45th Legislative Day

May 7, 1991

- Speaker McPike: "The House will come to order. The Chaplain for today is Father Philip Kraft of the Catholic Springfield Diocese. Father Kraft is the guest of Representative Hasara. The guests in the balcony may wish to rise and join us for the invocation."
- Father Kraft: "Let us pray. Heavenly Father, we ask Your blessing upon these, the elected Representatives of the State of Illinois. Today, we ask that You please grant them serenity to accept the things that they cannot change. Please grant them courage to change the things that they can. And, grant them wisdom to know the difference. Amen."
- Speaker McPike: "We'll be led in the Pledge of Allegiance today by Representative Hartke."
- Hartke 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 Kubik."
- Kubik: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, let the record reflect that Representative Barnes is excused today due to illness. Representative Harris, due to an illness in his family and Representative Myron Olson, on official business."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Harris is on family leave.

  Representative Matijevich."
- Matijevich: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, on this side of the aisle. Monroe Flinn is excused due to his injuries. Representative McNamara, due to official business and excused on official business with the Governor but they will return here between 3:00 and 4:00 Representative Phelps, Wollard and Deering."

45th Legislative Day

May 7, 1991

Speaker McPike: "I think that the Members would like to know that
I visited with the Monroe Flinn yesterday and he is not
able to walk yet, but he still thinks he'll be back here in
the month of June, and he's coming along very well. Mr.
Clerk, take the record. 110 Members answering the Roll
Call. A quorum is present. Representative Black."

Black: "An inquiry of the Chair, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker McPike: "Yes."

Black: "A very busy week and all of us are trying very diligently to clear our calendars so we'll know, when to be here, etc., but we don't have our goldenrod schedule. We were just wondering if that might be delivered to our desks shortly, as to when we're in..."

Speaker McPike: "We're in Session, we're in Session Friday, Mr. Black."

Black: "Ah..."

Speaker McPike: "We're in Session Friday."

Black: "And what time might we be in on Friday?"

Speaker McPike: "Probably from 9:00 until 3:00."

Black: "Thank you very much."

Speaker McPike: "And at 3:00 p.m. on Friday we'll call the Approp. Bills. Page 48 of the Calendar. Speaker's table. Consent Calendar. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Speaker's table. Consent Calendar. Fourth Day.

House Resolution 228, offered by Representative Turner,

urges the citizens of Illinois to recognize 'Statewide

Affordable Housing Week'. Housing, Committee on Housing

recommends to adopt."

Speaker McPike: "Question is, 'Shall these Resolutions pass?'

The Attendance Roll Call will be used, and the Resolution passes. House Bill, Second Reading. State and Local Government, Second Reading. Appears House Bill 17, Representative Lang. Out of the record. House Bill 391,

45th Legislative Day

May 7, 1991

Representative Sam Wolf. Sam Wolf. Out of the record. House Bill 832, Representative Brunsvold. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 832, a Bill for an Act to amend various acts in relation to riverboat gambling. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee."

Speaker McPike: "Any Motions?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed."

Speaker McPike: "Any Floor Amendments?"

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

Myron Olson."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Olson is not here.

Representative Brunsvold. The Gentleman moves to table the

Amendment?"

Brunsvold: "Yes, Sir."

Speaker McPike: "The Gentleman moves to table Amendment #2. All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment's tabled. Further Amendments?"

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

Speaker McPike: "Representative Sieben, Amendment #3."

Sieben: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. As I think many of you know, Members on this side of the aisle have strongly opposed the riverboat gambling Legislation that was passed here in the House in previous Sessions. And what Amendment #3 does, it deletes the exemption from the Open Meetings Act for information relating solely to the internal rules and practices of the gaming board, and, I think we would like to see much more openness with the information that comes out of the gaming board. And that's the purpose of Amendment #3."

Speaker McPike: "Excuse me, Representative Sieben.

45th Legislative Day

May 7, 1991

Representative Brunsvold asks the Bill be taken out of the record at this time. It's Out of the record. House Bill 1078. 1079. Representative Lang on House Bill 1078. Read the Bill. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1078, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker McPike: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. House Bill 1079. Read the Bill,
Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1079, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee or Floor Amendments."

Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. House Bill 1538, Representative Marinaro. House Bill 1587, Representative Jones; Lou Jones. House Bill 1715, Representative Keane. Mr. Keane? Mr. Steczo? Mr. Trotter? Representative Brunsvold, House Bill 2197? Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2197, a Bill for an Act to amend the Fire Equipment Distributor Act. This Bill's been read a second time previously. No Committee or Floor Amendments."

Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. Under Human Services, Second Reading. House Bill 739, Representative Jesse White. 954, Representative Daniels. House Bill 1408, Representative Bugielski. Representative Hicks. Representative Burzynski. House Bill 1908. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1908, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Act on the Aging. Second Reading of the Bill.

Amendment #1 was adopted in committee."

Speaker McPike: "Any Motions?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed."

45th Legislative Day

May 7, 1991

Speaker McPike: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representatives

Burzynski and DeJaegher."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Burzynski."

Burzynski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Floor Amendment #2 basically changes the Bill. It provides for a pilot, for a study to be done by the Department of Aging and Public Health and a report to be filed by April 1, 1992. Representative DeJaegher is in favor of this Amendment."

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

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

and the Amendments adopted. Further Amendments."

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. Representative Representative Steczo? Representative McGuire? Out of the record. Representative Trotter? Representative White? Representative Pullen? Representative Pullen here? Representative Capparelli? House Bill 2469? Out of the 2471, record. House Bill Representative Laurino. Representative Currie on 2510? On Human Services, Third Reading, does anyone have any Bill, they'd like to bring back to Second. Representative Currie does. House Bill 2452? Representative Currie."

Currie: "On House Bill 426, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker McPike: "426. Does the Lady have leave to return to Second Reading? Leave's granted. The Bill's on Second Reading. House Bill 426, Mr. Clerk, are there any Motions or Amendments?"

