker McPike: "Yes. Yes."

Breslin: "In particular, I have been told that savings and loans

106th Legislative Day

- May 18, 1988
- and credit unions already have this authority. What abuses have occurred because of their having this authority at this time?"
- Capparelli: "In committee that question was asked and no one could show any abuses were made. But under this Bill, there will be a fine of \$5,000.00 for any abuse."
- Breslin: "And how does one... how does a consumer who feels they have been improperly coerced into buying insurance from a bank. How do they go about prosecuting that kind of case?"
- Capparelli: "They can file an unfair claims practice in the Department of Insurance."
- Breslin: "Second question is, why are consumers in favor of this legislation? We're all being lobbied by consumers for this legislation. If there's already a tremendous amount of competition in this field, how does increased competition help the consumer? What's the argument?"
- Capparelli: "This will help the banks because they're at a competitive disadvantage. And, of course, when you do have everybody selling, you have competition breeds more business any time."
- Breslin: "Well it might help banks, but we want to help consumers. I mean we're supposed to be here to help consumers. How does it help consumers?"
- Capparelli: "If the banks can sell insurance cheaper, you're helping the consumer."
- Breslin: "How can they sell it any cheaper? Isn't the price set by the company?"
- Capparelli: "Well, it won't hurt consumers, because we can guarantee that it will not raise the rates. It will possibly lower the rates with the competition that's going to be established through it."
- Breslin: "Thank you."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Harris."

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

Harris: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The opponents to this Bill do indeed have some very justified concerns. This is a major ... major change we are making and I think we should look at it very closely. But I also think that the provisions which have been built into for abuses, that the provisions are indeed very strong. Especially when it comes to the question of credit tie ins. A fellow who has to go down to his banker, a small businessman, and get a line of credit to finance his inventory, he may indeed feel a subtle coercion. are protections built into this Bill. And I can reference the one... answer perhaps one of the previous speakers. There are protections built in and severe protections. a matter of fact the underlying... the underlying law was changed so that one violation is no longer just \$5,000.00. The penalty was increased. And you could say that \$5,000.00 isn't much, and maybe it isn't But additionally, and especially for the legal beagles in the audience, additionally, any violation is a cause of action against a bank which was not in the Bill before. So that means that someone who feels as though need... someone who feels as though they have they improperly taken advantage of, they have a cause of action and can... can recover through a law suit from the bank. Secondly, I would say that bankers are... banks are If a person cannot get a line of credit from competitive. a particular bank there are other banks to turn to. Maybe one bank, maybe there is some subtle coercion there. That doesn't mean that a person can't go to another bank there is no subtle coercion. So, it's competitive in the banking field just as it's competitive in the insurance field. It is a major change, but I believe the protections have been built in. I believe they're solid. We can

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

address any abuses that may occur. I think that it's an appropriate... appropriate course to take now and I would recommend an 'aye' vote."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Steczo."

Steczo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. last week or two I have been deluged with information regarding House Bill 2525 and I literally abstained taking a position in the Bill until this very moment. However, it's ironic that today we were visited Representative Greiman on the Floor of the House, who came down to pay us a visit, and I remember when Representative Greiman used to deal with issues on bank holding companies, and trigger mechanisms and this and that. He used to come on the House Floor and say this is a question of the millionaires versus the billionaires. And in a way this issue is not to unlike the whole question of the issues we were dealing with withholding companies and the rest. And when Representative Greiman was on the Floor, I had just received another ream of information about House Bill 2525, and Т thought about the millionaires versus the billionaires issue and it came to me that the person that was left out in the discussions on House Bill 2525 were the consumers. Who is going to benefit? And if Representative Capparelli's response is to Representative Breslin seems that there are protections that are placed in legislation and it seems that the compu... the consumer may benefit. And in fact among the reams of paper that I got, it seems that Consumer Reports Magazine, who certainly does not have an ax to grind, don't except advertising, don't do anything else, have suggested that the consumers may not be penalized, in fact may do better if we allow these kind of things to happen. If we allow banks to sell insurance. Based on surveys that they've done. So I don't

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

think we're taking the drastic step that we've taken before, in fact, another irony that approached me, because I have a brother who's an insurance agent. And I can go to him and I can buy insurance. And I can go to him and I can get annuities. And I can go to him and I can buy stocks. And I can go to him and I can be in invested money markets. And I can go to him and do a retirement plan. And I don't hear them complaining about that. So I think that if there's competition on one hand with they taking on some of the policies and some of the programs that stock brokers and other people have it's quite fair to allow others to provide and allow them that other kind of competition. I think that with the explanation and response to questions by the Sponsor that there, in fact, are ways that consumers would be protected. Consumers may in fact benefit. And I would, at this point, encourage a 'yes' vote on House 2525."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Krska."

Krska: "I move the previous question."

Speaker McPike: "The Gentleman moves the previous question. The question is, 'Shall the previous question be put?' All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The previous question is put. Representative Churchill to close."

