114th Legislative Day

May 10. 1990

Speaker McPike: "The House will come to order. The chaplain for today is Reverend T. M. Jackson of the United Pentecostal Church in Hazelwood, Missouri. Reverend Jackson is a guest of Representative Weaver. The guests in the balcony may wish to rise and join us for the morning invocation."

Reverend Jackson: "It is indeed an honor to stand with you today as we invoke the presence of Almighty God to impact our Shall we pray? Lord, we want to say every decision. thanks for this day that You have given. We will and be glad in it. We thank You for health and strength and pray for Your provison of knowledge and wisdom. Mav Representative of this statehouse be endowed with knowledge and courage to stand for truth that which is right. Lord, we are reminded today of how Samuel of the Old Testament era prayed for the people Samuel declared that You would not forsake Your Terapl people and that it pleased You to make our people for Your Samuel further stated God forbid that I Name's sake. should sin against the Lord in ceasing to pray for You, but I will teach you the good and right way. He further stated that we Your people should fear the Lord and serve you in truth with all our heart when we consider all the great things that You have done. Lord, You also admonished us that we are to love You with all our heart, soul, mind and strength, and in so doing show our love and Your those around us. We thank You for the privilege of prayer and communication that we can experience each day. alone know the future, and how it may impact our affairs, and the affairs of state. We pray that You will guide and direct the minds of we your creation, that we might fulfill responsibilities. respective As each committee convenes or each Session of this Body we invoke

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

- guidance and direction. We further rely on You to lead and guide us in every decision. With Your guidance we will not fear evil nor any force that might come against us. We pray especially for this day and that Your mighty hand will be felt on this Assembly. For all this we give You praise and honor, in the Name of our Lord Jesus Christ. Amen."
- Speaker McPike: "We'll be led in the Pledge of Allegiance by Representative Ropp."
- Ropp et al: "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United
 States of America and to the Republic for which it stands,
 one Nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice
 for all."
- Speaker McPike: "Roll Call for Attendance. Representative Matijevich."
- Matijevich: "Yes. Mr. Speaker, Bruce Farley is excused, but he's doing well today after his surgery. Thank you."
- Speaker McPike: "Mr. Piel."
- Piel: "Good Morning, Mr. Speaker. All present and accounted for."
- Speaker McPike: "Clerk will take the record. 117 Members answering the Roll Call; a quorum is present. Agreed Resolutions."
- Clerk Leone: "House Resolution 1672, offered by Representative Balanoff. 1673, offered by Representative Balanoff. 1674, offered by Representative Balanoff. 1675, offered by Representative Balanoff. House Resolution 1676, offered by Representative Balanoff. House Resolution 1677, offered by Representative Balanoff. House Resolution 1678, offered by Representative Balanoff. House Resolution 1679, offered by Representative Balanoff. House Resolution 1680, offered by Representative Balanoff. House Resolution 1681, offered by Representative Balanoff. House Resolution 1682, offered by Representative Balanoff. House Resolution 1682, offered by Representative Balanoff. And House Resolution 1683.

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

offered by Representative Balanoff."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, we have examined the Resolutions. They
are agreed to. I move the adoption of the Agreed
Resolutions."

Speaker McPike: "Gentleman moves the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. A11 in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. 'ayes' have it. The Agreed Resolutions are adopted. Special Order, Education, House Bills, Second Reading. House Bill 613, Representative McGann. Out of the record. House Bill 1222, Representative Curran. Out of the record. House Bill 1382, Representative Cowlishaw. Out of the record. House Bill 2874, Representative Shaw. Out of House Bill 3067, Representative Turner. Out of record. House Bill 3421, Representative Matijevich. the record. Out of the record. House Bill 3637, Representative Black. Representative Black here? Out of the record. House Bill 3789, Representative Wyvetter Younge. Out of the record. House Bill 3864, Representative McAuliffe. Out of the House Bill 3909, Representative Wyvetter Younge. record. House Bill 3989, Representative Hicks. House Bill 4023, Representative Turner. House Bill 4087, Representative Trotter. House Bill 4135, Representative Munizzi. Representative Shaw. Well, that's the end of 4180. Education Special Call, because no one wanted to call their Bill. Short day today. Now we go to Human Services, Second Reading. House Bill 1651, Representative Wyvetter Younge. Out of the record. House Bill 1656, Representative Wyvetter Younge. Out of the record. House Bill 3058, Representative Cullerton. Read the Bill, Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3058, a Bill for an Act to provide support services to prevent homeless. Second Reading of

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee."

Speaker McPike: "Any Motions filed?"

Clerk Leone: "No Motions filed."

Speaker McPike: "Any Floor Amendments?'

Clerk Leone: "No Floor Amendments."

- Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. House Bill 1681...I'm sorry.

 House Bill 3147, Representative Homer. Out of the record.

 House Bill 3483, Representative Lou Jones. Read the Bill,

 Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3483, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Public Aid Code. Second Reading of the Bill. There are no Committee or Floor Amendments."
- Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. House Bill 3565, Representative Currie. Out of the record. House Bill 3567, Representative Williams. Out of the record. House Bill Representative Didrickson. House Bill 3702, Representative Homer. House Bill 3755, Representative Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk. Read it and hold it on Levin. Second Reading."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3755, a Bill for an Act to amend the Nursing Home Care Act. Second Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker McPike: "House Bill 3958, Representative Bowman. Read
 the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3958, a Bill for an Act to amend the Children and Family Services Act. Second Reading of the Bill. There are no Committee or Floor Amendments."
- Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. Oh, Representative Bowman, there's a fiscal note requested. The Bill remains on Second Reading. House Bill 4074, Representative Curran. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 4074, a Bill for an Act to amend the Children and Family Services Act. Second Reading of the Bill. There are no Committee or Floor Amendments."

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

- Speaker McPike: "Alright. There's a fiscal note requested, that's not been filed. The Bill remains on Second Reading. House Bill 4099, Representative Farley. The Gentleman's in the hospital. Representative Cullerton, can you handle this for Representative Farley? We have leave for Representative Cullerton to handle this? Leave."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 4099, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act to provide for the enforcement of certain state and local food handling. Second Reading of the Bill. There are no Committee or Floor Amendments."
- Speaker McPike: "Out of the record. Bill stays on Second Reading. House Bill 4120, Representative Bugielski. Out of the record. House Bill 4178, out of the record. Insurance, Second Reading. House Bill 2839, Representative Sutker. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2839, a Bill for an Act concerning the use of replacement crash parts for damaged vehicles.

 Second Reading of the Bill. There are no Committee Amendments."

Speaker McPike: "Any Floor Amendments?"

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

Speaker McPike: "Representative Sutker."

Sutker: "Withdraw Amendment #1, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker McPike: "Amendment #1 is withdrawn. Further Amendments?"

Sutker: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. Floor Amendment #2...amends the Bill to provide for applicable warranties on replacement parts to include manufacturers, distributors, or installers. The original Bill only referred to manufacturers. I move that it be adopted."

Speaker McPike: "Is there any discussion on the Amendment?

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

Question is, 'Shall Amendment #2 be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment's adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. House Bill 2870, Representative Hultgren. Want the Bill called, Sir? Out of the record. Representative Young in the Chair."

Speaker Young, A.: "House Bill 3304, Representative Regan. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3304, a Bill for an Act in relationship to legislative proposals. Second Reading of the Bill. There are no Committee or Floor Amendments."

Speaker Young, A.: "Third Reading. House Bill 3324,

Representative Mautino. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3324, a Bill for an Act to amend certain
Acts in relationship to employees of Illinois. Second
Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in
committee."

Speaker Young, A.: "Are there any Motions filed?"

Clerk Leone: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Young, A.: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Young, A.: "Third Reading. House Bill 3683,
Representative Leverenz. Out of the record. House Bill
3941, Representative Satterthwaite. Out of the record.
House Bill 4025, Representative Giorgi. Out of the record.
House Bill 4048, Representative Williams. Representative
Williams? Read the Bill, Mr...out of the record. Out of
the record. On the same Order of Insurance, Second Reading
appears Senate Bill 100. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "On page 30 of the Calendar. Senate Bill 100, a
Bill for an Act to amend an Act in relationship to banks
and the sale of insurance. Second Reading of the Bill.

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

Amendment #4 was adopted previously."

Speaker Young, A.: "Are there any Motions filed?"

Clerk Leone: "There are no Motions filed."

Speaker Young, A.: "Are there any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No Floor Amendments."

- Speaker Young, A.: "Third Reading. We'll go back and pick up House Bill 2870, Representative Hultgren. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2870, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Insurance Code. Second Reading of the Bill.

 There are no Committee or Floor Amendments."
- Speaker Young, A.: "Third Reading We'll now go to the Order of Transportation, Second Reading. The Sponsors on this order are: Saltsman, LeFlore, Keane, Santiago, Parcells, Capparelli and Hicks. First Bill is House Bill 2867, Representative Saltsman. Out of the record. 2899, Representative LeFlore. Out of the record. 2967, Representative Keane. Out of the record. House Bill 2967, Representative Keane. Out of the record. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2967, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Highway Code. Second Reading of the Bill. There are no Committee Amendments."
- Speaker Young, A.: "Are there any Floor Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #1 is being offered by Representative McCracken."
- Speaker Young, A.: "Representative McCracken on Floor Amendment
 #1."
- McCracken: "Hi. I move adoption of Amendment #1. It would allow a city imposing impact fees to comply with previously set deadlines. This arose because of a vacancy in the city manager's office, which makes this necessary. I move adoption of Amendment #1."

- May 10, 1990
- Speaker Young, A.: "The Gentleman moves for adoption of Floor Amendment #1. On that question the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Keane."
- Keane: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I agree with the Amendment. It's a good one and urge its adoption."
- Speaker Young, A.: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #1 adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye', those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Young, A.: "Third Reading. House Bill 3043. Representative Santiago. Out of the record. House Bill 3050, Representative Saltsman. Representative Saltsman? Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3050, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Vehicle Code. Second Reading of the Bill. There are no Committee Amendments."
- Speaker Young, A.: "Are there any Floor Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #1 is being offered by Representative Saltsman."
- Speaker Young, A.: "Representative Saltsman."
- Saltsman: "Yes. All this Amendment does is clean up language from a Bill that we passed last year. And it's been agreed upon by the Secretary of State's office and the Illinois State Police. And this was a clean up some language in a Bill we passed previously."
- Speaker Young, A.: "The Gentleman moves for adoption of Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 3050. On that question is there any discussion? Hearing none. The question is, 'Shall the Amendment be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye', those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it and the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "There are no further Amendments."

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

- Speaker Young, A.: "Third Reading. House Bill 3618,
 Representative Capparelli. Representative Capparelli?
 Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3618, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Vehicle Code. Second Reading of the Bill.

 Amendment #1 was adopted in committee."

Speaker Young, A.: "Are there any Motions filed?"

Clerk Leone: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Young, A.: "Are there any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No Floor Amendments."

- Speaker Young, A.: "Third Reading. House Bill 3631,

 Representative Hicks. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3631, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Vehicle Code."
- Speaker Young, A.: "Take that Bill out of the record for one second, please. House Bill 3903, Representative Bugielski.

 Representative Bugielski? Representative Bugielski? Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3903, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Vehicle Code."
- Speaker Young, A.: "Out of the record. Mr. Clerk. House Bill 3915, Represent Representative Goforth. Out of the record. House Bill 4159, Representative Wennlund. Representative Wennlund. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 4159, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Vehicle Code. Second Reading of the Bill. There are no Committee or Floor Amendments."
- Speaker Young, A.: "Are there any Floor Amendments? Mr. Clerk, were there any Amendments on House Bill 4159?"
- Clerk Leone: "There were no Committee or Floor Amendments."
- Speaker Young, A.: "Third Reading. House Bill 4172,
 Representative Hicks. Out of the record. House Bill 4173,
 Representative Hartke. Representative Hartke.

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

Representative Hartke do you want your Bill called? Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 4172."

Speaker Young, A.: "4173."

- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 4173, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Highway Code. Second Reading of the Bill. There are no Committee or Floor Amendments."
- Speaker Young, A.: "Third Reading. On this same Order, some Bills we passed over. House Bill 2899, Representative LeFlore. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2899, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act in relationship to public conveyance transportation drivers. Second Reading of the Bill. There are no Committee Amendments."
- Speaker Young, A.: "Are there any Floor Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #1 is being offered by Representative Keane. No, that's...Floor Amendment #1 is being offered by Representative LeFlore."
- Speaker Keane: "Representative LeFlore on Floor Amendment #1."
- LeFlore: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Amendment #1 requires individuals who is applying for bus driver's position to be tested. For a criminal background check and also be tested for drugs and other substances abuse. We find that this is necessary, because there has been such a tragic of accidents with our drivers who is driving our busses in this in the inner city of Chicago. So therefore, I ask for a favorable vote on this Amendment."
- Speaker Young, A.: "Gentleman moves for the adoption of Floor

 Amendment #1 to House Bill 2899. On that question,

 Representative McCracken."
- McCracken: "What is the law currently? Who pays for background checks now in these same circumstances?"
- LeFlore: "They are paid for by the individuals themselves."

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

McCracken: "The applicant?"

LeFlore: "Yes."

McCracken: "How much, and is the thrust of the Amendment or the Bill to remove that burden? Is that the point?"

LeFlore: "Okay, Representative McCracken, I just was informed that the firm, or the contractor...CTA...would have to pay for the checks. In this Amendment."

McCracken: "Right. Do they do that now?"

LeFlore: "I don't think so."

McCracken: "Do they have background checks now?"

LeFlore: "Well, they have it, but not as...it's not in depth like it should be. And they are trying to...you know...add few more clause to the language so it can be stronger."

McCracken: "Do you know how much the background check costs? How
 much the charge is?"

LeFlore: "I understand it runs between 35 to 50 dollars...depends on the type."

McCracken: "\$35 dollars? And it's currently required, is that right?"

LeFlore: "YEAH."

McCracken: "And it's currently required, is that right?"

LeFlore: "Yes."

LeFlore: "I think the applicant is responsible for paying it."

McCracken: "Under this Amendment the company would be required to pay for it, is that right?"

LeFlore: "Right. Exactly. Right."

McCracken: "And is the purpose of that so that you don't burden the applicant with the cost?"

LeFlore: "Yes."

McCracken: "And this does not delete the underlying Bill, I take it."

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

LeFlore: "Correct."

McCracken: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Young, A.: "Further discussion? Hearing none. The question is, 'Shall the Amendment be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye', those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Young, A.: "Third Reading. House Bill 3334,

Representative Parcells. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3334, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Vehicle Code. Second Reading of the Bill. There are no Committee Amendments."

Speaker Young, A.: "Are there any Floor Amendments?"

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

Speaker Young, A.: "Representative Parcells."

Parcells: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Bill deals primarily with three areas. And this particular area which dealt with alcohol tests administered within two hours of a driver being stopped seemed to be controversial, and rather than take the time this year to work it out, we've decided to remove that paragraph entirely, which is what this Amendment does. And we'll deal with the issue next year when we can get all interested parties together on the issue. And I'd ask for the approval of House Amendment #1."

Speaker Young, A.: "The Lady has moved for the adoption of Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 3334. And on that question is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall the Amendment be adopted?' All those in favor vote 'aye'...all those in favor say 'aye', those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it, and

- May 10, 1990
- the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Young, A.: "Third Reading. House Bill 3631,
 Representative Hicks. Representative Hicks? Out of the
 record. Excuse me, Mr. Clerk. House Bill 3631. Read the
 Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3631, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Vehicle Code. Second Reading of the Bill. There are no Committee or Floor Amendments."
- Speaker Young, A.: "Third Reading. We will now go to the Order of Economic Development, Second Readings. The Sponsors on this Order are: Younge and LeFlore. House Bill 1560, Representative Younge. Out of the record. House Bill 2533, Representative Younge. Out of the record. House Bill 2535, Representative Younge. Out of the record. House Bill 2714, Representative Younge. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2714, a Bill for an Act to amend the Build Illinois Act. Second Reading of the Bill. There are no Committee Amendments."
- Speaker Young, A.: "Are there any Floor Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #1 is being offered by Representative Wyvetter Younge."
- Speaker Young, A.: "Representative Younge on Floor Amendment #1."
 Younge: "...mendment. Mr. Speaker withdraw the Amendment."
- Speaker Young, A.: "Withdraw Amendment #1. Any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "There are no further Amendments."
- Speaker Young, A.: "Third Reading. House Bill...Representative McCracken."
- McCracken: "We had requested a fiscal note. Has it been filed?

 Was it? I might have withdrawn on this..."
- Clerk Leone: "Fiscal Note has been filed on House Bill 2714."

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

McCracken: "Oh, alright."

Speaker Young, A.: "Representative Younge, a fiscal note has been filed on House Bill 2714. So, the Bill...the note has been filed and the Bill will move to Third Reading. House Bill 2876, Representative LeFlore. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2876, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act concerning small business surety bonds. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee."

Speaker Young, A.: "Are there any Motions filed?"

Clerk Leone: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Young, A.: "Are there any Floor Amendments?"

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

LeFlore: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Amendment #2 identifies...the administrators, agents for the program, and that agent happened to be the Department of Insurance. And this agent will regulate and administer the surety foundation. It takes out the Illinois authority and adds it to the Insurance Department."

Speaker Young, A.: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 2876. On that question the Gentleman from Dupage, Representative McCracken."

"Thank you. I rise in opposition to this Amendment. McCracken: originally to be handled by the Illinois Development Finance Authority, which estimated that cost of a pilot program, start up would be \$1.5 million. Obviously, to the extent the state is asked to guarantee bid bonds up to a million dollars on any particular bond in the amount of 90 percent. We are talking about potentially, very, very dramatic cost to the state for this program. Now, I understand that some of these contractors might have some problems securing bid bonds, but if all you're doing is asking the state to guarantee the loss in

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

the event of any losses, using tax dollars, for the purpose of securing contractor's rights. So the contractor faces virtually no risk in the job. The risk stays with the state. Now why should the risk stay with the state to such a dramatic extent? This is not a good idea. This is not productive, in fact I...I think it could very well be counter productive, because what you will find is people not going with low bidders in this sort of situation at times. To the extent they have the authority not to go with low bidders..."

Speaker Young, A.: "Excuse me, Representative McCracken. For
 what purpose does Representative Cullerton seek
 recognition?"

Cullerton: "I'm sorry. Just a point of Order. Are we on Third Reading?"

McCracken: "No. I'm talking about the Amendment."

Cullerton: "Oh, okay. The Amendment deals with insurance?"

McCracken: "Well, it's the whole Bill...its the Bill."

Cullerton: "Oh, the Amendment becomes the Bill? Okay, thank you."

Speaker Young, A.: "Representative McCracken."

McCracken: "So, I rise in opposition."

Speaker Young, A.: "The Gentleman from Coles, Representative Weaver."

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

Speaker Young, A.: "Indicates he will yield for a question."

Weaver: "Representative, we talked and debated this Bill in committee for great length. And I guess I'm still a bit concerned about where we're sending the money. Has the

Department of Insurance agreed to handle this program?"

LeFlore: "Yes. They have."

Weaver: "Why did we choose the Department of Insurance, rather

- May 10, 1990
- than the Department of Commerce and Community Affairs?"
- LeFlore: "Because Commerce and Community Affairs said they are not in a position to handle this type of program. I spoke with them."
- Weaver: "Even with...even with their office of Minority Business

 Enterprise, they felt they couldn't handle this

 program?..."
- LeFlore: "Well, I don't know their reason for a refusal, but that's what they've told me. And I didn't feel very good in going with them...forcing them to take the program if they are not willing to administrate the program. So, therefore, that's the reason I went to the Department of Insurance."
- Weaver: "I...I understand why you've done that. Not that I necessarily agree. I think, probably, DCCA's still the best place for it, but I understand why you did that. Thank you."
- Speaker Young, A.: "Further discussion? Representative LeFlore
 to close."
- LeFlore: "Just ask for a favorable vote on this Amendment."
- Speaker Young, A.: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Floor Amendment #2. All those in favor vote 'aye'. Those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk take the record. On this question there are 62 voting 'yes', 51 voting 'no', and the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments? Representative LeFlore."
- Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Young, A.: "There is a request for a fiscal note on this Bill, which has not been filed."
- LeFlore: "Mr. Speaker, I think that fiscal note has been filed already. They should have it up..."
- Speaker Young, A.: "The Clerk does not have a fiscal note, but

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

there is another request for a note, as amended by Amendment #2. The Bill will remain on Second Reading. For the Members later today we will be voting on House Supplemental Calendar #1, the yellow Calendar, Members should review the Calendar. There will be forms to vote against any Bills that a Member wishes to vote against, shortly at the Clerk's well. We'll now go to the Order of State Government Administration, Second Reading. The Sponsors of this Order are, Matijevich, Currie, Cullerton. The First Bill is House Bill 3197. Representative Matijevich. Out of the record. House Bill 3613. Representative Cullerton. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3613, a Bill for an Act to amend the

Home Ownership Made Easy Act. Second Reading of the Bill.

Amendment #1 was adopted in committee."

Speaker Young, A.: "Are there any Motions filed?"

Clerk Leone: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Young, A.: "Are there any Floor Amendments? There is a
 request for a fiscal note on House Bill 3613 which has not
 been filed. Representative Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Could you tell me what date the fiscal note was requested?"

Speaker Young, A.: "The note was requested on May 7th."

Cullerton: "May 7th."

Speaker Young, A.: "May 7th."

Cullerton: "Maybe...it's a good time to review the process when a fiscal note is requested. Is the request given...in addition to the Sponsor...is the request given to the appropriate state agency? Because maybe...maybe the Clerk might know that."

Speaker Young, A.: "No, Representative, the request is not given
to the appropriate state agency. It's up to the Sponsor of
the Bill to procure the note."

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

- Cullerton: "Okay. Well, I'll talk to Representative Madigan about this, and we'll get one today."
- Speaker Young, A.: "The Bill will remain on Second Reading.

 House Bill 3623, Representative Currie. Read the Bill, Mr.

 Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3623, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act concerning comparable worth. Second Reading of the Bill.

 There are no Committee Amendments."

Speaker Young, A.: "Are there any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "There are no Floor Amendments."

Speaker Young, A.: "Representative Currie."

Currie: "Has the fiscal note been filed?"

Speaker Young, A.: "The note has not been filed."

- Currie: "That was what held up the Bill yesterday, too. Thank you."
- Speaker Young, A.: "The Bill will remain on Second Reading.

 House Bill 3777, Representative Currie. Out of the record.

 House Bill 4050, Representative Currie. Out of the record.

 House Bill 4196, Representative Cullerton. Read the Bill,

 Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 4196, a Bill for an Act concerning college athletics. Second Reading of the Bill. There are no Committee or Floor Amendments."
- Speaker Young, A.: "Third Reading. Representative Cullerton."
- Cullerton: "Yes. I wanted to make sure the Bill was read a second time and left on Second Reading. We're going to have an Amendment ready today."
- Speaker Young, A.: "Leave the...House Bill 4196 on Second Reading, Mr. Clerk. Senate Bill 784, Representative Lang. Representative Lang? Senate Bill 784. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "On page 30 of the Calendar. Senate Bill 784, a
 Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Act on Aging. Second

- May 10, 1990
- Reading of the Bill. There are no Committee or Floor Amendments."
- Speaker Young, A.: "Third Reading. On this same Order we will go back to House Bill 3197, Representative Matijevich."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill..."
- Matijevich: "I think we want to hold that on Second."
- Speaker Young, A.: "Out of the record. We will now go to the Order of State and Local Governments Second Reading. State and Local Governments Second Reading. The Sponsors are: Black, Martinez, Wyvetter Younge, Giorgi, Matijevich, Hallock, Hicks. The first Bill is House Bill 970, Representative Black. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk. Out of the record. House Bill 1018, Representative Martinez. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1018, a Bill for an Act to amend the Personnel Code. Second Reading of the Bill. There are no Committee or Floor Amendments."
- Speaker Young, A.: "Third Reading. House Bill 1649,
 Representative Younge. Out of the record. House Bill
 2538, Representative Younge. 2538, Representative Younge.
 Out of the record. House Bill 2991, Representative Giorgi.
 Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2991, a Bill for an Act to amend the Sanitary Districts Act. Second Reading of the Bill. There are no Committee Amendments."
- Speaker Younge: "Are there any Motions filed? Out of the record,

 Mr. Clerk. House Bill 3000, Representative Matijevich.

 Representative Matijevich."
- Matijevich: "DCCA told me they are going to get a fiscal note, but I don't...do we have it yet?"
- Speaker Young, A.: "House Bill 3000."
- Matijevich: "They told me yesterday, they'd rush it in,

- May 10, 1990
- but...no?...no. Out of the record, then."
- Speaker Young, A.: "Out of the record. House Bill 3134, Representative Hallock. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3134, a Bill for an Act providing for a law enforcement medal of honor. Second Reading of the Bill. There are no Committee Amendments."
- Speaker Young, A.: "Are there any Floor Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "Amendment #1 was withdrawn in Committee. Floor

 Amendment #2 being offered by Representative Hallock."
- Speaker Young, A.: "Representative Hallock."
- Hallock: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Members of the House, this
 Bill creates a Law Enforcement Medal of Honor Committee.

 The Amendment merely changes the designees on that
 committee by statute. And I would ask that the Amendment
 be adopted."
- Speaker Young, A.: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #2. On that question is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall the Amendment be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye', those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Young, A.: "Third Reading. House Bill 3148,
 Representative Matijevich. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk.
 Representative Matijevich."
- Matijevich: "That Bill...the Clerk can take that off of Special
 Order. I'm not going to call that Bill this Session. So,
 you can that off the Special Order from now on."
- Speaker Young, A.: "Take the Bill out of the record, and off of Special Order. House Bill 3261, Representative Hicks. Out of the record. House Bill 3367, Representative Leverenz. Out of the record. House Bill 3404, Representative Myron Olson. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3404, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act to revise the law in relationship to Clerks of the Court.

Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee."

Speaker Young, A.: "Are there any Motions filed?"

Clerk Leone: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Young, A.: "Are there any Floor Amendments?"

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

Speaker Young, A.: "Representative Olson."

Olson M.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 3404 comes from the Illinois Supreme Court through their administrative arm. Relative to recommendations they make in February of this year for reform in the court system. This has to do with the handling of monies by Circuit Clerks. We adopted an Amendment in committee which was flawed in the sense that it in the view of our staffer, Art Harrison, it may have put attorneys in jeopardy relative to a malpractice situation. So, Amendment #2 has been drafted to offer relief in that area and still keep the substance of the Bill. I'd be happy to answer questions."

Speaker Young, A.: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 3404. On that question is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Dekalb, Representative Countryman."

Countryman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Gentleman yield?" Speaker Young, A.: "Indicates he will yield for a question."

Countryman: "Now, what does the underlying Bill do?"

Olson M.: "The underlying Bill comes from the administrative courts, and it basically prescribes the manner in which clerks will invest monies in accounts with the court order, and how the distribution will be made. And the Amendment

- May 10, 1990
- that I'm offering here protects attorneys from malpractice which seemed to have been included in the first draft."
- Countryman: "Okay, so if...if you file...state files an eminent domain proceeding and they deposit the money with the clerk or the treasurer or the clerk of the circuit court, or whoever. This is how they handle that money, is that right?"
- Olson M.: "If the clerk is directed to invest it in an account, then upon the order being filed in the case the clerk will do that. What is Amend..."
- Countryman: "Who gets the interest on that money?"
- Olson M.: "Well, the county gets the interest, but that's in the underlying Bill."
- Countryman: "Why should they get the money?"
- Olson, M.: "Pardon?"
- Countryman: "Why should they get the money?"
- Olson M.: "Because that is the way that it was described by the Supreme Court to be handled."
- Countryman: "Well, shouldn't the people who deposit the money get the money?"
- Olson M.: "Well, that would be a case for another measure. This is the way..."
- Countryman: "Oh, you're saying in the Amendment that you previously put on that the county gets the money."
- Olson M.: "No. That's in the underlying Bill."
- Countryman: "That's the underlying Bill? What's the Amendment do then?"
- Olson M.: "The Amendment has to do with the malpractice factor for attorneys which were inordinately stated in Amendment #1, which was drafted..."
- Countryman: "How can an attorney be guilty of malpractice if the county gets all the interest?"
- Olson M.: "Well, it's a matter of notification of the parties."

- May 10, 1990
- Countryman: "This only deals with...the Amendment only deals with the notice?"
- Olson M.: "That is basically what it does."
- Countryman: "Well, it sounds like a good Amendment, but a bad Bill."
- Olson M.: "Well, it sounds like a good Amendment and a good Bill, sir. Thank you."
- Countryman: "Thank you."
- Speaker Young, A.: "Further discussion? The question is, 'Shall the Amendment be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye', those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it and the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "No further...there are no further Amendments."
- Speaker Young, A.: "Third Reading. House Bill 3699,
 Representative Novak. Out of the record. House Bill 3872,
 Representative Matijevich. Out of the record. House Bill
 3984, Representative Ewing. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3984, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Lottery Law. Second Reading of the Bill. There are no Committee or Floor Amendments."
- Speaker Young, A.: "Third Reading. House Bill 3993,

 Representative Cullerton. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3993, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Municipal Code. Second Reading of the Bill. There are no Committee or Floor Amendments."
- Speaker Young, A.: "Third Reading. Representative Cullerton."
- Cullerton: "Could you, please, bring that Bill back to Second and leave it there?"
- Speaker Young, A.: "Leave House Bill 3993 on Second Reading.

 House Bill 4061, Representative Kubik. Representative

 Kubik? House Bill 4061. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 4061, a Bill for an Act to amend the

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

State Comptroller Act. Second Reading of the Bill. There are no Committee or Floor Amendments."

Wojcik: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. Would I have leave to take House Bill 3589 back to Second Reading for the purpose of an Amendment?"

Speaker Young, A.: "What was that House Bill?"

Wojcik: "3589."

Speaker Young, A.: "What Order is that Bill on?"

Wojcik: "It's on the Order of State and Local Government, Third Reading."

Speaker Young, A.: "House Bill 3589, Mr. Clerk. Representative Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Yes, I... I don't know if it's printed or distributed.

It's not."

Speaker Young, A.: "Representative Wojcik, the Amendment has not been printed and distributed."

Wojcik: "...I don't know. Let me check and see. I thought they were distributed."

Speaker Young, A.: "No. We are told that it has not been."

Wojcik: "It has not?"

Speaker Young, A.: "It has not."

Wojcik: "Then can I leave it on Second until the Amendment gets distributed?"

Speaker Young, A.: "The Lady asks leave to return House Bill 3589 to Second Reading for purposes of an Amendment."

Wojcik: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Young, A.: "Leave is granted. On that same Order appears
House Bill 3020, Representative Cullerton. Representative
Cullerton asks leave of the Body to return House Bill 3020
to Second Reading for purposes of Amendment. Does he have
leave? Leave is granted. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk, on

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

Second Reading."

- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3020, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Vehicle Code. It has been read a second time previously. Floor Amendment #1 is being offered by Representative Cullerton."
- Speaker Young, A.: "Representative Cullerton."
- Cullerton: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The Bill when it was originally drafted contained some language dealing with...private streets and roads, which had nothing to do with what I wanted the Bill to do. So, the Amendment just strikes that language and...clarifies some language with regards to the Bill that I want to pass, which deals with motorcycle helmets for minors. So I move for the adoption of the Amendment."
- Speaker Young, A.: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 3020. On that question is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall the Amendment be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye', those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment is adopted. Third Reading. Are there any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #2 offered by Representative Hallock."
- Speaker Young, A.: "Representative Hallock on Floor Amendment
 #2."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Hallock."
- Hallock: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Members of the House, this

 Amendment merely restricts the Bill to under 18. I would

 move that it be adopted."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Cullerton."
- Cullerton: "Yes. I agree with this Amendment. It's my intention to have this Bill only applied both for operators and for passengers for those people that are under 18. So I agree

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

with the Amendment."

Parke: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I've just one question. What is the difference between Amendment 1 and Amendment 2?"

Speaker McPike: "Representative Hallock."

Hallock: "I haven't seen Amendment #1 and I can explain #2.
 Number two (#2) makes it apply to those who are under 18
 years of age."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Cullerton."

Cullerton: "I think I can clear this up. Amendment #1 says in addition every operator and passenger who is under 18 years of age shall be required to wear a helmet. What Representative Hallock's Amendment says...the way it would read with his Amendment is...in addition every operator who is under 18 years of age and passenger who is under 18 years of age shall be required to wear a helmet. So he just wanted to make sure that it covered both the operator and the passenger. And restricted it to be under 18."

Parke: "Thank you, very much."

Cullerton: "I view it as a clarifying Amendment, and it's fine with me."

Parke: "Thank you."

Speaker McPike: "Question is, 'Shall Amendment #2 be adopted?'

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

and the Amendment's adopted. Further Amendments? Mr.

Clerk? Further Amendments?"

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

Speaker McPike: "Representative Hicks. Withdraw Amendment #3. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #4 being offered by Representative Hicks."

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

Speaker McPike: "Representative Hicks. Amendment #4."

Hicks: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #4 would require that helmets be used for all types of cycles including the small moped type cycles that some of the children would...would ride. Be happy and try to answer to questions."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Cullerton."

Cullerton: "Yes. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think this is going a little bit too far. I was in the committee, and the committee Members asked that...that I make it clear that this Motorcycle Helmet Law did not apply to these...pedacycles. I did that, but what Representative Hicks wants to do with this Amendment is to require even these small pedacycles that don't go very fast at all require that the passengers and the drivers under 18...not even sure if it's limited...well, it might be limited to people under 18, but he's requiring that they have to wear a helmet, too. I think mopeds and pedacycles are...are not as dangerous as these fast riding motorcycles. So, I don't agree with this Amendment, and I think it's going a little bit too far at this stage. And I would appreciate it if we would not pass this Amendment."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Weaver."

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

Speaker McPike: "Yes."

Weaver: "Representative, I understand the intent of the Bill is to make...Representative, I understand the intent of the Bill is to make motorcycle riding safer for children under 18, which the Sponsor of the underlying Bill maintains that that is his intent. Maybe you can help us understand why you want it to apply to pedacycles? Do you have an idea what the top speed of some of these pedacycles may be?"

- May 10, 1990
- Hicks: "Well, several of them are...they're quite quick really.

 I mean, I think some of them go actually as fast as 25 or

 30 miles an hour for the small pedacycle. Or can be at least."
- Weaver: "So...a child who would get into an accident riding a pedacycle going 25 or 30 miles an hour, may very well be subject to head injuries. Is that not true?"
- Hicks: "Certainly, they might be. And if we're going to require the helmets for all children, then we should include everything that is a motorized type vehicle, with the pedacycles being that type of vehicle."
- Weaver: "So, it appears that the intent of the Bill is to protect children, then perhaps we ought to consider this Amendment in a positive...positive vein. I think it's probably a good idea if we want...if our intent really is to protect children with this Bill to make it apply to vehicles that go 25 to 30 miles an hour. Thank you."
- Hicks: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd just simply ask for an 'aye'
 vote."
- Speaker McPike: "Question is, 'Shall Amendment #4 be adopted?'

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

 voted...have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the

 record. On this Amendment there are 26 'ayes' and 76 'nos'

 and the Amendment fails. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "There are no further Amendments."
- Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. Special Order Criminal Law,
 Second Reading. Appears House Bill 2399, Representative
 Homer. Out of the record. House Bill 2685, Representative
 Homer. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 26...House Bill 2685, a Bill for an Act to amend the Unified Code of Corrections. Second Reading

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

of the Bill. Amendments #1 and 2 were adopted in committee."

Speaker McPike: "Any Motions filed?"

Clerk Leone: "No Motions filed."

Speaker McPike: "Any Floor Amendments?"

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

- Speaker McPike: "Representative Countryman. Representative Homer."
- Homer: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a Motion with respect to Amendment #2. I would move to table Amendment #2, which was adopted in committee."
- Speaker McPike: "Alright. The Motion is to table Amendment #2.

 Is there any discussion on the Gentleman's Motion? Being no discussion, the question is, 'Shall Amendment #2 be tabled'? All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Amendment #2 is tabled. We're on Amendment #3.

 Representative Countryman."
- Countryman: "Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the house. This Amendment deals with the Boot Camp Bill and what this Amendment does is to clarify that there's no good time credit given for people serving in...in the boot camp program. The reason for that is we want the boot camp program will run between 120 to 160 days, and we want to make sure that somebody doesn't go a 100 days or something and say I'm entitled to be released. So, it's really a technical Amendment and would ask for its approval."
- Speaker McPike: "Is there any discussion? Being none, the question is, 'Shall Amendment #3 be adopted?' All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #4 offered by Representative

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

Homer."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Homer."