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

Speaker McPike: "Representative Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I move

45th Legislative Day

May 7, 1991

adoption of Amendment #3 to House Bill 426. The effect of the Amendment is to reduce what might have been substantial out—year costs in one of the provisions of House Bill 426. I'd be happy to answer your questions and would urge your support for the Motion."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Black on the Motion's adoption."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield to a question on the Amendment?'

Speaker McPike: "Yes."

Black: "Thank you. Representative, you're saying that you're going to tie the annual appropriation, in accordance with a single percentage, on a standard of need as recommended by a Joint Resolution?"

Currie: "Yes. But the Bill, as drafted, would also have set a floor below which future General Assemblies would have been restricted from going in establishing what percentage of the standard of need the cash bent will fund."

Black: "Well, do we, a...is your intent that the Joint Resolution be, a...adopted every year? Or...'

Currie: "Yes."

Black: "...one Joint Resolution..."

Currie: "Annually."

Black: "An annual Joint Resolution."

Currie: "But what this, what the Amendment does, is to take the second sentence out of that section. The sentence that says that the..."

Black: "'standard of need'..."

Currie: "'shall not fall below 45.3%. It was, it was..."

Black: "You're taking the 'standard of need' language out by this
Amendment."

Currie: "I'm taking the threshold out. I'm taking the..."

Black: "The threshold, alright,

Currie: "Yeah."

45th Legislative Day

May 7, 1991

Black: "Okay."

Currie: "And, that was, and it was that sentence that led to the possibility of substantial out-year costs in the underlying Bill."

Black: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker McPike: "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 O'Brien: "No further Amendments?"

Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. Under Labor, Second Reading.

First four Bills are out of the record. House Bill 824,

Representative Mautino? 824? Out of the record. Mr.

Trotter? Representative Hasara? 2177? Read the Bill, Mr.

Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2177, a Bill for an Act to amend the Personnel Code. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker McPike: "Any Floor Amendments?"

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

Speaker McPike: "Representative Hasara."

Hasara: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A...several groups have been working on this Bill, trying to define the word 'disabled', and we have come up with an Amendment that says that 'a disability means the physical or mental impairment that substantially limits a major life activity', and it goes on to define it in those terms. The underlying Bill is an effort to be able to hire more disabled people in state government. There are several programs going on in this area. This particular Bill is aimed at people who are not needing extra points on an exam. Umm, it's just that right now we're having difficulty even identifying disabled people so I move for the adoption of Amendment #1 that

45th Legislative Day

May 7, 1991

- defines the word 'disabled'."
- Speaker McPike: "Any discussion? Question is, 'Shall Amendment #1 be adopted?' All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. On Labor, Third Reading.

  Representative Ryder wishes to return House Bill 962 to
  Second Reading. Does the Gentleman have leave? Leave is
  granted. The Bill is on Second Reading. Mr. Clerk, 962.

  Are there any Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Brunsvold."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Brunsvold?"
- Brunsvold: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Amendment #1 would delete a section."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Ryder."
- Ryder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I would accept the Amendment."
- Speaker McPike: "The Question is, 'Shall Amendment #1 be adopted?' All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. Representative Steczo. Terry
  Steczo. We just ran through a number of your Bills. Do
  you want to call any Bills? House Bill 2045? Want to call
  that? No! House Bill 2050? Constitutional Officers,
  Second Reading. Representative Novak. Representative
  Homer. Representative Preston. House Bill 915. Read the
  Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 915, a Bill for an Act concerning future education accounts. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

45th Legislative Day May 7, 1991

Speaker McPike: "Any Floor Amendments?

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

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Preston."

Preston: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. What Amendment #1 to House Bill 915, "

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Clerk, is this Amendment distributed? It's not distributed. I'm sorry, Mr. Black. It is distributed. It is distributed. It is distributed.

Preston: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. What Amendment #1 does is to provide provisions to the Future Education Account Act to take care of situations where an individual, after putting in money in this fund, plans to attend, rather than a public school, plans to attend a non-public institution of higher education that is located in Illinois, or a non-public institution located outside of Illinois. And this was discussed in committee, and this takes those situations into account."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Satterthwaite."

Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker, has the Amendment been..."

Speaker McPike: "Yes."

Satterthwaite: ".. printed and circulated? It has?"

Speaker McPike: "Representative Black."

Black: "Thank you very much. We just got a copy of the Amendment. May I ask the Sponsor a quick question?"

Speaker McPike: "Yes."

Black: "Okay. Representative, does this Amendment have anything to do with, a...the guaranteed portion of the underlying Bill? That we're going to guarantee tuition?"

Preston: "Well, it does not, the underlying Bill...the provision remains that the guaranteed portion, a...if we're talking about a non-public, non-university, a non-public, non-Illinois school, is based on the weighted average

45th Legislative Day

May 7, 1991

tuitions of Illinois schools."

Black: "Can you give me a 'for instance'. If, a...if
the...person wanted to go to a private school in Illinois
and the tuition was considerably more at that time than the
equivalent tuition at a state school, can you give me a
'for instance'?"

Preston: "Yes. What would then take place, if they're going to a private Illinois university, is the guarantee would be for the average amount of Illinois universities..."

Black: "...State, state-supported universities"

Preston: "State supported universities. And that's the extent that the guarantee would be good for. However, if it were a non-Illinois university, then the average would be weighted according to Illinois public universities, depending on the popu, the student population of those universities. So that would be the extent of the guarantee."

Black: "Alright, thank you."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "If I may, Mr. Speaker. We have a celebration in focus here today for just a moment. Our Mother Hen here is celebrating a birthday and we'd like everybody to come over to the DMZ here and enjoy some cake with us. So, I think we owe congratulations to Chuck on his..."

Preston: "Mr. Speaker, if I may, I'm very pleased that
Representative Hartke is celebrating yet one more birthday,
but we're in the middle of a Roll Call and an Amendment if
we could just proceed with that I'd be very appreciative."