Churchill: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. There are several issues that have been brought up in the debate which I would like to try address. The first issue was the issue of coercion. It was said that because of the fact that a bank may give a loan that perhaps they would coerce a consumer into trying to buy insurance through the bank. This issue was addressed through the Amendments to the... refile... on the Bill and in response to some of the questions of the people on committee. The

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

Bill as it presently stands, has five provisions in it which are as follows: First, the person who makes the loan to the customer cannot sell insurance to the same customer. Second, employees of the banks insurance subsidiaries cannot access bank loan files unless so directed by the Third, the customer has five days in which to opt out from purchasing the policy without any financial penalty. Fourth, for persons injured by a violation of these provisions, a cause of action is established in Circuit Court for damages, injunctive relief or both against the person committing the violation. And fifth, violation of coercion provision constitutes a business offense of \$5,000.00. In addition, the fact that this insurance is to be sold by a bank cannot be done by the bank. It must be done by a subsidiary of the bank, so you have a legal entity owned by the bank that's in charge of selling insurance. It creates a buffer zone between the person who is taking out the loan and the person who has to buy the insurance. Second issue which was brought up in debate was that of competition. I would state for the record that there are insurance companies in the State of Illinois who at the present time are giving mortgages, who are giving CD's, who offer money market products. Who basically compete with banks. If insurance companies can compete with banks, why should banks be kept from competing insurance companies. That's unfair. In addition. there are several insurance companies that own banks. AETNA Life and Casualty owns Liberty Bank and Trust. State Sears owns the Greenwood Trust, the 'Hurley' State Bank and Sears Savings and Loan. E. F. Hutton Life owns E. F. Hutton Trust Company and E. F. Hutton Bank. Family Life Insurance/Merrill Linch owns the Merrill Linch Bank and Trust. John Hancock owns the First Signature Bank

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

Kemper Corporation owns Investors Feduciary Trust. Trust. New England Mutual Life owns Wolf Borrow Savings Bank. Prudential Insurance owns Prudential Bank and Trust. list goes on and on and on. The relationship between insurance companies and banks is very close. And yet they compete. The third issue and final issue that was brought up was that of consumerism. Is this the best thing that we can offer for the public? And it goes back to the issue of The Consumer Federation of America did a competition. study and that study shows that in states where banks can sell insurance, the price of insurance went down. Insurance was cheaper. The consumers benefitted because of the ability of the banks to compete with the rest of the people in the industry. In our society today, we're headed in the direction which I call the cafeteria approach to retail. Basically, you walk into one store and you get everything done. As you're walking around shopping for something you bring your insurance policy in and they at your insurance policy. They sell your house. They give you a mortgage. They do just about everything. It's the cafeteria approach. You get almost anything in the marketplace. If that's the way that this society is going, to be able to offer more services to more people, then it seems unfair to take one segment of our society, namely the banking industry, and restrict them from competing in that same marketplace that insurance companies already are in. This is a fine Bill. It's a good Bill. It's been around for a long time, so people had a good chance to take a look at it, to express their concerns, it's received the full debate that it deserves in this Body. I would ask for an 'aye' vote on this Bill."

Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 2525 pass?'

All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Representative

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

Stephens to explain his vote."

Stephens: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think I had a little electronic problem awhile ago. Representative Capparelli, I think this is unfair that you let our cheering section go home and I wondered if you would maybe reconsider, of course I guess the board's open so it's probably too late, but those people that were here this afternoon are probably back heading home this evening and they've got appointments this evening. They're taking care of small people with small businesses. And I hope that we'll consider protecting them. The bankers aren't going to go out of business without this Bill. But the private insurance agent just might. Thank you."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Speaker, I think many of us probably in our minds said who are we going to help, the bankers or the insurance agents. And the insurance people they mob me like they did you today, and I said to them I'm going to wait and I'm going to listen and I'm going to find out. I said, what is going to be the determining factor in my mind is will the public benefit from this. And I did listen and I'm convinced after hearing the debate that the public will benefit. I'm convinced because I heard that the Consumer America says that Federation of this will consumers. I'm convinced because I heard a survey that the Consumer Reports said that those banks that do have... sell insurance that rates are up to 30% lower. I'm convinced because I... in my own reading of the facts on both sides of the issue when I read a report from the... our own Legislative Research Unit when they made a survey..."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Matijevich, bring your remarks to a close."

Matijevich: "Alright. Made a survey as to why there may have

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

been a reduction and they were very careful not to mention about the banks that selling insurance. Those... all of those states said that the banks selling insurance had nothing to do, that were other factors that lead to some reduction in agents. It doesn't hurt the agents. It does help the consumers and that's why I'm voting 'aye'."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Wennlund, one minute to explain your vote."