Homer: "Thank you, Speaker. Would you withdraw that Amendment?"

Speaker McPike: "Amendment #4 is withdrawn. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "There are no further Amendments."

Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. House Bill 2957, Representative Cullerton. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk. Out of the record. House Bill 2959, Representative Countryman. Mr. Out of the record. Countryman? House Bill Representative Krska. Out of the record. House Bill 3523, Represe...out of the record. Alright. House Bill 3523, Representative Williams. Out of the record. House Bill 3610, Representative Homer. Out of the record. House Bill 3611, Mr. Homer. Out of the record. House Bill 3816, Representative Williams. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3816, a Bill for an Act to amend the Unified Code of Corrections. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee."

Speaker McPike: "Any Motions filed?"

Clerk Leone: "No Motions filed."

Speaker McPike: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #2 is being offered by Representative Williams and Kirkland."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Williams."

Williams: "Yes. This is the Amendment that we agreed to in the This deals with residential burglary. committee. The Amendment would allow for some minimum...number of sentence to be served...I believe it's not less than a 180 consecutive days. And it puts on additional conditions under which the first offenders could use this particular sentencing under the residential burglary aspect of statutes. We talked about this in committee. Agreed to these Amendments before the committee. And this basically

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

this...and with this Amendment the Bill actually now that former, I mean, not former but goes further than what the Bill Representative Cullerton formerly had here before the Body, because now in addition to the minimum days and the conditions under which it would be available, you now have restitution as part of the sentencing and an additional type of intensive probation. And I ask for a favorable...I ask that we adopt Amendment #2."

Speaker McPike: "Any discussion? On this Representative Piel."

Piel: "I don't know if I got...first of all, I've got not problem with the Amendment, but I question the Parliamentarian and the Chair, Mr. Speaker. Shouldn't this be as amended...the Amendment itself? I don't know if we can correct it on its face, but I think the Amendment should be that way. I think it's improper the way it's worded right now. Because of Amendment #1, Mike. The Amendment #2 is not as amended. I don't know if we can do that on its face, or if we'd have to...you know...you can..."

Speaker McPike: "The Amendment is in acceptable form the way it is."

Piel: "Without 'as amended' on it?"

Speaker McPike: "Yes. Representative Pullen. Representative Pullen. Representative Pullen...Mr. Electrician. No. Pullen is not 'on', Homer's 'on'."

Pullen: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to ask the Gentleman a question, please."

Speaker McPike: "Yes. Representative Williams."

Pullen: "Did you indicate that this Amendment, among other things, adds a requirement of restitution?"

Williams: "The Amendment has...it also has...and restitution be ordered as provided in Section 5.56 as would be discretionary with the judge, but restitution becomes a...one of the things that the judge can order for the

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

defendant as part and partial of any agreement that they might work out as it relates to this particular first offender."

- Pullen: "I'd like to congratulate you, Sir, on introducing this principle of rehabilitation. Thank you."
- Speaker McPike: "Question is, 'Shall Amendment #2 be adopted?'

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

 and the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. House Bill 3838. Representative Grace Mary Stern. Out of the record. Stern. Fiscal Note is...has not been filed on that. House Bill Representative McCracken. Out of the record? House Bill 4067, Representative Homer. The next three Bills are your's, Representative Homer. What's your desire, sir? Alright. House Bill 4067, 4124 and 4126 are out record. House Bill 4129, Representative Santiago. Representative Santiago, did you want this Bill called? House Bill 4138, Representative Out of the record. Munizzi. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk, 4138."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 4138, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act in relationship to insurance fraud. Second Reading of the Bill. There are no Committee or Floor Amendments."
- Speaker McPike: "You want this left on Second Reading? no Floor Amendments. Alright. Third Reading. House Bill 4149, Representative Santiago. 4149. Out of the record. The Supplemental...if I could... Chair could have your attention for а minute. Supplemental...yellow Calendar...that you have. You also have a long form printout. And if you would spend a little bit of reading through these Bills, we are going to vote on them this afternoon, at which time you can change your votes at the Clerk's well on the forms that will be provided.

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

- Special Order Children, Second Reading. House Bill 3579, Representative Trotter. Out of the record. 3581, Representative Trotter. Out of the record. House Bill 3771, Representative Breslin. Representative Breslin? Out of the record. Representative Breslin. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk, House Bill 3771."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3771, a Bill for an Act to amend the state agency."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Barnes, for what reason do you rise?"
- Barnes: "Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to introduce some students from my district from the Palos Heights Independence Junior High. They are up in the balcony and I'd like to welcome them to Springfield."
- Speaker McPike: "Clearly against the rules, Representative
 Barnes, but...there's a fiscal note requested on this Bill.
 You want to proceed? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3771, a Bill for an Act to amend the State Agency Employees Child Care Services Act. Second Reading of the Bill. There are no Committee Amendments."
- Speaker McPike: "Any Floor Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #1 being offered by Representative Breslin Barnes Deuchler."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Breslin."
- Breslin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen,
 Amendment #1 puts a limitation of fifty employees to be
 employed in any of these buildings before a child care
 facility would be considered for that building. It is the
 request of Central Management Services and with the
 adoption of this Amendment Central Management Services will
 go neutral on the Bill. I ask for the adoption of the
 Amendment."
- Speaker McPike: "Is there any discussion? Being none. The

114th Legislative Day

May 10. 1990

question is, 'Shall Amendment #1 be adopted?' All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the Amendment's adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "There are no further Amendments."

Speaker McPike: "Still need a fiscal note. Stays on Second Reading. On the Order of the Environment, Second Reading. Appears House Bill 3183, Representative Giglio. House Bill 3238, Representative Edley. Mr. Edley? Would you like to have your Bill called, sir? Out of the record. House Bill 3283, Representative Giglio. Out of the record. House Bill 3507, Representative Kulas. Out of the record. House Bill 3649, Representative Hartke. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3649, a Bill for an Act in relationship to agri-chemical contamination. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee."

Speaker McPike: "Any Motions filed?"

Clerk Leone: "No Motions filed."

Speaker McPike: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Hartke."

Hartke: "Could we take it out of the record, please?"

Speaker McPike: "Representative Kulas on House Bill 3846. Out of the record. Representative Novak, House Bill 3952. Mr. Novak...3952. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3952, a Bill for an Act concerning organic labeling. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee."

Speaker McPike: "Any Motions filed?"

Clerk Leone: "No Motions filed."

Speaker McPike: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. On the Order of Public

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

Utilities, Second Reading. House Bill 3667, Representative Homer. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3667, a Bill for an Act to amend the Public Utilities Act. Second Reading of the Bill.

Amendment #1...Amendment #1 on House Bill 3667 was adopted in committee."

Speaker McPike: "Any Motions filed?"

Clerk Leone: "No Motions filed."

Speaker McPike: "Any Floor Amendments?"

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

Speaker McPike: "Representative Homer."

Homer: "Mr. Speaker, would...I would like to withdraw Amendments 2 and 3."

Speaker McPike: "Gentleman withdraws Amendment #2 and Amendment
#3. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #4 being offered by Representative Homer."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Homer."

Homer: "Thank you. Mr. Speaker, Amendment #4 is an Amendment to the Caller Identification Bill that provides that the blocking that a phone company would have to provide to customers would be on a per call basis, and not a per line basis. In addition, the Amendment addresses some law enforcement concerns making exceptions with regard to blocking when dealing with call tracing—trapping procedures, and also for 800 and 900 calls. So, I would urge your favorable consideration of the Amendment."

Speaker McPike: "Is there any discussion on this Amendment? Yes.

On the Amendment Representative Black. Representative

Jones in the Chair."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Will the Gentleman yield? Am I to assume you've yielded, Representative? Am

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

I to assume you've yielded? That's very kind of you, thank you. Question on Amendment #4, Representative. With your Amendment could you tell the Body...the State Police and/or local law enforcement officials, are they supportive of Amendment #4? Neutral? Opposed?"

- Homer: "They...they support. There's a part of this Amendment that they asked for. The part about line 12 through 14 was put in at the law enforcement request."
- Black: "Okay. Let me ask you a couple of other questions on Amendment #4. If I have the service, and I'm sure that you would agree that we sometimes get some very interesting calls, so I may want that service. I may want to know who's calling me. If the person calling me has been involved in harassment at one time or another, would that customer have the ability to block his or her number from my caller ID service?"
- Homer: "The predicate of your question is if they've been involved in harassment?"
- Black: "Well, let's say that I have had my...more than my share, as many of us on this floor have...harassment type phone calls. I may really like this service. I may want that number to appear on my phone. Would this Amendment inhibit my right to see who's calling me?"
- Homer: "If someone evoked the blocking option, yes. You would not know who was calling you."
- Black: "Well, you know that's a very interesting concept.

 How...How in your Amendment, and I'm sure you...knowing
 your intelligence you've thought of this...How are we going
 to be able to prohibit or prevent someone who is a known
 telephone abuser, let's say, from just getting the blocking
 service, so he or she is free to do their thing with their
 telephone?"

Homer: "Well, that...that's what those lines that we were talking

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

about earier would...would prevent them from doing. Lines 12 through 14 exempt situations where there's a tracer or trapping procedure. In other words, if your line is being, if you have a tracer on your line to trap calls then the person could not block their calls. They would be revealed. There number would be revealed."

Black: "Even though that...the calling person may think that his number is blocked, it really won't be, will it?"

Homer: "That's true."

Black: "So if I have a trap on my line, every number is going to be displayed? Every incoming number will be displayed?"

Homer: "That's a good point. This could lead to greater detection of obscene phone callers, who think they are blocking the calls, but in fact because of this provision, and the police have a tracer on that line, they'll be detected."

Black: "Okay. Thank you very much."

Speaker Jones: "The Gentleman from Cook, Mr. Parke."

Parke: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I have some real concerns about this Amendment. My concern is that it seems that only if you have a tracer can you benefit from this. And how few people in the course of a given year will actually have a tracer put on their phone? Would the Sponsor yield for a question, please?"

Speaker Jones: "He indicates he will."

Parke: "Thank you. Would the...phone companies...what has been their position on this Amendment? What do you think their feeling would be on this Amendment?"

Homer: "Well, they...you know...my view is that they would probably prefer the Amendment. There are some...that Illinois Bell has indicated...that they have some objections to the Bill. But the Amendment is to address some of the objections. Most of the other phone companies

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

including CENTEL, who offers this service is now in favor of this Bill with this Amendment, because they already...in for example, Nevada where CENTEL operates and has this service, they already offer per call blocking. So, if they offer it in Illinois they...they plan to do this anyway."

Parke: "Well, thank you. To the Bill...to the Amendment, excuse

me. It is my understanding that this continues to be a blocking aspect of the initial concept. And that phone companies think that citizens should have the right to understand and be able to detect who is calling them. and I believe that having open access to this service is something that most citizens in this state would want. so, therefore, I rise in opposition to this Amendment because it further blocks the individual citizen's right to detect who in fact is calling them. Whether it's in connection with police departments or not. And I, therefore, rise in opposition to this Amendment."

Speaker Jones: "The Gentleman from Champaign, Mr. Johnson."

Johnson: "Representative Homer, approximately, how much would it cost to have a tracer service put on your telephone?"

Homer: "A tracer service?"

Johnson: "Yes. If you went, and you were being harassed or otherwise and you wanted to have a tracer service put on you telephone, how much would it cost? Do you know?"

Homer: "I don't...you know, if you call the police they do it without charge to you...I don't...there's no charge to the customer that I know of. Tim."

Johnson: "No, no. I'm sure that there's a charge. Police don't routinely do it anyway."

Homer: "We used to use these...We used to use these all the time when I was a prosecutor, and there was never a charge to the customer if they were being harassed."

Johnson: "Here's my concern. There's a lot of... I think elderly

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

people in particular, although it's certainly not limited to them, who receive harassing obscene phone calls on a regular basis. Get complaints about this all the time, it's just a reality. And those hose people are the least likely, either for considerations of cost or consideration of the process by which we do it to have a tracer put on their phone. So, you really wind up situation with this Amendment, where people are being harassed, can't sleep at nights because of obscene calls, have a regular routine of calls that are made to them, till they eventually get their phone unlisted, and this...this system that the...phone companies will soon initiate, or are being initiated in some areas addresses that problem and really goes a long ways towards making nights and days a lot easier for elderly people, and single women, and others, is going to be precluded by this And I don't think that's appropriate when I Amendment. don't think there's anything to be gained by it. I think, it's a well intended Amendment, but we ought to let the service work because it's being implemented for a reason, and the reason is because all over the State of Illinois in every one of our districts we have some substantial number of people who have their lives greatly disrupted obscene, harassing telephone calls..." (tapes inaudible) "Ah...is a more than adequate reason to oppose the Amendment and a more than adequate reason to allow the system to work as its being implemented as we intended it to."

Speaker Jones: "Representative Homer."

Homer: "Yes. Representative..."

Speaker Jones: "Representative McPike in the Chair."

Homer: "Doesn't your Amendment effectively negate the entire Caller Identification System?"

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

Johnson: "No."

Homer: "Why not?"

Johnson: "Well, because there are many times where you may want to place a call and you want the party your calling to know that...that you're the one calling. So, you would not block your call."

Homer: "Okay. But in the event that someone chooses a Caller Identification System, because they may be receiving annoying, obscene, irritating phone calls. Or, they may not, simply, want to take a phone call from someone. They choose to spend the money to buy the necessary equipment to receive or to have the ability to make caller identification. By your Amendment a person who is calling that number can say, 'I don't want my call to be identified.' So, that negates, does it not, the person's investment in the equipment that they've purchased, their desire to have a call identified. Does it not do that?"

Johnson: "That...that is...that is true and there are some
 very good reasons for that."

Homer: "Well, I understand that you think there may be very good reasons for that and to the Amendment, Mr. Speaker. I understand that there's a difficult question here between privacy of a phone call and the ability to know who is calling you prior to answering that phone. And, that's a difficult question. But I'm not sure this Amendment addresses it correctly. Ī think that the Identification System, personally I think it's an excellent idea, I think it's one which should be implemented, I think it's one which is used for good reason and should not be hampered and not negated and not overridden by what this Amendment does. This Amendment effectively kills Caller Identification. Somebody who wants to make an obscene phone call simply tells the telephone company,

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

'don't...don't let my number be identified. So, the person who is receiving those obscene phone calls and who chose to have Caller Identification no longer has the benefit of that modern technology. A person has the right, just by...just from...an example or analogy...is when somebody knocks on your door. You have the right to know who it is, who's at your front door, before you open the door. Similarly, because of our modern technology we now have the capability of knowing who's on our telephone before we answer the telephone. Let's take advantage of that. Let's not...let's not negate the wonders of modern technology that we have by an Amendment like this. And, I would urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Jones: "Representative John Dunn."

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

Speaker Jones: "Yes."

Dunn: "I...I've listened to part of the discussion, perhaps I didn't hear it all, I'm curious about Section 5 of Amendment #4. Would you explain that portion of the Amendment, please?"

Johnson: "That...ah...that would say that if someone...if someone places...ah...an 800 call or a 900 call...it...in those cases it's the person who receives the call who pays for the call. It's not the caller unlike when you just place a regular or long distance call. So, what this says is that there's an exception so that you can not block an 800 call if you...because...ah...the...it's the party who receives the call who actually is...is the only party that's recorded anyway. And so they're the ones who are paying for the call. So that was put in at the request of AT&T to take out those situations where there's a call to an 800 or 900 number."

Dunn: "But...um...am I reading the Bill backwards then. I

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

thought Section 5 indicated that...ah...that the customer receiving the call...ah...had no choice and could not receive identification of the 800 caller rather they wanted to or not...it's the other way..."

Johnson: "No, those are exceptions. Those are the exceptions.

These are...these are the cases where blocking would not apply."

Dunn: "So, let me...then...make if...if this Bill becomes law and an 800...ah..800 number...a person with an 800 number calls me. Or, I dial someone who has a 900 number...ah...will I be able to know, in the case of the 800 number, who's calling me?"

Johnson: "If you're at the receiving end, yes. In other words, if you have a 900 service and somebody calls you. You have to know who that is so you can bill them for ¢.50 for calling you. So, this..."

Dunn: "So, if I'm at the receiving end of an 800 number?"

Johnson: "Same result if you're at the receiving end you'll know, if you have this service, who called you."

Dunn: "So...so if a telephone solicitor calls me I then will know who it is and this Bill will not prohibit it. Okay."

Johnson: "Right. Right."

Speaker Jones: "Representative Levin."

Levin: "Will the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Jones: "Yes."

Levin: "It seems to me that this Amendment resolves the legitimate security concerns, in terms, of law enforcement that has been raised by previous Speakers. Am I not correct? That what you are doing is you are exempting from the ability to block situations where somebody has a trap placed on their phone. So, you know, if I'm the subject of harassing phone calls and a trap is placed on my phone in order to be able to interdict where those calls are coming

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

from. This legislation would not allow the...ah...the blocking of the receipt of the phone numbers. We'd override...it would override any blocking."

Homer: "That's...that's right...that's right. And. Representative Levin, you know, this debate that we're having now should be reserved for Third Reading. Amendment is to address concerns that were expressed in committee by the phone companies. This Amendment helps the phone companies. I would think they would want this I think what they've done is they've lobbied some Members on the other side to speak against the Bill. But, the Members are now speaking against the Amendment. don't think the phone companies are against this Amendment. This debate should be reserved for...for...and they can, you know, the other side can...can...can argue the phone companies' case on Third Reading."

Levin: "But this...was worked out with the State Police and the other law enforcement agencies in order to ensure that if you need a trap on your phone that trap is going to be effective."

Homer: "Right. This was put in, this part of the Amendment was put in, because law enforcement, obviously, where they have a tracer. When they have an obscene phone caller problem. They want to be able to trace and find out who's placing those calls. So, they wanted this Amendment so that if someone's making an obscene phone call even if they think they're being blocked, t won't be. And the police will be able to detect who it is that's making those calls and be able to interdict and prosecute. So, I think this overcomes any legitimate concerns that people have about this Bill. I think this is a good Amendment. And I think it ought to be adopted. Thank you."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Williamson."

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

Williamson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in opposition to the Amendment. I serve on a federal task force that is a Telecommunications Task Force. And, so we've discussed this issue at great length throughout the state. Jersey when they did a test, during a six month period of service in Hudson County, New Jersey, there was 49 percent reduction in phone...harassing phone calls that were complaints to the police department. Because of the tapes and the records with the obscene calls. Also, Illinois Bell has stated that...they have...an estimate of 180,000 complaints from customers who are being harassed or bugged. I know, personally, I would like to have the caller i.d. I don't want the blocking service. I support the Bill but I do not support the Amendment. I would ask everyone to vote 'no' on the Amendment. Thank you."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Myron Olson."

Olson, M.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentleman of the House. Will the Sponsor of the Amendment yield?"

Speaker McPike: "Yes."

Olson, M.: "Tom, looking at this Amendment, I believe I'm correct in saying that no company in Illinois at the moment has the technology or the ability to move forward on this. Is that correct?"

Homer: "I can't hear you please repeat that."

Olson, M.: "I understand that there is not any telephone company in Illinois, at the moment, who is in place to do that. Is that correct?"

Homer: "Yes, that's correct."

Olson, M.: "Where is...ah...where in the nation...in...ah... a state of our size are they currently doing this?"

Homer: "New Jersey has it and Nevada and, I believe, it's coming soon to...ah...California."

Olson, M.: "What is there experience been and how long has there

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

experience table been in place?"

Homer: "I think it's all relatively new...ah...you know, and I really don't know what the experience has been."

Olson, M.: "Okay."

Homer: "I know that...I know that New Jersey has no blocking. I
know that California has passed a law similar to the one
that I'm offering. But I don't know the experience."

Olson, M.: "Okay. Then I might suggest from my perspective alone is that, I think, that your...your appearance and look at this project maybe is running ahead of the ability of companies to provide this service or the technology to put it in place. Thank you very much."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Homer to close."

Homer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would think this Amendment should be very noncontroversial. This Amendment was put on to address the concerns of the opponents of the Bill in committee. So, even if you're against the Bill, you'd want to be for this Amendment. But, let me just simply say, that caller identification, Mr. Speaker, is an idea that's about to...ah...to descend upon Illinois. Which means that any customer, mostly business customers, who want subscribe to this service will be able to know the identity of all incoming calls. 'What's wrong with that?' you say. many, many times where that invasion of privacy is against the public policy. For example, the Women Against Sexual Assault are for my Bill. Because they're concerned that if women are battered go to a shelter call home to check on the children. That the husband who battered them will find out where they are, come to the center and batter them some more. Consumers are concerned that someone will...you may call a car dealer. You see an add in the paper. You call a car dealer to ask the price of that Escort that's in the newspaper.

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

gets your number and can call you back time and again to try to sell you that car. And maybe your calling about an...life insurance policy you see advertised. You may not want that company to have your phone number. Maybe you have an unlisted phone number and the reason you have unlisted phone number is because you don't want other people to have your number. Well, without blocking would be able...you would not be able to call and protect the secrecy of your number. Now, this whole thing about harassment...ah...and the harassing phone calls can be taken care of very easily by having a tracer put on If you're getting harassing phone calls, simply, have a tracer put on and we can find out, the police can find out, who's calling you, that...that's...ah...current technology and there's nothing here that would keep that from happening. You know, if...even if that weren't the case, don't you think an obscene phone caller who about telephone i.d. service would go to a phone booth somewhere and make their call? I mean it'd be easy enough to evade the system. So, this Bill is supported by law enforcement, it's supported by women's groups, it's supported by consumer groups, it's supported by everyone except the one telephone company who wants to make a lot of money with this service. And we've even put this Amendment forward to address their concern. So, I would hope would support the Amendment and support the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "The question is. 'Shall Amendment #4 be adopted?' All in favor say 'aye', oppo...all in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this Motion. 51 there are 'ayes', 53 Representative Homer asks for a Poll of the Absentees."

Clerk Leone: "Poll of those not voting. Capparelli. Davis.

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

Kulas. Mautino. Ronan and Williams. No further."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Homer."

Homer: "Speaker...ah...I would like to verify the negative."

Speaker McPike: "Alright. The Gentleman asks for a verification of the negative Roll. Mr. Clerk."

- Clerk Leone: "Poll of those voting in the negative. Ackerman. Barger. Barnes. Black. Brunsvold. Bugielski. Daniels. Didrickson. Countryman. Doederlein. Ewing. Flinn. Flowers. Virginia Frederick. Hallock. Hannig. Harris. Hasara. Hensel. Hoffman. Hultgren. Johnson. Lou Jones. LeFlore. Leverenz. McAuliffe. McCracken. McNamara. Mulcahey. Noland. Bob Olson. Myron Olson. Parke. Bernard Pedersen. William Peterson. Petka. Rice. Ropp. Ryder. Sieben. Stange. Steczo. Stephens. Sutker. Tenhouse. Terzich. Wait. Weaver. Weller. Williamson. Wojcik. Wyvetter Younge. Zickus."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Brunsvold changes from 'no' to 'aye'. Representative Santiago changes from 'present' to 'aye'. Representative Parke."
- Parke: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. If this, in fact, does get the prevailing votes then I would like to verify the positive."
- Speaker McPike: "Okay...yeah. Representative Wennlund from 'aye' to 'no'. Representative Munizzi from 'present' to 'aye'.

 You can but we don't know what side is verifying yet. Just a second, Representative Stange."

Stange: "Vote from 'no' to 'aye'."

Speaker McPike: "Stange changes from 'no' to 'aye'. Does anyone else change their vote? Alright, at this point, there are 54 'ayes' and 52 'nos'. So, Representative Homer, you can't seek a verification at this point. Mr. Parke has requested a verification of the 'aye' votes. Representative Churchill would like to be verified 'aye'. Representative Churchill...Mr. Homer...I'm sorry. Mr.

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

Parke, would you verify Mr. Churchill? Alright. Proceed, Mr. Clerk, read the...read the affirmative votes."

Clerk Leone: "Those voting in the affirmative. Balanoff. Bowman. Breslin. Brunsvold. Churchill. Cowlishaw. Cullerton. Curran. Currie. DeJaegher. Deuchler. Dunn Giglio. Giorgi. Goforth. Granberg. Edley. Hartke. Homer. Shirley Jones. Klemm. Krska. Kubik. Lang. Laurino. Leitch. Levin. Martinez. Matijevich. McGann. McPike. Munizzi. Novak. Parcells. Phelps. Piel. Preston. Pullen. Regan. Richmond. Saltsman. Santiago. Satterthwaite. Shaw. Stange. Stern. Trotter. Turner. Van Duyne. White. Wolf. Woolard. Anthony Young and Mr. Speaker."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Churchill."

Churchill: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will you please record me as a 'no' vote on this issue."

Speaker McPike: "Just...Rep...yes...Representative Homer."

Homer: "Speaker, now a point of order, this Gentleman..."

Speaker McPike: "Make your point."

Homer: "...asked to be verified and he was given leave to be verified 'yes'. Once the vote is verified 'yes', it can not be changed. I've never heard of that, that would be unprecedented. No."

Speaker McPike: "No, Representative Homer...Representative Homer, your point is not well taken. Any Member on the House floor can change their vote until the Chair announces that the Bill is passed or fails. So, Representative Churchill is now a 'no' vote. Now, Representative Parke, you can not seek a verification because the Amendment, at this point, has lost. No, I told him he couldn't...No. Now, Representative Mulcahey. Representative Mulcahey...ah...from 'no' to 'aye'. Representative Cowlishaw."

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

Cowlishaw: "Mr. Speaker, Please change my vote from 'aye' to 'no'."

Speaker McPike: "And, Representative Hicks, from 'present' to 'aye'. Now, Representative Goforth, changes from 'aye' to 'no'. Representative Homer, the vote is now 53 'ayes', 54 'nos'. Now, the Chair would respectively ask no one else to change their vote. So, we can decide who's going to do the first verification. Representative Homer now requests a verification of the negatives."

Homer: "Thank you. Countryman."

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Clerk, read the negatives. Some of them switched from I don't know."

Clerk Leone: "Poll of the negatives. Ackerman. Barger. Black. Bugielski. Churchill. Countryman. Cowlishaw. Daniels. Didrickson. Doederlein. Ewing. Flinn. Flowers. Virginia Frederick. Goforth. Hallock. Hanniq. Harris. Hasara. Hensel. Hoffman. Hultgren. Johnson. Lou Jones. LeFlore. Leverenz. McAuliffe. McCracken. McNamara. Noland. Bob Olson. Myron Olson. Parke. B. Pedersen. W. Peterson. Petka. Rice. Ropp. Sieben. Steczo. Stephens. Sutker. Tenhouse. Terzich. Wait. Weaver. Weller. Wennlund. Williamson. Wojcik. Wyvetter Younge and Zickus."

Speaker McPike: "Alright. Questions of the negative, Representative Homer."

Homer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative Bugielski...with...withdraw that one. Representative Countryman?"

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Countryman? Is Representative Countryman here? Remove him from the Roll."

Homer: "Representative Giglio?"

Speaker McPike: "Representative Giglio? The Gentleman here?

He's voting 'aye'."

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

Homer: "Sorry. Representative Flinn?"

Speaker McPike: "Representative Flinn? Mr. Flinn? Remove the Gentleman from the Roll."

Homer: "Representative Leverenz?"

Speaker McPike: "Representative Leverenz? He's right here.

Representative Mautino votes 'aye'. Change Representative

Mautino to 'aye'. Representative Kulas would like to vote
'aye'."

Homer: "Representative Steczo?"

Speaker McPike: "Is in his chair."

Homer: "Representative Sutker?"

Speaker McPike: "Representative Sutker? The Gentleman here?

Remove him from the Roll."

Homer: "Representative Zickus?"

Speaker McPike: "Representative Zickus is...ah...here."

Homer: "Representative Tenhouse?"

Speaker McPike: "Representative Tenhouse is...is in the aisle."

Homer: "No further."

Speaker McPike: "No further questions. Representative Parke now requests a verification of the negative. I'm sorry of the affirmative. Representative Countryman has returned...ah...how were you voting, Mr. Countryman? 'No'. Mr. Countryman, votes 'no'. Alright. Proceed, Mr. Clerk with the Poll of the Affirmative. Representative Wolf, for what reason do you rise?"

Wolf: "Request to be verified."

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Parke, would you verify Representative Wolf?

Yes, he will. And, how 'bout Representative Currie in the middle aisle? Alright, that's two. Anyone else? Proceed,

Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Poll of the Affirmative. Balanoff. Bowman.

Breslin. Brunsvold. Cullerton. Curran. Currie.

DeJaegher. Deuchler. Dunn. Edley. Giglio. Giorgi.

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

Granberg. Hartke. Hicks. Homer. Shirley Jones. Krska. Kubik. Kulas. Lang. Laurino. Leitch. Levin. Martinez. Matijevich. Mautino. McGann. McPike. Mulcahey. Munizzi. Novak. Parcells. Phelps. Piel. Preston. Pullen. Regan. Richmond. Saltsman. Santiago. Satterthwaite. Shaw. Stange. Stern. Trotter. Turner. Van Duyne. White. Wolf. Woolard. Anthony Young and Mr. Speaker."

Speaker McPike: "Anthony Young would like to have leave to be verified. He's right here. Alright, proceed...Mr...and...ah...Representative...Shirley Jones would like to change from 'aye' to 'no'. Is that correct? Alright, change Representative Jones from 'aye' to 'no'.

Parke: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Representative Giglio, please?"

Speaker McPike: "Representative Giglio? Mr. Giglio here? Remove him from the Roll."

Parke: "Representative Krska?"

Speaker McPike: "Representative Krska? Representative Krska here? Remove him from the Roll."

Parke: "Representative Richmond?"

Speaker McPike: "Representative Richmond? Is the Gentleman in the chamber? Representative Davis, how did you want to vote? She'd like to vote 'aye'. Mr. Clerk, would you vote Representative Davis 'aye'. Mr. Richmond is he here? Remove him from the Roll."

Parke: "Representative Leblin...Levin?"

Speaker McPike: "Representative Lou Jones, what do you want? What was the next one after Richmond?"

Clerk Leone: "Representative Levin."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Levin? Mr. Levin? Remove him from the Roll."

Parke: "Representative Bowman?"

Speaker McPike: "Representative Bowman? Representative Davis

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

would like to change now from 'aye' to 'no'."

Parke: "Did we do Representative Bowman, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker McPike: "No, we just changed Representative Davis from 'aye' to 'no'. Representative Bowman? Mr. Bowman here?

Remove him from the Roll."

Parke: "Representative Leitch? Whoops...I'm sorry, he's there.

Representative Stange?"

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Stange? Representative Stange here?

Representative Stange? He's not here. Remove him from the
Roll."

Parke: "Representative Breslin?"

Speaker McPike: "Representative Breslin? The Lady's right here."

Parke: "I have no more, thank you."

Speaker McPike: "Nothing further. On this Amendment, Amendment #4, has 48 'ayes' and 54 'nos'. Representative Kirkland."

Kirkland: "...vote me 'no' please."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Kirkland would like to vote 'no'.

Any other changes? Alright, on this Amendment, there are

48 'ayes' and 55 'nos. Amendment #4 is defeated. Further

Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "There are no further Amendments."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Homer, you want this Bill moved to Third Reading? Third Reading. House Bill 4171, Representative Hicks. Out of the record. Special Order, Civil Law, Second Readings. House Bill 3019, Representative Cullerton. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3019, a Bill for an Act to amend the Code of Civil Procedure. Second Reading of the Bill.

Amendment #1 was adopted in committee."

Speaker McPike: "Any Motions filed?"

Clerk Leone: "No Motions filed."

Speaker McPike: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No Floor Amendments."

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. House Bill 3025, Representative Homer. Mr. Homer. Oh, I'm sorry, there's a fiscal note requested on this. House Bill 3108, Representative Van Duyne. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk. No. Out of the record. House Bill 3163, Representative Black. Mr. Black. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3163, a Bill for an Act to amend the Cemetery Care Act. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee."

Speaker McPike: "Any Motions filed?"

Clerk Leone: "No Motions filed."

Speaker McPike: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Black."

Black: "Ah...thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I believe there was an objection to this Bill in committee. We promised an Amendment it has been drafted. It has not been filed. Pull it from the record."

Speaker McPike: "Alright. It stays on Second Reading. House Bill 3207, Representative Matijevich. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk. 3207."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3207, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act in relationship to court system in counties. Second Reading of the Bill. There are no Committee or Floor Amendments."

Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. House Bill 3256, John Dunn. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3256, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act concerning claims against decedents' estates. Second Reading of the Bill. There are no Committee Amendments."

Speaker McPike: "Any Floor Amendments? Fiscal note requested.

It stays on Second. House Bill 3257, Representative John Dunn."

114th Legislative Day

1

- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3257, a Bill for an Act to amend the Responsible Property Transfer Act. Second Reading of the Bill. There are no Committee or Floor Amendments."
- Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. House Bill 3395, Representative Preston. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3395, a Bill for an Act in relationship to charitable..."
- Speaker McPike: "Out of the record. House Bill 3402,
 Representative Stern. Representative Stern. Read the
 Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3402, a Bill for an Act to amend the Probate Act. Second Reading of the Bill. There are no Committee Amendments."
- Speaker McPike: "Any Floor Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #1 offered by Representative Stern."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Stern."
- Stern: "I don't remember what the hell it is...yeah, but I don't remember what the Amendment was...an Amendment on this? Oh, I...I...I got it. I got it. Okay. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. This Amendment is a negotiated Amendment...between the Sponsor and...the...Right to Life People who had some concerns about this Bill. And, while they do not, at this point, support it they, at this point, I will tell you what oppose it. And, those...Amendments were...in the first one we add sentence which says that, 'death would be immanent the individual would die of the underlying terminal condition with or without artificially administered nutrition and hydration.' And...we add at the bottom that, 'this section does not apply to the quardian of a minor'. This was at the request of Mr. McCracken...since the chapter that we are amending deals only with...the guardians of adult

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

in...in...incapacitated adults. That probably wasn't necessary but it was a gesture of good faith. I...ask that the Amendment be adopted."

Speaker McPike: "Alright the Chair has been requested to introduce all the children in the balcony. And, we certainly welcome you to Springfield but it's against our rules to do this. So, the Chair is not going to recognize Members for all these introductions. Representative McCracken, on the Amendment."

McCracken: "I have an introduction, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker McPike: "Proceed."

McCracken: "I'm kidding. Representative Stern, I appreciate the Amendment. Now, this Bill started out as an attempt to codify what's known as the Inray-Longway Decision. Is that...your understanding."

Stern: "That's correct. That's correct."

McCracken: "You agree, however, that with this Amendment the Bill becomes much more restrictive than the Longway Decision."

Stern: "I think it is a narrow...more narrowly drawn, yes."

McCracken: "Okay. It's your intention to so define...terminal condition. So, that if food and water is withdrawn, the person will not starve of...or...die of starvation or dehydration, but, rather die because of the condition."

Stern: "Because of the underlying condition, right."

McCracken: "Okay. And, I appreciate the Amendment that this doesn't apply to minors. Although, you're probably right it may not have been necessary. thank you for the Amendment. To the Amendment, Mr. Speaker. I support this Amendment expressly because of the reasons I've asked of Mrs. Stern. It is so important that food and water not be withdrawn where that would result in the dehydration or starvation of the person. This is a limited Statutory Act it is far more limited than the Longway decision. It is

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

more limited than the Longway decision because of the Amendment. And, in fact, limits the withdrawal authority to those situations where the person is terminal, as defined in the Act, meaning that the person will not die of starvation or dehydration. Thank you."

Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #1 be adopted?' All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment's adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "There are no further Amendments."

Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. House Bill 3481, Representative Barnes. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "House..."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Laurino in the Chair."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3481, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Parentage Act. Second Reading of the Bill.

Amendment #1 was adopted in committee."

Speaker Laurino: "Mr. Clerk, are there any Motions filed?"

Clerk Leone: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Laurino: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "There are none."

Speaker Laurino: "Third Reading. House Bill 3482, Representative Shirley Jones. Representative Jones? Out of the record. House Bill 3509, Representative Wojcik. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3509, a Bill for an Act to amend the Liquor Control Act. Second Reading of the Bill. There are no Committee Amendments."

Speaker Laurino: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "There are none."