Speaker McPike: "Well, Mr. Preston, this is Chuck Hartke's birthday."

Preston: "Well, yes, but, a...I think he had one last week, Mr. Speaker, and..."

Speaker McPike: "Well, congratulations, Mr. Hartke. And, we're

45th Legislative Day

May 7, 1991

sorry to interrupt your birthday with this Bill."

Preston: "Mr. Speaker, this Amendment affects the future..."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Black...Representative Black."

Black: "Well, yes, I was going to ask the 'Sponsor' of the Birthday Resolution' a question, but I suppose it could wait. We don't know how old Mr. Hartke is."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Hartke."

Hartke: "47."

Speaker McPike: "Nobody believes that. Is that all?

Representative Dunn."

Dunn: "Would the Clerk read the 'Birthday Resolution', please?"

Speaker McPike: "Representative Preston, do you want to take this

Bill Out of the record?"

Preston: "No, Mr. Speaker, we're in the middle of a vote on this good Amendment."

Speaker McPike: "The Gentleman has asked for a Roll Call. Roll Call vote? No? Voice vote would be fine. Question is, 'should Amendment #1 be adopted?' All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. House Bill 1309, Representative Curran. 1515. House Bill 1592, Representative Williams. Representative McAfee. Gentleman here? You want to call this Bill? House Bill 2110, Saltsman, Representative Saltsman. Representative Lou Jones. Representative Keane. Representative Williams. House Bill 2523. If anyone would like to have their Bill called, would you please just fill out a slip up here. Representative Williams, House Bill 2523. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2523, a Bill for an Act to amend the Consumer Fraud and Disceptive Business Practice Act. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendments #1 and #2 were

45th Legislative Day

May 7, 1991

adopted in committee."

Speaker McPike: "Any Motions filed?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed."

Speaker McPike: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

- Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. Representative Steczo. Steczo?

  House Bill 2531. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2531, a Bill for an Act regarding automatic telephone dialers. Second Reading of the Bill.

  No Committee or Floor Amendments."
- Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. Agriculture and Environment.

  Second Reading. House Bill 204, Representative Hoffman.

  House Bill 2531, Third Reading. Representative Hoffman.

  Representative Richmond. Representative Schakowsky. Jan

  Schakowsky. Representative Steczo, House Bill 706. Read

  the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 706, a Bill for an Act to amend the Environmental Protection Act. Second Reading of the Bill.

  Amendment #1 was adopted in committee."

Speaker McPike: "Any Motions?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed, no Floor Amendments."

- Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. Representative Granberg. Kurt Granberg. House Bill 742. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 742, a Bill for an Act to amend the Soil and Water Conversation District Act. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."
- Speaker McPike: "Out of the record. House Bill 1199,
  Representative Granberg. 1199. Representative Hartke,
  1207. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1207, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Fertilizer Act. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee or Floor Amendments."
- Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. House Bill 1449, Representative

45th Legislative Day

May 7, 1991

Peterson. W. Peterson. Representative Hicks. Hicks. Representative Hensel. House Bill 2022. Representative Kulas. 2250? Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2250, a Bill for an Act to amend the Environmental Protection Act. This Bill's been read a second time, previously. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker McPike: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #1 was adopted previously. Floor

Amendment #2, offered by Representative Kulas."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Kulas."

Kulas: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #2 would allow for the disposal of landscape waste at landfills which recover methane that is used to produce electricity for sale to a third party, and I move for its adoption."

Speaker McPike: "And on that, Representative Currie. Representative Regan."

Regan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I guess I really want to call attention to this Amendment. Just a few days ago, we put my compost legislation on this Bill, and I thank Mr. Kulas for the right to use one of his vehicles, and I guess what this is doing is removing the compost legislation that I worked on for three months, in addition to allowing the landfill to be used again with compost wastes. So, I just would like to call your attention to it, and, a, if you're interested in protecting the people of the State of Illinois from illegal compost sites, then I think you ought to vote 'no'."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I rise in opposition to the Gentleman's Amendment. I think that it is too soon to conclude that we need to find alternate ways of dealing with the composting of...leaves and other

45th Legislative Day

May 7, 1991

garden and yard wastes, and I think that the Gentleman's proposal to shifts those kinds of items to methane production activities, does not make good environmental sense at this point. So, I think that we might want to reject this Amendment. There is a later Amendment offered to this Bill that would provide for a study to find out how we can do a better job of dealing with whatever problems the composting of yard waste is presently creating. So, I would advise a 'no' vote if you are concerned about your environmental record."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Wennlund. Representative Kulas."

Kulas: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Is Amendment 3 on file because I think I want to table Amendment #2 if there's been a technical error."

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Clerk. Is Amendment #3 filed? Or, is it distributed? Three and 4 distributed? Yes."

Clerk O'Brien: "Yes"

Speaker McPike: "Three and 4 distributed."

Kulas: "Well, then, at this time I would move to table Amendment
#2."

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

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

Speaker McPike: "Representative Kulas."

Kulas: "Basically, this is the same Amendment that I just spoke of. This would sunset on October 1, 1993. The Department of Environmental Protection would look at this situation after the time is up. I think it's a situation which you all must address at the present time. There is a problem with odors from the composting sites. You've probably heard a lot about it. All we're saying here, the people still have to sort their landscape waste separately. They

45th Legislative Day

May 7, 1991

still have to separate the landscape waste, and so on, but they could, if they wanted to, instead of putting it into a compost site, put it into one of these landfills that have the waste energy project. So, I think it's a good Bill, and I would move for its adoption."

Speaker McPike: "On Amendment #3. Amendment #3. Is there any discussion on Amendment #3? No discussion? Representative Novak. Representative Novak."

Novak: "Thank you, thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Will the Sponsor yield, please?"

Speaker McPike: "Yes."

Novak: "Representative Kulas, is this exactly identical to House Bill 1588?"

Kulas: "No. It's been amended."

Novak: "To what respect?"