Wennlund: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to remind the Ladies and Gentlemen of the House that this is big banks against small businesses. Not millionaires versus billionaires. The AFL-CIO is strongly opposed to this Bill. They have over a thousand members in the State of Illinois, in addition to 70,000 insurance independent These are the people, this is not a consumer Illinois. issue. This is big banks and big banks alone. going to destroy the business of small Illinois. The largest single employer in the State I urge you to consider the fact the AFL-CIO is Illinois. opposed this legislation. One hundred and eighty-four banks failed in 1987. In 1986 one hundred thirty-eight banks failed. Banks can't even do the job of banking and do it right. They don't belong in the insurance business or the travel agency business or the dental business or any other business. What's next? They're going to end up in the Sears and Roebuck in every bank in the State of Illinois. I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Parke, one minute to explain your vote. Representative Park, did you speak in debate?"

Parke: "Thank you, I'm not asking to speak, I would like to verify the Roll Call if this gets the votes necessary."

Speaker McPike: "Alright. Representative Olson."

Olson, R.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To explain my vote. Some

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

sixteen years ago I helped organize a new bank in Illinois. I've served that bank as vice president, president, and now chairman of the board of the directors. Currently, I also sit on a bank holding company that holds twelve banks in Central Illinois. I cannot in good conscious acknowledge the probability of a conflict of interests and support this legislation. My mote... vote must be a 'present' vote."

Speaker McPike: "Have all voted? Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this Bill, there are 66 'ayes', 40 'nos' and 11 voting 'present'.

Representative Parke has asked for a verification. Do you persist? Do you persist in your verification, Sir?

Representative Parke. Representative Parke."

Parke: "Thank you, I have declined."

Speaker McPike: "On this Bill, there are 66 'ayes', 40 'nos', voting 'present'. House Bill 2525 having received a Constitu... having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3478, Representative DeJaegher. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk. Excuse me. Mr. Clerk. I wonder if the Chair could have everyone's attention for a minute. We have three Supplemental Calendars on the Floor. With Senate Bills, First Reading on those Calendars. And they do not have House Sponsors. We want to have a Rules Committee tomorrow and we can't have a Rules Committee on any Bills that do not have a So would you kindly look those list over and come the well and sign up on those Bills. Thank you. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill, 3478."

Clerk Leone: "On page 19 of your Calendar House Bill 3478, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Banking Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Representative DeJaegher."

DeJaegher: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the General

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

Assembly. House Bill 3478 amends the Illinois Banking Act to allow state chartered banks to operate or own travel agencies. House Bill 3478 is identical to 576 which passed the House last year as 74-37. In a brief comment or that this Bill had this morning when I withdrawed that, basically people addressed themselves to tourism. I us realize, of course, that tourism is... is a billion dollar industry. This particular legislation is not relatively new. Sixteen states in the United States have already adopted this type of legislation. To give you an example of states that have already adopted this legislation we have California, New York, Ohio. Pennsylvania, these are some of the largest states in the United States that have already addressed this situation. I think all of us, of course, must realize that competition is the backbone of this country. I feel that this would be a consumers... consumer asset for it to enable others to sell this type of travel accommodations. I think all of us realize. especially in the downstate county. basically there are many, many banks that are the center point of participation. Many, many of these small communities do not even have a travel agency. Basically, Bill was discussed Commissioner Harris... when this Commissioner Harris of the banks testified in behalf of this legislation. This... this measure also support of IBA and also the independent community banks of For those reasons I have stated I hope that we Illinois. have a positive vote on 3478."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Regan."

Regan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Here we go again. We just got through putting out of business, probably, about half of the general agents in the area, the independent agents. Now we're going to go after the travel

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

agents and put them out of business too. I hope you will readjust your thinking a little bit on this area and let's control the situation and I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Parke."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Parke: House. Earlier today we saw a group of men and women who businessmen coming down here talking about the were small ability to have free enterprise. The ability to make a living, to compete fairly and compete on a level playing ground. They are somewhat organized. They have good associations. But we have a travel agency industry that is not as well organized. They're not down here in the numbers that we really think they should be and now they have to compete against major banks. You know most banks are not going to get into this business. It's going to be the bigger banks. And you're going to continue to business in Illinois at a disadvantage. put businessmen and women now are going to continue to be at a disadvantage level. This is no longer a level playing field. The big get bigger, and we just put out the business. these small businessmen and women. I think we should vote 'no' on this and I ask that you do."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Kirkland."

Kirkland: "Sponsor yield?"

Speaker McPike: "Yes, he will."

Kirkland: "What is the necessity for this kind of combination? I

can understand it with the insurance, when you go into get
a loan and it's convenient for the consumer to buy
insurance that's required on the loan. What's the
convenience for the consumer in this case?"

DeJaegher: "Jim, I think one of the reasons this type of legislation came about was that I have a local bank and basically that travel agency defaulted. That in turn, the

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

bank took over the travel agency. And Commissioner of Banks ruled at that particular time that this was not permissible under the Banking Code. Since then revisions have been made and I think it's also an additional combination to people themselves."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Krska."