Speaker Laurino: "Third Reading. House Bill 3513, Representative Countryman. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3513, a Bill for an Act in relationship

114th Legislative Day

- May 10, 1990
- to electronic home detention. Second Reading of the Bill.
 There are no Committee Amendments."
- Speaker Laurino: "Any Floor Amendments."
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #1 is being offered by Representative Countryman."
- Countryman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentleman of the House. Floor Amendment #1 adds to the list of those offenses for which home detention is prohibited for the offense of second degree murder."
- Speaker Laurino: "Any discussion? There being none. The question is, 'Shall Amendment #1 to House Bill 3513 be adopted?' All those in favor indicate by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Amendment #1 is adopted. Further Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #2 offered by Representative Countryman."
- Speaker Laurino: "Representative Countryman."
- Countryman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Floor Amendment #2 deletes from those offenses for which home detention would be prohibited the offense of residential burglary."
- Speaker Laurino: "Any discussion? Seeing none, the Motion is will...the question is, 'Shall House...Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 3513 be adopted?' All those in favor indicate by saying 'aye', opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. Amendment #2 is adopted. Further Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #3 offered by Representative Countryman."
- Speaker Laurino: "Representative Countryman."
- Countryman: "Ah...just a minute, can I have the file? Can I get the file? Tom. Ah...Floor Amendment #3 is a technical Amendments to cleanup some language."

114th Legislative Day

- Speaker Laurino: "Any discussion? Seeing none, the question is,

 'Shall Amendment #3 to House Bill 3513 be adopted?' All

 those in favor indicate by saying 'aye', opposed 'nay'.

 The 'ayes' have it. Amendment #3 is adopted. Further

 Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Leone: "There are no further Amendments."
- Speaker Laurino: "Third Reading. House Bill 3533, Representative Dunn. Representative Dunn. House Bill 3533. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3533, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act in relationship to property owned by husbands and wives.

 Second Reading of the Bill. There are no Committee or Floor Amendments."
- Speaker Laurino: "Third Reading. House Bill 3625, Representative Ronan. Out of the record, Mr. Clerk. House Bill 3674, Representative Kubik. Out of the record. House Bill 3707, Representative Satterthwaite. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3707, a Bill for an Act to amend the Code of Civil Procedure. Second Reading of the Bill.

 There are no Committee Amendments."
- Speaker Laurino: "Any Floor Amendments?"
- Speaker Laurino: "Representative Satterthwaite."
- Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker, please withdraw Amendment #1."
- Speaker Laurino: "Withdraw Amendment #1. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #2 being offered by Representative Satterthwaite."
- Speaker Laurino: "Representative Satterthwaite."
- Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Amendment #2 brings the Bill into compliance with agreements made at the committee hearing to provide for a ten years' statute of repose and I move for the adoption of Amendment #2."

114th Legislative Day

- Speaker Laurino: "Any discussion? Seeing none, the question is,

 'Shall Amendment #2 to House Bill 3707 be adopted?' All

 those in favor indicate by saying 'aye', opposed 'nay'.

 The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Further

 Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Leone: "There are no further Amendments."
- Speaker Laurino: "Third Reading. House Bill 3766, Representative Homer. Out of the record, Mr. Clerk. House Bill 3875, Representative Giorgi. Out of the record, Mr. Clerk. House Bill 3879, Representative Young. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3879, a Bill for an Act to amend the Consumer Fraud Deceptive Business Practices Act. Second Reading of the Bill. There are no Committee Amendments."

 Speaker Laurino: "Any Floor Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #1 being offered by Representative
 Anthony Young."
- Speaker Laurino: "Representative Young."
- Young, A.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #1 is the Amendment offered by the Retail Merchants Association, which...ah...the Bill originally did three things after the Amendment. The Amendment deletes the provision in the Bill that will require monetary damages and provide for a jury party for either trial. So after the Amendment all the Bill will do will require...ah...leave for injunctive relief in these type of hearings. I move for its adoption."
- Speaker Laurino: "Any discussion? Seeing or hearing none, the question is, 'Shall Amendment #1 to House Bill 3879 be adopted?' All those in favor indicate by saying 'aye', opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. Amendment #1 is adopted. Further Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Leone: "There are no further Amendments."

114th Legislative Day

- Speaker Laurino: "Third Reading. We're going back to House Bill 3395, Representative Preston. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3395, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act in relationship to charitable trust. Second Reading of the Bill. There are no Committee or Floor Amendments."
- Speaker Laurino: "Third Reading. We're going to proceed to the...ah...Revenue, Second Reading, page 5 οf The first Bill to be heard is House Bill 2872, calendar. Representative Homer. Out of the record, Mr. Clerk. House Bill 2923, Representative Ronan. Out of the record, Mr. Clerk. Let's proceed to...ah...House Bill 3832. Representative Hicks, are you in the chamber? Out of Mr. Ryder, are you in the chamber? House Bill 3851, Representative Ryder. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3851, a Bill for an Act authorizing the issuance of state bonds. Second Reading of the Bill.

 There are no Committee or Floor Amendments."
- Speaker Laurino: "Third Reading. House Bill 3896, Representative Currie. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk. Representative Currie, there's a request for a fiscal note. Out of the record, Mr. Clerk. House Bill 4042, Representative Bowman. Representative Bowman, House Bill 4042, there's a request for a fiscal note. 4042. Out of the record, Mr. Clerk. Representative Munizzi. The Chair's going to proceed to page 16 on your calendar, Elections, Second Reading. House Bill 3824, Representative Stern. Grace Mary. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3824, a Bill for an Act to amend the Election Code. Second Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Laurino: "Any...ah...Floor Amendments? Committee
 Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "There are no Committee or Floor Amendments."
- Speaker Laurino: "Third Reading. House Bill 3825, Representative

114th Legislative Day

- Stern."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3825, a Bill for an Act to amend the Election Code. There are no Committee or Floor Amendments."
- Speaker Laurino: "Third Reading. House Bill 3826, Representative Stern."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3826, a Bill for an Act to amend the Election Code. Second Reading of the Bill. There are no Committee or Floor Amendments."
- Speaker Laurino: "Third Reading. We proceed now to page 8 on your calendar, Pensions, Second Reading. Is Representative Wolf in the chamber? House Bill 3228."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3228, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Pension Code. Second Reading of the Bill. There are no Committee or Floor Amendments."
- Speaker Laurino: "Out of the record, Mr. Clerk. We're going to go back to Revenue on page 17 of your calendar. House Bill 3896, Representative Currie. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3896, a Bill for an Act to amend the Service Occupation Tax Act. Second Reading of the Bill. There are no Committee or Floor Amendments. And a fiscal note has been filed on this Bill."
- Speaker Laurino: "Third Reading. Proceed to page 4 on your calendar, Banking, Second Reading. House Bill 934, Representative Young. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 934, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act concerning consumer credit. Second Reading of the Bill.

 There are no Committee or Floor Amendments."
- Speaker Laurino: "Third Reading. House Bill 1368, Representative Levin. Out of the record, Mr. Clerk. House Bill 1679, Representative Cowlishaw. Out of the record. House Bill 3510, on page 12, Representative Morrow. Is he here? Representative Morrow? Out of the record. Page 14, House

- ll4th Legislative Day May 10, 1990
 Bill 3554, Representative Turner. Read the Bill, Mr.
 Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3554, a Bill for an Act to amend the Code of Civil Procedure."
- Speaker Laurino: "Out of the record, Mr. Clerk. House Bill 3732,

 Representative Piel. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3732, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Savings and Loan Act."
- Speaker Laurino: "Any Floor or Committee Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "Second Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Laurino: "For what reason does Myro...Representative Kulas rise?"
- Kulas: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I'd ask leave of the House so that the Energy Environment and Natural Resources Committee could meet with the ad hoc Task Force on Solid Waste Disposal in the Speaker's Office at 1:00 o'clock."
- Speaker Laurino: "You heard the Gentleman's request. Does he have leave? All those in favor indicate by saying 'aye', opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. The Gentleman has leave."
- Kulas: "I would also invite all interested Members of the General Assembly, this isn't just for the...Members of the committee only, if you're interested in this matter, you're welcome to attend this meeting. Thank you."
- Speaker Laurino: "I'm sure Representative Munizzi and DeLeo would like to go."
- Clerk Leone: "On House Bill 37 and 32 (sic 3732) there are no Committee or Floor Amendments."
- Speaker Laurino: "Third Reading. House Bill 3208, Representative Davis. Out of the record. Okay. Page 30, of the calendar, is a Senate Bill. Senate Bill 934, Representative Hicks. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

Clerk Leone: "Senate..."

Speaker Laurino: "On page 30, of the calendar."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 934, a Bill for an Act to create the Illinois Banking Act..."

Speaker Laurino: "Any Floor or Committee Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "...Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee."

Speaker Laurino: "Any Motions?"

Clerk Leone: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Laurino: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "There are none."

Speaker Laurino: "Third Reading. We'll proceed back to Revenue.

For what reason does Representative Leverenz rise?"

Leverenz: "I have an optometrist I can recommend."

Speaker Laurino: "We need one. And, we're proceeding to page 5, of the calendar, Revenue. House Bill 2923, Representative Ronan."

- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2923, a Bill for an Act to amend the Motor Fuel Tax Law. Second Reading of the Bill. There are no Committee or Floor Amendments."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3625, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act relating to contractors. Second Reading of the Bill.

 There are no Committee or Floor Amendments."
- Speaker Laurino: "Third Reading. We'll proceed to...page 16, of the calendar, Revenue, Second Reading. House Bill 3832, Representative Hicks. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3832, a Bill for an Act to amend the Motor Fuel Tax Law. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee."

Speaker Laurino: "Further Amendments?"

114th Legislative Day

- Clerk Leone: "No Motions filed in respect to Amendment #1. Floor

 Amendment #2 is being offered by Representative Regan."
- Speaker Laurino: "Representative Regan."
- Regan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Amendment #2 to House Bill 3832 addresses the problems of senior citizens that are at the poverty level. It simply freezes their assessed valuation of their homes at age 65 and over if they are qualified for the circuit breaker. These poor senior citizens have a situation where the home is paid for and they have to sell it and move out. Because their real estate taxes are so high."
- Speaker Laurino: "Excuse me, Representative...Representative Regan excuse me. Representative Hicks for what reason do you rise?"
- Hicks: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. I question the germaness of Floor
 Amendment #2."
- Speaker Laurino: "Are there any more Amendments? Representative, the Parliamentarian advises the Chair that the Amendment is not germane. Germaness is for Republicans, I think...Further Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Laurino: Third Reading. The Chair proceeds to page 7, on the calendar, Labor, Second Reading. House Bill 3114, Representative Lang. Representative Lang. Out of the record. House Bill 3220, Representative Cullerton. Out of the record. House Bill 3373, Representative Countryman. Representative Countryman. House Bill 3373. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3373, a Bill for an Act in relation to employer provided health care benefits. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee or Floor Amendments."
- Speaker Laurino: "Third Reading. House Bill 3788, Representative Wy...Wyvetter Younge. Is the fiscal note requested and has

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

not been filed. Representative. Out of the record. Mr. Clerk. House Bill 3894, Representative Currie. Out of the record. Mr. Clerk. House Bill 3987. Representative Martinez. House Bill 3897 (sic - 3987), Representative Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk. Is the fiscal note Martinez. required? You have not filed the answer. Out of the record, Mr. Clerk. House Bill 4101, Representative Matijevich. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 4101, a Bill for an Act to amend certain Acts in relation to collective bargaining. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Laurino: "Third Reading."

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment..."

Speaker Laurino: "Floor Amendments? Excuse me."

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

Speaker Laurino: "Representative Hoffman in the chambers? Representative Matijevich?"

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, can I move it to Third and then I'll bring it back for Gene Hoffman...oh, here I've got to deal with the Amendment. Alright, where's Jean at...I'm going to oppose the Amendment. I didn't know for sure when Representative Hoffman offered the Amendment. The Bill has been introduced for the fire fighters. They don't oppose it but it deals with the police. And, I found that they do oppose the Amendment. So..."

Speaker Laurino: "In order for this Bill to be moved to Third Reading we have to have a request to table the Amendment."

Matijevich: "Well, I'll have to table it and I'll discuss it with

Jean later. I did want him to offer it but I'll move to
table..."

Speaker Laurino: "The Gentleman moves to table the Amendment.

Hold on a second. Representative McCracken."

114th Legislative Day

- May 10, 1990
- McCracken: "Thank you. I wonder if maybe we could read this a second time today. And, so we won't slow you up, Representative Matijevich and then...okay, yeah, I appreciate that."
- Speaker Laurino: "Are you still persisting in...tabling the Amendment? Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk. Let's go back to Banking, page 4 on the calendar, Second Reading. House Bill 1368, Representative Levin. Mr. Clerk, would you recognize Representative Ronan and Representative DeLeo's desk, please? He has a request. Representative Ronan, you have a request?"
- Ronan: "Yeah, we'd like to see the Speaker sometime before June 30th."
- Speaker Laurino: "Cancel that request. Representative Levin.

 Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk"
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1368, a Bill for an Act concerning financial institutions. This Bill has been read a second time previously. And no...no Committee or Floor Amendments."
- Speaker Laurino: "Third Reading...Page 17 of your calendar, Civil Law. House Bill 3875, Representative Giorgi. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3875, a Bill for an Act to amend the Vital Records Act. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee."
- Speaker Laurino: "Further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions. No Floor Amendments."
- Speaker Laurino: "Third Reading. We'll proceed to page 4,
 Professional Regulation, Second Reading. House Bill 2074,
 Representative Kubik. Out of the record, Mr. Clerk. House
 Bill 2929, Representative Novak. Read the Bill, Mr.
 Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2929, a Bill for an Act to amend the

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

Fire Works Regulation Act. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Laurino: "Any Floor Amendments?"

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

Speaker Laurino: "Representative Wennlund. Out of the record,
Mr. Clerk. House Bill 3386, Representative McGann. 3386,
Representative McGann. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3386, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act prohibits solicitation or inducement of sale of real estate. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee."

Speaker Laurino: "Any Motions?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Laurino: "Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

Amendment. Rep...Mr. Clerk."

Speaker Laurino: "Third Reading. House Bill 3449, Representative Ryder. Out of the record, Mr. Clerk. House Bill 3524, Representative Parke. Out of the record, Mr. Clerk. House Bill 3836, Representative Lang. Out of the record, Mr. House Bill 4185, Representative Davis. Out of the record, Mr. Clerk. The Chair now is entertaining the thought of going to the Supplemental Calendar #1 on the Agreed Bills List. Are there any Sponsors that have these Bills on Third Reading that wish to bring them back to Second for Amendments? We're on Supplemental Bill...Calendar #1 on the Agreed Bill List. And we're entertaining Amendments that are needed on these Bills that are on Third Reading. Would the Sponsors please come to the well. We're on page 8 of the Supplemental Calendar. House Bill 4058, Representative Currie, wishes the Bill to be brought back to Second Reading for the purposes of an

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 4058, this Bill has been read a second time previously."

Speaker Laurino: "Any Floor Amendments?"

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

Currie: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Amendment

l is a clean up Amendment clarifying the changes that were
in the original Bill. I'd appreciate your support."

Speaker Laurino: "Any discussion? Representative McCracken."

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

Speaker Laurino: "Yes, he will."

McCracken: "The...Amendment among other things makes reference to a four month validity period for the signatures. Is that entirely new?"

Currie: "That's...that's existing law."

McCracken: "That is, four months is already the law?"

Currie: "That's...that's existing law."

McCracken: "Okay, thank you."

Speaker Laurino: "Further discussion? Seeing or hearing none, the question is, 'Shall Amendment #1 to House Bill 4058 be adopted?' All those in favor indicate by saying 'aye', those opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Laurino: "Third Reading. The Chair entertains the thought of having this Bill heard on Third Reading with the rest of the Bills on the Agreed Bill List. All those in favor indicate by saying 'aye', opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. So, adopted. On House Bill 4058 leave was granted, for this Bill to be heard with the other Bills on Third Reading in the Agreed Bill List on the Supplemental Calendar #1, by the use of the Attendance Roll Call. We're on page 6 of the calendar, Second Reading, Criminal Law.

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

House Bill 2959, Representative Countryman. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2959, a Bill for an Act to amend the Narcotics Profit Forfeiture Act. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee."

Speaker Laurino: "Further Amendments?"

Countryman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Floor Amendment #1 which was adopted in committee changed this Bill from the Narcot...Narcotics Forfeiture Act to the Jurors Act and the Jury List, Selection of Jurors. Amendment #2 does some things which are being done at the request of the Chief Judges of the state with regard to the combination of Juror Lists...of lists...of various lists to compile the Jury List. All of these requests are...are fairly technical but what thev do, in essence, is take out the listing...ah...people alphabetically by precinct or and rather alphabetically by county...in duplication. there's given some leeway for...for...duplications to make it much easier for...the judges and the jury commissioners to administer this law. It's generally a clean up piece of legislation. It was brought of committee...in a shell form. This is the substantive Amendment that...everybody's requested me to put on and will bring the Bill into conformance with my agreements with regard to it. I ask your favorable opinion."

Speaker Laurino: "Further discussion? Seeing or hearing none.

The question is, 'Shall Amendment #2 to House Bill 2939

(sic - 2929) be adopted?' All those in favor indicate by saying 'aye', opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendment."

- Speaker Laurino: "Third Reading. School's in. The Chair is now going to proceed to Third Readings. We are going to start at the back of the...calendar the pages and...of your calendar on your desk. The first Bill to be heard is in Labor, on page 34 of your calendar. House Joint Resolution 106, Representative Breslin. For what reason does Representative Black arise?"
- Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. It's...nice that you told us where you are going but on what sheet: the regular calendar, the supplemental, the special order, the yellow one, the white one, the in-between one...on this sheet?"
- Speaker Laurino: "You should have been listening. I said, it was the regular calendar."
- Black: "Well, if you said that, we didn't hear you. I certainly apologize but it's very glad that we know where you are.

 Thank you."
- Speaker Laurino: "Your apology's accepted. Thank you. Out of the record, Mr. Clerk. We're on page 30 of the calen...no...let's see...page...page 22 on your calendar, Civil Law. House Bill 2972, Representative Stern. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2972, a Bill for an Act concerning the determination of death. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Laurino: "Representative Stern."
- Stern: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, House Bill 2972, codifies a definition of death. We have no where in the law outside of the organ donor chapter, a definition of death, and what this says in fact is an individual who has sustained either irreversible cessation of circulatory and respiratory functions or irreversible cessation of all functions of the entire brain, including the brain stem, is dead. Now, this Bill has been in...supported by and I ask

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

that you listen to this list of proponents because it is very revealing. It is supported by the Illinois Catholic the Illinois Conference of Churches, the Illinois State Medical Society, the Illinois Department of Health, the American Medical Association, the American Bar Association, the Presidents Commission for the study of ethical problems in medicine, and bio-medical and behavioral research, which recommended the exact language in this Bill, finally the Archdiocese of Chicago, and Joseph Cardinal Bernadine, support the Legislation as a means to provide doctor's and hospitals with some direction to the appropriate behavior governing the determination of death. In the recent report from Cook County States Attorney Cecil Partees task force he requested or they excuse me...specifically that а uniform determination of death be codified into the Illinois Statutes, that is exactly what this Bill would do no more, and no less. I ask that you support it for clarification of this vitally important subject, so doctors and hospitals in Illinois do not have to rely on there own judgement in this matter but are governed by the Legislature as they should be. Thank you."

Speaker Laurino: "Further discussion? Representative Piel."

Piel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House.
Will the Lady yield for a question?"

Speaker Laurino: "She indicates she will."

Piel: "Representative Stern, something's a little bit baffling to me, I'm looking at our analysis here and it says the Illinois Catholic Conference is one of the proponents of the Bill, but it also says in the opponents, it says the Illinois Federation for Right to Life. Well, the Illinois Federation for Right to Life and the Illinois Catholic

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

Conference, on 99 9/10 percent of the issues are on the same side. Now, I was just wondering can you tell me why there on opposite sides of the issue because I would classify the Illinois Catholic Conference as a pro life group, and I was wondering why the Illinois Right to Life which has a lot of the same Members is against the Bill."

Stern: "I don't know, Mr. Piel, but I could speak for the...for either of those I could only tell you that this has been a subject that the pro life federation has opposed right along. Although, I am frank to say I have not understood why. I think the support of Joseph Cardinal Bernadine and the Catholic Conference recognizes the fact that this a needed definition. That this is not anything that is going to assist in the death of anybody. This simply defines statutorily when death occurs. I think you will have to ask someone closer to the pro-life camp than I for the answer to that."

Piel: "No, I just...you know when I saw the...them on opposite sides of the issue, I was just a little bit taken back and thought well maybe there is a misprint here and one was on the other side..."

Stern: "No, I think it shows that it is possible to have a difference of opinion, even for people who generally agree."

Piel: "I guess that's the political process. Isn't it?

Stern: "I'm sorry?"

Piel: "That's the political process."

Stern: "That is indeed the political process, honorable people may differ."

Piel: "No further questions, Mr. Speaker. Thank you very much. Speaker Laurino: "Further questions? Representative Stephens."

Stephens: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Speaker excuse me. We've seen this Bill before we see it every Session, we see it

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

every year. The Representative is of among other things. persistent, and I guess we admire that but we don't admire the substance of this Bill. This is something we call the spare parts Bill, the... and that really does define it I I think we just need to remember what the votes were the last time we saw this, I think it got about 40 votes the last time we voted on it, it probably should get about 39 today, because more and more people are becoming aware of the real intention of this Bill, and it amazes me, the...our analysis is kind of interesting when you read it. suggested by the Regional Organ Bank Illinois, and that's why we call it the spare parts Bill. The fact of the matter is that that's what human reduced to by this piece of legislation. Taking a human being who is in certainly a very trying situation making them available for spare parts. I... I think the less we talk about this Bill the more we just ease our into voting it down and moving to the next issue, probably the better off all of us are. Thank you."

Speaker Laurino: "Representative McCracken for what reason do you rise. Sir?"

McCracken: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I rise to address the Bill.

The we have had this Bill before there have been various votes on it, and I want to tell you what prompts it. And I don't think it's the Sponsors intention necessarily, but I want to tell you what historically in this state has been the driving force behind this. It's been the organ banks in the state that have been the driving force behind this.

Last year there was testimony in the committee, we dispensed with any testimony in the committee this year because we all remembered the issue. But let me tell you the witnesses who testified last year, a theologian testified in favor of the Bill, a second theologian,

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

testified in opposition to the Bill, a nurse came in and testified that she had participated in organ removal transfer when she felt the presence of that human being still in that room, she felt that she had participated in the ending of a persons life before it occurred naturally and that she had been shaken by that experience and drove her to come down and testify in opposition to the adoption of this Bill. That is what we heard in the committee last year, that is what this allows to occur in the hospitals of our country. Now, I grant you there split among those you may feel traditionally are together on this type of issue, but why is it that we should forced to decide when even people on our side of the issue can't decide. Why is it that all the moves in this area of society and the law is always toward more and more death? isn't life we move toward, it is death we move toward. Every year we come back we want an earlier determination of death, and I'll tell you what drives this, what drives this is the desire for spare parts, that's precisely it, organs, the sooner you declare a person dead the sooner you can remove those organs and the better quality they are, that's what drives this Bill. And the Gentleman from one of the donor banks last year admitted that they didn't necessarily need this Bill for that purpose that it might be just as a media event. Well, I tell you that our society is headed in the wrong direction, it is headed in the direction of reserving life only for the fit, reserving life only for the healthy, reserving life only for productive, that is what this Bill does. It moves us another step down that road, where only the strong will survive, and the weak will die even earlier than they have to die today. That's where this Bill takes us, I stand in opposition to this Bill, and I am proud to be in opposition

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

to this Bill."

Speaker Laurino: "Further discussion? Representative Preston." Preston: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the I have great respect for Representative McCracken, admiration, even affection, but I couldn't more seriously and deeply disagree with him than I do on this legislation. This Bill was requested by the States Attorney of Cook County and others to assist them in advising doctors and hospitals when they can, when they are permitted under the law to make decisions concerning life and death, decisions concerning when a family might be permitted to in fact turn off life support systems when a doctor may be permitted to that to end a vegetative state of patients who are in irreversible situations on death beds but being kept alive all sorts of artificial means, and sec...and yes, some of those decisions are necessary to be made, one to make to relieve the anguish of the victims family and to relieve the loss of dignity of the victim himself, or herself, and also yes, as spare parts and it's very easy for us who are in need of the donorship of a necessary organ to sustain our lives or the lives of a loved one to talk about it as if we're talking about automobile parts. fact, if somebody needs a new heart or a new cornea for there eye, or some other vital organ and there is...they precluded from having that donated because there isn't a satisfactory definition of when death occurs in the law to allow someone to be laid to rest who has no hope of recovery, that's the purpose of this Bill. It's not easy to be standing here as a Legislator and be standing in the place, or looking at is if your standing in the place I understand who makes life and death decisions, but this is just an attempt to get to a definition of what necessary so that people who need the donorship of organs,

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

can have them in order to sustain life, not to encourage death but to sustain life. I'm voting 'aye' on this Bill, I don't pretend to have all the answers and I don't pretend that Representative Stern does either, but she is searching for them and I think this Bill is a step in the right direction."

Speaker Laurino: "Further discussion? Representative Didrickson."

Didrickson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I too support this measure, I don't think any of us want to be labeled as being in the business of looking for spare parts. We are sustaining life longer, and longer because of the technology that is available longer than natural life...longer than natural life would normally dictate because of the medical technologies that are there. I think what we have to do is look to what the actual language says here what we're talking about is individual who has sustained either irreversible, irreversible cessation of circulatory and respiratory functions or irreversible cessation of all functions of the entire brain. I join with you Representative Stern, in support of this measure, I think it is a life giving measure. I think it is something to hand down to the next generation. And I applaud you for it, it is difficult."

Speaker Laurino: "Further discussion? Representative Harris."

Harris: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, a question of the Sponsor?"

Speaker Laurino: "She indicates she will answer."

Harris: "Representative, help me out here a little bit. What happens...or what is the procedure now, regarding determination of death?"

Stern: "To a large extent, Representative, the doctor and or the hospital decide at what point death has occurred, there is a common law belief that brain death is death, exactly as

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

we have defined it in this Bill. And tests are made to indicate whether in fact the brain is dead. That is in general the way it is done. However, often a doctor or a hospital is apprehensive about declaring death too soon and awaits an indefinite period of time, the family suffers, the possibility of organ donation suffers as was indicated there are the expenses mount for everyone, it is not practical or kind, or decent, or christian to pursue that kind of limitless definition...nondefinition, if you will."

Harris: "I follow what you saying but didn't you indicate that using the definition which is here as you propose in the law. Isn't it possible that the doctor could indeed determine a person to be dead under current statute using the definition that you have."

Stern: "There is no definition in the statute, Mr. Harris.

Yes...."

Harris: "Using this standard though."

Stern: "Yes, it is possible. Yes, yes."

Harris: "Using what you want to put in the statute, he could use this standard and say that a person is dead now."

Stern: "Correct."

Harris: "Okay, so you want to put that, you want to take what is now an option and make it a statute."

Stern: "I want to take what is now common law and make it definitive statute. Yes."

Harris: "Thank you to the Bill, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I recognize the difficulty that this issue raises, it is not an easy one to decide and perhaps indeed there should be something in law, but on the other hand I'm not sure that there is indeed a problem. Yes, we want to try to make a determination, but if the doctor currently can make a determination than indeed that's the person who should be making the determination and if he can use the

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

standard which is proposed here, if he can use that standard currently then let him use that standard, and let's not lock him into anything there will be times when he needs to be flexible and maybe for some reason, for some reason, he doesn't want to be locked into this type of a statute, he should have that flexibility, we don't want be premature here, we don't want to be premature in saying that a person is dead simply because he meets letter a,b,c, and condition 1, 2, and 3. This is a case when flexibility is to be desired and not locked into statute, give the doctor that flexibility, I think yes the issue is an important one but I don't think that this is the right way to go. I would recommend a no vote on this."

Speaker Laurino: "Further discussion? Representative Ropp."

Ropp: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of House, would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Laurino: "I assume she probably will."

Ropp: "From a philosophical point of view isn't it somewhat more important to attempt to sustain or extend a life versus knowing that someone is pretty much terminally going to die. I mean isn't it our thought that we want to try to extend life if at all possible."

Stern: "Do you want an answer?"

Ropp: "Yes."

Stern: "Of course, of course, we want to extend life where it makes sense to do so, we are not, we are not truncating life by this definition, we are simply codifying what is dead. We are not hurrying it along Representative."

Ropp: "Well, my point was going to be for those who are saying this is a spare parts Bill if for example you are the parents of a three year old or a twelve year old who obviously is at the beginning of their life. If we have any averages and that we have situations where people are

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

very near death as the Bill is attempting to address, would seem that even those pro-lifers ought to give some consideration for attempting to provide extended life for someone who is very young, or for someone who is really not we consider an average length of life. So I don't think that this is necessarily to say well it's spare parts Bill, even if it is there are those who I'm sure would love to have their loved ones have extended life, as a result of someone giving or sharing of a particular part that they may have when they are in according to this definition dead. And so I would say that this a Bill that is not easy to support but certainly I think it's one that you have to address that for those who may have extended life as a result of someone providing his or her part is something that we ought to look to as a plus pro-life kind of concept and I would support this measure and think that once and for all it does give true definition to death and as you have already indicated in the course they have had some problem with that."

Stern: "Thank you."

Speaker Laurino: "Further discussion? Seeing none, Representative Stern to close."

Stern: "Mr. Speaker, and Members of the House. Since a couple of people have come up to me and asked me if this is related to the Bill we discussed this morning, the withholding of food and hydration, I want to say they are not related, this is a this has only one subject it is the definition of death, that is all, the other was a different Bill. I want to respond to a few of the things that were said, first of all, there is a reason for having this standard, Representative Harris, the reasons are easily told to by the American Medical Society and the Bar Associations who need to have a peg on which to hang a statement that an

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

individual is dead, this is important. Date and time are important in many cases. We are not pushing this back earlier and earlier, Representative McCracken, the formula which declares them dead in this Bill, is the formula which has been used in common law for many, many since we have gotten a relatively, take out relatively, since we have gotten the test, that proves what we need to know about brain activity. Your statement about the nurse who was in the room when organs were harvested her feeling that she was in the room with an and I'm sorry, I cannot hang any credence on that, yes, we would all be awed and overcome perhaps with emotion at watching the life of one individual being transferred to the life of another. Very moving, very important, what we're talking about here, this is not voodoo, this is the real thing. I guess I just want to emphasize, hardly improve on the eloquence of some of my colleagues, this is a Bill which will promote life, that is what it is designed to do that is what it will do, I urge you to support this Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Laurino: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 2972, pass?'

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

Voting is open. This is final passage. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Dunn to explain your vote, you have one minute."

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

The Democrat analysis states what I'm sure is true for the record that the Archdiocese of Chicago and Roman Catholic Cardinal Bernadine support this legislation as does their lobbying arm the Illinois Catholic Conference, those who are reluctant to vote for legislation which they might oppose should take that into consideration and support this legislation. This is a good Bill, which will be helpful to

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

doctors, families, and everyone concerned. I would urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Laurino: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. Representative Stern."

Stern: "May I have postponed consideration on this Sir."

Speaker Laurino: "No, it doesn't appear you have enough votes, Representative. This Bill having received 45 'aves'. Representative Young, Anthony Young 'aye'. Representative Jones 'aye'. Representative Shirley Jones 'aye' Representative Lou Jones 'aye'. Representative Morrow Representative Morrow, asks for leave of the House to be verified? Representative Mautino, wishes to be voting 'no'. The Sponsor requests Postponed Consideration, leave being granted the Bill will be put on postponed consideration. Representative Mautino, wishes to be voted 'no'. Hold on a second, hold on a second. Representative Deuchler, wishes to be recorded as 'aye'. Representative Bill Pedersen, wishes to be recorded as 'no'. Any further requests of the Chair to be added or deleted from the Roll Call. Take the record, Mr. Clerk. The Bill is on Postponed Consideration. Page 23 of your Calendar it's House Bill 2985, Representative Weller. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk. House Bill 2985."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2985, a Bill for an Act to amend the Liquor Control Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Laurino: "Representative Weller."

Weller: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 2985, is part of the Drug Free Youth Legislative package. House Bill 2985, is designed to deal with one of the biggest problems facing every community and that's the problem of teenage drinking which is also the number 1 killer of our young people in the State of

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

Illinois. House Bill 2985, as amended holds accountable the adults who purchase that keg of beer for those high school teenage parties. Currently, the penalty for a violation of this law is a Class A misdemeanor, this legislation maintains that penalty for the first offense, however, on a second conviction for a repeat offender elevates the penalty to a Class IV felony, one step higher. Ladies and Gentlemen this is an important message this sends a shot across the bow of those adults who are purchasing alcohol and providing it to high school teenage parties and I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Laurino: "Further discussion? Representative Dunn."

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

Will the Sponsor yield for a question? Will the Sponsor

yield for a question? I presume he will."

Speaker Laurino: "Yes, he indicates he will."

Dunn: "There are I think three Amendments on this Bill at the present time. Is that correct."

Weller: "That is correct."

Dunn: "And Amendment #4, 5, and 7 I guess, are on the Bill. What does Amendment #4 do, I don't seem to have a copy of that handy here."

Weller: "Amendment #4, Representative, amended the original language from the Bill, to provide for a second subsequent conviction for this offense to make it a Class IV felony. This Amendment was a suggestion of Representative Young, and I accepted the sugggestion and filed the Amendment and it was adopted."

Dunn: "So if this Bill becomes law the first offense would be Class A misdemeanor which is punishable by what up to a year in jail."

Weller: "Yes, that is the current law and only..."

Dunn: "And for the second offense it'd be a felony which is a

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

prison offense. Is that correct?"

Weller: "That is correct. That is for a repeat offender, yes Sir."

Dunn: "And what does Amendment #5 do?"

Weller: "Amendment #5, establishes an Illinois Youth Service Corp task force, a public, private sector task force to look into the problem of the high rate of recidivism regarding drug and alcohol treatment for teenagers during the hearing in Judiciary II the sum of those who were testifying brought up the concern that we need to look at finding ways to better improve the results of treatment for teenagers. House Bill 2985, now includes as amended the task force which will look into that problem, and look for a way to provide and alternative..."

Dunn: "Okay, that's enough, what about Amendment #7? What does it do?"

Weller: "Let's see Amendment #7, restores the provisions which would allow a minor under 21 years of age to consume alcohol under the direct supervision of their parents within there home. The original Bill inadvertently removed that provision and we restored it."

Dunn: "So, as the Bill now stands, it doesn't cover alcohol consumption in the private home, by...by children living at home, I guess. What if a guest comes to a home and gets a beer out of the basement refrigerator."

Weller: "Anyone under the age of 21, under the law would not be allowed to consume alcohol if it's provided by an adult."

Dunn: "And if if a parent is out for the evening or out of town, and has six cans of beer in the basement refrigerator and one of the children brings some friends home a guests gets in the basement has one beer, are the parents guilty under this Act, of a Class A misdemeanor."

Weller: "Well, Representative we always have the problem of

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

teenagers taking advantage of mom and dad being away under these circumstances, I think it would be difficult for..."

Dunn: "The question is if they drink one beer are they guilty of a Class A misdemeanor? The parents."

Weller: "As I understand it Representative currently now under the law they would be guilty, of a Class A misdemeanor currently under the law."

Dunn: "And so what your...in addition to the...or what your legislation actually does is it enhances it so that if they drink the second beer, it's a Class IV felony, I quess."

Weller: "No, Representative your incorrect, what I'm saying in the language of this Bill is that on a second conviction for this offense, if someone was previously convicted and then was arrested, charged and convicted a second time for this offense then it would be a Class IV felony."