Kulas: "Well, it sunsets in October of 1993. It doesn't take, it still mandates the sorting of landscape wastes from your regular wastes, and...let's let's see...and it allows the Director of Illinois EPA to extend the exemption each year, depending on what the composting situation would be."

Novak: "But does it allow the grass to go into these landfills that produce methane?"

Kulas: "It would allow grass clippings to go into landfills which use methane to produce electricity, yes."

Novak: "Well, with all due respect to the Chairman of the House and Energy and Environment Committee, I have to rise in opposition to this Amendment. I'd like to have everyone's attention on this, especially if you represent a district in downstate Illinois, as you know the landfills are getting pretty well filled up around Chicago and suburbs and collar counties. Yard wastes and yard clippings constitute roughly 30%, or excuse me, 18% to 20% of what goes into the landfills. If we allow the grass to go into

45th Legislative Day

May 7, 1991

these landfills, we're going to fill these landfills up quicker and they'll be looking for more landfill sites, and if you represent an area that has a lot of wide open spaces, such as myself, or Southern Illinois or Western Illinois, or Southwestern Illinois, I'm sure you'll consider this a very hostile Amendment that could cause landfill operators to come down in your area and try to site a landfill. So, I'd ask everyone to defeat this Amendment."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Hultgren."

Hultgren: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ι rise in joining Representative Novak in opposing Amendment #3 to House Bill 2250. You know, we fought this battle a few years ago to keep that landfill waste out of the landfills. And it's absolutely nuts to start right now and put that landfill waste back in the landfills. Representative Novak is absolutely correct. Anyone who represents open spaces downstate Illinois is simply creating a problem for themselves in terms of the future siting of landfills in downstate by allowing the landfill waste in the metro area to go into the landfills there. I urge a 'no' vote on the Amendment."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Balanoff."

Balanoff: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is a bad, bad, bad idea. If people have a problem with the smell from composting piles, we have an Amendment. It's Amendment #4. The idea is not to allow bad haulers an option and say, 'Well, you can put it over here.' This is a piece of 'special interest' legislation. The only landfills in the State of Illinois, to the best of my knowledge, and this was said in committee, that would qualify, are waste management landfills. It's a bad Amendment, and I'd would urge everybody to vote 'no' to

45th Legislative Day

May 7, 1991

Amendment #3, and Amendment #4, for everybody who has a problem with composting piles, we'll deal with that."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Satterthwaite."

Satterthwaite: "Will Sponsor yield?"

Speaker McPike: "Yes."

Satterthwaite: "Representative Kulas, is it my understanding that
this Amendment would be restricted to having these yard
wastes deposited only in certain landfills that are
designated as producing methane gas."

Kulas: "That is correct."

Satterthwaite: "Are there landfills currently in operation with that designation?"

Kulas: "I believe there are three or four, yes."

Satterthwaite: "And it would continue in the future to be restricted only to depositing these wastes in those landfills that were producing methane?"

Kulas: "That is correct."

Satterthwaite: "It appears to me, then, that we may have a good
Amendment here that will provide for a method of producing
methane gas that would otherwise not have a viable
operation if we were to withdraw these products from that
landfill, and I would urge Members to adopt the Amendment."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Kulas, to Close."

Kulas: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I don't know why there's so much controversy on this Amendment. All we're basically saying is there is a problem with the composing sites. There is an odor problem. We don't want to repeal the law that we worked hard on the last few years, to ban landscape waste from landfills, all we're saying is that it would allow you to ship that landscape waste, if you want to pay the price, to a facility which turns methane gas into electricity. So, you don't have to send it, you can send it to the compost

45th Legislative Day

May 7, 1991

site or anything else. I think this is a good Amendment.

I think it addresses the problem that we're facing now, and

I would move for the adoption of Amendment #3."

Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #3 be adopted?' All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. Roll Call. All in favor of the Amendment vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wished? The Clerk will take the record. On this Motion there are 27 'ayes' and 78 'nos'. The Amendment is defeated. Further Amendments?"

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

Balanoff."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Balanoff."

Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Balanoff: "Mr. Amendment #4 is to deal specifically with the problems that many communities have faced regarding odor from landfills. It also includes Bob Regan's Amendment, but, what it would do is create a landscape waste composting task force made up of eight Members of the General Assembly, three persons representing the waste disposal industry, two persons representing environmental organizations, four living within one mile of an existing landscape waste composting facilities, one person representing a profit' and one person representing the 'not-for profit' recycling industry. The task forces would meet four times during the next six or eight months to determine what can be done about the problem of smell and odor coming from composting piles, because the problem is that with the smell, normally, that the pile is not turned over often enough or, in some cases, it's allowed to sit in the alley, or whatever, for a couple of weeks. So, the anaerobic decomposition has already begun. So possibly they should have an unloading facility at the composting facilities,

45th Legislative Day

May 7, 1991

but composting is here, it is something that we have to protect and I certainly think that everybody should join in supporting Amendment #4.

Speaker McPike: "Representative Lang."

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have sympathy for what the Sponsor's trying to do, but, I frankly think we have enough task forces, another legislative task force is just an additional burden to the General Assembly. I don't think this is the way to go. I think we have enough of these task forces. I would urge my colleagues to vote 'no' or 'present'."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Balanoff, do you wish to close?"
Balanoff: "I just urge your, 'aye' vote on this good Amendment."

Speaker McPike: "Question is, 'Shall Amendment #4 be adopted?'

All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'nos' have
it. The Amendment's defeated. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. House Bill 2253, Representative Kulas. House Bill 2254, Mr. Kulas? Representative Weller, 2325. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2325, a Bill for an Act to amend the Civil Administrative Code, Second Reading of the Bill.

Amendment #1 was adopted in committee."

Speaker McPike: "Any Motions?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed."

Speaker McPike: "Any Floor Amendments?"

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

Speaker McPike: "Representative Weller."