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

Speaker McPike: "The Gentleman moves the previous question. The question is, 'Shall the previous question be put?' All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The previous question is put. Representative DeJaegher to close."

DeJaegher: "Ladies and Gentlemen, I think we've discussed this

Bill adequately. Hopefully that you will be supportive of

House Bill 3478. Thank you."

Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 3478 pass?'

All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this Bill, there are 54 'ayes', 47 'nos'. The Gentleman asks to put this on postpone consideration. Put in on postpone. Representative Matijevich."

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

I would ask leave to suspend the rules and use the Attendance Roll Call for that purpose. The... waive the posting notice that... so that all Senate Bills that are received the posting notice will be waived, and so that at 1:00pm tomorrow in the Speaker's Conference Room the Rules Committee could meet to exempt Bills. Only those Bills that have House Sponsors will be heard in the Rules Committee. This procedure is necessary so that we can expedite committee hearings next week. As all of you know we're only going to be here two weeks... two days next

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

week. The Speaker is accommodating our schedules, but we need this to expedite the process. And this has been cleared on both sides of the aisle. And therefore I ask leave."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Hallock."

Hallock: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would support the Motion, urge our Members to pick up the Senate Bills as they come along."

McPike: "The Gentleman moves that we waive the Speaker appropriate rules, so that all Bills from the Senate that have been received by the House, can be heard in Rules tomorrow, with the understanding that no Bill without a House Sponsor will be heard. All in favor... I'm sorry is there any objections? Hearing none. Attendance Roll Call Appropriate rules are waived. The Rules be used. Committee will meet at 1:00pm tomorrow. Representative Oh, I'm... Representative Cullerton moves that we postpone the Special Orders of Call to the Call of Allowing the Clerk perfunctory time for Senate Chair. Bills, First Reading, Representative Cullerton now moves that the House stands adjourned until tomorrow at the hour of 9:00am. All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The House stands adjourned."

Clerk O'Brien: "Messages from the Senate. Message from the Senate by Ms. Hawker, Secretary. 'Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has passed Bills with the following titles. Passage which I am asked to ask concurrence of the House of Representatives, to wit; Senate Bills number... Senate Bills 1529, 1534, 1563, 1593, 1599, 1609, 1616, 1642, 1647, 1657, 1668, 1685, 1689, 1690, 1691, 1692, 1693, 1694, 1695, 1696, 1697, 1701, 1714, 1719, 1728, 1729, 1730, 1731, 1732, 1733, 1734, 1735, 1736, 1737, 1738, 1739, 1740, 1741, 1742,

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

1743, 1744, 1746, 1747, 1748, 1749, 1750, 1751, 1752, 1753, 1754, 1755, 1756, 1757, 1758, 1759, 1771, 1776, 1777, 1778, 1779, 1780, 1781, 1786, 1789, 1793, 1794, 1800, 1826, 1834, 1842, 1835, 1836, 1856, 1868, 1870, 1871, 1888, 1897, 1913, 1923, 1926, 1937, 1972, 1996, 2003, 2009, 2012, 2013, 2014, 2021, 2022, 2023, 2035, 2042, 2043, 2049, 2050, 2097, 2098, 2102, 2110, 2112, 2115, 2117, 2136, 2151, 2174, 2181 2185, passed by the Senate May 18, 1988.' Linda Hawker, Secretary of the Senate. Message from the Senate by Ms. Hawker, Secretary. 'Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate refused to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendments to a Bill of the following title, to wit; Senate Bill 2202, House Amendment #1, action taken by the Senate May 18, 1988. Linda Hawker, Secretary of the Senate.' Senate Bills, First Reading. Senate Bill 1534, Keane, a Bill Act in relation to tax increment financing. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1563, Phelps, a Bill an Act to amend the School Code. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1593, Hallock, a Bill for an Act in relation to regulation of savings and loan association. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1599, Novak, a Bill for an Act to amend the Environmental Protection Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1616, Wennlund, a for an Act to amend the Illinois Solid Management Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1642, Williams, a Bill for an Act to amend the Child First Reading of the Bill. Passenger Protection Act. Senate Bill 1647, Granberg and Phelps, a Bill for an Act to improve the delivery of health care services in rural areas in Illinois. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1685, Granberg, a Bill for an Act to amend the Employee Ownership Assistance Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

1690, Leverenz, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Illinois Community College Board. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1691, Phelps, a Bill for an Act to amend the Public Community College Act. First Reading of the Senate Bill 1692, Satterthwaite, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Board of Trustees to the University of Illinois. First Reading of the Bill. Bill 1693, Keane, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Board of Governors of state colleges universities. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1694, Richmond, a Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expenses of Southern Illinois University. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill Ropp, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Board of Regions. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill Tate, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Illinois State Scholarship Commission. First Reading of Senate Bill 1697, Kulas, a Bill for an Act to the Bill. amend the School Code. First Reading of the Bill. Bill 1701, Brunsvold, a Bill for an Act to amend the Wildlife Code. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1714, Kulas, a Bill for an Act in relation to the abuse and neglect of elderly persons. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1719, Levin, a Bill for an Act in relation to property taxes and condominiums. First Reading of the Senate Bill 1728, Mays, a Bill for an Act appropriations to the Abandoned Mined Land Reclamation Council. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1729, Mays, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Department of Agriculture. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1730, Mays, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the ordinary and contingent expenses for the Commissioner of