• ממנום "Well, you realize that could happen over a weekend, the parents are gone and someone drinks one beer, Friday night, and one on Saturday, two arrests two convictions, Class A misdemeanor, Class IV felony. Now, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, to the legislation. I don't know anyone in this room or anyplace else in the State of Illinois who really condones underage drinking. I know I certainly don't and I have children myself, I don't condone but most of us who have children, at least off the microphone indicate that we consider our children healthy, red blooded people who have a normal sense of adventure and curiosity, and at this point in time, or it shouldn't be a sin to have some alcohol in your own home, in the basement refrigerator or in the liquor cabinet, and it shouldn't be a sin to go out to a movie on friday evening and fail put that alcohol under lock and key. This is in your own home, with your own family, and just think about situation. I understand we're trying to get at the the big

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

keg parties, the wild drinking parties that sometimes take place in warmer weather. Or when the family is gone. this is a meat ax Bill, it's a meat ax approach, and it attacks the good as well as the bad. It attacks those who growing up and may make a minor innocent mistake as well as those who are bent upon evil activity and of course it doesn't contain anything about knowingly doing this we usually put in our criminal statutes, it simply says that if you have six cans of beer in the basement refrigerator and you go out for a movie and your child brings a friend home and your child is just as innocent you dream your child would be but this sinister quest consumes one can of beer and is under the age of 21, you've committed a fel...or a Class A misdemeanor which exposes you to up to one year in prison and I think up to what a thousand dollar fine, or should happen to be the second offense which could happen in the course of all over one weekend, a Class IV felony, a felony conviction for a can of beer out of your refrigerator. This is just stupid, ludicrous, ridiculous, heavy headed, meat ax approach, trafficing and news releases to get a problem which does exist in some instances but it does not exists in every home, in every basement refrigerator in this state or this country and it effects everyone of those people and it's a problem that should not be awarded the status of statute in the State of Illinois, this legislation should be beaten, should be beaten on behalf of all the good citizens of the State of Illinois, who are doing a darn good job of raising their children and who would have to admit under some circumstances that the kids may have had a beer out of their refrigerator. That doesn't make people world class criminals, this Bill tries to do that. tries to do that to the children and to their parents, bad

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

legislation."

Speaker Laurino: "Bring your remarks to a close, Representative."

Dunn: "Kill this Bill vote 'no'."

Speaker Laurino: "Representative Granberg."

Granberg: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Laurino: "He indicates he will."

Granberg: "Representative Weller, what is the penalty, the current penalty now for this offense?"

Weller: "Currently. under the law as I explained to Representative Dunn, the current penalty is a Class A misdemeanor for an adult intentionally going out, purchasing alcohol and delivering it to someone that's Ι£ it was a parent who had alcohol in the refrigerator who unknowingly a teenager in the household went and purchased the alcohol would not be a Class A misdemeanor under this law. The Bill as it is amended would make it on a repeat conviction for this violation, a second conviction would make it a Class IV felony. currently in the law and this legislation maintains it for a first conviction as a Class A misdemeanor."

Granberg: "And a Class A misdemeanor is up to a year in jail, is that correct?"

Weller: "That is correct, that is current law."

Granberg: "Do you know how many, class...how many cases have been filed in this state for this offense?"

Weller: "According to the Department of State Police, 1989, they had about 890 charges were filed."

Granberg: "And out of those 890 charges how many were sentenced to any jail time."

Weller: "Well, I don't have that exact information, I would of had to contacted each of the Circuit Clerks offices, difficult to obtain."

Granberg: "So out of those 890 cases we don't know how many of

114th Legislative Day

- May 10, 1990
- went to jail under that offense that was charged for a Class A misdemeanor."
- Weller: "Misdemeanors are of course, very rarely sent to jail many times it's more of a financial penalty Representative."
- Granberg: "So, we don't know what effect this Bill would have then on anyone receiving jail time for a conviction."
- Weller: "Representative, the goal of this Bill by mak...by saying that on a repeat conviction for this violation, we will upgrade the penalty to a Class IV felony, is to send a signal to those adults that are going out and buying kegs of beer and delivering them to high school teenage parties. Representative that's the number 1 killer of young people in my district, as probably is in yours."
- Granberg: "So, your intent is to send a strong signal to those
 people who would buy alcohol for minors?"
- Weller: "Well, Representative, of course, I want to send a strong signal so that adults know that they will be held accountable. I feel that by communicating to adults that they will be held accountable we can accomplish the same goals that we accomplished with the tougher DUI penalties, since 1982, tougher DUI penalties have resulted in a 8% drop in alcohol related traffic deaths."
- Granberg: "Representative, if you'd like to send a strong signal would you be enabled to putting this Bill back to second for the purposes of an Amendment to make it a Class X felony."

Weller: "No."

Granberg: "Why, would that be too strong of a signal?"

Weller: "Representative, it's not proportional to the crime it's currently a Class A misdemeanor, we feel that by making it on a second conviction that upgrading it to a Class IV felony that's just one step up that that would accomplish

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

the job, Representative."

Granberg: "But if you would like to make...if you want to send that strong signal, shall we than widely enhance the penalty and really make a strong signal to those people."

Weller: "Well, Representative, if you would like to introduce a

Bill to do that, that's fine, but my legislation just
increases the penalty one step on the second conviction."

Granberg: "Would you vote for that to make it a Class X felony?" Weller: "Probably not Representative."

Granberg: "And what reasoning would be behind that?"

Weller: "Well, I feel, Representative, it has to be proportionate to the...to the crime and I feel that a Class IV felony is strong enough."

Granberg: "So that would be too strong of a signal?"

Weller: "You know, Representative we want these adults that go out and buy the kegs of beer and buy beer for high school teenagers to understand that they will be accountable, currently under the law it is a Class A misdemeanor that is a tough penalty, we fine tune the legislation to make it on a second conviction, a Class IV felony, I feel that that is a strong signal and also an accountability measure and I am satisfied with that."

Granberg: "So, Representative you want to send a strong signal
 but you don't want to send too strong of a signal, is that
 correct?"

Weller: "Representative, I feel that this is accomplishing that signal, that you're looking for."

Granberg: "Thank you."

Speaker Laurino: "Further discussion? Representative Mautino."

Mautino: "Thank you very much, will the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Laurino: "Sure."

Mautino: "Representative Weller, would you for my edification tell me."

114th Legislative Day

- May 10, 1990
- Weller: "Excuse me, would the staffer next to Representative Stange, if he would move to the side so that I could see Representative Mautino."
- Mautino: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker...Jerry for those of us that are not attorneys would you tell me what other crimes are involved in a Class IV felony. What is robbing a gas station? Or home burglary? or battery? What is included in a Class IV felony?"
- Weller: "Without, I'm not an attorney either Representative but truly I can tell you what is a Class A misdemeanor, without checking the statutes..."
- Mautino: "No, I want to know what a Class IV felony, is not a Class A misdemeanor, I want to know what constitutes a Class IV felony."
- Weller: "Representative without going through the statutes it would be time consuming and difficult to determine everything that's a Class IV felony."
- Mautino: "That's exactly correct, it is not. Representative, I'm going to ask you a question, and I would hope that the Members of this Body would listen. If you hold up a bank, if you rob a bank, what is that classification?"
- Weller: "Would that be an armed bank robbery or without being armed?"
- Mautino: "What classification is that Class X?"
- Weller: "Armed bank robbery is a Class X felony."
- Mautino: "Alright, now I'm gonna work my way down. How about stealing an automobile, is that a Class IV felony?"
- Weller: "I'm not sure I don't believe so."
- Mautino: "Well, what are you sure of Representative, how about holding up a gas station is that a Class IV felony?"
- Weller: "If it's with a deadly weapon it's a Class \boldsymbol{X} felony, Representative."
- Mautino: "How about if it's not with...how about breaking an

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

entering into a home. Is that a Class IV felony?"

Weller: "It's a Class I felony."

- Mautino: "Well, what's a Class IV felony, please give the Members of this General Assembly some idea of what classification you want to put parents in so we'll know how they stack up against criminals in whatever category which you don't even know what your talking about, you want to put them in."
- Weller: "Representative, as I discussed with you at length previously to todays debate, under this legislation and under the first defense it would be a Class A misdemeanor, only under a second conviction would it be a Class IV felony, Representative."

Mautino: "I know that but what..."

- Weller: "Just a second Representative we're getting an answer for you. Representative do you want a complete entire list of Class IV felonies or just an example of one or two."
- Mautino: "Well, I want to make sure that the parents of children in this state understand what classification they could possibly be included with, are we talking about home invasion, is that a Class IV felony? They should know who they are going to be in jail with, the type of convict that's going to be in there with them."
- Weller: "Let's see here is an example of a Class IV felony, without going through the entire statutes Representative.

 Compelling confession or information by force or threat would be a Class IV felony, on a first offense."

Mautino: "How about battery?"

- Weller: "Representative my understanding is that it depends on the circumstances it could be a Class A misdemeanor."
- Mautino: "Alright how about sexual assault is that a Class IV felony?"
- Weller: "Criminal Sexual Assault is a Class I felony.

 Representative, that's my understanding."

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

Mautino: "How about child molestation is that a Class IV felony."
Weller: "We'll look it up for you Representative, I'm not exactly
sure."

- Mautino: "To the legislation if I may, Mr. Speaker. What I'm trying to point out is that it is very difficult to pass legislation in the General Assembly if in fact the populous are not aware of what the ramifications are, let's say in some cases and in many cases by virtue of innocence. Now, let me say to you."
- Speaker Laurino: "Representative Mautino, hold your talks for a moment. Could we give Representative Mautino some attention please. Thank you."
- Mautino: "Representative Dunn made some very very important comments, no one on this House Floor or in this states. this state advocates people under 21 drinking in this state that is not lawful. There is no disagreement on that fact, to establish this type of legislation, let me give you a scenario, my nephew is 20 years old he's an underwater welder, and he's a member of the Navy seals, he comes home from Hawaii with four of his friends, and if they have a drink in my brothers home, and they are convicted, that means that if over a long weekend if that would occur twice, my brother and his wife probably could be charged with a Class IV felony. I find that impossible to accept and unrealistic for the citizens of this state to accept. If in fact, I think you want to address this situation of underage drinking then address it, do not establish parents of 20 year old individuals who would probably be serving a prison term while there offspring became 21 years old and legal under your legislation and that could occur. A 20 year old individual the parents, and have two convictions on that issue, the parents would get one to three in jail and the individual who was under 21 would of course be of

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

legal drinking age while that criminal sentence is carried on. I think you should address your concerns as it pertains to maybe marijuana and illegal drugs as opposed to an item that legal except for those that are under 21. I think it's misguided, and it's intention in the legislation and I would hope that the Members would at least consider a 'present' or a 'no' vote on this legislation, that would basically make parents possible Class IV felons."

- Speaker Laurino: "Further discussion? Representative Johnson."

 Johnson: "Just for purposes of legislative intent,

 Representative. Is the underlying offense, whether it is a

 first or second offense, is there a requirement of specific

 intent, knowingly? You can't hear? Can you...Can you

 commit the offense unintentionally, or does there have to

 be an intent a knowing perpetrator."
- Weller: "Representative, it has to be a according to the interpretation of the law in the legislation, it would have to be intentional."
- Johnson: "The current law provides that or this Bill changes it to that."
- Weller: "It is it's provided presently in the current statutes Representative."
- Johnson: "Because in Champaign/Urbana as I suppose most college towns, there is a common prosecution of bar owners who serve liquor to minors not knowing, and our understanding in the interpretation in the local courts I think has been that this is not specific intent crime. I guess that's my question."
- Weller: "Could you repeat your question, Representative. My understanding as I understand what your question is is whether or not it's an intentional act. And it would have to be an intentional act under the current law no,

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

intentional or knowingly under this legislation or under current law we do not change that Representative."

Johnson: "Well, your saying that in order under current law and under this Bill, for someone to be criminally prosecuted they have to serve alcohol to someone under eighteen or whatever the age is knowing that they are under that age.

Is that correct?"

Weller: "Correct."

Johnson: "I wasn't aware that that was the law. Makes it a lot different."

Speaker Laurino: "Further discussion? Representative Harris."

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

Speaker Laurino: "He indicates he will answer."

Harris: "Representative, is Amendment #7, on the Bill."

Weller: "Amendment #7 was added to the Bill."

Harris: "Okay, help me out here does Amendment #7 indicate that if alcohol is served to an underaged person by a parent during a religious ceremony that it then does not apply the provisions of the Act would not apply to the parent."

Weller: "Representative, I think that there is some confusion in the chambers, as to whether it was knowingly provided to this chamber or not. But to clear up your question Representative currently under current statute and this legislation does not change it, alcohol consumed by someone under twenty one for a religious ceremony is exempt. Can you hear me Representative? The second part of your question was regarding Amendment #7, which and I'll read the Amendment to you so that everyone understands it. Amendment #7 says the possession and dispensing or consumption by a person under 21 years of age of alcoholic liquor in the performance of a religious ceremony or service or the consumption of a person under 21 years of age under the direct supervision and approval of the

114th Legislative Day

May 10. 1990

parents or parent or those persons standing in local parentous of such person under 21 years of age in the privacy of a home, is not prohibited by this Act."

Harris: "Well, thank you very much, it seems very clear to me and answered my question. Thank you."

Speaker Laurino: "Further discussion? Seeing or hearing none.

The question is, 'Shall House Bill 2985 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', those opposed. Excuse me Representative. Representative Weller to close."

Weller: "Mr. Speaker, let me just begin by clarifying one point here. Under this Legislation we do not change the law as it deals with parents providing alcohol to their children in their own home. This legislation maintains a parental exemption as it currently is under the law. Ladies and Gentlemen, two weeks ago in my district there is a terrible tragedy that occurred, teenage drinking goes on in every community and in my district in the village of Bourbonna is a middle upper middle class professional community a teenage party where teenagers where drunk, and it resulted in the death of a teenager because of a stabbing incident, kids were so loaded that one of them got in a argument and stabbed another teenager, and then slashed a few other kids. That was a result of a result of an adult purchasing a keg of beer and providing it to those kids Ladies and Gentlemen. That was a terrible tragedy, that is the kind of adult we're trying to hold accountable by this legislation. Is alcohol consumption by teenagers a serious problem? Yes, it is. In 1988, 64 percent of drivers under the age of 25, involved in single vehicle crashes were intoxicated. Twenty seven percent of fatally injured drivers age 15 to 19 were intoxicated. Ladies and Gentlemen, alcohol related crashes are the number 1 killer of our young people. I have eight teenagers in my district

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

in the last three years die from alcohol related accidents including that teenage party in the village of Bourbonnais. Teenagers can only get alcohol from adults Ladies and Gentlemen and I think it's time that we sent a message those adults and we want to hold them accountable. Bill does that but it exempts parents currently as the law is, don't let them mislead you. Ladies and Gentlemen were targeting the clown who purchases that keg of beer for that high school teenage party. With this legislation were telling that clown that we're holding them accountable. in there effort to buy popularity with those kids they're endangering the life of those kids. 1989, 982 adults were were charged with this offense, 886; 1988, Ladies and Gentlemen where do we draw the line on teenage drinking. Ten years ago when I was a college student this General Assembly decided that the legal drinking age was 21, under the age of 21 alcohol is a legal substance, where do we draw the line? What are we telling our young people? Will tougher penalties work Ladies and Gentlemen? Yes, they will. If we hold those adults accountable, if we tell them we're gonna hold them accountable we can have results because tougher penalties have worked in the case of DUI's. between 1982 and 198...I only have a couple of sentences Between 1982 and 1988 total alcohol related fatalities were down because of tougher penalties for DUI, about 8 percent. That's a big jump Ladies and Gentlemen. We can make a difference. This legislation is supported by the Department of Public Health, Mothers Against Drunk Driving, Alliance Against Intoxicated Motorist, Cook county State's Attorney's office and the Department of State police. Ladies and Gentlemen I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Laurino: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 2985, pass?'

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

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

Voting is open. This is final passage. Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "I'm going to explain my vote."

Speaker Laurino: "One minute to explain your vote."

Matijevich: "This is the second time since this Member's been a Member of the House, where he said something was in a Bill or Resolution and I question, I didn't question this time, but the last time I question whether it was in there, he said it was that last time it wasn't. This time again, John Dunn in presentation said that knowingly was not in the statute, and at first I thought the Gentleman said no it wasn't later he said it was. I now understand it is not in the statute, that to me is enough for me to vote against this Bill, because to put someone in prison and not have the usual Criminal Act where it be knowingly committed, I think is counter to all we stand for, not only that..."

Speaker Laurino: "Bring your remarks to a close, Representative."

Matijevich: "Not only that in the presentation of the Bill at

times, the Sponsor of the Bill seemed more confused than I

was about the Bill and I therefore vote 'no'."

Speaker Laurino: "Thank you, Representative Regan, one minute to explain your vote."

Regan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. There is a little confusion over the fact of knowingly, I believe that the intent of the law the way it stands now, the wording knowingly is not there but it is the intent of the law that it is there, another point to make is that molesters of children use alcohol and drugs to lure the kids into there homes and there back yards and into there cars. Think about that. The other thing is that Amendment 7, takes a parent off the hook with giving his own child a beer at Christmas time, it's strickly if you buy alcohol for someone else's youth, you should be prosecuted. I would

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

not vote for this Bill if it wasn't for Amendment 7, I urge a 'yes' vote."

- Speaker Laurino: "Bring your remarks to a close, Representative, oh, he has concluded. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. This Bill having received 41 'aye', 31 'nay', 31 voting 'present'. Representative Weller."
- Weller: "Mr. Speaker, in response to Representative Matijevich's, when I was attempting to answer Representative Johnsons question regarding knowingly intent Mr. Speaker, I'm not doing this to delay Representative, I'm doing this to respond to some comments by a colleague. I responded to the best of my knowledge and my request to staff and that was our interpretation at the time, it does not specifically state in the statute knowingly intent and I recognize that Representative and so I understand what your saying and I want to make that clear."
- Speaker Laurino: "This Bill having received...Representative Giorgi wishes to be recorded as 'no'. This Bill having received 41 'aye' votes, 32 'nay' votes, 37 'present' fails. The Chair will now...would like to inform Members that Supplemental Calendar #1, we will now vote on Supplemental Calendar #1. the Agreed Bill Supplemental Calendar #1. Voting is open. The question is, 'Shall Supplemental Calendar #1, the Bills pass are indicated on Supplemental Calendar 1, the Agreed Bills list?' All those will vote. Voting is open. final passage. The Chair will leave the Roll Call open for one hour, for those people that wish to change their mind and vote otherwise will have one hour approximately hour until 3:30 to change their vote. Representative Hultgren."

Hultgren: "Mr. Speaker, question of the Chair. Mr. Speaker."

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

Speaker Laurino: "Dump the Roll Call, Mr. Clerk."

Hultgren: "Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Laurino: "Dump the Roll Call, Mr. Clerk."

Hultgren: "Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Laurino: "Representative Hultgren."

Hultgren: "Did I understand you to say that we would have one hour to opt..."

Speaker Laurino: "Hold on a second, I'll explain something in a second. Okay. These Bills will be now read for the Second time by the Clerk...Third time by the Clerk. At which time after he reads the Bills we will have a Roll Call and you will have one hour or approximately one hour from the time we take that Roll Call until we finalize it on the Supplemental Calendar #1, on the Agreed Bill list, for you to change your vote any time within that hour. Read the Bill...read the Bills Mr. Clerk. Pages will be passing out the Roll Call, not the Roll Call the description of the Bills to you, and a change of vote form so that you can indicate to the Clerk which Bills you may want to vote 'nay' and 'aye' on a changed Motion. Read the Bills, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bills, Third Reading. House Bill 893, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act to establish a joint legislative reference bureau. House Bill 950, a Bill for an Act to amend the Mental Health and Developmental Disabilities Code. House Bill 951, a Bill for an Act to Mental Health and Developmental Disabilities Code. House Bill 952, a Bill for an Act to amend the Probate Act. House Bill 953, a Bill for an Act to amend the Code of Criminal Procedure. House Bill 954, a Bill for an Act to amend the Abused and Neglected Long Term Care Facility Residents Reporting Act. House Bill 1055, a Bill for an Act in relation to the adoption of persons. House

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

Resolution 1483, a Bill for an Act to amend and Dissolution of Marriage Act. House Bill 1550, a Bill for an Act to amend the Condominium Property Act. 1632, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. House Bill 1817, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Public Aid Code. House Bill 1916, a Bill for an Act to amend the Condominium Property Act. House Resolution, House Bill 2013, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Public Aid Code. House Bill 2173, a Bill for an Act in relation to interior design profession. House Bill 2296, a Bill for an Act to conform the Illinois Human Rights Act. House Bill 2619, a Bill for an Act concerning aquariums and museums in public parks. House Bill 2822, a Bill Act to amend the Wildlife Code. House Bill 2873, a Bill for an Act in relation to organization. House Bill 2900, Bill for an Act to amend the Natural Resources Act. House Bill 2903, a Bill for an Act designating a State Soil. House Bill 2918, a Bill for an Act to amend the Code of Civil Procedure. House Bill 2936, a Bill for an Act to amend the Uniform Disposition of unclaimed Property Act. House Bill 2965, a Bill for an Act to amend the Military House Bill 2990, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Insurance Code. House Bill 3015, a Bill an Act to amend the Civil Administrative Code. House Bill 3027, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Vehicle Code. House Bill 3040, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Vehicle Code. House Bill 3063, a Bill for an Act to amend the Emergency Medical Services System Act. House Bill 3070, a Bill for an Act to revise the law. House Bill 3072, a Bill for an Act to amend the Uniform...Revised Uniform Limited Partnership Act. House Bill 3107, a Bill for an Act to amend the Uniform Criminal Extradition Act. House Bill 3112, a Bill for an Act to amend the Code of

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

Civil Procedure. House Bill 3136, а Bill for an Act concerning Southwest Illinois Development Authority. House 3170 (sic. 3150), a Bill for an Act to create the office of voluntary action. House Bill 3155, a Bill for an Act providing protection for public safety. House Bill for an Act to create the Local Government Health Care Fund. House Bill 3181, a Bill for an relation to Natural Resources. House Bill 3200, a Bill for an Act concerning annexation. House Bill 3242, a Bill for an Act to amend the Archaelogical Resources Protection Act. House Bill 3254, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act relation to clerks of courts. House Bill 3288, a Bill for an Act to amend the Criminal Code. House Bill 3306. a Bill for an Act to amend the Probate Act. House Bill 3310. for an Act to provide for the creation of forest preserve districts. House Bill 3316, a Bill for an Act relation to copies of Bills and committee material. House Bill 3325, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Low-Level Radioactive Waste Management Act. House Bill 3350, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Municipal House Bill 3356, a Bill for an Act to amend the Counties Code. House Bill 3374, a Bill for an Act to amend the State Finance Act. House Bill 3409, a Bill for an Act amend the Fees and Salaries Act. House Bill 3411, a Bill for an Act to amend certain Acts in relation House Bill 3454, a Bill for an Act to amend the service. Township Law. House Bill 3475, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act relating to the use of credit cards. House Bill 3478, a Bill for an Act to amend the Code of Civil Procedure. House Bill 3492, a Bill for an Act to amend the Public Utilities Act. House Bill 3506, a Bill for an Act in relation to radiation protection. House Bill 3518, a for an Act to amend the Civil Administrative Code.

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

House Bill 3528, a Bill for an Act to the Illinois amend Insurance Code. House Bill 3562, a Bill for an Act to amend the Hospital Licensing Act. House Bill 3573, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Vehicle Code. House Bill 3590, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Controlled Substance Act. House Bill 3591, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Purchasing Act. House Bill 3598, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Vehicle Code. House Bill 3603, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act relating to secular textbooks. House Bill 3628, a Bill for an Act to repeal the Illinois Neighborhood Corps Act. House Bill 3639, for an Act to amend the Illinois Vehicle Code. House Bill 3658, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act to require prompt payments by the State of Illinois. House Bill 3679. Bill for an Act to amend the Uniform Commercial Code. House Bill 3710, a Bill for an Act in relation to rights and interest in multi party deposit accounts. House Bill 3711, a Bill for an Act to amend the Radiation Protection Act. House Bill 3717, a Bill for an Act to amend the Environmental Protection Act. House Bill 3718, a Bill for an Act to amend the State Finance Act. House Bill 3719, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act in relation to asbestos. House Bill 3722, a Bill for an Act to amend the Abused and Neglected Child Reporting Act. House Bill 3725, a Bill for an Act to amend the State Officers and Employees Money Disposition Act. House Bill 3736, a Bill for an Act to amend the Boat Registration and Safety Act. House 3739. a Bill for an Act in relation to Vermilion County Conservation. House Bill 3749, a Bill for an Act to amend the Barber, Cosmetology, and Esthetics Act. House Bill 3799, a Bill for an Act to amend the State Finance House Bill 3815, a Bill for an Act to amend Environmental Protection Act. House Bill 3817, a Bill for

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

an Act to amend an Act to provide for a system of probation. House Bill 3828, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. House Bill 3829, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act in relation to security deposits. House Bill 3830, a Bill for an Act to create a home environment program. House Bill 3834, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Insurance Code. House Bill 3847, a Bill for Act regarding contracts relating to artistic and creative services. House Bill 3856, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Insurance Code. House Bill 3857, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Insurance Code. House Bill 3859. a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Vehicle Code. House Bill 3882, a Bill for an Act to revise the law in relation to attorneys and counselors. House Bill 3897, for an Act to amend the Illinois Public Aid Code. House Bill 3932, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act relating to township purchasing. House Bill 3955, a Bill for an Act creating, ratifying and approving the Midwest Higher Education Compact. House Bill 3971, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Insurance Code. House Bill 3994, a Bill for an Act to amend the Federally Subsidized Housing Preservation Act. House Bill 4035, a Bill for an Act to amend and Act in relation to county recorder fees. Bill 4037, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Vehicle Code. House Bill 4049, a Bill for an Act to amend Condominium Property Act. House Bill 4058, a Bill for an Act to amend the Liquor Control Act. House Bill 4068, Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Insurance Code. House Bill 4071, a Bill for an Act to amend the Public Utilities Act. House Bill 4080, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act concerning various fees. House Bill 4081, Bill for an Act to amend the Counties Code. House Bill 4085. a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois School for the Deaf.

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

House Bill 4114, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act in relation to public utilities. House Bill 4117, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act in relation to health care. House Bill 4118, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act concerning health care. House Bill 4119, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Public Aid Code. House Bill 4140, a Bill for an Act to amend the Home Repair Fraud Act. House Bill 4151, a Bill for an Act to amend the Code of Civil Procedure. House Bill 4169, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Oil and Gas Act. House Bill 4202, a Bill for an Act to amend the Animal Control Act. House Bill 4204, a Bill for an Act to amend the Military Code. Third Reading of these Bills."

Speaker Laurino: "Representative Ewing for what reason do your rise?"

Ewing: "Mr. Speaker, I think the Clerk did an excellent job in reading those Bills, we ought to give his voice just a moments rest, and in doing so we should recognize Rotary Group Exchange Team from Brazil which is in the rear gallery on the right, and we would like to welcome them they are touring northern Illinois. Thank you."

Speaker Laurino: "Alright, the Clerk has read the Bills from the Supplemental Calendar on the Agreed Bills list into the record for the Third time, voting is now open. Okay, on Page 2 of your Calendar, at the top of the page House Bill 3811, is on Second Reading on the Supplemental list. It's on Second Reading, it will not be voted on. Other than that all the other Bills on your supplemental lists are on Third Reading and they are to be voted on now. The Clerk will...The question is, 'Shall these Bills pass?' All those in favor indicate by saying...by voting 'aye', those opposed voting 'nay'. You have approximately one hour to change your mind and have these...have your supplemental

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

sheets that have been placed on your desk brought to the well, to the Clerk. Who's voting no? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. There will be a delay on the announcement of the Roll Call until approximately ten minutes to four, at that time we will announce the Roll Call. You have one hour in which to change your mind if you so desire, on the Supplemental Calendar #1, on the Agreed Bills list. We'll proceed to Public Utilities The Special Order of Business, on page 21, public utilities, Third Reading, House Bill 1007, Representative Levin. Out of the Record. Page 22, Representative McNamara, House Bill 2851, Representative McNamara. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2851, a Bill for an Act to amend the Public Utilities Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Laurino: "Representative McNamara."

McNamara: "Thank you, Speaker, Mr. Speaker, Members of Committee. The genesis of this Bill is very simply that during many power outages that occurred on both the north side, northeast, northwest side of the State of Illinois the last couple of years, those power outages were in duration of four hours or more. It was very important to those people that some incentive be given to the companies in order to rebuild there lines. In order to do that we thought that it would probably be better if we come along with refunding the service charge since that service not presented, so I'd be happy to answer any questions and I ask for your approval of this Bill."

Speaker Laurino: "Further discussion? Representative Barger."

Barger: "Thank you, would the...Mr. McNamara, this rebates the payment for service charges in case your electricity is turned off? I didn't quite understand it."

McNamara: "No, what it does is, when there is a power outage, and it not due to a natural catastrophe, and it is due to an

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

equipment failure, let's say by Commonwealth Edison, an electrical utility. If that exceeds more than four hours in a given month, then the resident who is effected who pays the Bill all the time is eligible then for the service charge portion of there Bill which may amount from five to twelve dollars for that given month. That's what it's for, it's some sort of a compensation for the spoiled food the rest of the things that could happen."

Barger: "I was just wondering because I've had that problem with

my business where I've had to send my employees home, shut

down for a couple of days for Commonwealth Edison and there

was no reimbursement that I know of."

McNamara: "That's correct."

Barger: "Okay, thank you."

Speaker Laurino: "Representative Stern."

Stern: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I rise in support of this Legislation, we have areas in Highland Park that are and in Glen Cove that are constantly having power failures."

Speaker Laurino: "Representative Cullerton in the Chair."

Stern: "Representative Cullerton, let's start again. Mr. Speaker, and Members of the House, we've spent a lot of time here talking about carrots and incentives for various people to do the thing that is right. This is a carrot and an incentive to urge Commonwealth Edison to do right. One shopping strip not far from my house, which used to have only a gas station on it is constantly having the power go off. And we've discovered that now that it has in it a bakery, a c.d. shop and all kinds of things, about five different shops, it still has the same relay box or whatever that it had when it was only a gas station, so I want to tell you Commonwealth Edison is going to have to examine it's response time to consumers because there is a

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

lot of agitation in some of these communities about the poor service they have been getting. I urge you to vote 'aye' on this Bill."

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

Preston: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I just have a question I guess for the Sponsor, Representative McNamara, though it's in reference to a comment made by Representative Stern. Not that I'm not vitally concerned with the difficulties that the very wealthy people of Representative Stern's district Highland Park and Glen Cove may have with there Commonwealth Edison power. But does this anything to do with the poor fixed income senior citizens who live in my district, how do they benefit from the provisions of this Bill."

McNamara: "If I understand your question, the way people benefit from the provisions of the Bill, is that if a transformer blew up on the pole, they we're paying there Commonwealth Edison bills etc. and or if they had a power interruption that was due to the utilities fault, not through an act of God or anything else, that senior citizen in your area would be eligible for a service charge rebate for the month, for that month for four hours or more of interrupted service.."

Preston: "So then this Bill is not only for people like, for instance, the Democratic Chairman of the Cook County Party in his Glen Cove summer home, it doesn't only benefit that individual, it can benefit the poor..."

McNamara: "It benefits all the people of the State of Illinois." Preston: "Thank you. It's a good measure."

Speaker Cullerton: "Any further discussion? There being none.

The question is, 'Shall House Bill 2851, pass?' All those

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. This is final passage. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question there are 110 voting 'yes', 4 voting 'no', none voting 'present'. This Bill having received the required Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2921, Representative Anthony Young, Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2921, a Bill for an Act to amend the Public Utilities Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Cullerton: "Representative Anthony Young."

Young, A.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 2921, requires that the monthly service charge or access fee for gas, water and electric companies be based on the actual costs of providing service to the individual unit, it's identical to the Bill this House passed last Session, it's a bipartisan Bill I ask for you support. Be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Cullerton: "The gentleman moves for the passage of House Bill 2921, on that is there any discussion. The Gentleman from Tazewell, Representative Ackerman."

Ackerman: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Cullerton: "He indicates he will."

Ackerman: "Would this increase the cost to farmers in a year when it appears there is going to be a lot more corn drying."

Young, A.: "Absolutely not, there is nothing in this Bill that would require a utility to increase the cost."

Ackerman: "Well, they are going to make up this loss of revenue somewhere, it seems that it would be redistributed..."

Speaker Cullerton: "Excuse me, Representative Ackerman,
Representative Young, if you wouldn't mind we just have a
brief announcement we can leave the Bill in the record and
come back to the debate after an announcement.

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

Representative Levin in the Chair."

- Speaker Levin: "We are fortunate to have with us this afternoon, a delegation of Asian Americans here to celebrate Asian Heritage Month, and we have in the House already passed the res...House Resolution 1656, calling attention to Asian Heritage Month, and I would like to present to 'Tising Tuang' a copy of that Resolution and ask Mr. Taung who is the President of the Chinese/American Development Corporation, that is redeveloping the China Town area in Chicago to say a few words on behalf of the various people who are here today."
- Mr. Tising Taung: "Thank you, Representative. It's certainly a signal honor for a group of us to come down to visit the Legislative process, this is the very first time. We hope that it will not be the last time, we know there are many of you out there that have been our friends and have worked with us and we hope to learn more of the legislative process and to present those special concerns that are of special interest to us. And we know that your help and cooperation will build a better Illinois, it will make us better citizens and hopefully as our numbers grow and double as it should appear in the new census, that we can do a better job of participating in a better government for the State of Illinois. Thank you, very much."
- Speaker Levin: "I just want to introduce one other person, who has been helping to shepherd this delegation around today to the various leaderships, and that is the governors liason for Asian/American affairs, Won Lay."
- Won Lay: "Thank you very much for giving us this opportunity as

 Tising Taung said this would only be the first time, you

 will see us many times in the future. Thank you again."

Speaker Levin: "Thank you."

Speaker Cullerton: "Okay, we'll return to the debate on House

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

Bill 2921, Representative Ackerman was questioning Representative Anthony Young the Sponsor of the Bill. Representative Ackerman."

Ackerman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. I rise in opposition to this Bill, I feel shifting these fees will increase the cost to high users which would be farmers this year due to the lateness in many areas of planting grain, and also I feel this is rate making through the legislature rather than through the ICC, which I don't believe is improper, so I oppose this Bill."

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

Rvder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I also stand in opposition to this Bill. Again we have a Bill, well intentioned though Sponsors may be, concerning what it is that they propose the net affect would be to shift from those to homeowners to businesses to farmers to other folks who also pay the fees for the utility companies, we are setting rates, we are not doing what legislators should be doing, but doing what the ICC should be doing. If we are to subsidize, then let's appropriate the money, file a Bill to do that and we'll vote on it 'yes' or 'no', based on what it costs the state. This simply shifts from those who may not be able as well to pay to those who are in business, those who are farmers and homeowners, other than those who meet the limits. It is not a good idea, it will cost all of our constituents money, I would ask for a 'no' vote."

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

Harris: "Thank you. Mr. Speaker, a question of the Sponsor."

Speaker Cullerton: "He indicates he'll yield. Representative Anthony Young."

Harris: "Thank you, Representative you list five items which can

114th Legislative Day

- May 10, 1990
- be used in computation of the monthly service fee."
- Young, A.: "I'm sorry I can't hear you."
- Harris: "You list, the Bill which you propose 2921, lists five
 items which would be used for computation of the monthly
 service fee. Is that correct?"
- Young, A.: "Yes, Representative."
- Harris: "What do they use now? In other words what are we either including or excluding that they use now in computation of the monthly service fee."
- Young, A.: "The main difference in the computation will be Representative, in terms of cost, right now the ICC has determined that the cost of service can be determined by estimating the costs of new customers that aren't on line yet."
- Harris: "So in other words, they don't..."
- Young, A.: "Rather than charging the actual cost of the service that we're using today."
- Harris: "Okay, so in other words they don't use any of...what I hear you uelling me is they don't use any preset factors.

 In other words they don't use these five in their computation now, it's just whatever they estimate it to cost."
- Young, A.: "Well, they do use some factors but they use factors for equipment that is existing and in service and on line and they also estimate equipment that is not in service or on line."
- Harris: "Okay. The Citizens Utility Board, do they have a position on the Bill?"
- Young, A .: "I think they support it."
- Harris: "Did they come up with any estimates in terms of costs, if there is any associated, I don't know, would there be any...is my monthly...is my monthly bill going to change in anyway because of this Bill?"

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

Young, A.: "I can comment this Bill should not effect monthly costs to any individual, but it will effect monthly service charges. So for those residents that don't use a great deal of electricity, there service charge should in fact go down other residents that use a great deal of electricity some of that usage right now is being hidden in the service fee."

Harris: "Okay, I appreciate your...the directness of your To the Bill, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the Gentleman has I think a reasonable idea in so far as he spells out specifically what should be included in a monthly service charge, the difficulty though is, with the information that I have and with some respect The information that I have is that although CUB supports the Bill, CUB has indicated that this will an increase, a monthly increase...excuse me and annual increase in the cost of electricity service to homeowners. to farmers, to businesses. So, we're caught in the horns of a dilemma I like the fact that we want to specify what should be included in the charges but I certainly don't like the fact that it could result in an annual increase to the rate payers on their electric service. Now when comes down to me to either specifying what's in the charges keeping those utility bills lower, I've gotta go with the information that I have, which again says it's CUB, that the bills are gonna go up and if the bills are gonna up, I think the appropriate vote in 'no' and would urge such a vote."