Weller: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #2, a, effective July 1, 1992, requires all gasoline motor vehicles operated under the Downstate Mass Transit District Act, to use ethanol blended fuel.

45th Legislative Day

May 7, 1991

This Amendment has been discussed at great length with the...downstate, the ll downstate urbanized mass transit districts affected, the legislation was negotiated with them, they've agreed to the language and, I move for its adoption."

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

Black: "Will Sponsor yield?"

Speaker McPike: "Yes."

Black: "Representative, in all honesty, I haven't read your Amendment, but from the discussion, if the buses burn diesel, then you're not about to ask them to retrofit, correct?"

Weller: "That is absolutely correct. It only affects gasoline burning vehicles that are capable of using ethanol blended fuel."

Black: "Thank you."

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

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. Representative Morrow. House Bill 2451. Representative Kulas, 2473. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2473, a Bill for an Act to amend the Pollution Abatement Enforcement Act. This Bill's been read a second time previously. The Bill was held for a fiscal note which is now filed. No Committee or Floor Amendments."

Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. Banking, Second Reading. House
Bill 67, Representative Currie. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 67, a Bill for an Act to amend an act

45th Legislative Day

- May 7, 1991
- relating to the use of proceeds of reversed mortgage loans. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."
- Speaker McPike: "Any Floor Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representatives

  Shaw and Monique Davis."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Shaw. Withdraws Amendment?"

  Number 1. Further Amendments."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representatives

  Shaw and Monique Davis."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Shaw? Withdraws the Amendment?

  Mr. Shaw withdraws Amendment #2."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative
  Currie."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Currie."
- Currie: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. The Amendment substantially rewrites the Bill. The proposals in the Amendment come from a model state law on reverse mortgages drafted by the American Association of Retired Persons and the point of the rewrite is to establish the public policy purposes for reverse mortgages to provide some consumer protections and to retain adequate flexibility in the lending community. I'm aware of no opposition to the Amendment, and I would appreciate your support for the Motion to adopt."
- Speaker McPike: "Any discussion? Question is, 'Shall Amendment #3 be adopted?' All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. House Bill 1488. Representative Capparelli. Capparelli? Consumer Protection, Second Reading. House Bill 208, Representative Schakowsky. Representative Farley? Representative Hartke. House Bill

45th Legislative Day

May 7, 1991

1981. Out of the record. Representative Granberg, 2026. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2026, a Bill for an Act to amend the Consumer Fraud and Deceptive Business Practice Act. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee."

Speaker McPike: "Any Motions?'

Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed."

Speaker McPike: "Any Floor Amendments?"

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

Speaker McPike: "Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is a consumer protection Amendment. What it does, all of you have received these so—called 'phony checks' in the mail as a promotion gimmick, and this would provide that on those types of checks, in large print, they shall write it across, diagonally, 'This is not a check'. I would move for the adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Granberg."

Granberg: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We have no objections to the adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Pullen."

Pullen: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. I can certainly understand what the Gentleman's trying to get at with this Amendment, but I do think we should keep in mind that many direct mailings are national and are not based in Illinois, and I don't believe that the Illinois State Legislature really has the authority or the effective opportunity to do anything about this problem, and I think that adopting this Amendment will do nothing but burden the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Pedersen."

45th Legislative Day May 7, 1991

Pedersen: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker McPike: "Yes."

Pedersen: "It's my understanding that the law already provides that they have to have wording on the front and the back that says that 'This is not a check'."

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Matijevich."

Matijevich: "I'm not aware of that, Bernie."

Pedersen: "That's what we understand over here."

Matijevich: "Well, if so, this is an added protection, and I would ask you how can they do that according to what Penny Quillen said, but I think it can be done. I would disagree with her, but I this this would be an added protection. I keep receving complaints, if that is true, they sure aren't living up to it, because I just received one last week in the mail that didn't have that warning on it."

Pedersen: "But...to the Amendment, Mr. Speaker. It seems to me there's a limit about how much stuff you have to put on these things. It's already in the law, so it's just unnecessary acretion to those big red books that are filling up our district offices, so I would recommend...a 'no' vote on this Amendment."

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

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

The Amendment's adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. Representative DeLeo, House Bill 2030. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2030, a Bill for an Act to amend the Medical Patient Rights Act. Second Reading of the Bill.

No Committee or Floor Amendments."

Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. Representative Giglio, House Bill 2576. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2576..."

45th Legislative Day

May 7, 1991

- Speaker McPike: "Representative Giglio, there's a request for a fiscal note. Fiscal note. Is it filed? Mr. Clerk?

  Gentleman says it's filed. Clerk doesn't have it.

  Economic Development, Second Reading. Representative McNamara. Representative Wyvetter Younge. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk. House Bill 879."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 879, a Bill for an Act to amend the Build Illinois Act. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker McPike: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #1, offered by Representative Wyvetter Younge."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Younge."

Younge: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Floor Amendment #1 would make it clear that the purpose of this Bill is to have DCCA to have the authority to fund incubators for a fourth year under Build Illinois, and I move for the adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker McPike: "On the Amendment, Representative Black."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. To the Amendment. We had asked the Sponsor to take this out of the record because we thought it was drafted in error and only applied to Robbins. She was kind enough to do that, we've checked into it, the Amendment is correct as drafted, does what the Sponsor intends for it to do, we support her Amendment."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Younge, to close."

Younge: "I move for the adoption of the Amendment."

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

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

The Amendment's adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. House Bill 882. Read the Bill,

45th Legislative Day

May 7, 1991

Mr. Clerk."

- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 8..."
- Speaker McPike: "Out of the record. Representative John Dunn.

  House Bill 1021. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1021." A Bill for
- Speaker McPike: "Fiscal note's not filed, Mr. Dunn.

  Representative Younge. Wyvetter Younge. House Bill 1571.

  Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1571. Fiscal note not yet filed."
- Speaker McPike: "Fiscal note is not yet filed, Miss Younge.

  Representative Homer, 1624. Out of the record.