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

Banks and Trust Companies. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1731, Mays, a Bill for an Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Bureau of the Budget and the Executive Office of the Governor. Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1732, Mays, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Capital Development Board. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1733, Mays, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the ordinary and contingent expenses for the Illinois Commerce Commission. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1734, Mays, a Bill for an Act making appropriations and reappropriations to various state agencies. First Reading of the Bill. Bill 1735, Breslin, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the ordinary and contingent expenses for the Department of Conversation. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1736, Mays, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority. First Reading of the Bill. 1738, Senate Bill Mays, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the ordinary and contingent expenses for the Department of Employment Security. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1739, Mays, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the ordinary and contingent expenses for the Environmental Protection Agency. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1740, Mays, a Bill for an Act appropriations to the Environmental Protection Agency. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1741, Hicks, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Illinois Farm First Reading of the Bill. House Development Authority. Bill (sic - Senate Bill) 1742, Mays, a Bill for an Act appropriations to the ordinary and contingent expenses of the Department of Financial Institutions. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1743, Mays, a Bill

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

for an Act making appropriations to the ordinary and contingent expenses for the Department of Labor. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1744, Mays, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the ordinary and contingent expenses for the Department of Lottery. First Reading of Senate Bill 1446, Mays, 1746, Mays, a Bill the Bill. Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses for the Military and Naval Department. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1747, Mays, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses for the Department of Nuclear Safety. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1748, Mays, a for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses for the Prairie State 2000 Authority. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1749, Mays, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of certain retirement systems. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1750, Mays, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the ordinary and contingent expenses for the Office of Commissioner of Savings and Loans. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1751, Mays, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses for the Department of Alcoholism and Substance Abuse. First Reading of the Bill. Bill 1752, Mays, a Bill for an Act making appropriations the ordinary and contingent expenses Guardianship and Advocacy Commission. First Reading of the Senate Bill 1753, Mays, a Bill for an Act making Bill. appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses for the Medical Center Commission. First Reading of the Bill. Bill 1754, Mays, a Bill for an Act making Senate appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses for the Department of Mental Health and Developmental

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill Disabilities. 1755, Mays, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses for the Department Public Aid. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1756, Mays, a Bill for an Act making certain appropriations of the Governor's Purchase Care Review Board. First Reading of the Bill. House Bill... Senate Bill 1757, Mays, a for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses for the Prison Review Board. Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1758. Tate, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for the ordinary and contingent expenses of certain retirement systems. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1771, Preston, a Bill for an Act for the sale of the interest of the State of Illinois in certain lands to Loyola University. First Reading of the Senate Bill 1776, take that out of the record. Senate Bill 1777, Laurino, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the General Assembly for staff offices. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill Keane, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Auditor General. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1780, Keane, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Enterprise Zone Act. First Reading of the Bill. Bill 1781, Mautino, a Bill for an Act in relation to quarter monthly payments for certain tax payers. Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1793, Giglio, a Bill for an Act to amend the Charitable Games Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1794, Giglio, a Bill for an Act relation to waste water treatment. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1800, Cullerton, a Bill for an Act relation to certain mortgages, loans and contracts. Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1868, Frederick, for an Act in relation to the regulation of the rivers,

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

lakes and streams in the State of Illinois. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1888, Mays, a Bill for an Act authorizing the Director of Central Management Services to convey the Singer Madison (sic - Mansion) in Cook County. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1913, O'Connell, a for an Act to amend an Act in relation to corporate criminal liability. First Reading of the Bill. Myron Olson, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Controlled Substance Act. First Reading of the Senate Bill 1776, Madigan - Leverenz, a Bill for an Bill. Act to provide for the ordinary and contingent expenses for the General Assembly. First Reading of the Bill. Bill 1777, Madigan and Leverenz, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the General Assembly for staff First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1778, offices. Madigan and Leverenz, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to various legislative support agencies. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1926, Steczo, Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1937, Wennlund, a Bill for an Act to amend certain Acts in relation to Solid Waste Management. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1972, Cullerton, a for an Act to amend the Illinois Horse Racing Act. Check that. House Bill (sic - Senate Bill) 1972, Giorgi and Hallock, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Horse Racing Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1996, Preston, a Bill for an Act to amend certain Acts in relation to alcohol and substance abuse treatment. First Senate Bill 2003, Kubik, a Bill for Reading of the Bill. an Act to amend the Civil Administrative Code. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 2009, Cullerton, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Health Facility Authority Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 2012, Mays, a