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

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

Speaker Cullerton: "He indicates he will."

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

Black: "Thank you, Representative, I know that some of these questions have been asked but it's very hard to hear in hear so forgive me if I repeat something, but it appears.

Let me just ask you a straight out question. Does this Bill, does House Bill 2921 lower our utility bills...?"

Young, A.: "No."

Black: "No, it does not. Okay. Does it shift charges between or among customer classes?"

Young, A.: "Representative Black, as you well know, right now you will get a utility bill that will based in two parts. part will say service charge, the other part will There was a time when the service charge was based on the cost of providing service to the residents, on the cost of the meters, on hooking 'em up, on reading them. What this Bill says is that a service charge should actually be the cost of the service and nothing more. doesn't set rates, all it says is there was a time when the service charge for Commonwealth Edison was a \$1.94, was less than 10 years ago. Right now, it's \$11.00 and they're asked for more money. The service charges for Commonwealth Edison and CITCO are the highest in the country. Their own Representative have acknowledge in committee, on record, that the service charges actually reflect more than the cost of service. All our Bill doing is saying, make the service charge reflect the cost of service. And if there is a charge for usage then make the usage charge reflect that charge also."

Black: "Well, let me go back and try again, because I'm not sure that it really answers the question. And I understand your answer, and I appreciate that. But it would appear to me that we are then shifting a portion of the charge between customers or classes of customers. In other words, would it be a fair statement to say, Representative, that if I

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

was a low energy user, I would pay less on the service charge. If I was perhaps a high energy user, I might see indeed under this Bill an increase in my utility Bill. Fair statement or not?"

Young, A.: "Well, that's not a fair statement, Representative Black, because you talked about the low users service charge and the high users total bill. What this will do, it will decrease the service charge across the board. Now in terms of what the total bill will be then the total bill for low users will go down, and high users will go up. But the service charge will be based on the cost of service, which will be the same."

"Thank you, very much, Representative. Mr. Speaker Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, to the Bill. I think the Gentleman made it very clear, and I appreciate his candor. This does not lower utility bills across the board. I'll tell you what it will do, and all of you of you particular downstate to pay attention, it will and the reason the Illinois Farm Bureau opposes this Bill, it will increase the annual electric bill to our farmers of approximately \$100. If you have an electric heat system in your house, it will probably mean a \$120 increase on your bill. I think the Gentleman may have a point here, I'm not sure the bill adequately or accurately reflects what he's attempting to do. This is a shift of the burden of cost, no more, no less. I think it deserves a no vote."

Speaker Cullerton: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Sp...Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentleman of the House. I, too, rise in opposition to this Bill. I would point out that the Illinois Public Utility Act mandates that, and I quote, 'the utilities rate designed accurately reflect the long term cost of service.' The

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

fact of the matter is House Bill 2921 reverses this specific direction, and it is in fact a shift and not a shift in the right direction, because it in fact will not accurately reflect the long term cost of service. For that reason, I rise in opposition to the Representative's legislation, and would ask the...this Body to join with me in that opposition."

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

Kubik: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the I rise in support of this Bill. We've heard a lot of discussion on the floor about how if we pass this Bill. rates will go up. Well, if you stop and think about what that means it's just preposterous. In '83 the service charge was \$1.94, now it is about \$12.00 and slated to go up, and that's before you even turn on your electricity, in the Commonwealth Edison area. That doesn't make sense. And we've heard about how this might shift the burden to other users or customers. Well. in talking with Commonwealth Edison, I... I explained that if we remove the service charge and or if we made service charges a matter expense, then we looked at the usage, those people who watch how they use their electricity, and are careful how they use electricity, may even lower electricity bill. So, I don't the...the...and...and the Representative for Commonwealth Edison, did not deny that particular statement, she said well, yes it is possible. So, I think there's a lot of scare tactics involved. I think it's absolutely unconscionable that we have a rate of \$12.00 every month just to...just for the privilege of having electricity. That to me is just wrong. If you have any senior citizens in your district, this is a Bill you really ought to be

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

careful about voting on, because folks, they're the ones who get hit hardest on this kind of legislation, or...or this kind of policy. And so be careful on how you vote on this Bill. I would urge a 'yes' vote. I think it's a fair vote, and I think it will send a message that we want to have rates set on usage rather than just some arbitrary figure that has been pulled out of the sky."

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

Levin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentleman of House, I think the last Speaker was absolutely right, for your senior citizens, for other people on fixed income, for anybody. The rates ought to be based on cost. should be subsidizing anybody else. And when we rewrote the Public Utility Act five years ago, that was one of paramount things we talked about, no class of customers should subsidize anybody else. Yet, we have these access charges that say you gotta' pay \$10.00 or \$12.00 before you even use the first kilowatt of electricity. That is direct violation of the concept of everybody paying his own and not subsidizing anybody else. And do you know what one of the problems is of having this kind of a system? You can have inequities. You can have situations where utilities make mistakes on what their charging people. There was a complaint case filed before the commerce commission which languished for several years where they were charging apartment owners the rates the access that they were supposed to be charging only home owners. Twice as much. And it took them several years to discover In fact they were charging many thousands of people more than they should Because of this access have. So just recently, they said if you think that you've been overcharged by this access charge, if you're an

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

apartment owner and you think you were charged watts, a homeowner was charged. Take your records from five and six years ago, and bring them in and we may give you a rebate. This would prevent that kind of mistake. This would base any access charge on actual cost, it's fair, it's equitable to everybody. And I urge the passage of House Bill 2921." Speaker Cullerton: "Representative from DuPage, Representative Barger."

Barger: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentleman, we should give due consideration to this. When I first started paying electric bills which was some time ago, there was no service charge. Today, they're asking for \$12.00 a month for service charge. In an area like I live in, a meter reader can read from 200 to 300 meters a day. collecting from \$2,400 to \$3,600 a day for service charges for one meter reader. This is a lot money and totally unwarranted. Now, they are the farmers here are objecting to the large users having to pick up the amount, but we set a multiple rate scale on the collection of rate charges here in Illinois so that the small user only pays a large amount on the first 400 kilowatt hours, as they more and more, it becomes less and less. This Bill would allow a senior citizen or a poor person to save part of the cost of their electric bill during the summer by not using so much electricity. A base \$12.00 that a poor person or a senior has to pay before they have an opportunity to start saving is absolutely ridiculous. A person should have an opportunity to save by using less, and anytime you have poor people in you district, if you have poor people, if you have seniors in your district, if you have people who want to have an opportunity to save money, it's responsibility to help them do it. Now, as far as the big users, the industries, they will have to pay a little

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

but the rate increase will not be all that much, because this will normally be balanced out, out of that first 400 kilowatt hours of use, that will probably go up. So the home owner who is using 400 units and will be getting this reduction will be making up the differential in their use charges, but the person who is...does without their air conditioning and tries to save a little bit, will have the opportunity to survive through the summer, and spend that money on food or something they need even more than that \$12.00 base fee to have electricity brought into their house. I thank you all very much for listening."

Speaker Cullerton: "Representative Anthony Young to close."

Young, A.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentleman of the House. The last was quite eloquent in outlining the issues very clearly. I would just say if you have constituents who are serviced by Commonwealth Edison. they're paying 11.24 now, Com Ed wants to charge them 13.25. If you have constituents serviced by Illinois Power, you're paying 12.00 now, Com Ed want to raise them to \$15.00. For some senior citizens, the senior...the service charge is more than the actual cost of usage. you want to give one vote to your constituents that recognize, that it's the plight with utilities, this is the Bill. Vote for your constituents, give me a green vote. Thank you."

Speaker Cullerton: "Question is, 'Shall House Bill 2921 pass?'

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

Voting is open, this is final passage. Representative

Morrow, one minute to explain his vote."

Morrow: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, even though I have a possible conflict of interest on House Bill 2921, I will vote my conscious, as the Representative from the 32nd District. Thank you."

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

Speaker Cullerton: "Representative Matijevich, one minute to explain your vote."

Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, if there's one thing that irks the people in my area, it's this monthly service charge. For example, there are people that, you know, we don't mind paying Commonwealth Edison and others if they're reading the meters, but one of my constituents said, you know, it's been estimated, there's nobody reading the meter. Why should I be paying for the service. They should only pay for the actual service. For anybody to be charged \$11.00, which it's going to be over 13.00 now, before you even turned on the first light, that is very unfair. I would urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Cullerton: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 62 voting 'yes', 46 voting 'no', 7 voting 'present'. Representative McCracken."

McCracken: "Requests verification."

Speaker Cullerton: "Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Same thing."

Speaker Cullerton: "Representative McCracken has asked for verification. Representative Anthony Young has asked for a poll of the absentees."

Clerk O'Brien: "Poll of those not voting. DeLeo. And Terzich.

No further."

Speaker Cullerton: "Rep...Mr. Clerk, would you please read the poll of those voting in the affirmative?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Poll of the affirmative."

Speaker Cullerton: "Representative Stephens, for what purpose do you rise."

Stephens: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I was distracted during the vote, and I voted incorrectly. I wanted to recorded as 'aye'."

Speaker Cullerton: "Alright, change the Gentleman to 'aye'. Mr.

ll4th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

Clerk, please read the poll of votes according to the affirmative."

- Clerk O'Brien: "Balanoff. Barger. Bowman, Breslin, Brunsvold, Capparelli. Cullerton. Curran. Currie. Deiaegher. Deuchler. Edley. Flinn. Flowers. Gialio. Giorgi. Hannig. Hartke. Homer. Lou Jones. Shirlev Jones. Keane. Klemm. Krska. Kubik. Kulas. Lang. Laurino. LeFlore. Levin. Martinez. Matijevich. McGann. McNamara. McPike. Mautino. Morrow. Munizzi. Novak. Phelps. Preston. Rice. Ronan. Saltsman. Santiago. Satterthwaite. Steczo. Stephens. STern. Sutker. Trotter. Turner. VanDuyne. Wennlund. White. Williams. Williamson. Wolf. Anthony Young. Wyvetter Younge. Zickus. And Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker Cullerton: "Representative McCracken, are there any questions of the affirmative?"
- McCracken: "Yes, thank you. Representative Klemm?"
- Speaker Cullerton: "Representative Klemm. Is Representative Klemm in the chamber? The Gentleman is recorded as voting 'aye', if he's not in the chamber, please remove him."
- McCracken: "Representative Deuchler."
- Speaker Cullerton: "Representative Deuchler. The Ladies voting 'aye'. Representative Deuchler. She's Representative Klemm's seatmate maybe they're...they're together, but they're not here. So remove them...remove her from the roll."

McCracken: "Representative Kulas."

Speaker Cullerton: "Representative Kulas. The Gentleman's recorded as voting 'aye'. Is Representative Kulas in the chamber? Representative Kulas is not here. Mr. Clerk, please change Representative Shaw's vote from 'present' to 'aye'. And remove Representative Kulas."

McCracken: "Representative Keane."

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

Speaker Cullerton: "Representative Jim Keane. How's the Gentleman recorded?"

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

Speaker Cullerton: "Is Representative Keane in the chamber?

Remove him."

McCracken: "Representative Giglio?"

Speaker Cullerton: "Representative Giglio. Representative Giglio is voting 'aye'. Is Representative Giglio in the chamber?

Giglio? You don't look like Representative Giglio. Remove him, please."

McCracken: "Representative Laurino?"

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

McCracken: "Okay, thank you. Representative Shirley Jones?"

Speaker Cullerton: "Please add Representative Deuchler to the Roll Call, so got her signals mixed."

McCracken: "Shirley Jones?"

Speaker Cullerton: "Representative Shirley Jones. She's in her seat."

McCracken: "Yeah, okay. Representative Currie?"

Speaker Cullerton: "Representative Barbara Currie. She's in her seat."

McCracken: "I see her she's there. Representative Phelps?"

Speaker Cullerton: "What was that name?"

McCracken: "Phelps."

Speaker Cullerton: "First, add Representative Klemm to the Roll Call, and Representative Keane to the Roll Call. And Representative, the last question you had was of Representative?"

McCracken: "I thought it was too easy. Phelps?"

Speaker Cullerton: "Phelps. And how is Representative Phelps recorded? Is he voting 'aye'?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Yes, he is."

Speaker Cullerton: "Representative Phelps. Is he in the chamber?

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

No, he's not. Please remove him."

McCracken: "Representative Breslin. Alright, I see her.

Representative Wyvetter Younge."

Speaker Cullerton: "Representative Wyvetter Younge. The Lady's recorded as voting 'aye'. Is Representative Wyvetter Young in the chamber? She's not. Could you remove her?"

McCracken: "Representative Balanoff, is he in the..."

Speaker Cullerton: "Yes."

McCracken: "Representative Capparelli?"

Speaker Cullerton: "Representative Capparelli's in his chair."

McCracken: "Representative Richmond?"

Speaker Cullerton: "Representative Bruce Richmond's in his chair.

And he's not voting 'aye'."

McCracken: "Oh, well just stay there, Bruce. Representative Steczo?"

Speaker Cullerton: "Representative Steczo. He's in the rear of the chamber. And Representative Sutker asks leave to be verified."

McCracken: "Yes."

Speaker Cullerton: "Representative Kulas has returned to the chamber. Please add Representative Kulas to the Roll Call. Well, I've got....no I won't. Any further question?"

McCracken: "No, I have nothing."

Speaker Cullerton: "Representative Regan wishes to change his vote, and vote 'aye'. On this question, Representative Terzich votes 'aye'. Representative Hicks votes 'aye'. Representative Bruce Richmond votes 'aye'. Representative Johnson votes 'no'. Representative Granberg votes 'aye'. Representative DeLeo votes 'aye'. Any further changes? Representative Bugielski votes 'aye'. Representative Goforth votes 'aye'. Any further changes? There being none. The quest...this Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is declared declared passed. 69

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

voting 'yes', 43 voting 'no', 2 voting 'present'. Representative Breslin, House Bill 2932. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2932, a Bill for an Act to amend the Public Utilities Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Cullerton: "Representative Breslin."

Breslin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentleman, House Bill 2932 requires a commissioner on the Illinois Commerce Commission to disqualify himself or herself from cases pending before the commission if he or she or their immediate family has a personal association with or a financial interest in the public utility that is being regulated. Currently no laws govern a commissioner in this circumstance. The rules, are I believe, strict but fair. It specifically indicates that a commissioner who has a personal bias or prejudice concerning a party, should disqualify himself or herself. They should also disqualify themselves if they have worked or been employed by or the public utility within the last seven years, or if their association has worked for the...that public utility within the preceding last three years. In addition to that, the commissioner is required to know the financial interest of themselves and their family especially their children that And if they have a financial are living with them. interest in a case pending before them they disqualify themselves. They are to in writing indicate what their fina...their reasons are for disqualification. If they do not, do not knowingly disqualify themselves when they should have, then their office shall become vacant. These rules are patterned after Supreme Court Rule 63, which governs the conduct of judges in similar instances. I think they are fair, but tough, and I think they guarantee the public that they are going to get honest and

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

unbiased decisions on the part of commerce commission members. I'm happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Cullerton: "Please move to the passage of House Bill 2932, and on that is there any discussion? There being none. The question is, 'Shall all those in favor...shall House Bill 2932 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting's open. This is final passage. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question there are 115...116 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. This Bill having received the required Constitutional Majority is declared passed. Representative Countryman, House Bill 2948. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2948, a Bill for an Act to amend the Public Utilities Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Cullerton: "Representative Countryman."

Countryman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Bill amends the Public Utilities Act. Provides if a new commissioner is appointed to the commission during the pendency of any case before the commission, that commissioner takes and subscribes to the Constitutional office on a date after the issuance of the hearing officer's proposed order on a pending case. Then the new commissioner may not vote on any order regarding the pending case. In this section, new commissioner does not mean a commissioner who is reappointed to a new term at the expiration of his or her current term. The situation can arise where new commissioners are appointed, they came in after the hearing officer has issued his report and do not have sufficient knowledge in which to render a judgment. Also avoids the difficulty of the temporary appointment, where they may be temporarily appointed to provide test

114th Legislative Day May 10, 1990 votes on pending cases. And I would ask for your favorable support."

Speaker Cullerton: "The Gentleman moves for the passage of House Bill 2948. Is there any discussion? Hearing none. The questions is, 'Shall House Bill 2948 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting's open. This is final passage. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 114 voting 'yes', 1 voting 'no', none voting 'present'. Representative Morrow wishes to be added as voting 'aye'. 115 voting 'yes', 1 voting 'no', none voting 'present'. This Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Representative Bowman, House Bill 3355. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3355, a Bill for an Act to require all coin operated telephones for use by the general public to be equipped with amph...amplification device. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Cullerton: "Representative Bowman."

Bowman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentleman of House, this Bill represents an agreement between Illinois Bell Telephone Company and some hearing impaired groups who seeking greater access to public telephones. basically it requires that in public places such as in the rotunda of the Capitol, or malls, or public buildings that at least where at least one telephone per floor or bank of telephones be supplied with. or provided with amplification device. And if you notice, Ladies and Gentlemen, when you go out in the rotunda, we have finally achieved this standard here in the Capitol building. One of the pay phones in the rotunda on the third floor is equipped with amplification equipment. The, as I

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

indicated, this is agreed to by the Illinois Bell Telephone Company, and I recommend an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Cullerton: "The Gentleman moved for the passage of House 3355. On that is there any discussion? There being Bill none. The question is, 'Shall House Bill 3355 pass?' those in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. This is final passage. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are...on this question 114 voting 'yes', none voting 'no', 1 voting there are 'present'. House Bill 3355, having received the required Constitutional Majority is declared passed. The Chair is prepared to go to the Order of Environment, Third Reading. Representative Parcells, House Bill 3139. Out of the record. We'll take House Bill 1042 out of the record. House Bill 3326, Representative Peterson. Representative Well, perhaps we will come back to it. Representative Phelps, House Bill 3585. Representative Phelps. Representative Goforth. House Bill 3743, are you ready to go forth with this Bill? Yes, Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3743, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Explosives Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Cullerton: "Representative Goforth."

Goforth: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is just a clean up Bill for the Departments of Mines and Minerals. We made a few technical changes and I don't think there is any opposition to the Bill. And I ask for your support."

Speaker Cullerton: "The Gentleman moves for the passage of House Bill 3743, and on that is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Could the Sponsor at least explain what the little simple technical changes are?"

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

Leverenz: "From may to shall."

Goforth: "Yea, just about that thing."

Leverenz: "And what else."

Goforth: "And then we...for the thirty day permit after they went through all the process when they issue a permit they can immediately go in and dig the hole. Instead of waiting for the thirty days, it brings it in line with the federal law or any thing."

Leverenz: "Seems like we're doing the agreed list piecemeal."

Leverenz: "I got a couple of good Bills do you think you could pay 'em?"

Goforth: "Well, I normally vote for all of your Bills."

Speaker Cullerton: "Any further discussion? There being none, Representative Goforth would you like to close?"

Goforth: "I would just ask for you approval."

Speaker Cullerton: "Alright, the Gentleman moved for the passage of House Bill 3743. All those in favor vote 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. The voting's open. This is final Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who passage. Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On question, there are lll voting 'yes', none voting 'no', l voting 'present'. House Bill 3743 having received the required Constitutional Majority i 5 declared...Representative Lou Jones wishes to be added to the Roll Call as voting 'aye'. There are 112 voting 'yes', none voting 'no', 1 'present'. This Bill having received the required Constitutional Majority is declared passed. Mr. Clerk, Mr. Clerk, do you have a Calendar announcement? Representative Ewing, on House Bill 3743, wishes to be

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

added as voting..voting 'aye'. I don't know if you can get on that Roll Call, but the reco...the transcript will show...reflect."

Clerk O'Brien: "Supplemental Calendar #2 is being distributed." Speaker Cullerton: "Supplemental #2 contains Senate Bills. If anyone wishes to sponsor any Senate Bills, they can come to the podium and indicate so to the Clerk. Representative William Peterson, we had a Bill that we took out of the record cause you weren't here. 3326, keep it out of the record. Representative Klemm, House Bill 3831, on Third Reading. We're on the Order of Third Reading, Environments. 3831, Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3831, a Bill for an Act in relation to
 recycling used motor oil. Third Reading of the Bill."
Speaker Cullerton: "Representative Klemm."

Klemm: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 3831, creates the Used Motor Recycling Act. What it does is require a feasibility study by the Department of the Energy and Natural Resources to find out what in the world we can do with our used motor We really don't have a policy in Illinois nor do we have really any facilities in the state where the hobbyist, the person is at home who changes their oil, or a small business man has an opportunity or a location to take the motor oil and dispose of it safely. Right now through my district I have caught some people dumping their motor oil in the side of the highway, in the roads in some bushes. And what I found out about, the environmental groups who used to collect it, found out that their liability insurance was so high they stopped taking it. So I thought perhaps, it would be best if the state starts looking into this issue. I remember most of you joined with me to have the Bill out of the committee so that we could hear it, so

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

we could start action on this immediately. Some of the ideas that were brought were perhaps using the motor pool sites, if you will, of central management, maybe even IDOT's locations. But at least whatever we do, I think we should start today. And I do ask for your support, that we start looking at this problem. It may even be considered a hazardous waste by the federal government and that would even compound the problem. So, I do ask you to join me to support 3831."

- Speaker Cullerton: "The Gentlemen moved for the adop...passage of House Bill 3831, on that is there any discussion? There being none. The question is, 'Shall House Bill 3831 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. This is final passage. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 113 voting 'yes', none voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. This Bill having received the required Constitutional Majority is declared passed. Representative Matijevich is in the Chair."
- Speaker Matijevich: "We will return to House Bill 3139, Representative Cullerton. The Clerk will read the Bill. 3139."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3139, a Bill for an Act requiring permanent noise monitoring systems. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentlemen from Cook, Representative Cullerton."
- Cullerton: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Bill creates the Illinois Permanent Noise Monitoring Act, and it provides that the Division of Aeronautics of the Department of Transportation shall design, construct, and operate a permanent noise monitoring system at O'Hare Airport. This shall begin by...this shall

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

begin in December and provides that there shall be a report that the of what the results are of these permanent noise monitoring systems. The state shall pay the cost of the system and in committee, it was indicated that the figures should be approximately one million dollars. The only opponent was the Illinois Department of Transportation indicated that they didn't want...they didn't think the money wasn't in the budget. But I want you to know that the testimony by Kathy Lane was very convincing, she is Head of the Suburban O'Hare Commission, and she indicated that the temporary noise monitoring system that's being used now is not adequate. And that these permanent ones would be very helpful. So we all know about the problems of noise at the airport, I feel that this is a step in the right direction. I'd be happy to answer any questions, and I would appreciate your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Matijevich: "The Gentlemen from Cook, Representative Cullerton has moved for the passage of House Bill 3139. there any discussion? Hearing none. The question is, 'Shall House Bill 3139 pass?' All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the On this question, there are 115 'ayes', no 'nays', none answering 'present'. And this Bill having received Constitutional Majority is declared Representative Cullerton in the Chair."

- Speaker Cullerton: "House Bill 3980, Representative Breslin. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3980, a Bill for an Act in relation to packaging and recycling of certain materials. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Cullerton: "Representative Breslin."
- Breslin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Amendment #1 to this Bill has

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

gutted the Bill and the Bill will go over to the Senate and be used for waste reduction should there be an agreement on that task force. Thank you."

Speaker Cullerton: "The Lady has moved for the adoption or passage for House Bill 3980. On that, is there any The Gentlemen from DuPage, Representative discussion? Doesn't wish to speak, any other's questions? McCracken. There being none. The question is, 'Shall House Bill 3980 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. This is final passage. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk, please take the record. On this there are 115 voting 'yes', none voting 'no', 2 voting 'present'. Bill having received the required Constitutional Majority is declared passed. House Bill 3983, out of the record. House Bill 4046, Representative Regan. Mr. Clerk. the Bill, please."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 4046, a Bill for an Act to amend the Environmental Protection Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Cullerton: "Representative Regan."

Regan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. House Bill 4046, is a Bill that quite affects my districts as well as all of you now, when we come to the point where the composting sites are being sited in the State of Illinois. It's by our rules that July 1 that this must be done, nothing can be put in a landfill. But I feel the people in the neighboring areas where these sites are sited, should know, should be warned, I should know, I don't care for any more 11:30 at night phone calls. Three sites in my districts pop out of nowhere. So, it simply indicates that if there's a site being thought of, that I should know, the Senator and the Representative in the area, all the people within 250 feet from this site should know, and a

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

newspaper...a general notice in the newspaper should be known. In addition to that, this Bill also carries the Amendment that was supported by the Illinois Environmental Protection Agency that allows street sweeping to go to a landfill rather than compost, because the remnants of a street sweeper would destroy the composting ability. I urge for it's passage."

Speaker Cullerton: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage of House Bill 4146. On that, is there any discussion? The Lady from Cook, Representative Didrickson."

Didrickson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Members of the House, I too, rise in support of this notification with regards to composting. It's nothing that is anti-composing, it is just simply that there is a particular situation in our region where by without notification, we have found that the concern has to do with the leeching into the ground water system and tracking that into our creeks and rivers is a concern and certainly people should be notified so that they could object when they are that close to such a situation. And I move for it's endorsement, also."

Speaker Cullerton: "Any further discussion? There being none.

The question is, 'Shall House Bill 4046 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. This is final passage. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 115 voting 'yes', none voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. House Bill 4046, having received the required Constitutional Majority is declared passed. Ladies and Gentlemen, I'm giving you a standard five minute warning to return all of your change of vote forms on the agreed Bill list. Five minutes. On this order of business, Representative Hasara, House Bill 4082.

Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 4082, a Bill for an Act to amend the Wildlife Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Cullerton: "Representative Hasara."

Hasara: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 4082 amends the Wildlife Code for 95 licensed falconers in the State of Illinois to bring our code in compliance with new federal legislation which takes affect July 31. Basically it provides for three year rather than an annual license. I move for it's adoption."

Speaker Cullerton: "The Lady's moved for passage of House Bill 4182. On that, is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 4082 pass?' All those favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. This is final passage. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 112 voting 'yes', none voting 'no', none voting 'present'. House Bill 4082 having received the required Constitutional Majority is declared Representative Phelps, passed. House Bill 3585. Representative Phelps. Representative Phelps. Phelps. Representative Phelps. Do you understand me now? House Bill 3585, we took it out of the record before and you wanted to pass the Bill. Please read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3585, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Coal Technology Development Assistance Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Cullerton: "Representative Phelps."

Phelps: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a different voice. This is an annual request in the budget for the research and development which is the time to have it this year, you know with the acid rain question facing us, is very much needed. So what House Bill 3585 does is increase the portion of the revenue to be deposited in the Coal

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

Technology Development Assistance Fund, and it has increments and phases of 1/32 in 91, 1/25, in fy/92, 1/20 in fy/93 and each year there after. I appreciate your support."

- Speaker Cullerton: "The Gentlemen moves for the passage of House
 Bill 3585. On that is there any discussion? The Gentlemen
 from DuPage, Representative McCracken."
- McCracken: "Current analysis says, the possible impact of this would be two million in the next fiscal year, three and a half million in '92, five million in '93 and there after.

 Is that correct?"
- Phelps: "That's what I was saying by the fractional break-down. Yes, 1/20, 1/32, you use them in terms of millions."
- McCracken: "Okay. Now, is there an appropriations Bill to fund this?
- Phelps: "It's the annual appropriations with which we do each year for the Coal Development Fund. We are increasing it this year because of the crisis situation of the acid coal and the possibility of the 6,000 miners being out of work. It's a low cost for the investment return."
- McCracken: "Yea, well, I don't understand it, so I guess I'll stop talking."

Phelps: "Thank you."

Speaker Cullerton: "Any further discussion? There being none.

The question is, 'Shall House Bill 3585 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. This is final passage. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 115 voting 'yes', none voting 'no', none voting 'present'. House Bill 3585, having received the required Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Next we will go on, Third Reading, to the Order of Children. Representative Currie and

114th Legislative Day

the Bill."

May 10. 1990

Preston the only Sponsors in this Order. So. Representative Currie, on House Bill 1268. Out of the Representative Currie. House Bil1 3558. Representative Currie. Representative Currie. Yes, that was for the last one. Now, the next one is yours as well. 3558, do you want that out too? Oh. I'm sorry it's Curran. Representative Curran. 3558. Yeah, there's a big difference. I apologize. Only two letters in the spelling. though. That's what my problem Representative Curran. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill." Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3558, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act

in relationship to children and families. Third Reading of

Curran: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Bill amends the Children and Family Services It prohibits separation of families in placements when neglect, abuse or dependency can be cured by provision of permanent housing. All we're really doing here is requiring the Department of Children and Family Services, to determine before they break up a family the simple question of housing is all that is necessary to be handled, then they would have to provide housing for that family before they broke the family up. Often times you find that the simple question of a down payment on a or a deposit on an apartment, will keep a family of four. or six people together. Much cheaper and much more humane to do it this way, and I would be glad to answer any questions, and ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Cullerton: "The Gentleman has moved for adoption of House Bill...passage of House Bill 3558. On that is there any discussion? The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative McCracken."

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

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

Bill. The Department of Children and Family Services is in opposition to the Bill. It would require DCFS to provide suitable permanent housing services to children and their families in certain situations, where DCFS involved. It is estimated to cost in the first year alone, over \$8 million, for the housing services. The provisions giving the courts the authority to order DCFS to provide the services would unduly infringe on the departments discretion in handing its duties under the law. It places the department in the position of providing housing rather than it's main goal to provide welfare and assistance the children as necessary, or the families as necessary. It is a good idea, it's well intentioned, but it's very expensive, and it takes away from the departments focus as what it should do, and will cost money that we do not to spend. I rise in opposition."

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

Preston: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of House. Contrary to the remarks of the previous Speaker, this Bill does...not only doesn't cost money, it going to state an enormous amount of money because it provides that the money that otherwise will go to provide foster care for a child, which is far in excess of the money that this Bill provides, would have to go to some housing assistance to keep a child or children from going into foster care. With housing assistance, children can stay in the care of their natural parents, and the state would not have to spend the money on foster care, which is far in excess of the amount provided for for this simple housing allowance. This goes...what the Bill has to do with is providing money where otherwise a child would be taken away from it's natural, biological parents and put in

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

foster care. When the only reason for that is because there isn't sufficient housing for the children, by giving a little money for housing you make it unnecessary for the state to pay a lot of money for foster care. So this is a cost savings Bill, not a...not a expenditure."

Speaker Cullerton: "Further discussion? The Gentlemen from Madison, Representative Stephens."

Stephens: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I...a little money housing and we solved this problem. It sounds to me like a little money for welfare in 1963 will feed all the hungry in our nation. We've heard that promise before, we know that it gets out of hand. We have to understand if spend \$8 million on this program, we are going to have to take money away from many other programs, homemakers, counseling and therapy services. There is absolutely no way we can fit this in the budget without making other needed programs suffer. General Assemblies before us, and including this one, have wisely decided how to spend the existing funds that we have, what programs we could fund and which ones we couldn't. Everytime we bring new program in, it is incumbent upon us to take those services away from someone else, and I suggest to you that although this might be a worthy idea, there aren't enough dollars to go around and we wind up hurting other agencies, other people who are in need of state services. So, I have to stand in opposition."

Speaker Cullerton: "I have an announcement, the time for changing your vote on the Agreed Bill list has now passed and the ability to change your vote on the Agreed Bill list has passed. Mr...Representative Curran."

Curran: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, let's focus on this. Let's understand what's before us. By this Bill, we tell the Department of Children and

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

Family Services, you do not break-up a family, you do put children in foster care, which is costly. You do not break up a family, if the only thing that is required to keep the family together is housing. Now, what we are talking about is a small group of people in this state, who are at risk of families being separated, sometimes months or years, simply because the parents couldn't afford a deposit on an apartment. That is unconscionable for us as a society to put people in that situation, and then force the separation of the family. We're only talking about children and families who fall in under the pre...preview of the Children and Family Services, and families who the state would break-up, but for the cost of If you want to break-up families, if you want to pay an exorbitant amount for foster care, if you want put a tremendous strain on foster care system that is already strained beyond belief, then vote against this Bill. But if you're for families, if you're for children and their parents staying together, if you're for doing something about the homeless problem which doesn't cost us anything, and we all know what the fiscal notes from these departments do, they just inflate beyond belief the cost of even a small request from their attention. But if you want to do something for families and children, you ought to support this Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Cullerton: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 3538

pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed

vote 'no'. The voting open. This is final passage.

Representative Hartke, one minute to explain your vote. He

doesn't wish to explain his vote. Have all voted who wish?

Representative Regan, one minute to explain your vote."

Regan: "I would just like to explain my vote. DCFS is overwhelmed, just overwhelmed, now this Bill puts them in

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

the housing business. What are we doing? They got zero to twenty—one, cocaine babies, sexually molested kids. Come on guys, give 'em a break."

- Speaker Cullerton: "Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 63 voting 'yes', 47 voting 'no', 5 voting 'present'. This Bill having received the required Constitutional Majority is declared passed. Representative Preston, House Bill 3577. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3577, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act concerning the protection and advocacy of children. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Cullerton: "Representative Preston."

Preston: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 3577 is one of a package of Bills that came out of the Foster Care Task Force, and this Bill authorizes...authorizes the governor to designate private, nonprofit corporation as the agency to provide protection and advoc...advocacies services for the rights of children who are wards of the state, foster children. It is based on the model of the protection and advocacy organization that was designated under federal law to perform protection and advocacy duties for the mentally ill and developmently disabled. There is no cost in this Bill to the state, they're in the protection advocacy organization, there is no state funds that are used to fund that, and this is also permissive. It authorizes the governor to do this, to have an advocacy arm to promote the best interest of children in foster care. I would be glad to answer any questions, and I encourage your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Cullerton: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage of House Bill 3577, and is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black."

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

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

Speaker Cullerton: "He indicates he will."

Black: "Thank you. Representative, a couple of questions. On your...one of your last comments you said that this is a permissive Act. Our analysis would indicate that it requires the governor to so designate. Do we have a semantics problem here or just normal confusion?"

Preston: "Well, I think there's a problem with your analysis."

Black: "Oh, oh heavens, no."

Preston: "So, cause our...cause reading from my analysis it says, authorizes the governor to designate, and rather than requires the governor."

Black: "Well, let's...let's look at the Bill."

Preston: "Oh, I don't want... I don't want to do that."

Black: "Well, when all else fails, let's look at line twelve, page one. The governor shall designate. Perhaps that's a typo and really means may designate."

Preston: "It is supposed to be permissive and you are correct, and I commit to you that we will make it permissive when it gets to the other chamber. You are correct."

Black: "So, so, we can expect that to be changed."

Preston: "Absolutely. Yes."

Black: "Well, now let me focus on something else. You said no cost, and yet a fiscal note was filed that indicates the cost to be approximately \$1 million."

Preston: "Yes, that apparently was based on that erroneous insertion of shall rather than may. And I do commit to you that we will make it permissive and the cost at that point will be whatever is appropriated for the purpose if anything."

Black: "Thank you, very much, Representative. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, to the Bill. In all due

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

respect to the Representative, it was only about 45 minutes ago, that one of our Members was chastised severely misrepresenting а Bill. Now. T don't sav the Representative misrepresented, I have too much respect for him and he knows that. He wouldn't do that deliberately. but we do have a problem here with a permissive Bill isn't permissive. It is...it is clearly states it shall be done. I quess you'll just have to vote your conscience. The Sponsor said he'll change it in the Senate, but here again what was related to be the case is not the case."

Speaker Cullerton: "Further discussion? Representative Hasara."

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

Speaker Cullerton: "Indicates he will."

Hasara: "Mr. Preston, where will the money come from if such a
group is appointed by the governor?"

Preston: "Right now the funds for the advocacy and protection group that represents the mental health and developmentally disabled community has a budget of about \$1 million, all those funds come from private and federal sources, not a penny from the State of Illinois. And that is my expectation here as well."

Hasara: "You're expecting federal money to fund this?"

Preston: "You bet. Yes, there are federal mandates to provide certain services including advocacy for the foster care community."

Hasara: "With no matching state funds?"

Preston: "I'm sorry."

Hasara: "With no matching state funds?"

Preston: "Not with state...not requiring state funds. Now, there may be private funds for the mental health, there is not a penny of state funds. And this is modeled on that program."

Hasara: "Pat, I would also remind you there are other advocacy

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

groups in Illinois that do come under the state and do require state funds and with the shrinking federal dollars we're experiencing, I find it very difficult to believe that we'll be able to fund this on a federal fund with no matching state fund."