  Representative Morrow. Representative Giorgi.

  Representative Giorgi? Representative Giorgi. 1935. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1935, a Bill for an Act to amend the Metropolitan Pier and Exibition Authority Act. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."
- Speaker McPike: "Any Floor Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative White."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative White. Representative Giorgi, are you the hyphenated Sponsor of this? Do you want to present the Amendment?"
- Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, I'm aware of Jesse White's Amendment, but I think that I ought to move to table this Amendment at this time because I think there's going to be a vehicle Bill and I'd rather not have it encumbered going in the Senate."
- Speaker McPike: "Alright, all in favor of the Gentleman's Motion, say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment's tabled. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. Housing, Second Reading.

  Representative Turner. House Bill 1243. Read the Bill,

45th Legislative Day

May 7, 1991

- Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1243, a Bill for an Act in relation to housing for low-income households. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee or Floor Amendments."
- Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. House Bill 2003, Representative Davis. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 20..."
- Speaker McPike: "Out of the record. House Bill 2151.

  Representative Turner. Mr. Turner. Read the Bill, Mr.

  Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2151, a Bill for Act to amend the
  Abandoned Housing Rehabilitation Act. Second Reading of
  the Bill. No Committee Amendments."
- Speaker McPike: "Any Floor Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative
  Turner."
- Speaker McPike: "Mr. Turner. Amendment #1. Gentleman moves the adoption of the Amendment. Is there any discussion? Mr. Turner, they want an explanation of the Amendment."
- Turner: "The Amendment becomes the Bill. It amends the Illinois
  Affordable Housing Act. It adds new category of
  low-income-housing, lowest-income housing. It defines
  persons or families, unrelated persons living together
  whose adjusted moneys is not more that 30% of the median
  income for an area, and I move for the adoption for this
  Amendment."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Doederlein."
- Doederlein: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House.

  I believe this just adds another term to 'low-income housing', 'lowest-income housing', 'average income housing'. I think it's just another term, and I'm not sure just where this term fits into the category of 'low-income housing'."

45th Legislative Day May 7, 1991

Speaker McPike: "Anything further, Representative?"

Doederlein: "Yes, was there a fiscal note requested for this?"

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Clerk, was there a fiscal note requested?

No."

Doederlein: "There was none filed - asked for?"

Speaker McPike: "There was none asked for."

Doederlein: "Could we ask for that?"

Speaker McPike: "You could! Yes. Go ahead. Proceed. Question, is, 'Shall Amendment #1 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. Government Operations, Second Reading. House Bill 12, Representative Stern. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 12. a Bill for an Act relating to the appointments to boards, commissions and councils. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker McPike: "Any Floor Amendments?"

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

Speaker McPike: "Representative Stern."

"Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. This Amendment was offered in subcommittee, and I thought it would be adopted in committee, and it was not and I will give it to you now, it's been distributed. What it does. mv feminist supporters feel that I have knuckled under by filing this Amendment, I think it is a step in the right direction and instead of asking for, as we did on the original Bill, a full 50% balance on every board and commission, what we ask for is 'substantial representation' on every appointed board and commission. I ask adoption of the state Amendment."

45th Legislative Day

May 7, 1991

Speaker McPike: "Representative McCracken. Good to hear your voice, Sir."

- McCracken: "Thank you, Sir. If it's any consolation, your friends on the other side of the aisle are still opposed to the Bill. I see up there, there are only two males sponsoring that Bill. Don't you think that's unfair?"
- if I may respond to that. Certainly Stern: "Mr. Speaker, chauvinistic. There are only, I believe, let's see, how Sponsors? One, two, three, four, five Sponsors and two of them are men? I think that's pretty considering that women are three-fifths of the...60, excuse me, 53% of the population of Illinois. But, I want to make point that this Bill would require substantial representation of men on boards that are considered to be more populated by women. chauvinistic, Representative McCracken. We believe that both sexes have a great deal to contribute to the decisions made by the State of Illinois. I ask adoption of the Amendment, and I know that Representative McCracken will want to second that Mmotion."
- McCracken: "I don't want to prolong the agony, but let me assure everybody that I have no desire to second this Amendment. I don't know why it's any more fair that there be three women instead of three men, or maybe the fact that there are three women sponsoring your Bill proves it's not necessary in the first place. But this Amendment is an attempt to water down that which is repugnant to our system of fair play and equal protection. If you support this Amendment, it'll make a 'no' vote harder on Third Reading. If you don't like the concept, vote 'no' on the Amendment."
- Speaker McPike: "Question is, 'Shall the Amendment be adopted?'

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

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

45th Legislative Day

May 7, 1991

the Amendment there are 66 'ayes', and 31 'nos'. The Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. Representative LeFlore. Bob LeFlore. House Bill 143. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 143. Fiscal note's not yet filed."

Speaker McPike: "Fiscal note is not filed. Fiscal note. Mr. LeFlore?"

LeFlore: "Filed two fiscal notes on this Bill. I don't know what's happening to them. They're losing them in the well."

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Clerk. He's filed two fiscal notes. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brian: "House Bill 143, a Bill for an Act to amend the Steel Products Procurement Act. This Bill's been read a second time previously. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee."

Speaker McPike: "Any Motions?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed."

Speaker McPike: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker McPike: "Fiscal note filed? Is the fiscal note filed?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Fiscal note is filed."

Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. Representative Obrzut. House Bill 242. Representative Curran, House Bill 452. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 452, a Bill for an Act concerning procurement of agricultural engineering and land surveying services. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendments #1, #2 and #3 were adopted in committee."

Speaker McPike: "Any Motions filed?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed."

Speaker McPike: "Any Floor Amendments?"

45th Legislative Day

May 7, 1991

- Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."
- Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. Representative Deering.

  Representative Edley. Mr. Edley. Bill Edley. House Bill
  738. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 738, a Bill for an Act to amend the State Prompt. Payment Act. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee or Floor Amendments."
- Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. Representative Steczo. 841.