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

Bill for an Act to amend the Fish Code. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 2013, Countryman, a Bill for an Act to amend the Criminal Code. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 2014, Keane, a Bill for an Act to amend the Revenue Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 2021, Mays, a Bill for an Act making appropriations for permanent improvements. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 2022, Ewing, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Capital Development Board. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 2023, Brunsvold, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 2035, Phelps, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act concerning state historic sites and state parks and other state property. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 2042, Laurino, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Vehicle Code. Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 2043, Levin, a Bill for an Act to amend the Code of Civil Procedures. Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 2050, Ewing, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act in relation to the collection of deposits of state monies. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 2097, Countryman, a Bill for an Act to amend the Election Code. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 2112, Mays, a Bill for an Act making appropriations of the State Board of Education. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 2115, Kulas, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act creating the Joint Committee on the Oversight of First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 2217, Hoffman, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 2174, Madigan, a Bill for an Act in relation to voter registration. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 2181, Sieben, a Bill for an Act amend the School Code. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 2185, Brunsvold, a Bill for an Act to amend the School

106th Legislative Day

May 18, 1988

Code. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1979, Hensel, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Insurance Code. First Reading of the Bill. Being no further business, the House now adjourns at 7:15."

STATE OF ILLINOIS 85TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES DAILY TRANSCRIPTION OF DEBATE INDEX

PAGE 11/30/88

HB-0012	THIRD READING	PAGE	117
HB-0196	RECALLED	PAGE	91
HB-0253	THIRD READING	PAGE	114
	RECALLED	PAGE	85
	THIRD READING	PAGE	87
	THIRD READING	PAGE	111
	THIRD READING	PAGE	83
	SECOND READING	PAGE	9
	THIRD READING	PAGE	168
	SECOND READING	PAGE	8
	THIRD READING	PAGE	101
	THIRD READING	PAGE	170
	THIRD READING	PAGE	48
	THIRD READING	PAGE	233
	OUT OF RECORD	PAGE	51
	SECOND READING	PAGE	57
	SECOND READING	PAGE	59
	THIRD READING	PAGE	84
	THIRD READING THIRD READING	PAGE	113
	THIRD READING	PAGE	24
	SECOND READING	PAGE	115
	OUT OF RECORD	PAGE	171
	THIRD READING	PAGE PAGE	172 112
	THIRD READING	PAGE	148
	THIRD READING	PAGE	148
	SECOND READING	PAGE	173
	THIRD READING	PAGE	174
	THIRD READING	PAGE	175
	RECALLED	PAGE	179
HB-3132	SECOND READING	PAGE	150
	THIRD READING	PAGE	106
	THIRD READING	PAGE	177
	THIRD READING	PAGE	180
HB-3273	THIRD READING	PAGE	186
	THIRD READING	PAGE	154
HB-3309	POSTPONED CONSIDERATION	PAGE	155
HB-3327	SECOND READING	PAGE	33
	THIRD READING	PAGE	198
	THIRD READING	PAGE	155
	THIRD READING	PAGE	202
	THIRD READING	PAGE	156
	OUT OF RECORD	PAGE	157
	SECOND READING	PAGE	79
	THIRD READING	PAGE	81
	RECALLED	PAGE	207
	THIRD READING	PAGE	208
HB-3447	THIRD READING	PAGE	208
	SECOND READING	PAGE	58
	THIRD READING	PAGE	209
	THIRD READING THIRD READING	PAGE	51
	POSTPONED CONSIDERATION	PAGE	247
	OUT OF RECORD	PAGE	250
	THIRD READING	PAGE Page	57 118
	THIRD READING		
	THIRD READING	PAGE PAGE	210
	RECALLED	PAGE	210 213
	THIRD READING	PAGE	213
	SECOND READING	PAGE	158
	SECOND READING	PAGE	40
	THIRD READING	PAGE	215
	SECOND READING	PAGE	9
	SECOND READING	PAGE	ģ
		1 400	,