- Preston: "Mr. Speaker, if I might request that this Bill be pulled out of the record, so we can fix it up and address these concerns, and if we can have a call tomorrow."
- Speaker Cullerton: "Alright, House Bill 3577 out of the record.

 House Bill 3578, Representative Preston, do you want to
 call that now? Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3578, a Bill for an Act to amend the Children and Family Services Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Cullerton: "Representative Preston."

Preston: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of House Bill 3578 corrects an injustice that has House. existed for over 20 years in the care that we as a state have committed to provide for children in foster care. Among the provisions of the Bill, is the clothing allowance that is given to foster parents. It was set in 1969 at \$202 per month. From 1969 to today, 1990, it has not been increased by a single penny. The same...what this address is when a child, a typical situation is a child who shows up at the door of a foster parent, immediately after placement, typically has only the clothes on his or her back. And the foster parent has then to provide frequently for a teenager, for a 10 year old, 8 year old, provide clothing whether it be winter clothing and spring, and summer, and fall, provide clothing and shoes for that child who has nothing but the clothes they're wearing. they're supposed to do that with \$202. This raises the requirement to a \$350 initial clothing allowance and

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

by July 1 of 1991, that the Department of requires that Children and Family Services sets a room and board payments for foster children at a hundred percent of United States Department of Agriculture cost index of raising a child in the urban midwest, and that's the low cost index. permits foster parents to continue on as foster parents which now unfortunately the system is turning off because. frankly. people simply can't afford to take care of children with the additional financial burden that's placed on their backs. There are some 18,000 children in care in the State of Illinois, and we need foster parents to take care of these children and we have to give them some reimbursement for those costs. We simply aren't doing and we're so far behind we have to do something to catch up, and this is a weak playing of catch up."

Speaker Cullerton: "The Gentlemen has moved for passage of House Bill 3578, and is there any discussion? The Gentlemen from DuPage, Representative McCracken."

McCracken: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. You know, it's nice to make promises, it's nice to tell fairy tales to people, nice to treat the citizens of Illinois like you treat your kids when you put them to bed at night. and sav nice things, happy dreams. Bless you for doing that. Your heart is in the right place. But this is goofy, it's absolutely goofy, it's short sighted and Representative Preston you should know this by now. fiscally irresponsible. And for that reason, we cannot allow this This clothing allowance alone will cost an extra \$1.4 million. The 1992 increase in appropriation necessary to fund the 100 percent level is about \$18 million. The budget the DCFS presented was not including \$18 or million for this program. But you know what happened to it? It was cut by \$16 million in committee. are

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

confronted once again with the evils of the fabricated system of doing government business. On the one hand, tell people we have all these dreams for them, that we can help them attain. And on the other hand, we take away what we give 'em. We tell 'em, well those are nice dreams to have, but we don't have the dollars. Only nobody finds out what the truths is until it's too late. They don't find out, the press captures this moment for the greater glory of everyone involved, but do they tell the people in the next week or so, hey, there's no money to do that, that was all a sham. That's precisely what's happening here. Now I know that Representative Preston would like the budget reflect his priorities, but it isn't going to reflect his priorities and that's a fact of life. We're talking about million short fall in the budget this year. Nobody's talking taxes, nobody's talking realistic spending limits, and this certainly is not part of the program. There is no reason we should pass this, and put this burden on the department, and raise the expectations of it's clients and the citizens of Illinois, only to dash them by the end of June, in their hard reality of our fiscal status. Please vote 'no'."

Speaker Cullerton: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from McLean, Representative Ropp."

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

Speaker Cullerton: "Indicates he will."

Ropp: "Representative, is this a \$350 clothing allowance per recipient per year?"

Preston: "No, this is \$350 per recipient one time initial placement."

Ropp: "Well, one of the tragedies that we kind of have in this operation is that if for some reason the foster child chooses to leave or the foster parents choose not to

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

continue, they can make that request and it's on to the next foster parent, and I wonder if you've attempted to address this. If the foster child gets to the third foster parent in a year without any clothing allowance, how do you address that situation?"

Speaker Cullerton: "Representative Preston."

Preston: "Representative Ropp, let me put this in a perception so we all can understand it. We are not talking about a placement of an adult who is going to be staying essentially at the same size, we're talking about a child that's put in foster care. And the comments that I've heard here about holding our head, about how gosh, we can't...it's a nice idea, and my heart's in the right place but we just can't do it. We're talking about a child showing up somewhere in the wintertime without a winter coat, without galoshes to wear on their feet when they have to go to school the next day and they grow. We're talking about at what...what a foster parent gets to provide all the clothing, almost virtually 100 percent all of the clothing. And yes, when the child a year later goes on to a different placement, that...that new foster parent is going to get a new allowance which they need because the child shows up typically without having packed the bags of the previous placement. It's a one, two, three, the change is done on emergency basis. So yes, that person may need a new winter coat, or maybe а spring rain That's...that's what we're talking about, and the previous Speaker I would...I would submit doesn't let his children go without clothing nor do you let children go without clothing or does anyone here. Why those who are least fortunate among use are we saying that what was given for clothing in 1969 is more than adequate because DCFS has it's own problems?"

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

Ropp: "That's not exactly the response to the...that's a nice response but it wasn't to the question."

Preston: "I do my best."

Ropp: "The question concerning is, that when foster children move from one family to another, two or three times maybe in one year, which is the case all too often, that those dollars may not follow or the clothing doesn't follow. And I guess what I'm trying to find out is the intent and I don't think it's the intent but I want to get your response to it, that every new foster parent gets \$350 to take care of the clothing allowance for that growing child."

Preston: "Alright, the situation that you described is not typical situation. A child does not typical go to three, two, three placements in a single years time. because if it's that quick is back to the typical placement biological parents, where there is no clothing, of course, there is no clothing allowance. That simply is typical, but what is typical even in the situation described is for that child who moves to the next home, that child again did not pack his or her belongings, is typical. Where no matter what was purchased for that child the change takes place generally quite abruptly. child didn't have the inclination and wasn't told or asked to pack your belongings, you're leaving, the child is picked up, and the child is delivered somewhere else, the new foster parent has this child, and without any coat, with first of all, without any medical records, but also without any clothing allowance."

Ropp: "So they get another 350. If a child moves three times in one year, we're talking about a \$1,000, plus."

Preston: "Yes, yes, the simple answer is yes. Yes, if you're looking for a reason to vote against it, that's as good as any."

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

- Ropp: "I'm not looking, I've been told any number of times that too many of these foster children get moved as many as 10, 11, and 12 times. Which I'm trying to prevent."
- Preston: "It makes you wonder what kind of foster care system we have if what you're saying is correct. But that is not the typical situation."
- Ropp: "Well, what I've always thought is that sometimes when there are problems you have to work them through, like you and I do with our own children, I think it's too easy in some cases to call up and say I don't want this kid after I have been credited as a foster parent or if I'm a child, I could say, I don't like these parents. I mean we don't do that in a normal situation, but it does occur, and I think that's a sad situation."
- Preston: "Are you implying, Representative, that the foster parent then is able to pocket this \$350, is that...?"

Ropp: "Well, I would hope not."

Preston: "Well, you're right, they can not. That's correct."

Ropp: "Well, what's to prevent it? What's to prevent it?"

- Preston: "They have to provide...produce vouchers for the money that was spent for the clothes, the clothing that was purchased. So there's no, it's not something pocketable.

 Foster parents don't make a profit in this great business of taking care of unwanted children."
- Ropp: "Why wouldn't the DCFS make sure as you some what indicated, does not happen that these kids are picked up and moved without bringing their clothing? Why wouldn't DCFS in their compassion for kids make sure that the \$350 they spend on shoes, clothing, ect., wouldn't follow them?"
- Preston: "Travels with them. I would share your concern about that, and I asked the same question you have."
- Ropp: "Will they mend that into...in the Senate, when it gets back over there?"

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

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

Stern: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I may be the individual on the floor who has unpacked a foster child when he arrived. We took a foster child who was seven years old back in 1952, which will give you some idea of how old the Speaker is, who came to us not in a hurry, briskly from an unhappy situation, he was in another foster home. He came to us with a paper shopping bag. of shoes he was wearing, which were sneakers that belonged an older sibling that didn't fit, a sailor suit, no underwear, no toothbrush, and that was it. And this was a reasonably successful placement that he had come from. don't know where his clothes were, and I didn't ask. took him uptown and bought him jeans and shirts and sock and shoes and underwear, and that is the norm. And that is the reality."

Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman from Madison, Representative Stephens."

Stephens: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. There is no doubt that there is a need. One of the programs that I'm fortunate enough to be associated with is Adopt A Child Program run in the Collinsville area, and what we try to do is help families who are in need. And I am sometimes shocked and surprised at the basic needs that some families have that are trying to stay together, and certainly with foster children there is a tremendous need on occasion. And there is no question that we need to address that. But the question before us today is not whether we want or can afford to do that, it's program do we want to strip funds away from. not print money here, and it's fine to sit and talk about the merits of the issue. The merits I think could not be questioned. We all want to make sure that children in

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

winter have coats, and that they have shoes, that they're presentable to the best degree possible. But if it costs \$19 million, just tell us what program you want eliminate. Where do you want the money to come from? you've got a printing press and you can print the money and you want to do it, well, let's do it. That's what they do in Washington, they just put us further and further in debt, so that we spend almost \$200 billion on interest. instead of providing programs. But that's the mistake that we're making, Representative, and I think we all admire what you're trying to do. But we have to openly admit that it's going to cost some other program, if we're going to accomplish this goal. So, as admirable as you're concept and your idea is we have to recognize that we can only take from education or away from mental health, or away from public aid, or away from some other section of Department of Children and Family Services to fund this noble program. I just don't think we can spread ourselves that thin."

- Speaker Giglio: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Shirley Jones."
- Jones, S: "Yes, would the Sponsor yield? This is not only just for clothing is it for the board, is it the money for their board?"
- Speaker Giglio: "Representative Preston."
- Preston: "Yes, Representative, that in addition to the initial clothing allowance this Bill provides that by the year 1991, the DCFS will bring its room and board allowance that it pays to foster parents up to the U.S. Department of Agriculture Index for what that cost ought to be in the Midwest."
- Jones, S.: "So the amount you quoted \$350 is including board and the clothing?"

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

Preston: "No, there two different funds. One part of the Bill is for an initial clothing allowance, going from \$202 that was set in 1969, to \$350 now, so that's an increase. The second part of the Bill talks about bringing the general room and board allowance up to the recommendation of the U.S. Department of Agriculture."

Jones, S.: "Representative Stephens, I know where we can get the money from. Where we can get the money, if the governor would stop traveling so much we could take it out of his allowance, then this way we will be able to support his Bill. Thank you."

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

Davis: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen. I do believe that children are important, and I think sometimes we put them last, they're our last priority. Everything comes before the children. And if you really look at how a country or how a state treats its children, then you can pretty much predict the future of that country or think in the State of Illinois, there are times T when we maybe unintentionally...unintentionally are in reference to our children. This is a very simple Bill, for a small number of people, and when we ask the question of where can we get the money, Shirley Jones had an excellent suggestion. But Shirley, I have an even better one. I think we can look at the DCCA budget and we can ask ourselves, should we support big business or which should we support children? Should we support children who are in unfortunate circumstances through no fault of their should we support Sears and Robuck? Little children versus big business, this should be an 'aye' vote."

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

Currie: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Members of the House, happily

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

we won't have to cut the governor's travel budget in fiscal this Bill passes, we won't have to cut out other important items in the governor's budget if you look at House Bill 3578, you will see that the fiscal implications do not become due until next year's budget, until So all the carrying on, the screams, and the year 1992. shouts, the jeers from the Representatives who have against this Bill are completely misplaced. I would urge that it's critical that we establish the provisions of this Bill as a strong priority in this fiscal year, so that can do the planning that it takes to make sure that the monies are there to meet our commitments to foster children in the following fiscal year. If we do not adopt this Bill at this time, we'll be back next year with the problem. the same complaints, the monies that would fund clothing, and adequate payments to foster parents next year will already have been used up in somebody else's priority during the coming budget year. So, allay your fears, this is not a question of false dreams, false hopes, sweet good nights, to the foster children in the State of Illinois. We can say, 'yes', to House Bill 3578, this fiscal We can do so responsibly to the tax payers, because what this Bill will do for us, is to establish a commitment fiscal funding in the next, not this, budgetary year."

Speaker Giglio: "This Bill, if I may remind the Body, is supposed to be on Short Debate. The Lady from Cook, Representative Didrickson."

Didrickson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Members of the House, I think its interesting that those on the other side of the aisle are telling us that we can save those dollars out of DCCA budget, that we can save it out of the governor's travel line item, but it's not going to come due fiscally, the due note doesn't come due until 1992. That's going to

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

be a new governor, and we don't know which Governor that's going to be. And if it happens to be the governor you guys are going to be voting for, we may have a problem, right?"

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Munizzi. Oh, your light was on.

Did you want to speak on this issue? The Lady from DuPage,

Representative Cowlishaw."

Cowlishaw: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Since, someone originally mentioned the subject of transportation in relation to this Bill, which I can't see and it has any relevance at all. I'm sure that you will regard my comments as relevant. It seems as thought there is always somebody who wants to spend money for really good things then there are usually people who want to spend money period. I want to tell you briefly about a proposal that has just recently been made by a Democrat in the State Legislature in California. Now this Gentleman wants the State of California to operate it's own airline. The California Airline, sponsored by, paid for by, subsidized by, the people of California. A typical Democrat idea. Thank you."

Speaker Giglio: "The Lady or the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Trotter."

Trotter: "Thank you, very much, Mr. Speaker. Members of the House, I rise in support of this Bill, as being a Member of that task force and it was a bipartisan task force. One of the things that came out of it, not just dealing with the children, but keeping the parents in the system. What this Bill does is alleviate those costs that are now being absorbed by these parents who have taken this responsibility of raising other people's children. And what we need to do is start addressing, when are we to start paying people to help this state to get out of it's deficit that it's in. What's happening, if we do not make these parents become viable and help them become

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

viable in working with these children, these children are continuously going be wards of our state. It doesn't get any better, it just gets worse. It's time now that we address these concerns, and start paying for them before they become problems later on down the line."

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

Preston: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Bill was one of the cornor stones of findings of the Speaker's 1291 Force on Foster Care that as Representative Trotter said, was a bipartisan task force that held hearing through the State of Illinois. parents are a state treasure of this state, they are worth far more than gold, or platinum, or diamonds because they take in other people's children who are troubled children and they open their homes and their hearts to these children. Parents in this program are not being attracted, parents not yet in the program aren't being attracted to the foster care program, and parents who are already in the program are given a great incentive not to continue in the program, because their costs have increased so much by if nothing else, just the weight of inflation because we haven't paid them any more then we paid them decades ago for the cost of providing care to other people's children. Now, let me tell you, there is another approach we can take in this state, we can follow the approach of Brazil. Brazil doesn't have an increase cost for caring for foster children. They don't have a court backlog that has to deal with foster children. Because in Brazil, they assassinate foster children and homeless children. The merchants there hire assassins to go out the neighborhood and to shoot to death children who have no homes and too often become problems to merchants in Brazil. So we have another

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

alternative, we could actually treat our children worse than we already do, if we try real hard, and we're getting there by not providing some means for foster parents to do their job, the job, not their job to do our job of caring for other peoples children. We have to give some increase incentive to keep foster parents in the program to care for these needy children. Please vote 'aye'."

- Speaker Giglio: "Question is, 'Shall House Bill 3578 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. This is final action. Representative Matijevich."
- Matijevich: "I want to tell the Sponsor, I'll go through corporal punishment rather than hear this again."
- Speaker Giglio: "The Lady from Champaign, Representative Satterthwaite."
- Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, while I hope the passage of this Bill will in fact give it priority in next year's budget, I am amazed at the fact that the governor in this year's budget has or for next year's budget has totally ignored the Pension Bill that we passed and has not seen that as an obligation. I urge whoever comes in as our new governor, to look at the obligations we have placed upon the budget and to fund those before we start looking at new programs. This Bill deserves to be passed so that children can be placed in a high priority with next year's governor."
- Speaker Giglio: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Gentleman from Livingston, Representative Ewing."
- Ewing: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I think that the last Speaker is a little misguided. We certainly should look after our pensions and you the people on the other side of the aisle control this Body, and you

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

can take care of that for the coming budget if you so chose. So don't put all that on the governor's proposal, you can rearrange that. But we certainly shouldn't be starting new programs until we take care of those old ones. And I would be glad to join with Representative Satterthwaite, to see that pensions are funded in the coming budget."

- 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 74 people voting 'yes', 41 voting 'no', none voting 'present'. House Bill 3578 having received the required Constitutional Majority is declared passed. House Bill 3583, Representative Preston."
- Preston: "Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to bring this Bill back to the Order of Second Reading for the purpose of an Amendment."
- Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman have leave to bring the Order of Bill back to the Order of Second? Hearing none, leave is granted. Represen...the Bill's on Second Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3583, has been read a second time previously. Floor Amendment #1 is being offered by Representative Cullerton."
- Speaker Giglio: "Representative Preston."
- Preston: "With leave of the House, I would like to handle this

 Amendment for Representative Cullerton at his request. He
 is in a meeting."
- Speaker Giglio: "He's in a meeting. Does the Gentleman have leave? Hearing none, leave is granted. Representative Preston on the Amendment."
- Preston: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Amendment #1 is a excellent idea. It makes it primafacie that a mother that gives birth to a drug addicted baby has mistreated for the

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

purposes of foster care has mistreated that child. It's a rebuttable presumption and a mother can present evidence, but the DCFS may base it on a cocaine baby, being addicted to cocaine at birth. Bring if they deem necessary, a case to have that child put into foster care, if other factors so deem it. And I'd ask for the adoption of Amendment #1."

- Speaker Giglio: "Any discussion on the Amendment? Hearing none, all those in favor...Representative McCracken."
- McCracken: "Thank you, this is on the same subject the press sometimes refer to cocaine babies. Now, does this mean that the mother who gave birth to the child with drugs in it's system, is she unfit for purposes of terminating parental rights? Or is she merely neglected as we passed the law last year?"
- Preston: "A mother shall have...who gives birth to a cocaine baby, I'm reading from the Amendment, shall be found to be an unfit mother, with respect to the child. If while pregnant with the child she knowingly or intentionally used a dangerous drug, or a narcotic drug, other than one that's legally, lawfully prescribed, and the child or newborn showed signs of a narcotic or dangerous drug exposure. At that point the department, wa...the cause of that, giving birth to a cocaine addicted baby may if they deem it necessary to seek to have the child placed in foster care."
- McCracken: "Well, it isn't...it isn't a cocaine addicted baby,
 it's a baby with drugs in it's system, isn't that it? Or
 it's as broad as drugs in it's system?"
- Preston: "Well, it says 'showed signs of narcotic or dangerous drug exposure or drug addition. Or the child's blood or urine showed presence of narcotic or dangerous drug'."
- McCracken: "So, it's...so, it's a presence. Well, okay, last year we passed laws which would define a child born with drugs in it's system as neglected, and that neglect finding

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

was necessary to authorize DCFS's intervention. This year, this Amendment, would allow DCFS or a court of law to terminate the parental rights. Now, I don't know if that's a good idea or bad. I would think that might offend some people's sensibilities though. So..."

Preston: "Might even affect the sensibilities of that cocaine addicted baby."

McCracken: "Well, I know. I know. I'm not trying to engage in political one-upmanship. But, it's a very extreme result that flows from that and I just raised it for the Body's consideration."

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

Representative Anthony Young."

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

Speaker Giglio: "Indicates he will."

Young, A.: "Representative Preston, I missed part of the questioning under Representative McCracken. Could...did I understand it right that the presence of drugs in the baby system is...is basis for neglect now?"

Preston: "Yes."

Young, A.: "Primafacie evidence."

Preston: "Yes."

Young, A.: "To have the baby removed from the parent, then?

Representative..."

Preston: "That's primafacie evidence that the mother who had, gave birth to that child who has these controlled substances in the baby's system, is unfit. That's primafacie rebuttable presumption and DCFS by virtue of that may if they deem it necessary to seek to have foster care provided for that child."

Young, A.: "So in other words, the fact that these drugs in the system could in fact terminate parental right."

Preston: "That's correct."

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

Young, A.: "Mr. Speaker, to the Amendment. I have to reluctantly rise in opposition to this Amendment. I understand what the Sponsor's trying to do, but I think we're approaching this in the wrong way. Quite often, drug addiction fact an illness. It's a sickness, it requires treatment. I think I was under the impression that the standard formerly used by the courts in DCFS was what's in the best interest of the child. Quite often, they will find that it's in the best interest of the child to remain with the mother, even though the mother may have a drug addiction and drug sickness. Now, unless I'm misunderstanding, and it sounds like this Amendment will make it...will make a mother guilty of neglect without going through the hearing of what's in the best interest of the child. Maybe missing something, Representative, but this sound t.00 strong of a measure to take a newborn child away from a mother who has a drug addiction, which is a sickness and an illness, and needs treatment. I don't think this is what we want to do. We passed a measure last year, that really hasn't had time to work. I don't think we can judge how effective what we passed last year was, and maybe we ought to wait until we have more results in before we go even further."

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

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

Speaker Giglio: "Indicates he will. Representative Preston."

Preston: "Mr. Speaker, since this Amendment seems to be running into some difficulty, I'd be glad...I don't want it to destroy the Bill, so I'd be glad to withdraw the Amendment at this time."

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

Clerk Leone: "There are no further Amendments."

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

Speaker Giglio: "Third Reading. Gentleman now asks leave by the Attendance Roll Call to have this Bill immediate consideration. Gentleman have leave? Hearing none. Leave is granted. Mr. Clerk, the Bill is now on Third Reading. Read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3583, a Bill for an Act to amend the Children and Family Services Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Preston."

Preston: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of House, House Bill now for...for those who were otherwise occupied, that Amendment is not part of this Bill. 3583 does, again coming out of the Speaker's House Bill Blue Ribbon Task Force on Foster Care, this Bill amends the Department of Children and Family Services Act. prohibits more than three foster care placements of a child unless the court...a further placement is brought before the court so the court can see exactly what the permanency planning is for this child, who is in foster care drift, going from one foster home to another. This excludes case of, where there may be an emergency situation, and spoken with the Department and agreed with the Department that in the Senate we will have language to their liking to make it very clear that emergency placements are not counted in that three or more placement situations. And the purpose of this Bill again is to that a child isn't floating aimlessly going from one foster care situation to another, which is very detrimental to the development of a child. And it gives an outside party, in this case, the court, the opportunity when there has been three already placements to at least look at it and see what is going on, and what permanency planning is taking place for this child. And I'll be glad to answer your many

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

concerns, Representative Ropp, and I urge your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Giglio: "Lady from Sangamon, Representative Hasara."

Hasara: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in opposition to this Bill, because I am very concerned that the already crowded courts do not know how to handle these cases anyway. Let's say you have four placements in a year, and you go into the juvenile court, and you say okay I've had four placements in a year. What are we expecting the court to do? Having been in the juvenile court myself I think this is putting an undue burden both on DCFS and on the judge. If we're upset about the excessive placements, my suggestion is to work with DCFS to solve the problem, not to bring this problem to the court, where I don't see any answers that the judge can give, that DCFS should not be able to give. So, there may be a problem, that's true. But I think we're going about solving it in the wrong way."

Speaker Giglio: "Gentleman from DuPage, Representative ${\tt McCracken."}$

McCracken: "Yes. I rise in reluctant opposition, as well. think nobody would want to see a child needlessly shunted back and forth between numerous foster parents. However. by the time you get to a fourth placement, the child can often be an...an habitual problem. And in fact, the fourth placement is only the first placement of five or six placements. And Representative Hasara makes a very good point, the courts have no capacity to deal with this issue at all. All that would happen is that any transfers would be paralyzed in an already clogged court system. yourself in Cook County, how is the Cook County judiciary going to handle all of these measures? Not only do have a tremendous case load, a case load frankly, which is so great that they can only afford to consider the important cases, or the most heinous cases in juvenile

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

court, and here we're asking them to intervene in every situation where there's a transfer. It's a terrible problem you highlight, sir, I certainly agree with that, but the answer is not to require court intervention. I think we have to work harder to make the foster care program better. Along those lines DCFS is seeking more money in its budgets for next year and the year after. It's seeking more federal money for this purpose, and really the answer lay there not with involving the court in every transfer."

Speaker Giglio: "Gentleman from Dekalb, Representative Countryman."

Countryman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of this Bill. I think that the court doesn't lose jurisdiction. It doesn't lose a responsibility to a child that it places in a foster home. It owes that child the responsibility and the obligation to review that situation, and if that child has been through three placements, that person sitting as judge has a tremendous responsibility to that child to make sure that that child is getting along in the way in which they should be getting along. And it's unfortunate we have these cases where these children bounced from place to place, but if they are bounced from place to place, the person who signed the order, who them a product of this system should know that that happened, and this is a solution to that. And it would be appropriate to go back to the courts. Now we can talk about overcrowding, and then someday we'll talk about judicial compensation, but let's put our judges and courts to work. Let's review these cases and deal with it Let's make the judges get them back and appropriately. vote for this Bill."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Preston to close."

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

Preston: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think Representative Countryman said it very well. should focus on something here, Representative McCracken, that these children 100% of the children in foster care are wards of the court. So, the court has been given custody of these children, and they are responsible for the well being of these children. And it is natural for the court to monitor what's happening to the children that the court has been made responsible for. And if children are going through this foster care drift from multiple foster care placements, because that child may be troubled child, it is the...the entity that's responsible, the court, that ought to be looking at permanency planning has taken place. And when one of the previous speakers talked...spoke of the clogging of juvenile courts, that's the purpose of the juvenile court. One of their main purposes is to look after wards of that And this legislation is based on a proposal by the court. Cook County Public Guardian, Patrick Murphy, who claimed the children are being harmed by the foster care system in Illinois, because the Department of Children and Family Services cannot and does not adequately monitor, recruit and train foster home placements. So that's where the Bill comes from, that's who needs it. And I ask for you 'aye' vote."

Speaker Giglio: "Question is, 'Shall House Bill 3583 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed 'nay'. 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 84 voting 'yes', 30 voting 'no', none voting 'present'. House Bill 3583 having received the required Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. The next order of business will be State

114th Legislative Day

- May 10, 1990
- and Local Government Third Reading. And on that order appears House Bill 706, Representative Cullerton. Out of the record. House Bill 2178, Representative Steczo. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2178, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act to revise the law in relationship to counties. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Steczo."
- Steczo: "Speaker, I'd ask leave of the House to bring House Bill 2178 back to the order of Second Reading for the purposes of amendment, please."
- Speaker Giglio: "Does the Gentleman have leave? Hearing none, the Bill is on Second. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2178 has been read a second time previously. Amendments #1 and 2 were adopted. Floor Amendment #3 is being offered by Representative Woolard."
- Speaker Giglio: "Representative Woolard on Amendment #3."
- Woolard: "Yes. Basically what this does, Mr. Speaker, is in those counties which have the commission form of government, it would allow them to be paid not to exceed that of the county clerk."
- Speaker Giglio: "Any discussion? The Gentleman from...Representative McCracken. Representative Black."
- Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor of this Amendment yield for a question?"
- Speaker Giglio: "He indicates he will."
- Black: "Thank you. Representative, it's been a while since I served on a county board. Can you define 'county commissioner' as you use it in this Amendment?"
- Woolard: "There are some twenty counties in the State of
 Illinois that have three commissioners, which form the
 commission form of government. And this would be the
 counties that we're dealing with at this time."

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

Black: "And what you're doing in this Amendment, you are deleting the maximum salary of said commissioners?"

Woolard: "Yes. The maximum salary will be that of the county clerk."

Black: "So, in other words your Amendment saying that they could not be paid more than the county clerk of the county that they serve."

Woolard: "Yes."

Black: "And how would that be brought about? Were we going to bring it about by this Amendment? Or do they have to go on record as voting to do that?"

Woolard: "It will be up....it will be up to them to set their salary."

Black: "So...your Amendment then is purely permissive. And if the commissioners in the affected counties want to raise, I assume that all of them will get a raise under this. Certainly, we're not going to decrease any of their salaries, are we?"

Woolard: "Could possibly decrease, yes."

Black: "Ah...okay. But...it would...your Amendment is strictly
 permissive?"

Woolard: "Yes."

Black: "They would have to act on it?"

Woolard: "They have to make the decision."

Black: "Alright. Thank you very much."

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

The Amendment's adopted. Are there further Amendments?"

The Amendment's adopted. Are there further Amendments?"

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

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Saltsman on Amendment #4 to House Bill 2178."

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

- Saltsman: "Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. All this does is a correction from some legislation that we passed last year.

 Last year the tax was supposed to have been .05. There was a mistake made in the printing of the legislation, and it was set at .5. So we're putting it back where it belongs."
- Speaker Giglio: "Any discussion on the Amendment? Hearing none.

 All those in favor of the Amendment signify by saying
 'aye', 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. Now the Gentleman will ask leave for the immediate consideration by the Attendance Roll Call. Hearing none, leave is granted. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2178, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act to revise the law in relationship to counties. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Giglio: "Representative Steczo."
- Steczo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Members of the House. in its amended form House Bill 2178 does three things. It adds the provision that Representative Woolard just added county commissioners in those smaller regarding the counties. It adds Representative Saltsman's language about the dissolution of a district, which actually is going to save taxpayers of Peoria money by the dissolution of a...a taxing body. And in addition to that, the original Bill...or the orginal Amendments to this Bill are the Bills that we pass every year dealing with the validation of the tax levy and appropriation ordinances for Cook County, for Cook County Forest Preserve District and for the DuPage County Forest Preserve District. Something we've done since 1966 to take care of any technical protest that

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

happened. I'll answer any questions on any of the three, Mr. Speaker, I, otherwise, would ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Giglio: "Heard the Gentleman. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'. Those opposed 'nay'. This is final Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. this question 106 voting 'yes', 2 voting 'no' and none voting 'present'. House Bill...DeLeo 'aye'. Representative Stephens 'aye'. On this question there are now 108 voting 'aye', 2 voting 'no' and none and House Bill 2178 having received the required Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Bill 2179, Representative Steczo. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2179, a Bill for an Act to amend the Township Law. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Giglio: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative Steczo."

Speaker. Members of the House, in its Steczo: "Thank you, Mr. present form with Amendment #1...Amendment #1 adopted committee deletes everything after the enacting clause to the Bill, and makes the Bill applicable to township law...and it makes two changes. Number one, current law provides that road districts may borrow money from any bank or financial institution, provided the money is paid within one year. What this Amendment does is, says that township road districts can borrow money from the fund, or from the general assistance fund. However, as with banks and financial institutions the money has to be paid back to that fund within one year. Secondly, in the same vein a current law provides...that the town board of might borrow money from banks or financial institutions and also pay that money back within one year. This Amendment provides that the board of trustees can

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

borrow from the general assistance fund, or with approval of the highway commissioner from township road district fund. So, it provides another mechanism where, especially, small townships on limited budgets and some do in fact have excess dollars in their general assistance fund, in time of need rather than going to the bank and spending money for interest can in fact borrow amounts for short periods of time to cover short term, you know, bridge loans from their general assistance fund. I would answer any questions. I would ask for the support of the House in passing this Bill."

Speaker Giglio: "Any discussion? The Gentleman from Coles,

Representative Weaver."

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

Speaker Giglio: "Indicates he will."

Weaver: "Representative, isn't this somewhat of a violation of the trust of the taxpayers who voted in a tax to be paid for general assistance and then spending the money for something else?"

Steczo: "Representative Weaver, it's... I don't think it would be considered that because there...there's two things that I think have to be...considered first. The township officials certainly would not borrow money from a fund when they're using the proceeds for general assistance in other programming. Yet, in some townships we understand there is, or are, excess funds in the township general assistance fund. The purpose of this is to allow the board of trustees, or the highway department to be able to do this on a short term basis. Right now those departments can go to banks and financial institutions borrow the money and pay it back within one year. So, any money that's borrowed from those funds must be repaid within one year.

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

is for a short term...for short term only and our understanding talking to township officials is for the emergency circumstances. But if they borrow the money to work on the roads from the general assistance fund, or if they borrow from a bank, and that bank loan is repaid from the general assistance fund, is that not using the money for purpose other than originally collected?"

Steczo: "It is using the money for a purpose other than it was originally collected. However, we in the General Assembly have in the past...and are this year considering other means by which townships can utilize excess general assistance money. There are some townships, Representative Weaver, that...that in the state that have collected excess general assistance money, and simply fund their general assistance off the interest received from that money, that they get from the bank."

Weaver: "Wouldn't...wouldn't it make more sense to their taxpayers to reduce the tax rate, so they won't pay in unneeded money into the general assistance fund?"

Steczo: "I think it makes sense to taxpayers in two ways. Yes.

Reducing the tax rate certainly would make sense.

Absolutely. Yet, to be able to borrow on a short term basis from this fund and save the taxpayer from having to pay the interest in those cases helps the taxpayer as well."

Weaver: "Well, I can understand the reasoning behind wanting to be able to borrow short term for very valid uses, but I have a little bit of trouble I think with borrowing or repaying that money from a tax element that we have told the taxpayers in collecting this money that it was going to be used for. Thank you very much for your response."

Speaker Giglio: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Effingham, Representative Hartke."

114th Legislative Day May 10, 1990

Hartke: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Giglio: "He indicates he will."

Hartke: "Representative Steczo, what is the percentage tax that
 must be kept in the general assistance fund?"

Steczo: "It's ten percent of the assessed valuation."

Steczo: "They do, I believe."

Hartke: "If that's the case, then the balance in that fund is laying there unused and most drop their levies. Since they drop their levies this money is gaining interest for the general assistance fund. To the tune of where no levy is left for the general assistance fund. And I think it's a wise use of taxpayers' money, since this law does require that that money be paid back. And I support the legislation."

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

Cowlishaw: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise very reluctantly in opposition to this Bill, partly because I have such respect for the Sponsor and have always found that nearly all of his Bills were very worthwhile. But I would like to remind you that last we passed something we called a surcharge, that's because we don't like to use the word tax increase. And half of the proceeds from that surcharge were sent to local governments. It had been our hope, and I believe that pretty much the hope of all of us from both sides of the aisle, that some of that money would be used by those local governments to reduce property taxes. That happened in so few instances and even in those instances to such a minimal extent, that the people who pay these property taxes were a little disgruntled and rightfully so. I cannot understand

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

this kind of fundamental concept that pervades units of local government and this state, that if you have money in a given fund and it's more than what you need, find someplace else to use it, don't ever give it back to the taxpayers, for heaven's sakes. If they've got extra money they don't need for general assistance remember where it came from, rebate it to the taxpayers. Thank you."

Speaker Giglio: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Will the Sponsor yield? I reluctantly rise knowing that you have always introduced such good Bills. I have no idea what this Bill does. Absolutely, no idea. But I have such respect, profound respect for the Sponsor, I am going to vote 'aye'. And encourage every Member on this Floor to vote 'aye' for this Bill will probably get 90+ votes and should have been on the Agreed Bill list or the Consent Calendar, because we just keep sitting here kicking these babies out with what 90+ votes. I can't imagine anyone that would rise in opposition to this fine Sponsor, who I respect. Let me hear the church say 'amen'."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Steczo to close."

Steczo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It was just yesterday that one of our colleagues mentioned that the only time someone gets up and says they respect you is when they are coming after you. So, so I think that Representative Leverenz has started a new trend, and we respect that very, very much. I respect him too, Mr. Speaker, but the purpose of House Bill 2179 in all seriousness is to try...is not to try to...to rob the general assistance fund from a township. The purpose is not to try to do something which would inhibit the ability for a township to rebate taxes back to the...back to their constituents. The fact is that the purpose is for a short term period to be able to loan to the township...township road fund, small amounts of

It's permissive. It does not have

114th Legislative Day

dollars.

May 10, 1990 to be done.

but there are some instances where, on a short term basis, this may need to be done, and the fact is, is that if you save taxpayers, especially in townships that are small and have very few dollars available, it, in fact, can taxpayers dollars. It can save taxpayers money. Ιn addition, the comments that were made about the state surcharge or income tax disbursements last year, we should all know that townships did not share in that. So, I would just indicate that to you and ask you for an 'aye' vote." Speaker Giglio: "Question is, 'Shall House Bill 2179 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed 'no'. Voting is open. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, the record. On this question there are 103 voting 'yes', 7 voting 'no', none voting 'present'. House Bill 2179 having received the required Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2366, Representative Steczo. Out of the record. House Bill 2366. Out of the record. House Bill 2367, Representative Steczo. Representative Steczo?"