  Out of the record. House Bill 1011, Representative Barnes.

  Does someone wish to handle this for Representative Barnes?

  Mr. Black. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1011, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Vehicle Code. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments?"
- Speaker McPike: "Any Floor Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative
  McNamara."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative McNamara. Mr. McNamara? Mr. Black. Representative Black."
- Black: "Is...Representative McNamara on the floor?"
- Speaker McPike: "No."
- Black: "I have...I have no idea, in all honesty, whether this Amendment's even been discussed..."
- Speaker McPike: "Shall we take it out of the record?"
- Black: "Yeah, let's just take it out of the record."
- Speaker McPike: "Alright, out of the record. Representative Ewing. Mr. Ewing back there? Representative Granberg, 1198. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee or Floor Amendments."

45th Legislative Day

- May 7, 1991
- Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. Representative Hicks?"

  Representative Homer, 1397. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1397, a Bill for an Act to amend the Fees and Salaries Act. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee or Floor Amendments."
- Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. Representative Edley, 1497. Out of the record. 1688, Representative Frederick. Read the Bill. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1688, a Bill for an Act to amend the Carnival and Amusement Rides Act. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee or Floor Amendments."
- Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. Representative Laurino.

  Representative McGann, House Bill 1945. Read the Bill, Mr.

  Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1945, a Bill for an Act to amend the State Finance Act. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee or Floor Amendments."
- Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. House Bill 1949, Representative Keane? Representative Hensel, 1956. Representative Currie, 2032. Representative Giorgi, 2048. Giorgi? Representative Churchill. Bob Churchill. Representative Manny Hoffman on 2181. Representative Steczo, 23...read the Bill on 2181, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2181, a Bill for an Act to amend the State Finance Act. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee or Floor Amendments."
- Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. House Bill 2309, Representative Steczo. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2309, a Bill for an Act to amend the
  Illinois Public Library District Act. Second Reading of
  the Bill. No Committee or Floor Amendments."
- Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. Representative Edley. Mr. Edley. Bill Edley. Mr. Edley. 2364. Read the Bill, Mr.

45th Legislative Day

May 7, 1991

Clerk."

- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2364, a Bill for an Act to amend the
  Civil Administrative Code. Second Reading of the Bill. No
  Committee or Floor Amendments."
- Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. House Bills, Third Reading. State and Local Government. There's House Bill Representative Matijevich. Representative Santigo, 288. Representative Stern. 351. 352. Representative Rice. Representative McAfee. McAfee? Representative Santiago, 536. Representative Curran, 575. Representative Young, Anthony Young. Representative Balanoff on 760. Does anyone wish to call a Bill? Representative Bugielski. Representative Lang. Representative Homer. 1000. Representative John Dunn 1014. Thank you, Mr. Dunn. read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1014, a Bill for an Act to amend the
  Board of Higher Education Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

  Speaker McPike: "Mr. Dunn."
- Dunn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 1014, is the inventor in-residence program. This would enable up to five universities within the state to corral someone who has special invention talent and have them take up residence on their campus to make inventions. The state would pay up to \$25,000 of the costs for each individual, and the costs, and that, whatever the state pays, would have to be matched by the college. Whatever inventions come out of this, would be, would become the propriety, the property of the university, or not, in accordance with its previously established policy. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Ropp."

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

Speaker McPike: "Yes, he will."

45th Legislative Day

May 7, 1991

Ropp: "I think this is a Bill you've had some time, and I think we had probably a first in this Committee by hearing from a U.S. Congressman. I guess the question I had is, 'Is there money currently in the budget for this and where do you plan to get it if there isn't?'"

Dunn: "We will have to come up with the, if this becomes statutorially enacted, we would have to come up with the grand sum of a total of \$125,000 of taxpayers' money."

Ropp: "Did you say \$125,000?"

Dunn: "Total. Maximum. That's it. There's a possibility in this legislation of five of these positions and the state would pay no more that \$25,000 each so the total cost of this program, max., will be \$125,000, or less, depending if fewer numbers of the universities apply to participate, or if the match provided by the university is only \$10,000 per campus, the total cost of this program would be \$50,000 so, it's not expensive."

Ropp: "So, the intent really is to encourage people to be innovative thinkers, innovative people who may ultimately come up with some kind of innovations..."

Dunn: "Yes, but not just any people. I think I was chosen to sponsor this legislation because I am the only licensed patent attorney in the Illinois General Assembly. I have dealt with inventors for many years and...this legislation is aimed at those who have already spent their lifetime in productive invention work and are in the retirement years but who still have a lot to offer. And this would enable a university campus to capture them onto the university and provide some facilities and encouragement and hope that they would continue productivity in the invention area and...and then we would all be better off."

Ropp: "Well, in other words, this is not necessarily for new inventors, is that for older people who have been around a

45th Legislative Day

May 7, 1991

while with the university would provide them space and equipment to further develop ideas that they may have had but just have not been able to, let's say, pursue to the final patent process."

Dunn: "Or, these may be retired people who have...left their career places of employment and just need a shop to continue doing business because they're creative. This Bill is not designed to assist in any way someone who thinks they might be an inventor. This is only for proven people who have done this throughout their adult life. They're very special people and they're not very many in number, and we shouldn't let them get away."

Ropp: "So, some of these people might be in a position to make outstanding...tremendous sums of money because of their inventions and then could turn around and contribute money to the university in order to build a brand new building to be named after 'em."

Dunn: "Well, that could happen. Very well could happen."

Ropp: "Thank you."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Klemm."

Klemm: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield for a short question?"

Speaker McPike: "Yes."

Klemm: "Representative, I was curious about what constitutes an inventor and what would that person have to invent and what are they doing to qualify? I mean, what gain do we have for a so-called inventor to receive this grant?"

Dunn: "The term is, if you're asking if it is defined in detail in legislation, no, the word inventor is used, but the legislative intent that we're discussing right now, and the policy behind the introduction of this legislation, is to capture people who are known, productive, prolific inventors already. And..."