STATE OF ILLINOIS 85TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES DAILY TRANSCRIPTION OF DEBATE INDEX

PAGE 2 11/30/88

HB-3662	THIRD READING	PAGE	2
HB-3668	THIRD READING	PAGE	2
HB-3678	THIRD READING	PAGE	158
HB-3683	SECOND READING	PAGE	60
HB-3697	THIRD READING	PAGE	2
HB-3700	THIRD READING	PAGE	2
HB-3705	THIRD READING	PAGE	2
HB-3714	THIRD READING	PAGE	90
HB-3718	THIRD READING	PAGE	2
HB-3719	THIRD READING	PAGE	2
HB-3720	THIRD READING	PAGE	2
HB-3725	THIRD READING	PAGE	2
HB-3726		PAGE	62
HB-3738	THIRD READING	PAGE	3
HB-3739	THIRD READING	PAGE	3
HB-3742	SECOND READING	PAGE	62
HB-3752	THIRD READING	PAGE	3
HB-3763	THIRD READING	PAGE	3
HB-3767		PAGE	92
HB-3769	SECOND READING	PAGE	100
HB-3770	THIRD READING	PAGE	3
HB-3785	THIRD READING		
HB~3788	THIRD READING	PAGE	3
HB-3792	THIRD READING	PAGE	126
		PAGE	124
HB-3793	THIRD READING	PAGE	124
HB-3799	THIRD READING	PAGE	3
HB-3803	THIRD READING	PAGE	3
HB-3810	SECOND READING	PAGE	101
HB-3826	THIRD READING	PAGE	3
HB-3828	THIRD READING	PAGE	3
HB-3835	THIRD READING	PAGE	3
HB-3838	THIRD READING	PAGE	3
HB-3840	THIRD READING	PAGE	3
HB-3841	THIRD READING	PAGE	3
HB-3848	SECOND READING	PAGE	62
HB-3856	THIRD READING	PAGE	3
HB-3857	THIRD READING	PAGE	4
H8-3858	THIRD READING	PAGE	4
HB-3864 HB-3873	THIRD READING	PAGE	4
	SECOND READING THIRD READING	PAGE PAGE	74 4
HB-3873			=
HB-3878	SECOND READING	PAGE	63
HB-3878	THIRD READING	PAGE	81
HB-3879	THIRD READING	PAGE	4
HB-3880	THIRD READING	PAGE	4
HB-3890	THIRD READING POSTPONED CONSIDERATION	PAGE	188
HB-3890	THIRD READING		198
HB-3896		PAGE	126
HB-3896	OUT OF RECORD	PAGE	126
HB-3898	THIRD READING THIRD READING	PAGE	4
HB-3900	THIRD READING THIRD READING	PAGE	126 4
HB-3910		PAGE	
HB-3911	THIRD READING	PAGE	4
HB-3913	THIRD READING	PAGE	4
HB-3915	THIRD READING	PAGE	4
HB-3917	SECOND READING	PAGE	159
HB-3934	THIRD READING	PAGE	4
HB-3938	THIRD READING	PAGE	4
HB-3943	THIRD READING	PAGE	4
HB-3949	THIRD READING	PAGE	4
HB-3951	THIRD READING	PAGE	38
HB-3955	THIRD READING	PAGE	4
HB-3959	THIRD READING	PAGE	5
HB-3969	THIRD READING	PAGE	5

STATE OF ILLINOIS 85TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES DAILY TRANSCRIPTION OF DEBATE INDEX

PAGE 3 11/30/88

		_
HB-3972 THIRD READING	PAGE	5
HB-3980 THIRD READING	PAGE	5
HB-3987 THIRD READING	PAGE	5
HB-3990 THIRD READING	PAGE	5
HB-3998 THIRD READING	PAGE	5
HB-4004 SECOND READING	PAGE	68
HB-4009 THIRD READING	PAGE	5
HB-4011 THIRD READING	PAGE	5
HB-4027 THIRD READING	PAGE	147
HB-4033 THIRD READING	PAGE	5
HB-4035 THIRD READING	PAGE	5
HB-4039 SECOND READING	PAGE	69
HB-4039 THIRD READING	PAGE	5
HB-4052 THIRD READING	PAGE	5
HB-4053 THIRD READING	PAGE	5
HB-4060 THIRD READING	PAGE	5
HB-4063 THIRD READING	PAGE	5
HB-4068 SECOND READING	PAGE	161
HB-4075 THIRD READING	PAGE	5
HB-4091 THIRD READING	PAGE	5
HB-4098 SECOND READING	PAGE	11
HB-4107 THIRD READING	PAGE	6
HB-4111 SECOND READING	PAGE	69
HB-4116 THIRD READING	PAGE	6
HB-4125 SECOND READING	PAGE	42
HB-4125 HELD ON SECOND	PAGE	47
HB-4127 THIRD READING	PAGE	6
,		
HB-4139 THIRD READING	PAGE	6
HB-4145 THIRD READING	PAGE	6
HB-4153 THIRD READING	PAGE	6
HB-4172 THIRD READING	PAGE	6
HB-4179 THIRD READING	PAGE	6
HB-4180 THIRD READING	PAGE	6
	PAGE	
		70
HB-4184 THIRD READING	PAGE	6
HB-4194 THIRD READING	PAGE	6
	PAGE	6
HB-4213 THIRD READING	PAGE	116
HB-4214 THIRD READING	PAGE	116
HB-4220 THIRD READING	PAGE	6
HB-4229 THIRD READING	PAGE	6
HB-4232 THIRD READING	PAGE	6
HB-4233 THIRD READING	PAGE	6
HB-4247 THIRD READING	PAGE	7
HB-4251 SECOND READING	PAGE	164
HB-4254 SECOND READING	PAGE	165
HB-4255 SECOND READING	PAGE	166
HB-4256 SECOND READING	PAGE	167
HB-4257 SECOND READING	PAGE	167
HB-4258 THIRD READING	PAGE	7
HB-4279 THIRD READING	PAGE	7
HB-4280 THIRD READING	PAGE	7
		7
HB-4282 THIRD READING	PAGE	
HB-4286 SECOND READING	PAGE	47
SB-0566 THIRD READING	PAGE	93
SB-0566 OUT OF RECORD	PAGE	99
SB-1534 FIRST READING	PAGE	252
SB-1563 FIRST READING	PAGE	252
SB-1593 FIRST READING	PAGE	252
SB-1599 FIRST READING	PAGE	252
SB-1616 FIRST READING	PAGE	252
SB-1642 FIRST READING	PAGE	252
	PAGE	252
SB-1685 FIRST READING	PAGE	252