Steczo: "Mr. Speaker, I think that we missed House Bill 2181?" Speaker Giglio: "2181, right?"

Steczo: "Correct. I'd like to call that, but then not call 2366 and 2367."

Speaker Giglio: "2181, Mr. Clerk. Read the bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2181, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act to revise the law in relationship to counties. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Steczo."

Steczo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Members of the House, as amended House Bill 2181 contains two provisions relating to townships. And one of the things it does is changes one of

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

the procedures for conducting a township or multi-township And that language reads and puts in a things that a written notice of intent to be a caucus nomination might be required. And also changes the current law that says when there's an annual town meeting, township electors can vote and ask that the township distribute funds of any amount to senior citizens' Right now there's a twenty thousand dollar cap. services. This removes the cap, if the electors at the annual meeting choose to do so. That's what the Bill does and I'd appreciate your support."

- Speaker Giglio: "Does anyone stand in opposition? 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 114 voting 'yes', none voting 'no', none voting 'present'. House Bill 2181 having received the required Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2944, Representative Matijevich. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2984...2944. House Bill 2944, a Bill for an Act to amend the Public Utilities Act. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Giglio: "Lady...Gentleman from Lake, Representative Matijevich."
- Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House.

 House Bill 2944 extends the present law with regards to the

 Public Utilities Act. Where the current law is that no
 former member of the Illinois Commerce Commission may
 represent any person before the Commission in a
 professional capacity, or accept employment with any public
 utilities subject to ICC regulation for one year. This
 Bill extends that one year prohibition to three years. The

114th Legislative Day

- May 10, 1990
- Bill, as introduced, was a five year prohibition. We compromised with a three years prohibition, and I would urge the Members to support House Bill 2944."
- Speaker Giglio: "The Bill's on Short Debate. Is there anybody in opposition? Hearing none. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed 'nay'. 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 117 voting 'yes', none voting 'no', none voting 'present'. House Bill 2944 having received the required Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2950, Representative Satterthwaite. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2950, a Bill for an Act to amend the Counties Code. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Giglio: "The Lady from Champaign, Representative Satterthwaite."
- Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker, and Members of the House, this legislation would put in requirements for continuing professional education for county auditors. It would apply only in about eighteen counties throughout the state, where the auditor is elected. And I would be happy to respond to questions, or move for passage of House Bill 2950."
- Speaker Giglio: "Any discussion? Hearing none. All those in favor...the Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black."
- Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor
 yield?"
- Speaker Giglio: "She indicates she will."
- Black: "Representative, where...where'd the idea of this Bill come from? Was it from Champaign County?"
- Satterthwaite: "It came from the statewide auditor's association, the Illinois Association of County Auditors."

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

- Black: "We show that they have no position on the Bill."
- Satterthwaite: "Well, I would say that the president of the association was in committee and testified in favor of the Bill. Steve 'Samager' from Peoria."
- Black: "Okay. In fact our analysis indicates that the auditors cited cost to the county as potential concern for this Bill. I assume if the president of their association showed up in committee and testified, that they evidently have...they either have a division in their ranks, or they have solved their concern about the cost. Could you tell us...enlighten us as to what that might be? Have they solved their division? Or are they not concerned about cost? Or have they indeed gotten that worked out?"
- Satterthwaite: "I believe that they feel that the association itself will provide some of the training programs that it would be at very minimal costs. And people from Winnebago County and several other counties in the state are also supportive of the legislation."
- Black: "I...I appreciate your response. Just one last question.

 Do you anticipate that there will be a cost that will be passed on to the county board that...you know can the county board elect to let the auditors participate in this?

 Or can the county board say no thank you?"
- Satterthwaite: "I believe that the county board would be required to pay for the expense of the courses that were taken. However, I think that it may also end up being a cost saving measure for the county in the long run, for the auditor to be up to date with accounting procedures."
- Black: "You would think then it might be a mandated cost to the country board? However, small that might be?"
- Satterthwaite: "Yes. But as I also indicated I think that it would end up being a cost savings to the county to know that their auditor was doing the work well."

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

- Black: "Alright. Thank you very much, Representative."
- Speaker Giglio: "Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Klemm."
- Klemm: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield for a short question? Representative, I see it's twenty hours per year. And since the auditors are normally elected for a four year term, will that mean they can only do twenty hours in each year they'd have to do that?"
- Satterthwaite: "If I understand your question correctly, I believe that it would be each year they would have this requirement to fulfill. Yes."
- Klemm: "So, they could not take eighty hours during two weeks and take some intensive course and that would meet their requirement for the four year term?"
- Satterthwaite: "I think not. The requirement is in order for them to keep up to date. And so we're not suggesting they take eighty hours and that that fulfills it for the four year term, when there might be changes that they would need to be aware of on an ongoing basis throughout that four year term."
- Klemm: "So, a county auditor that's reelected several times could they be taking the same courses since there's a limitation really of what they can take unless they go back to college, obviously? And most of the audits are done professionally with outside auditing firms, as you know."
- Satterthwaite: "My understanding of why the auditors association feels that this continuing education requirement is desirable is because it is a field where there are constant changes in laws and procedures. And the twenty hour refresher course, if you will, would be in order for them to keep up to date."
- Klemm: "Has it been established that the county auditors association now is in favor of it? Because I understand one member spoke to you."

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

Satterthwaite: "My understanding is that they always have been."

"Alright. Our analysis doesn't show that."

Satterthwaite: "It was at their request that the legislation was introduced."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative McCracken."

McCracken: "Yes. I wonder you know, sometimes this happens. I've had the same experience. We think a group is in favor of something because we deal with an individual officer. Is there something in writing of an official act of the association in support of this?"

Satterthwaite: "I do not have anything in writing that says that the association is in favor. However, as I indicated the president of the association, Steve 'Sanamaker' from Peoria county was in committee, testified in favor of it, and the auditors association was responsible for getting Cosponsors with me from Zeke Giorgi and Mary Lou Cowlishaw and Don Hensel. They also have four Sponsors lined up for the Senate: Senators Etheredge, Friedland, Jacobs and Karpiel."

"Okay. Well, that answers it. Thank you." McCracken:

Speaker Giglio: "The Lady from Champaign to close."

Satterthwaite: "I would simply ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Giglio: "You've heard the Lady's Motion. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed 'no'. The voting is open. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 98 voting 'yes', 17 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. House Bill 2950 having received the required Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Representative 3024? Out of the record. Representative Stern, House Bill 3049. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3049, a Bill for an Act to amend

114th Legislative Day

- May 10, 1990
- Illinois Corneal Transplant Act. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Giglio: "Lady from Lake, Representative Stern."
- Stern: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, this really is a simple Bill. This simply puts into the Corneal Transplant Act that a medical examiner may perform the same duties as a coroner, under the Act. It simply...that's all it does...where it says 'coroner' it say now 'medical examiner/coroner'."
- Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman from Lee, Representative Myron Olson."
- Olson M.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, as a member of the Lions Clubs of Illinois where we have a major program enucleation and corneal transplant, we're highly supportive of anything that will enhance the ability of people to regain their sight with corneal transplants."
- Speaker Giglio: "Further discussion? Hearing none. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed 'no'. 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', none voting 'present'. House Bill 3049 having received the required Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Representative Stern on House Bill 3060. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3060, a Bill for an Act relating to appointments to boards, commissions, committees and councils. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Giglio: "Lady from Lake, Representative Stern."
- Stern: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask for leave to take it back to Second Reading for an Amendment."
- Speaker Giglio: "Does the Lady have leave to return the Bill back

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

- to the order of Second Reading? Hearing none. Leave is granted. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3060, on the order of Second Reading.

 Amendment #1 is being offered by Representative Stern.

 Representative Stern."
- Stern: "Amendment #1, let me tell you, the underlying Bill deals with gender balance and getting equal numbers of men and women on the appointed boards and commissions of the State of Illinois. The Amendment recognizes some of the difficulties involved in doing that, and where it is impossible for the appointing body to get equal gender balance, they can acknowledge their inability to do so by filing a statement of noncompliance with the Department of Human Rights. And the General Assembly will receive a report annually on the number of those noncompliances that have occurred. That's all it does."
- Speaker Giglio: "Any discussion? The Gentleman for DuPage, Representative McCracken."
- McCracken: "Only because I have no aspiration to higher office can I afford to say this in public. But I am sick to death. Enough is enough. Whatever happened to individual merit? We have to go out and create all of these divisive little subgroups into which people fit and make sure every subgroup, every mathematical possibility is honored in all facets of our lives. And here's another one. thinks because the Amendment says, well, if you've tried in good faith and failed all you have to do is file a noncompliance certificate, that that makes it alright. The fundamental premise is wrong. How many times do you have to hear it, to get the message? The fundamental premise is wrong. Justice is blind..."

Stern: "I can't hear you...I can't hear you."

McCracken: "It does not see race. It does not see gender. And

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

every time you...drives me nuts. Every time you take these corrective measures, you throw justice out of the window. Enough is enough. It's absolutely wrong, and I know that because I've said this I will never be elected to higher office, but you know what? I don't care."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Leverenz, the Gentleman from Cook."

Leverenz: "Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Giglio: "She indicates she will."

Leverenz: "With or without the Amendment #1, could you briefly describe how you would handle a subcommittee...does this even effect subcommittees?"

Stern: "No. I'm not talking about committees of the House. I'm talking about boards and councils appointed by the Governor..."

Leverenz: "Oh, this is the big, big one?...This is the big one.

The big ones appointed by the Governor?"

Stern: "I'm sorry?...Right...Right...Right."

Leverenz: "The Governor?"

Stern: "The Governor."

Leverenz: "Have you checked with either the of the Governor candidates? Are they for this?..."

Stern: "As a matter of fact Hartigan supports it. Has publicly endorsed it, and has requested that we do whatever we can to pass it."

Leverenz: "Well, there's another blast in the foot."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Leverenz."

Leverenz: "Pardon me. I just have one other question."

Speaker Giglio: "Proceed."

Leverenz: "How does this square with the Paper Reduction Act?...for state government with regard to filing these extra I-tried-to-comply-but-I-simply-can't."

Stern: "That was a very ingenious question, Mr. Leverenz. I

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

don't believe it will effect the Paper-whatever-it-is-Act."

Leverenz: "Paper Reduction Act."

Stern: "Paper Reduction Act."

Leverenz: "Same as the federal."

- Stern: "I have every reason to believe that there are qualified women in every line standing, waiting to be appointed to these boards and commissions. These reports will not have to be filed...except for surveyors."
- Leverenz: "Okay. And then, simply one other, could you guess at how many appointments may go unappointed or vacant and thus not be able to conduct business because they haven't found someone that wishes to serve?"
- Stern: "I...I really am not concerned about that, sir. I have here a packet of all the appointments that are made in this line. Most of those boards are not full. Most of them are predominately male appointees. There are approximately twenty percent women on these boards. I would make the point to you that in the state office building was built in Rockford, without female input, without a shelf or a closet. Women have distinctive perspectives to bring to all kinds of matters. And I think it is appropriate that they should be included in of decisions."
- Leverenz: "And then, well, I simply would add that, that same analogy would hold true for the State of Illinois Center in Chicago, which was built without doors."
- Stern: "Well, that's the same Capitol Development Board, I have to assume."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative McPike in the Chair.

 Representative Satterthwaite."
- Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I rise in support of the Lady's Amendment. And I also rise to suggest to the Gentleman, whose blood pressure went up so high a little while ago on the other side of the aisle,

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

that Justice may not be blind, but in fact the people charge of making appointments seem to have been blind to the fact that there are many qualified women throughout the state to hold positions such as would be covered under this legislation. If in fact it is impossible, the appointing person to find appropriate people to fill these positions, there is an out in the Amendment itself that is under consideration. All that appointing person has to letter do is to file a noncompliance and explain what efforts have been made to try to meet the conditions. And so, in fact, if there is a dearth of people who qualify for these offices, then there is an out. There is nothing in here that is going to prohibit government from proceeding, it will in fact give it a better perspective on all of the problems that we face a state. And I certainly support the Sponsor's Amendment."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Didrickson."

Didrickson: "Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I...I feel like somebody on my side of the aisle has to stand up respond to some of the comments that were made with regards to merit. Clearly, I would suggest that these boards over the years probably would have been more meritorious had they had the input from the female population in the State of Illinois. Clearly, this is 1990 going into the 21st century, we certainly need to have a balanced and a more fair representation on these boards, and I think certainly those Members on my side of the aisle would agree. And if they can't quite understand that, I think they probably recognize that about 53% of the voting population out there are women. And clearly, they want to make certain that they are represented within governmental bodies and with the ...with the appointed

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

legislative boards that we are talking about. So, I would say that we probably all ought to cool down the rhetoric a little bit, understand that there are good solid reasons why we ought to have...more female representation on these boards, and support Representative Stern's balanced approach to this."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Kubik."

Kubik: "Mr. Speaker, it appears to me we are on Second Reading. We're debating an Amendment. I get the feeling a lot of these people are debating the Bill. Could we debate the Amendment and leave the rhetoric for Third Reading?"

Speaker McPike: "Yes. Your point is well taken. Representative Wojcik."

Wojcik: "Mr. Speaker, I believe that's exactly what I was going to say let's discuss Amendment #1."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "I really wanted to talk about the Bill. So, I'll save my time until later."

Speaker McPike: "Alright. You want to close on the Amendment?

Representative Stern."

Stern: "You want a Roll Call on that Amendment?"

Speaker McPike: "Yes."

Stern: "I thought you would at least say that this Amendment purified a disgusting Bill? But you're not going to say that? Alright. This Amendment permits noncomplicance with the main Bill, which I would think would be what Mr. McCracken would like to see...in situations where it is impossible. And it seems to me this ameliorates the starkness of our request in the underlying Bill. I urge an 'aye' vote on the Amendment. No matter where you stand on the underlying Bill."

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

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

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

voted? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this Amendment there are 59 'ayes', 47 'nos'.

The Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "There are no further Amendments."

Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. Representative Stern, for what
 reason do you rise?"

Stern: "I was going to ask for immediate consideration."

Speaker McPike: "Well, it takes 71 votes to pass your Bill, but
if you'd like to request it."

Stern: "Oh. Is that right? Sorry about that. I should have known that, shouldn't I? Well, I can count on Mr. McCracken. Alright, we will...we will defer. Thank you..."

Speaker McPike: "House Bill 3120, Representative Woolard. Read the Bill, Mr...No? Out of the record? Out of the record. House Bill 3125, Representative Balanoff. Out of the record. House Bill 3210, Representative Stern. Representative Grace Mary Stern? 3210. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3210, a Bill for an Act to amend the Counties Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Stern."

"This Bill deals with the County Executive Act, and I Stern: believe, is noncontroversial. It was requested by the Lake County Board, which is considering a referendum on the possibility of a County Executive, but finds that statute has a lot of contradictions and unclear areas. Bill would provide county boards with guidance as to the restructuring of a new legislative branch, which is what it will be. This a county executive without home rule, maybe should emphasize that. In counties over 450.000 population, this Bill would mandate the appointment of a professional administrator. We think that's good

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

government. This would change the referendum language proposing to adopt the county executive form of government by making it clear that the county government adopting the referendum will not become a home rule unit, no matter what the outcome of the referendum. We believe that that was unclear in the way it is in the statute. That is all the Bill does. I think it will serve the counties of Illinois well."

Speaker McPike: "On the Bill, Representative Van Duyne."

Van Duyne: "Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to the Lady explain the confusion in committee wherein that the...some of the Members of the committee thought that would preclude the county executive from having the option to preside over the meeting. As we discussed it in There was some confusion, and I'd like to have you clear that up for all the Members who are about county executive form of government, and because, you know, it's new in Will County. This is our first county executive. And he does preside over county board meetings. And in your Bill and in the synopsis it says that it precludes the county board executive...chief executive...from presiding over the meeting. Now you glossed over that very quickly, and I really can't remember what the disposition of the Bill was in committee. Can you tell us the vote of the committee?"

Stern: "I will try to clarify that, Mr. Van Duyne. A clear separation of powers between executive and legislative branches of government requires that the elected county executive not preside at county board meetings."

Van Duyne: "Right. Now I want everybody on the House floor to know that if you have a county executive, and this Bill tells you point blank, that he will not preside over the county board. Plus the fact, as I understand it, and you

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

can clarify this for the Body, also, that he must appoint a chief executive, which also gives us another so called patronage, or whatever kind of a employee you want, to do certain duties. I'd like to have you clarify that for them, also."

- Stern: "That is only in counties over 450,000, Mr. Van Duyne.

 That would not apply to Will, as I understand it. Am I right?"
- Van Duyne: "Well, that's only another year away. Will County is 325,000 or 350,000 now, and in five years from now it's going to be 450,000."
- Stern: "Well, I don't think I glossed over this. I...I..."
- Van Duyne: "I always thought...I always thought that we were endowed with some kind of wisdom when we...when we reached this Body to understand that...as the future does apply to this Body, especially in growing counties like Will County and all the collar counties around Cook. So, you can't say with any conviction that Will County will not be 450,000 within the next ten years."
- Stern: "I won't say that with conviction. I am simply saying to you that it makes sense to those of us who drafted this legislation that in order to keep separate the legislative and...whatever the other kind is, wait a second here...the two branches of government, that it is necessary to put in this prohibition that the executive preside at country board meetings. That that is part and parcel of the system."
- Van Duyne: "Okay, thank you, Mr. Speaker, if I might, and I'm

 Chairman of Counties and Townships Committee, the Bill

 passed out of Counties and Township by a vote of 8-1-4

 (four presents). I believe, I was the absta...negative

 vote on that Bill. And I say it's a resumption on other

 counties, wherein that the voters have taken the...the

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

liberties with...with the constituents to elect a county executive and now we are now taking away the very thing that we just elected. In Will County we have a...we have a county executive for the first term he don't even know what he's doing. Much less a Bill like this to come out and say well, now he's got to appoint a county administrator to do...to take care of his duties, which is going to cost you another thirty...in Will County is going to cost you another thirty, forty, fifty thousand dollars...and by the same presumption takes away the power that we've just given to the person. So, with my negative vote in committee, and with all due respect to my cohort and Sponsor, I really think the Bill is ambiguous to the degree as of now that we should not...absolutely should not pass the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Harris."

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

Speaker McPike: "Yes. Go ahead."

Harris: "Representative, we talked about this slightly in committee and I think the Chairman of the committee made some points which are really...should be clarified a little bit further. The Bill also does...makes one other provision, if I'm correct, does it not prohibit the county executive from voting at all at a county board meeting?"

Stern: "That is correct, except to break a tie...wait a min...wait a minute...wait a minute. Hold everything. That is correct. I...I...I have to say that I don't think that this is cloudy. I think this is a perfectly clear separation of executive and legislative powers."

Harris: "And the county...I understand. But the...again the question was asked in committee. The county executive is an elected official from the county, correct?"

Stern: "That's correct."

Harris: "Alright. I appreciate the clarification. To the Bill,

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

Mr. Chairman...or Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, that causes some trouble. The county executive elected by...by the voters in that county. Now what we are saying with this Bill, is that we're electing a county executive, but we're not giving him the chance to vote at a county meeting even to break the tie. He cannot even preside at a county board meeting, the point is we have idea what his stand is on any particular issue, from a vote that he might cast or from some proceedings over which he might oversee. Yet, when he goes to face the voters, should, it seems to me, have some record on which to run. Just as we have a record to run on based on the votes that we cast in this chamber. Likewise the county executive should have a vote...or should have a record...on which to We are taking that away. We are saying he cannot preside at any meeting. He cannot vote at any meeting. think that's an inappropriate approach, and I'm not sure if it was Representative Van Duyne, or if it was me that voted 'no' in committee, but I think in this case that might be the appropriate vote and would recommend that. Thank you."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Barger."

Barger: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question of the Lady, please. As I interpreted what you said...you said it was mandatory for counties of over 450,000 people to have a county executive."

Stern: "Correct."

Barger: "That...that's it. Now does that include Cook County?"

Stern: "No. This Bill does not talk to Cook County at all."

Barger: "How about DuPage County?"

Stern: "Yes. If it votes the county executive form of government."

Barger: "It mandates a county executive for DuPage County?"

Stern: "No. No. No. You have to have a referendum to get the

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

county executive form of government in DuPage, or in Lake, or in Will. And the only one at this point that has it is Will. And it is not up to 450,000 yet, so that new county executive that Mr. Van Duyne mentioned will not have to face this particular problem."

Barger: "I was wondering about it, because from what you said...you've said that it would be mandatory for counties of over 450,000 people, which apparently is DuPage County."

Stern: "We are clarifying only the County Executive Act. So, this deals only with those counties that have voted by referendum to adopt the county executive form of government."

Barger: "So, there must be a referendum to do it. Okay. Thank you very much."

Stern: "Right. You bet."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Wennlund."

Wennlund: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, just to clarify it. It only affects...it only amends the County Executive Act. It doesn't effect any of the colleagues here in the House, other than Representative Churchill, Representative Stern, and Representative Frederick and and Representative Peterson, and that's all. It's...it's a good government Bill. It's a good cleanup Bill. And I'd ask all the colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support Representative Stern's Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Representative McCracken."

McCracken: "So I understand it then. There are two possibilities in this Act. One is to choose to be a home rule pursuant to referendum. The other county executive, but not home rule pursuant to referendum."

Stern: "Correct."

McCracken: "This Bill amends only the law governing the decision to be a county executive form, but not home rule..."

114th Legislative Day May 10, 1990

Stern: "without home rule. Right."

McCracken: "Okay. And in either event there has to be a referendum in the county in question....okay. Thank you."

Stern: "Correct."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Stern to close."

Stern: "I think we have probably debated it enough. I think you understand the technical aspects. It is not an easy Bill to get a handle on, but we believe it is an important Bill and necessary to those counties which are considering this option. I ask for your 'aye' vote."

Speaker McPike: "Question is, 'Shall House Bill 3210 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this Bill there are 95 'ayes' and 14 voting 'present'. House Bill 3210 having received the Constitutional Majority is here...is therefore declared passed. House Bill 3213, Representative Churchill. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 3213, a Bill for an Act to amend the Counties Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Churchill."

Churchill: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 3213 deals with a situation where a certain township officials may also simultaneously serve on the county board. Currently, if you are in a county of less than 300,000 you can be a township assessor or highway commissioner or township clerk or you can serve on the county board. In counties over that amount up through Lake County, which would be in excess of 550,000, you cannot do that. What this Bill does is solely to correct that situation, so that Lake County would be treated like the smaller counties, in that a highway commissioner would be also able to serve simultaneously on the county board."

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

Speaker McPike: "Is there any discussion? Being none. The question is, 'Shall House Bill 3213 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. Take the record. On this Bill there are 104 'ayes', 6 'nos', 3 voting 'present'. House Bill 3213 having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3230, Representative Novak. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3230, a Bill for an Act in relation to state contracts. Third Reading of the Bill."

Novak: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 3230 creates Veterans State Employment Contract Act. It requires that not less than five percent of total dollar amounts in state contracts be awarded to veteran owned businesses within three years. We do have a Minority and Female Business Enterprise Act, and what we're trying to do here is allow those veterans that have served...served their country in time of need and in time of war that those that own businesses to have some preference on state contracts. I'd be happy to entertain any questions."

Speaker McPike: "And on the Bill, Representative Black."

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

Speaker McPike: "Yes."

Black: "Thank you. Representative, address the question, if you will, if we pass and this becomes law, and we give a veterans' contract preference, would this necessarily increase contractual amounts? ... If you would address that, there seems to be some confusion over whether or not we would destroy the low bid."

Novak: "No. No, Representative Black, it would not. It would

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

not increase the contract amounts."

Black: "How are you going to work that out? It just gives them...I really don't understand...the five percent? Does it mean they have a kicker in there where they could be five percent over."

Novak: "If there are qualified available bidders, let's say on a state contract, alright? Let's say I owned a construction company. I'm a U.S. Army veteran. If I was a qualified bidder that came in at the right price, then...then I would be able to be part of that five percent that should be set aside for veteran owned businesses. If there aren't any veteran owned businesses that...that don't qualify...that don't meet the specifications, that don't meet all the other regulations and standards, then they're simply not going to be available to get the contract."

Black: "But...but the Bill as drafted it does not mean, or it is not your intent then, that the veterans bidder would get a five percent leeway from the apparent low bidder? That if the low bidder was a non-veteran, and I bid on the contract as a veteran. I could be anywhere within that five percent range and then I would get the contract, rather than the low bidder?

Novak: "No. That's not correct. You have to...whoever accepts the low bid gets the job. But what we're trying to do is...five percent of this...five percent of this dollar amount of contracts, should at least...should have some preference to be set aside for those qualified veteran businesses that are qualified to bid on the job."

Black: "Okay, then for purposes of intent, it is not your intent then to say that if the bid is within five percent of the low and the bidder not getting low, but as a veteran, he...as long as he is within five percent of the low bid. that contract is not automatically awarded to

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

veteran."

Novak: "Right. Thank you very much."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Munizzi, for what reason do you rise? Representative Munizzi."

Munizzi: "Mr. Speaker, I am not rising. Thank you very much."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Piel."

Piel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just one quick question of the Sponsor. Phil, can you explain...what exactly is your definition of a veteran owned business? In other words, if the president of a company happens to be a veteran, or does it have to be a company owned by veterans, a veterans organization, what exactly is the definition there?"

Novak: "Representative Piel, the definition of a veteran owned business is on the first page. It means a business concern, which is at least fifty—one percent owned by one or more veterans or in the case of a corporation at least fifty—one percent of the stock in which is owned by one or more of the veterans, and the management and daily business operation of which are controlled by one or more veterans."

Piel: "Thank you."

Speaker McPike: "Anything further? Question is, 'Shall House
Bill 3230 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed
vote 'no'. Representative Munizzi, for what reason do you
rise?"

Laurino: "I'd like to yield my time to Representative Munizzi to explain her vote."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Munizzi. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this Bill there are 108 'ayes', 6 'nos', one voting 'present'. House Bill 3230 having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3293, Representative Capparelli. Representative Terzich, do you want to call this Bill? No. Out of the record. House Bill 3294. Read

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3294, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act to create sanitary districts and remove obstructions in the DesPlaines and Illinois rivers. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Terzich."

Terzich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 3294 allows the General Superintendent issue a cease and desist orders against the persons discharging pollutants and increases the fines, but allows for a reduced fine if the violation occurs before the entry of order by the port. The United States Environmental Protection Agency has indicated some concern that existing enforcement process against these polluters continue to discharge unlawfully and the fines now authorized under the statute are not adequate. This simply adjusts those fines."

Speaker McPike: "Is there any discussion? There being none. The question is, 'Shall House Bill 3294 pass?' Excuse me.

Just a minute. Representative Piel."

Piel: "I'm sorry. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Question of the Sponsor."

Speaker McPike: "Yes."

Piel: "Maybe I've got a misprint here. Right now we're talking about a maximum of a thousand dollar fine. What under the new Bill would the maximum be?"

Terzich: "The Bills eliminates the conciliation steps in the enforcement process and increases the fines to a range from one thousand to ten thousand dollars per day."

Piel: "Okay, in other words. I don't need the entire thing written out. I wanted to know what it was...in other words you want to increase the fine by ten fold?"

Terzich: "That's correct. At the present time..."

Piel: "So, in other words, what we're talking about is a maximum

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

right now of one thousand dollars, and you want the...maximum up to ten thousand dollars. Doesn't that seem a little bit ridiculous, when you want to increase it ten times? I mean, I can understand increasing a fine maybe from one to two thousand dollars, but when you want to go from one to ten thousand dollars. It seems a little bit ridiculous."

Terzich: "No. It isn't...Well, you didn't let me finish. At the time..."

Piel: "To the Bill, Mr. Speaker...No. I just asked you what the increase was...Mr. Speaker, he can cover all his points when he closes. I just wanted to know what the increase was. I thought I had a misprint on my paper. To the Bill, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think, you know when we was talking about the US EPA, they are concerned, you know...with the fines not adequate by the Chicago Metropolitan Sanitary District. The US EPA they figure it should be up to about \$2500 instead of a \$1000. But here the Sponsor wants it to go up to \$10,000 and I would ask for a 'present' or 'no' vote at the present I think the Sponsor should amend this. Bring it down to about \$2500 as a max, and then we could sit there and, you know, work on that, but when you sit here and talk about wanting to raise something...you know, raise a fine. I think it's a little bit ridiculous when you want to raise the fine ten times higher than what it presently is as maximum level. I think it's a...you know...by the way Ladies and Gentlemen, that is per day. That is not a total fine. That is per day. You know, wanting to raise it from \$1000 a day to \$10,000 a day. I think it's a little bit ridiculous, and so I would ask for a 'no' or 'present' vote at the present time on this Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Terzich to close."

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

- Terzich: "Yes. As the previous speaker stated...he was all wrong on his figures. United States Environmental Protection Agency was also encouraging these against some of the major polluters of our streams and our communities. But at the current time the US EPA under the Clean Water Act ranged from \$2500 to \$25,000 per day, and not \$2500 a day. This is a small adjustment and it also allows up to a \$100 per day by orders of the Commissioner. And I'd appreciate your support."
- Speaker McPike: "Question is, 'Shall House Bill 3294 pass?' A11 those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the On this Bill there are 69 'ayes', 42 'nos'. Representative White 'aye'. 70 'ayes'. 70 'ayes', 3 'present'. House Bill 3294 having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Bill 3398, Representative Novak. Out of the record. Bill 3412, Representative Dunn. John Dunn? Representative John Dunn? Gentleman is not here. House Bill 3571. Representative Phelps. Mr. Phelps? Out of the record. House Bill 3589, Representative Wojcik. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3589, this was taken back to Second Reading and held. It is back on Second and held."
- Speaker McPike: "Why is it listed on Third Reading?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "We brought it back earlier today...One is
 printed? You've got Amendment 2 on this, also? I'm
 sorry."
- Speaker McPike: "Alright. House Bill 3589. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3589, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act in relation to state finance. This Bill has been read a Second time previously. No Committee Amendments."

114th Legislative Day

- May 10, 1990
- Speaker McPike: "Any Floor Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #1 offered by Representative Parcells."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Parcells. Representative Bowman."
- Bowman: "Mr. Speaker, is this Amendment germane to the Bill? Would you please rule on that?"
- Speaker McPike: "Alright. The Clerk has to get a copy of the Bill...so just a second. Representative Bowman, your point is well taken. The Amendment is not germane. Further Amendments? Representative Parcells."
- Parcells: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If you'll note that Amendment changed the title, and therefore as on...the very Gentleman that questioned my Bill...did the very same thing on House Bill 4148, and therefore, I think it would be germane.

 Because I changed the title of the Bill."
- Speaker McPike: "Well, you are correct. You did change the title, but the Amendment is not germane. And therefore, it's out of order. Representative Piel."
- Piel: "I don't think it's asking too much of the Chair if you'd mind explaining to us. One's talking about state finance. The other one's talking about state money. To me finance is money, and I'd appreciate the Chair giving us a reasoning why you're saying it's not germane."
- Speaker McPike: "Well, the Bill itself changes sections of the Illinois Health Care Cost Containment Council. And the Amendment deals with...a completely different subject matter unrelated to the Cost Containment Council, or to the Bill itself. It deals with depositing of funds. It has no relationship...whatsoever to the Bill...And the Chair has ruled that it is nongermane, and you can move to override the Chair."
- Piel: "If you'll note, Mr. Speaker...If you'll notice, Mr.

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

Speaker. I'm asking the Chair a question. I mean, we don't need to get testy. What I'm basically asking is...you asked the Clerk to read the Bill, and he said an Act dealing with state finance. Alright, it's a broad area. Now true, she is changing...she is changing...the title of the Bill. So, she's changing the title of the Bill. She's dealing with state finance, and so my question is why would that...why wouldn't that be germane? Because you know, to me monies are finance...I mean is it a situation where the Chair does not want to hear these Amendments? If that's the case just."

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Piel...Representative Piel...Representative Piel, I answered your question. Further Amendments? Representative Wojcik."

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

Speaker McPike: "Yes. Bill be out of the record. House Bill 3656, Representative Leverenz. Out of the record. House Bill 3716, Representative McGann. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 37..."

Speaker McPike: "Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk. 3716."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3716, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois State Collection Act. Third Reading of the Bill." Speaker McPike: "Representative McGann."

McGann: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Members of the Assembly, this is a Legislative Audit Commission Bill. House Bill 3716, which is to create a Debt Collection Board, consisting of the Director of Central Management Services as a Chairman, the State Comptroller and the Attorney General. The Board is empowered to contract with private collection agencies for collection of accounts which state agencies have been unable to collect. We have as of December 31, 1989 1,803,566,000, or approximately fifty percent of the

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

accounts are past due. So, it's indeed a need of an extra arm, an additional arm in trying to make these collections of dollars for the state. I'd ask for a favorable vote, and answer any questions."

Speaker McPike: "On the Bill, Representative Black."

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

Speaker McPike: "Yes."

Black: "Thank you, Representative. Currently, these debts are...every attempt would probably be made to collect these debts by what...each agency doing that?"

McGann: "Pardon me?"

Black: "Would each agency currently be involved in trying to collect debts owed to it?"

McGann: "That is correct."

Black: "If...does your Bill address the question of what would happen to the collection efforts being made by the agencies? Are we going to have a duplication of effort here?"

McGann: "No. No. There would be no duplication. It's just a back-up arm in order to be able to help. Just to give you an idea of...for example...in income tax there was three hundred million four hundred ninety three thousand gross, past dues: a hundred sixty seven million; the sales tax is seven hundred and thirty million, past due is: four hundred thirty seven million. These are dollars that belong to the state. And especially sales tax they should be just a pass through to the Department of Revenue. Amongst the other agencies is many other dollars that are owed, which is a total like I said of one billion eight hundred and three million. By the use of this board it will empower them to deal in contract with the private collection agencies to help the individual agencies in order to be able to collect

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

these dollars."

Black: "Let me follow up on that, Representative, because I think the point, or the central issue here, is are you creating a super collection agency to take the place of say the Department of Revenue's attempts to collect bad debts?..."

McGann: "No."

Black: "Or are you simply creating an agency that will work in parallel with efforts already being made by the Department of Revenue to collect back taxes, et cetera."

McGann: "Let me put it to you this way, Representative. The Bill places the principal responsibility for collection on each state agency. The proposal is only a back-up, or secondary method for collection to insure that the agencies do not shirk their collection responsibility. That's exactly what we're doing."

Black: "Alright. Thank you very much, Representative. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I think the Gentleman may have a good idea here. I'm not sure if you read through the Bill, it's rather a simple straightforward Bill, that it does or will be able to do what he...he expects it to do and perhaps what needs to be done. really think you have to be careful, and maybe you want to take a look at this, but it appears to me that we are simply creating another duplic...duplicative service of state government. Perhaps this Bill should say that this agency will collect all bad debts and distribute them as...as required by law. I don't think it says that. think it just creates another entity that will drain resources of the state, and perhaps even follow and step over and trip over efforts already being made. It may add to the confusion rather than solve the problems attempting to solve."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Ryder."

114th Legislative Day May 10, 1990

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

Speaker McPike: "Yes."

Ryder: "Representative, does the State of Illinois now enter into contracts with collection agencies to collect money?"

McGann: "I believe that is correct. We do."

Ryder: "And do you know specifically which departments may do this? Or does the Department of Revenue?...I'm sorry, didn't hear."

McGann: "The Department of Revenue, my understanding Employment Security, the Scholarship Commission, former which is now differently named."

Ryder: "Department of Revenue?...I believe in response to Representative Black that you indicated that there was some significant amount of income tax that was not collected?"

McGann: "That's correct."

Ryder: "Right. And that is collected directly by the Department of Revenue, is that right?"

McGann: "That is correct and also sales tax."

Ryder: "Right. Those would be, I would assume, the largest amounts that are due?"

McGann: "That is...that is correct. Also, another area in that area is the child support claims..."

Ryder: "Child support is being collected by the Attorney General, is that not correct?"

McGann: "There's four hundred and fifteen million in...past due in that area."

Ryder: "So, because these folks aren't doing their job...because the Department of Revenue and the Attorney General are not doing their job in collecting this money, that's why you want to have this board established?"

McGann: "I believe, what we're trying to do, over and over through the years, we have tremendous amount of past due

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

dollars to the state. Let's just use sales tax for example. It's a pass through project. The consumer the sales tax, the sales tax is to be paid on whatever arrangement they have in thirty days, or fifteen days, whatever, to the Department of Revenue. We're talking of four hundred and some million dollars that are out there We had a special committee four years and uncollectable. ago, and we had many...equallly amounts...millions of dollars not collected. So, we have to try something else, because after all, we're looking for dollars. We can't continually raise the taxes. We have to do something. Let's collect what we owe. This is another approach to the collection."

Ryder: "One last question, Representative, as a percentage of total state revenues is the amount that is uncollected larger or smaller than it was four years ago? As a percentage?"

McGann: "Right now, it's fifty point eight percent."

Ryder: "Excuse me?"

McGann: "Fifty point eight percent. In other words half of dollars owed to the state had not been collected as of December 31, 1989."

Ryder: "And that's larger than it was four years ago?"

McGann: "I don't have that exact figure for you, Representative."

Ryder: "Okay. To the Bill, Mr. Speaker..."

McGann: "Excuse me. Representative Ryder, I've just been told by another member of the Audit Commission, that the amnesty cut down some of it. By the use of the amnesty, which was another...Let me put it this way to you. When we had the new budget for 1991, Dr. Mandeville stated there were one billion dollars in uncollected amounts. Three hundred million has been lost because of businesses pulling out, or people have died, moved away; three hundred million was

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

never collected. There's another three hundred million out there that's in litigation presently. And beyond that there's another three hundred million dollars that is not collected from active accounts. That gives you a good example, Representative, of what we're up against."

Ryder: "To the Bill, Mr. Speaker. Or do I get to close, like just did? This may be a good idea, I can't tell. appears that, what the Sponsor of the Bill wants to do create another state bureaucracy, because the current state bureaucracy can't collect the money. Now, if the Attorney General can't collect the child support that we need, the Department of Revenue is having trouble collecting the dollars that are due us, then we ought to take a But the knee jerk why they are not doing their job. reaction to create another agency, the knee jerk to say, well, government is not doing its job, we need more government to do the job, just doesn't work here. What we need is for those who have the power to do this, this Bill would require that we have another layer of insulation, another layer of government attempting to collect money. I certainly agree on one point with the Sponsor of the Bill. We're entitled to those funds, and we ought to get them. But I think, even the Sponsor of that Bill would indicate that it is impossible for us to economically collect one hundred percent. What we need do is to find the most reasonable and economic way of collecting the largest percent. And this Bill does not do that."

Speaker McPike: "Representative DeJaegher."

DeJaegher: "Andy, one quick question. If a department goes out and hires an outside collection agency to collect the debts that's been incurred, what amount of money does that particular agency get for collecting the debts?"

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

McGann: "I believe...I believe that...it is negotiable. I believe that...they receive that about...I believe that the Department of Revenue said that they enter into different contracts on differing bills."

DeJaegher: "It's negotiable?"

McGann: "It would be negotiable. It would be negotiable."

DeJaegher: "But there is a rather exorbitant fee that that agency that goes out and collects these debts would receive from the State of Illinois, is it not?"

McGann: "Pardon me, I...I'm not following you."

DeJaegher: "In other words, if I hire an agency to go out and collect these debts for me...sometime..."

McGann: "You'll pay them thirty percent roughly."

DeJaegher: "Thirty percent. Then that sounds rather ridiculous that we would go out and hire someone to collect our state debts, give them thirty percent of our state money, when here we can basically put out a state agency, keep money in house that would pay for the personnel that need it for the implementation of this office. I think it's a good Bill. I don't think that we should go out for competitive bidding, having someone else distinctive from the state go out and collect these debts."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Parcells."

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

Speaker McPike: "Yes."

Parcells: "Representative McGann, do you remember, and maybe you stated it and I didn't hear it, what that outstanding amount of money is that the state is owed?"

McGann: "As of December 31, 1989 there was one billion eight hundred three million five hundred sixty six thousand dollars owed, or fifty point some percent of the total amount that is due to the state."

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

Parcells: "Then Ladies and Gentlemen, I don't know how anybody could object to forming this board. I think it's an excellent idea. As a matter of fact I was a cosponsor on the Bill. We're obviously not collecting the monies that we should be collecting. Now those who oppose the Bill are maybe some of the agencies who are owed the money. maybe they need some help collecting the money. If we had collected the monies last year that we are owed, wouldn't have had to have a tax increase. think that this Bill should be voted out. And I ask for your favorable vote."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Keane."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of this legislation. On a number of years we have funded the Department of Revenue to go out and hire more revenue collectors. The Department of Revenue has not seen fit use that money to hire revenue collectors and have them bring in normally five times their salary. A revenue collector does at least five times his salary in state owed So, if we don't have revenue collectors out beating debt. on people who owe the state for their money, they're going to pay it. I think the evidence that we haven't been doing that is the Governor's budget message to us, when he said let's pass another tax amnesty. We passed the amnesty, in fact I sponsored that in the House a few years ago. That was to be something that happened once every five twenty years. Since the Governor...since Governor's budget message I have talked to CPAs and accountants who have told their clients, do not pav anything that you owe the state, because we will settle a reduced amount on a tax amnesty. We have a collection system...revenue collection system in the state Illinois, which is second to none in terms of being bad.

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

We have over a billion dollars in uncollected revenue. W۵ could avoid many many serious tax increases if we collected what is owed us. In the case of merchants who have sales tax, when you go in to a store and you pay for the price of the goods and you pay the sales tax, and that merchant doesn't refund that money to us...to the state for which it has been collected, he is stealing money from the State of Illinois. If you look at the numbers, they have been getting away with it in larger and larger numbers. We've also found, the Audit Commission has found, that the longer a debt lasts, the older it becomes, the less collectible it becomes. For many of our agencies there is no incentive for them to collect debt. They would rather take people who are on their payrolls and send them to other areas of agency to do other jobs, because there's no payback In certain cases what we've done, for them. is we've allowed the agency to use a percentage of what they collect to fund the collections. And that's been very good. some of these areas, it doesn't work. And what we're asking for in this Bill is that on old debt, on debt that the agency has not collected, that we have a group move very, very quickly to collect that debt. Believe me, if they follow the numbers they will collect five times their cost. I would urge your adopt...I'd urge your 'aye' vote."

- Speaker McPike: "Representative McGann, did Representative Keane close for you?"
- McGann: "I believe he did a very good job. And I'd ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker McPike: "Thank you. Question is, 'Shall House Bill 3716

 pass?' All those 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 114 'ayes', and no
 'nays'. This Bill having received the Constitutional

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3720, Representative McGann. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3720, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Sports Facility Authority Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Representative McGann."

McGann: "Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Members of the Assembly, this is the second Audit Commission Bill. recall a few years back, we had the Illinois Sports Facilities Act, we allowed a hundred fifty million dollars in bonding, we are not questioning that, that in fact been done. We don't need to do anything with that. The hundred and fifty million dollars is being spent. there was a little loophole in that legislation, when we should have requested that sports authority come back to the Legislature for any additional bonding as they paid off the bonding from the hundred and fifty million, they should come back to the Legislature for permission for additional bonding in that hundred and fifty million dollar cap. That's what this Bill does. That's good government. I would ask for an 'aye' vote. And I'll be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker McPike: "Alright. Representative Mautino."

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

Speaker McPike: "Yes."

Mautino: "I understand your intentions with the Sports Facility
Bond provisions. We've capped them at 150 (million), now
if your legislation would happen to come back from the
Senate and move the bond authorization from this entity to
another entity, another authority, which could be done with
this Bill, because it's in the same section. Would you
oppose that change in bond authorization, because the
Sports Facility Authority has already used, sold and capped

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

out the 150? So, they can't do anything, but if you were to take the bond authorization and provide it in another section of that same statute, you end up coming up with a kind of a McPeer bond authorization. Now what would your position be if that Amendment was placed on this..this little innocuous Bill going over?"

McGann: "We would not accept, number one."

Mautino: "We would not accept what?

McGann: "Accept any Amendments to this Bill. This Bill only does one thing and one thing alone. As time goes on and they pay off fifty million dollars of bonds, they want to spend another fifty million dollars on that...that White Sox stadium. Let them come back to the Legislature and ask for that amount. That's all we do."

Speaker McPike: "Question is, 'Shall House Bill 3720 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this Bill there are 86 'ayes', 11 'nos', 19 voted 'present'. House Bill 3720 having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. On House Calendar, Supplemental #1. Agreed Bills were voted on this afternoon. The Roll Call on each of these Bills is up front in the well next to the Clerk, and these Bills having received the Constitutional Majority are hereby declared passed. Every Bill on the list passed. House Bill 3721, Representative Novak. a minute, Representative Novak. Representative Leverenz has returned on House Bill 3656, we just passed it by. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk. 3656."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3656, a Bill for an Act to amend the Counties Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Leverenz."

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

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

Bill to deal with storm water management. The Bill actually says it removes two words as amended. I want to send it to the Senate. I appreciate your 'aye' vote."

Speaker McPike: "Any discussion? There being none. The question is, 'Shall House Bill 3656 pass?' All those 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 107 'ayes', 3 'nos', 7 voting 'present'. House Bill 3656 having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3721. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3721, a Bill for an Act to amend the State Finance Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Novak."

Novak: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 3721 amends the State Finance Act. What we're doing here is taking the cap off the present five thou...five million dollar limitation that's...that puts money into the local tourism fund. We're attempting to take the cap off, which is at five million and push it up to eight million. There are a number of tourism boards that exist in the State of Illinois, not only in the City of Chicago, but tourism boards, such as in my area, and all over the downstate. And with the last few years many tourism boards have been created, such as the new one in DuPage County and a few other ones. While money...while the money figure remains constant, the five million dollar figure, these new tourism boards that qualify for matching dollar grants are draining this pot of money. Now what's happening all over the State of Illinois is that our existing tourism boards are receiving less dollars. What...what we're attempting to do here is take the cap off, move it up to eight million dollars. So, two

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

million...two million of that three million dollars goes to downstate, and one million goes to Chicago as the current formula allocates. Tourism is becoming a multi-million dollar industry in the State of Illinois with the advent of Parks and Conservation Program I, the Parks and Conservation Program II, with what the Department of Commerce and Community Affairs, the Department Conservation are doing to promote Illinois tourism in sites and parks. To get people from other states to come and spend their dollars and resources, our tourism industry is going to be very close to one of our major industries in the State of Illinois. I'd be happy to entertain any questions."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Black."

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

Speaker McPike: "Yes."

Black: "Representative, is your Bill on Short Debate?"

Novak: "It certainly is."

Black: "And is the formula stay the same: two thirds downstate, one third Chicago?"

Novak: "Yes, Representative."

Black: "I'm very glad we visited. Thank you."

Speaker McPike: "Does anyone stand in opposition to this? Mr.

McNamara do you stand in opposition to this?"

McNamara: "I have a quick question, if I could have it answered?

The five million to the eight million, where does that three million dollars come from? Where is it being taken away from now since it's going to be increasing the cap on it."

Novak: "GRF."

McNamara: "So, the money is there?"

Novak: "Yes. It is."

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

McNamara: "In GRF?"

Novak: "That's right."

McNamara: "So, you're increasing this fund by three million dollars out of GRF?"

Novak: "Right."

McNamara: "That answers my question."

Speaker McPike: "Question is, 'Shall House Bill 37...3721 pass?'
All those 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 95 'ayes', 16 'nos', 5
voting 'present'. House Bill 3721 having received the
Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House
Bill 3852, Representative Regan. Read the Bill, Mr.
Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3852, a Bill for an Act to amend the Township Law. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Regan."

Regan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Members of...of the House, House Bill 3852 is a simple Bill that allows small townships the right to have a planning committee. As it stands right now under 12,000 they are eliminated from the rights that other people have in planning their own future. Will County has a lot of townships that have small population, but very shortly we will have tremendous growth. And they have a right just like everyone else to have their own planning committee and try to see if they can plan their own future for themselves. And I urge your support of this issue."

Klemm: "Just a short question of the Sponsor. Does this require zoning approval for building or any thing such as that?"

Regan: "Yes. It's input into the county board and by

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

recommendation, but it does if they deny, go three quarter majority."

Klemm: "So, in a township or in a county that has zoning, you would have seventeen, or eighteen or nineteen different townships and they would each have different zoning requirements, perhaps, for a developer or a builder or somebody?"

Regan: "No. They certainly...they have a right to plan their areas and what they want in their areas. That's going to change the zoning codes. That's a county issue."

Klemm: "It's true though that each township could have different zoning requirements within a county?"

Regan: "It's permissive. That's all."

Klemm: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Weller, do you stand in opposition to this Bill? Question is, 'Shall House Bill 3852 pass?' All those 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 114 'ayes', no 'nays', 2 voting 'present'. House Bill 3852 having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3866, Representative Keane. Mr. Keane? House Bill 3886, Representative Steczo. Out of the record. House Bill 3918, Representative Steczo. 3918. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3918, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act concerning compensation of clerks of courts. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Steczo."

Steczo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Members of the House, as we're all aware last year the General Assembly by agreement decided that we were going to increase salaries of county officials. Over the course of the summer there was a

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

ruling that the county...circuit court clerks of counties are considered not technically elected county officials, but officers of the court as is the case with State's Attorneys. State's Attorneys when they receive increases can receive those increases in the middle of their terms, as now can circuit court clerks, with the ruling that happened after we adjourned last summer. What this Bill does is takes the salary of the circuit court clerk and advances it up by one year and makes it retroactive to last December, and...treats them as the officers of the court as it has been suggested that they are. I would ask to answer any questions, Mr. Speaker, would ask for support for this legislation."

Speaker McPike: "Does anyone stand in opposition to this Bill.

Representative Black."

Black: "Just one very quick question, Mr. Speaker. If the Gentleman will yield?"

Speaker McPike: "Yes."

Black: "Representative, on page four of your Bill, I'm not sure I understand that language it appears that you're saying that no reimbursement by the state is required for the implementation of this Act, is that correct?"

Steczo: "Is that the Mandate's language, Representative?"

Black: "I believe that it is. Yes."

Steczo: "That was by agreement last year. As you recall one of the final things we did in the Session last...last June was come up with an agreement between the county boards and the...the elected county officials for steps in pay increase over four years. It was by agreement that that language was added to that Bill at the time. And so, therefore, in this Bill we did the same."

Black: "I guess the confusion is that if they have been adjudicated as an officer of the court, why would the money

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

come out...come directly out of the county general revenue
fund? If I'm interpreting this correctly."

Steczo: "Could you read that for me one more time, please?"

- Black: "'Notwithstanding section VIII of this Act reimbursement by the state is required for the implementation of any mandate created by this amendatory Act of 1980...or of 1990'. Excuse me."
- Steczo: "Well, the fact is, Representative Black, without that language there would be a question as to whether or not the state would have to pick up the...pick up the tab for the increases. But because there was an agreement last year on the pay increases, we absolved the state from any...from any duty to provide the funds."
- Black: "I...I just stand in real confusion over it. That an officer of the court, the county board has to appropriate the money, but it didn't have any trouble getting out of here last year, so, I thank you for your indulgence."

Steczo: "Sure."

- Speaker McPike: "Mr. Weaver, do you stand in opposition to the Bill? Representative Weaver."
- Weaver: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just one quick point of clarification, Representative. I've received a couple of Resolutions from my county board indicating that this would remove control of the circuit courts' office from the county board. Are you aware of where the County Boards Association is on this Bill?"
- Steczo: "Representative, no, I'm not. I can't imagine that this Bill would remove the authority from anybody. The authority that the county boards may have over the circuit court clerks now stays the same. There's nothing in this Bill that addresses...duties, powers, functions anything but the...the salary increase that was agreed upon last year."

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

Weaver: "Thank you."

- Speaker McPike: "Question is, 'Shall House Bill 3918 pass?' All those 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 89 'ayes', 18 'nos', 7 voting 'present'. House Bill 3918 having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3934, Representative Peterson. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3934, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act in relation to fire protection districts. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Peterson."

- Peterson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 3934 as amended takes out the section regarding the removal of a fire protection trustee, but does call for a hearing to be held by the appointing authority, either the county board or the township. As amended the Fire Protection District Association of Illinois supports the Bill. I ask for your affirmative vote."
- Speaker McPike: "Question is, 'Shall House Bill 3934 pass?' All those 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', and 1 voting 'present'. House Bill 3934 having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3949, Representative Giorgi. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3949, a Bill for an Act to amend the Sanitary District Act. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Giorgi."
- Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, House Bill 3949 provides for the indemnification of Sanitary District Members of the Board

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

of Trustees, officials and employees of sanitary district and now this Amendment includes former members of the board of trustees, and former officials and employees of the various sanitary districts. I urge the adoption of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Black."

Black: "Yes. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. An inquiry of the the Chair. Amendment was filed with this Bill in agreement with Representative Giorgi, I don't show that it's been adopted. Floor Amendment #2, I believe."

Speaker McPike: "House Bill #1 and...I'm sorry...House Amendment #1 and #2 have been adopted."

Black: "They have been adopted? Thank you very much."

Speaker McPike: "Yes. Question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. voted? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this Bill there are 109 'ayes', l 'no', l voting 'present'. House Bill 3949 having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Bill 4027. Representative Phelps. House Bill Representative Steczo. Out of the record. House Bill Representative Hicks. House Bill 4152. Representative Hicks. House Bill 4193, Representative House Bill 4194, Representative Keane. On Second Reading - Human Services appears House Bill 4120. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk." .

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 4120, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Public Aid Code. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker McPike: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Clerk, is this on Second or Third Reading?" Clerk O'Brien: "It is Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee

114th Legislative Day

- May 10, 1990
- Amendments. No Floor Amendments."
- Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. House Bill 4178, read the Bill,
 Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 4178, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Public Aid Code. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."
- Speaker McPike: "Any Floor Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."
- Speaker McPike: "Yes. Representative Wojcik."
- Wojcik: "Yes. Mr. Speaker, it's my understanding that the Sponsor was supposed to hold this until...a compromise could be reached?"
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Bugielski, did you care to answer that?"
- Bugielski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Yes, Representative, I mentioned that in there, but they are in negotiations right now with the Department of Public Aid and the long term health care and...they just wanted to move the Bill, but they are in negotiations."
- Wojcik: "I would suggest we keep it on Second Reading."
- Bugielski: "We were told that there was no opposition on the Republican side."
- Wojcik: "But as long as negotiations are going on I think it would be wise to keep it on Second Reading."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Piel. Representative Piel."
- Piel: "Can I just sort of expound on what the Lady said,
 Representative. Both shell Bill, I mean they're basically
 for legislation if the parties all come up with general
 agreement...so we could leave them on Second Reading...Yes,
 Mr. Speaker?"
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Piel...Representative Piel. You could have your conversation someplace else. The Bill's on Third Reading."

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

- Piel: "I'm trying to talk the man to bring it back to Second Reading, Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker McPike: "Well, could you come down front and talk to him?

 Representative Wojcik."
- Wojcik: "Mr. Speaker, it seems there is an entourage of 'yes' people on this side of the aisle. So, therefore, I would yield to the Sponsor, and say by all means but it on Third Reading."

Bugielski: "Thank you."

- Speaker McPike: "The Bill is on Third Reading. On the same order of business is House Bill 3958. Mr. Clerk, has this Bill been read a second time?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3958. This Bill has been read a Second time previously and the fiscal note has been filed."
- Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. Page 30, the regular Calendar.

 I'm sorry, page 31. Consent Calendar, Third Reading,

 Second Day. Read the Bills, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Consent Calendar, Third Reading, Second Day. House Bill 1476, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. House Bill 1504, a Bill for an Act to amend the Criminal Code. House Bill 2938, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act in relation to fire protection districts. House Bill 3154, a Bill for an Act to amend the Public Community House Bill 3371, a Bill for an Act to amend College Act. the Public Utilities Act. House Bill 3372, a Bill Act to amend the Bingo Licensing and Tax Act. House Bill 3479, a Bill for an Act to amend the Unified Code of Corrections. House Bill 3582, a Bill for an Act in relation to juvenile placement. House Bill 3584, a Bill for an Act to amend the Children and Family Services. House Bill 3671, a Bill for an Act concerning educational matching grants. House Bill 3842, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act to revise the law in relation to plats. House

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

Bill 3874, a Bill for an Act to amend the Emergency Telephone System Act. House Bill 3953, a Bill for an Act to amend the Child Care Act. House Bill 3986, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act to authorize the state's attorney to empoint (sic — appoint) investigators. House Bill 4038, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Funeral and Burial Fund Act. House Bill 4192, a Bill for an Act to amend the Children and Family Services Act. House Bill 4203, a Bill for an Act to amend the Unified Code of Corrections. And House Bill 4221, a Bill for an Act to create the Juvenile Detention Center Revolving Loan Fund. Third Reading of these Bills."

- Speaker McPike: "Question is, 'Shall these Bills pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On these Bills there are 116 'ayes', no 'nays', 1 voting 'present'. And the Bills on the Consent Calendar are hereby declared passed. Under Special Order of Housing appears Senate Bill 721. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk. Senate Bill 721."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 721, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Housing Development Act. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendments #1 and 2 were adopted in committee."
- Speaker McPike: "Any Motions filed?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "A Motion to table Amendments 1 and 2, by Representative Capparelli."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Capparelli moves to table
 Amendments #1 and #2 are there any objections?

 Question...Leave the use of the Attendance Roll Call.

 Attendance Roll Call will be used. Amendments #1 and 2 are tabled. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #3 offered by Representative
 Turner and Morrow."

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

Speaker McPike: "Representative Turner."

Turner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the Assembly, Amendment #3 becomes the Bill. In fact, what it does is it allows IDHA the...it gives IDHA the ability to give monies to not-for-profit and limited profit entities for the benefit of building low and moderate income housing in this state. There is a flaw in the IDHA Act that currently prohibits them from doing so."

Speaker McPike: "Question is, 'Shall Amendment #3 be adopted?'

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

The Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. House Bill 722...Senate Bill 722. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 722, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Housing Development Act. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments. And no Floor Amendments."

Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. Representative Kubik, for what reason do you rise?"

Kubik: "Inquiry of the Chair."

Speaker McPike: "Yes?"

Kubik: "We adopted Amendment #3, correct? On that last Bill?"

Speaker McPike: "On 72...on Senate Bill 721."

Kubik: "721?"

Speaker McPike: "Yes. There were no Amendments on Senate Bill 722. Is that correct, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "That's correct."

Speaker McPike: "Schedule says we will adjourn at 7:00 p.m.

Representative Matijevich now moves the House stand adjourned until tomorrow at the hour of 9:00 a.m. All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no', the 'ayes' have it.

The House stands adjourned allowing Perfunctory time to the Clerk for messages from the Senate and Senate Bills First

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

Reading."

Clerk O'Brien: "A message from the Senate by Ms. Secretary. 'Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform House of Representatives that the Senate has passed Bills following title, passage of which I am instructed to ask concurrence of the House of Representatives, to wit; Senate Bills #1484, 1498,1504, 1506, 1518, 1522, 1545, 1550, 1567, 1568, 1572, 1577, 1578, 1580, 1613, 1619, 1623, 1630, 1635, 1636, 1642, 1643, 1660, 1663, 1668, 1674, 1676, 1689, 1700, 1702, 1711, 1716, 1744, 1750, 1742...that's 1842, 1843, 1859, 1860, 1874, 1884, and 1904 passed the Senate March 9, 1990. Linda Hawker, Secretary of the Senate. Senate Bills - First Reading: Senate Bill 1484, Bugielski, a Bill for an Act to create the Illinois Economic Development Board. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1498, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Vehicle Code...Scratch that...no Sponsor on 1498. Senate Bill 1504, Capparelli, a Bill for an Act to amend the Counties Code. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1506, Leitch, a Bill for an Act to amend the Housing Authority Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1518, Balanoff, a Bill for an Act to amend the Unified Code of Corrections. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1522, Bowman, a Bill for an Act relating to school districts and the office of township treasurers and trustees of schools. First Reading of the Bill. Bill 1545, Lang, a Bill for an Act in relation to taxation. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1550, Parcells, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Vehicle Code. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1567, Ropp, a Bill for an Act to amend the Revenue Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1568, Wolf and Hasara, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Employees Group Insurance Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1572, Dunn, a Bill for an

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

Act to amend an Act to prohibit minors from buying and selling tobacco. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1577, Parke, a Bill for an Act to amend the Abused, Neglected Child Reporting Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1578, Hasara, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Insurance Code. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1580, Black, a Bill for an Act to Soil and Water Conservation Districts Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1613, Munizzi, a Bill for an Act to amend the Criminal Code. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1619, Hartke, a Bill for an Act to amend the Smoke Detector Act. First Reading of the Bill. Bill 1623, Churchill, a Bill for an Act to amend...a Bill for an Act to amend the Mental Health Developmental Disabilities Code. First Reading of the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1630, offered by Representative Petka, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act to provide for the creation and management of Forest Preserve Districts in counties having a population of less than three million. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1635, offered by Representative Deuchler, a Bill for an Act to amend the Township Law. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1636, offered by Representative Steczo and Cowlishaw, a Bill an Act to amend the Illinois Municipal Code. First Reading Senate Bill 1642, offered by Representative the Bill. Goforth, a Bill for an Act to create the Columbia Civic Center Authority. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1643, offered by Representative Black, a Bill for an Act to amend the Juvenile Court Act. First Reading of the Senate Bill 1660, offered by Representative Steczo, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1663, offered by Representative Countryman, a Bill for an Act to amend the Election Code.

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1668, offered Representative Kubik, a Bill for an Act to amend the Revenue Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1674. offered by Representative Phelps, a Bill for an Act to sections of the School Code. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1676. offered by Representative Cowlishaw, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1698...that's correction...Senate Bill 1689, offered by Representative Kulas, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Credit Union Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1700, offered by Representative Phelps, a Bill for an Act to create Cave in Rock Township Civic Center Authority. First Reading of the Bill, Senate Bill 1702, offered by Representative Goforth, a Bill for an Act to amend certain Acts in relationship to solid waste. First Reading of Senate Bill 1711, offered by Representative Currie, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Insurance Code. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1716, offered by referenda. Representative Kubik, a Bill for an Act in relationship to back door referenda. First Reading of the Senate Bill 1744, offered by Representative DeLeo, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Physical Therapy Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1750, offered by Representative Brunsvold, a Bill for an Act to amend the Riverboat Gambling Act. First Reading of the Bill. Bill 1842, offered by Representative Curran, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1843, offered by Representative Steczo, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1859, offered by Representative...strike Senate Bill 1859. Senate Bill 1860. pa Representative Parke, a Bill for an Act to amend the Crime

114th Legislative Day

May 10, 1990

Victims Compensation Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1874, offered by Representative Weller, a Bill for an Act to amend the Unified Code of Corrections. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1884, offered by Representative Giorgi, a Bill for an Act to amend the Liquor Control Act. First Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1904, offered by Representative Countryman, a Bill for an Act to amend the Fair Campaign Practices Act. First Reading of the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "There being no further business, the House now stands adjourned."

ح.

4 8 4

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

MAY 10, 1990

90/08/02 14:25:57

HB-0934 SECOND READING	PAGE	61
HB-1018 SECOND READING	PAGE	19
HB-1368 SECOND READING	PAGE	65
HB-2178 THIRD READING	PAGE	162
HB-2178 THIRD READING	PAGE	164
HB-2179 THIRD READING	PAGE	165
H3-2181 THIRD READING	PAGE	170
H3-2685 SECOND READING	PAGE	28
HB-2714 SECOND READING	PAGE	13
HB-2839 SECOND READING	PAGE	5
HB-2851 THIRD READING	PAGE	104
HB-2870 SECOND READING	PAGE	7
HB-2876 SECOND READING	PAGE	14
HB-2876 HELD ON SECOND	PAGE	17
HB-2899 SECUND READING	PAGE	10
Hu-2921 THIRD READING	PAGE	107
HB-2923 SECOND READING	PAGE	63
HB-2929 SECOND READING	PAGE	66
HB-2932 THIRD READING	PAGE	122
HB-2944 THIRD READING	PAGE	171
HB-2948 THIRD READING	PAGE	123
Hb-2950 THIRD READING	PAGE	172
H6-2959 SECOND READING	PAGE	69
HB-2967 SECOND READING	PAGE	7
HB-2972 THIRD READING	PAGE	70
HB-2985 THIRD READING		
	PAGE	81
HB-2991 SECOND READING	PAGE	19
HB-2991 JUT OF RECORD	PAGE	19
HB-3019 SECOND READING	PAGE	52
HB-3020 SECOND READING	PAGE	25
		175
HB-3049 THIRD READING	PAGE	
HB-3050 SECOND READING	PAGE	8
HB-3058 SECOND READING	PAGE	3
HB-3060 SECOND READING	PAGE	177
HB-3060 RECALLED	PAGE	176
HB-3060 THIRD READING	PAGE	176
HB-3134 SECOND READING	PAGE	20
HU-3139 THIRD READING	PAGE	128
HB-3163 SECOND READING	PAGE	53
H3-3207 SECONO READING	PAGE	53
HE-3210 THIRD READING	PAGE	182
HB-3213 THIRD READING	PAGE	188
HD-3228 SECOND READING		
	PAGE	61
H3-3230 THIRD READING	PAGE	189
HB-3256 SECOND READING	PAGE	53
HB-3257 SECOND READING	PAGE	54
HB-3294 THIRD READING	PAGE	192
HB-3304 SECOND READING	PAGE	6
HB-3324 SECOND READING	PAGE	6
HB-3334 SECOND READING	PAGE	12
HB-3355 THIRD READING	PAGE	124
HB-3373 SECOND READING	PAGE	64
HB-3395 SECOND READING	PAGE	60
HB-3395 OUT OF RECORD	PAGE	54
HB-3402 SECOND READING	PAGE	54
HB-3404 SECOND READING	PAGE	21
H3-3481 SECOND READING	PAGE	56
HB-3483 SECOND READING	PAGE	4
HB-3509 SECOND READING	PAGE	56
HB-3513 SECOND READING	PAGE	56
HB-3533 SECOND READING	PAGE	58
HB-3554 SECUND READING	PAGE	62
HB-3577 THIRD READING	PAGE	138
Hb-3577 OUT OF RECORD	PAGE	141
,		- · -
•		

REPORT: TIFLDAY PAGE: 002

, . -

STATE OF ILLINOIS BOTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES DAILY TRANSCRIPTION OF DEBATE INDEX

90/08/02 14:25:57

MAY	10,	1990

H8-3578	THIRD READING	PAGE	141
	SECOND READING	PAGE	154
	THIRD READING	PAGE	158
	THIRD READING	PAGE	132
	SECOND READING	PAGE	194
-	RECALLED	PAGE	24
	SECOND READING	PAGE	17
	SECOND READING	PAGE	9
	SECOND READING	PAGE	18
	HELD ON SECOND	PAGE	18
	SECOND READING	PAGE	63
	SECOND READING	PAGE	13
	OUT OF RECORD	PAGE	9
	SECOND READING	PAGE	34
	THIRD READING	PAGE	206
	SECOND READING	PAGE	35
	SECOND READING	PAGE	58
	SECOND READING		13
	THIRD READING	PAGE PAGE	196
	THIRD READING		
	THIRD READING	PAGE	205
-		PAGE	207
	SECOND READING	PAGE	62
	SECOND READING	PAGE	62
	THIRD READING	PAGE PAGE	125
	SECOND READING		4
	SECOND READING	PAGE	33
		PAGE	30
	SECOND READING	PAGE	60
	SECOND READING	PAGE PAGE	61
			61
	THIRD READING	PAGE	127
	SECOND READING	PAGE	63
	SECOND READING	PAGE	60
	THIRD READING	PAGE	209
	SECOND READING	PAGE	66
	SECOND READING	PAGE	59
	OUT OF RECORD	PAGE	61 9
	THIRD READING	PAGE	
	THIRD READING	PAGE PAGE	210 213
	THIRD READING	PAGE	213
	SECOND READING	PAGE	34
	SECOND READING	PAGE	4
	RECALLED	PAGE	216
	THIRD READING	PAGE	129
	SECUND READING	PAGE	23
	SECOND READING	PAGE	23
	HELD ON SECOND	PAGE	23
	THIRD READING	PAGE	130
	SECOND READING	PAGE	68
	SECOND READING	PAGE	23
	SECOND READING	PAGE	4
	HELD ON SECOND	PAGE	5
	THIRD READING	PAGE	132
.:"	SECOND READING	PAGE	65
	SECOND READING	PAGE	214
	SECOND READING	PAGE	32
	SECOND READING	PAGE	9
	SECOND READING	PAGE	10
	SECOND READING	PAGE	215
	SECOND READING	PAGE	18
	HELD ON SECOND	PAGE	18
	SECOND READING	PAGE	6
	SECOND READING	PAGE	217
33 3,21		. AGE	~ 4

į

, e: ···

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

90/08/02 14:25:57

MAY 10. 1990

11111 227 2772		
S8-0722 SECOND READING	PAGE	218
SB-0784 SECOND READING	PAGE	18
SB-0934 SECOND READING	PAGE	63
SD-1496 FIRST READING	PAGE	219
SB-1504 FIRST READING	PAGE	219
SB-1506 FIRST READING	PAGE	219
SH-1518 FIRST READING	PAGE	219
SE-1522 FIRST READING	PAGE	219
SB-1545 FIRST READING	PAGE	219
SB-1550 FIRST READING	PAGE	219
SB-1567 FIRST READING	PAGE	219
SB-1568 FIRST READING	PAGE	219
SB-1572 FIRST READING	PAGE	220
SB-1577 FIRST READING	PAGE	220
SB-1578 FIRST READING	PAGE	220
SE-1580 FIRST READING	PAGE	220
SB-1613 FIRST READING	PAGE	220
SB-1619 FIRST READING	PAGE	220
SB-1623 FIRST READING	PAGE	220
S8-1630 FIRST READING	PAGE	220
SB-1635 FIRST READING	PAGE	220
SB-1636 FIRST READING	PAGE	220
SB-1642 FIRST READING	PAGE	220
SE-1643 FIRST READING	PAGE	220
Sb-1660 FIRST READING	PAGE	220
Sb-1663 FIRST READING	PAGE	220
SB-1668 FIRST READING	PAGE	221
SB-1674 FIRST READING	PAGE	221
SB-1676 FIRST READING	PAGE	221
SH-1689 FIRST READING	PAGE	221
S8-1700 FIRST READING	PAGE	221
SE-1702 FIRST READING	PAGE	221
SB-1711 FIRST READING	PAGE	221
SB-1716 FIRST READING	PAGE	221
S8-1744 FIRST READING	PAGE	221
SB-1750 FIRST READING	PAGE	221
S8-1784 FIRST READING	PAGE	219
Sd-1842 FIRST READING	PAGE	221
S3-1843 FIRST READING	PAGE	221
SB-1860 FIRST READING	PAGE	221
SA-1874 FIRST READING	PAGE	222
SE-1884 FIRST READING	PAGE	222
SB-1904 FIRST READING	PAGE	222
SB-3386 SECOND READING	PAGE	67
S5-3558 THIRD READING	PAGE	134
SUBJECT MATTER		
HOUSE TO ORDER - SPEAKER MCPIKE	PAGE	1
PRAYER - REVEREND JACKSON	PAGE	1

PRAYER - REVEREND JACKSON	PAGE	1
PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE	PAGE	2
ROLL CALL FOR ATTENDANCE	PAGE	2
AGREED RESOLUTIONS	PAGE	2
REPRESENTATIVE YOUNG IN THE CHAIR	PAGE	6
REPRESENTATIVE MCPIKE IN THE CHAIR	PAGE	25
INTORDUCTION - PALOS HEIGHTS INDEPENDENCE JR. HIGH	PAGE	33
REPRESENTATIVE JONES IN THE CHAIR	PAGE	35
REPRESENTATIVE MCPIKE IN THE CHAIR	PAGE	43
REPRESENTATIVE LAURING IN THE CHAIR	PAGE	56
SUPPLEMENTAL CALENDAR #1	PAGE	98
INTRODUCTION - ROTARY GROUP EXCHANGE TEAM	PAGE	103
REPRESENTATIVE CULLERTON IN THE CHAIR	PAGE	105
REPRESENTATIVE GIGLIO IN THE CHAIR	PAGE	147
REPRESENTATIVE MCPIKE IN THE CHAIR	PAGE	179
Agreed Bill's 3rd Reading	PAGE	98

REPORT: TIFLDAY PAGE: 004

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

90/08/02 14:25:57

garages 1987

MAY 10, 1990

CONSENT CALENDAR SUBJECT MATTER	Page	102-103
CONSENT CALENDAR - THIRD READING	PAGE	216
ADJOURNHENT	PAGE	218
PERFUNCTORY SESSION	PAGE	219
MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE	PAGE	219
PERFUNCTORY ADJOURNMENT	PAGE	222