PAGE 4 11/30/88

STATE OF ILLINOIS 85TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES DAILY TRANSCRIPTION OF DEBATE INDEX

SB-1690	FIRST	READING	PAGE	253
SB-1691			PAGE	253
SB-1692				
			PAGE	253
SS-1693			PAGE	253
SB-1694	FIRST	READING	PAGE	253
SB-1695	FIRST	READING	PAGE	253
SB-1696	FIRST	READING	PAGE	253
SB-1697			PAGE	253
SB-1701				
			PAGE	253
SB-1714			PAGE	253
SB-1719	FIRST	READING	PAGE	253
SB-1728	FIRST	READING	PAGE	253
SB-1729	FIRST	READING	PAGE	253
SB-1730	-		PAGE	253
		READING	PAGE	254
SB-1732			PAGE	254
SB-1733	FIRST	READING	PAGE	254
SB-1734	FIRST	READING	PAGE	254
SB-1735			PAGE	254
SB-1736			PAGE	254
		READING	PAGE	254
SB-1739			PAGE	254
SB-1740	FIRST	READING	PAGE	254
SB-1741	FIRST	READING	PAGE	254
SB-1742	FIRST	READING	PAGE	254
SB-1743			PAGE	254
		READING	PAGE	255
SB-1746			PAGE	255
SB-1747	FIRST	READING	PAGE	255
SB-1748	FIRST	READING	PAGE	255
SB-1749	FIRST	READING	PAGE	255
		READING	PAGE	255
		READING	PAGE	255
SB-1752			PAGE	255
SB-1753	FIRST	READING	PAGE	255
SB-1754	FIRST	READING	PAGE	255
SB-1755	FIRST	READING	PAGE	256
		READING	PAGE	256
		READING	PAGE	256
SB-1758			PAGE	256
SB-1771			PAGE	256
SB-1776	FIRST	READING	PAGE	257
SB-1777	FIRST	READING	PAGE	257
SB-1778	FIRST	READING	PAGE	257
		READING	PAGE	256
SB-1780				256
			PAGE	
		READING	PAGE	256
SB-1793	FIRST	READING	PAGE	256
SB-1794	FIRST	READING	PAGE	256
SB-1800	FIRST	READING	PAGE	256
		READING	PAGE	256
SB-1888				
			PAGE	257
		READING	PAGE	257
		READING	PAGE	257
SB-1926	FIRST	READING	PAGE	257
SB-1937	FIRST	READING	PAGE	256
		READING	PAGE	257
		READING	PAGE	259
SB-1996		READING	PAGE	257
SB-2003			PAGE	257
SB-2009	FIRST	READING	PAGE	257
SB-2012	FIRST	READING	PAGE	257
SB-2013		READING	PAGE	258
SB-2014		READING	PAGE	258

STATE OF ILLINOIS PAGE 5 85TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY 11/30/88 HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES DAILY TRANSCRIPTION OF DEBATE INDEX

MAY 18, 1988

SB-2021	FIRST	READING	PAGE	258
SB-2022	FIRST	READING	PAGE	258
SB-2023	FIRST	READING	PAGE	258
SB-2035	FIRST	READING	PAGE	258
SB-2042	FIRST	READING	PAGE	258
SB-2043	FIRST	READING	PAGE	258
SB-2050	FIRST	READING	PAGE	258
SB-2097	FIRST	READING	PAGE	258
SB-2112	FIRST	READING	PAGE	258
SB-2115	FIRST	READING	PAGE	258
SB-2174	FIRST	READING	PAGE	258
SB-2181	FIRST	READING	PAGE	258
SB-2185	FIRST	READING	PAGE	258
SB-2217	FIRST	READING	PAGE	258

SUBJECT MATTER

HOUSE TO ORDER - REPRESENTATIVE MCPIKE	PAGE	1
PRAYER - FATHER SEPICH	PAGE	1
PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE	PAGE	1
ROLL CALL FOR ATTENDANCE	PAGE	2
ADJOURNMENT	PAGE	251
PERFUNCTORY	PAGE	251
MESSAGES FROM THE SENATE	PAGE	251
PERFUNCTORY - ADJOURNMENT	PAGE	259