45th Legislative Day

May 7, 1991

Klemm: "Would they have to be on staff already? Would they have to be a staff person who has a number of inventions perhaps that would qualify? Or, for anybody? Could I qualify?"

Dunn: "I don't know if you have patents or not. If John Bardine at the University of Illinois only had one patent and it is a transistor, I think he would qualify for this program. It's difficult to describe, unless you've brushed up against these people on a regular basis because most of us sit at our kitchen table and say that we have an idea really don't have the creative capacity to follow through with it. Inventors are a special group of people, they are well—known in their own community and that will be the least of the problem of this legislation, to capture these people."

Klemm: "Okay, now, Representative Hartke says he has a patent and I hold five patents, I'm wondering, would we qualify for this, I mean, do I just go to the university and get this grant and sit around looking for another invention, or how would I handle it?"

Dunn: "If I had to choose between you and Hartke, I'm not sure it'd be a typical choice, I..."

Klemm: "You'd obviously take none of us, I know that. I was just curious how it worked but it's still not clear."

Dunn: "I think, in any case like this would be some element of a gamble and just take a chance."

Klemm: "Thank you."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Hultgren."

Hultgren: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise reluctantly in opposition to House Bill 1014. Not because I don't appreciate the Sponsor's good intentions and not because I don't believe it's a fine program, but rather because I believe it duplicates programs that we already have in existence in the State of

45th Legislative Day

May 7, 1991

Illinois. We all know the difficult financial problem that the state faces this year in putting together its budget. Clearly, we don't have money to duplicate programs which we The Department of Commerce and already are operating. Community Affairs operates the Technology Commercialization Program in a number of universities throughout the State of Illinois. I'm acquainted with programs at Western Illinois University and at Bradley University simply because they are in the neighborhood of the district that I But. it's mν understanding that similar technology commercialization centers are funded by the state at universities and colleges throughout the State of Illinois. These programs are essentially doing the same thing that's proposed by House Bill 1014. That is, to encourage promote and subsidize the inventions, the inventors and the marketing of the...of the...inventions that those gentlemen are able to patent. I think for that reason, simply because it's essentially duplicating the existing state program, we ought to have some second thoughts about this proposal. Thank you very much."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Dunn, to close."

Dunn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The program proposed by this legislation is not similar shape, or form to existing policy on the statute any way, This is a different books of the State of Illinois. designed to capture, not those who think Ιt is they might be inventors, but those who are well-known in their twilight years, who, are productive and would like the opportunity to have a to pursue their inventive careers. Obviously, the campus setting of an institute of higher education is great а place to do this. It's a mutually beneficial thing, gives the inventor a way to retain, the, to continue to

45th Legislative Day

May 7, 1991

prolific and provides an opportunity for the university to capture the inventive talent of these people. Whatever policy the university has, with regard to staff inventions, would remain in place and I ask for an 'aye' vote."

- Speaker McPike: "Question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this Bill there are 75 'ayes' and 32 'nos'. House Bill 1014 having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1203, Representative Lou Jones. Lou Jones? Lou Jones. House Bill 1203. House Bill 1685, Representative LeFlore. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1685, a Bill for an Act in relation to the Metropolitan Transit Authority Employees. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative LeFlore."
- LeFlore: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. 1685 is a Transit Authority Bill. This Bill was called last week and Representative Black had a question about it. That has been straightened out. So, I'll just ask for a favorable Roll Call on this Bill. Thank you."
- Speaker McPike: "Question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this Bill there are 108 'ayes' and no 'nays'. House Bill 1685 having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. 1700. Representative Santiago, 1699. Representative Curran, 1776? Representative Burke. Dan Burke. Mr. Representative Giorgi. 1849. Giorgi. 1871. Burke. Horse racing. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk. Out of the record? Out of the Record. Bugielski. Mr. Laurino. 2165. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

45th Legislative Day May 7, 1991

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2165, a Bill for an Act concerning

Adult Education. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Laurino."

- Laurino: "Mr. Speaker, the Bill does essentially what the Amendment does 'cause we adopted the Amendment on Second Reading. And, essentially what it does is set up competitive situations for, and the directions on, how to establish the funding for adult education classes. I move for the an adoption of House Bill 2165."
- Speaker McPike: "Question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. Weller, 'aye'. On this Bill there are 106 'ayes' and no 'nays'. House Bill 2165, having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Representative Hensel. Representative Turner, 774. Mr. Ryder, you want to call 962? It was amended today. You want to call it? Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 962, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act in relation to salaries. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker McPike: "The Gentleman asks leave to hear this Bill on Third Reading. Any objections? There being no objections, the Attendance Roll Call will be used. The Gentleman has leave. Mr. Clerk has the Bill been read a Third time? Mr. Ryder."
- Ryder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 962 amends the Election Code of the Illinois Public Labor Relations Act. It would eliminate salaries for the Boards, of the State Board of Elections, State Labor Relations Board and Local Labor Relations Board. We anticipate the savings to be in excess of \$400,000. It would, however, allow these Members to receive a per diem for their expenses. I will be glad to answer any questions."

45th Legislative Day

May 7, 1991

- Speaker McPike: "Any discussion of the Bill? The question is,
   'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye', opposed
   'no'. Jack. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish?
   The Clerk will take the record. On this Bill there is 100
   'ayes' and 1 'no'. House Bill 962, having received the
   Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed.
   Representative Parke."
- Parke: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I inadvertently was not on the floor when the last Roll Call was taken. Had I been here I would have voted 'yes'. If the record would reflect that.

  Thank you."
- Speaker McPike: "The record will so reflect. Representative.

  Kirkland. Mr. Kirkland, on 1843. Mr. Shaw, if you could

  move, the Chair can't see Mr. Kirkland. Read the Bill, Mr.

  Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1843, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Human Rights Act. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker McPike: "Mr. Kirkland. Out of the record.

  Representative Currie. Currie, 2074. Read the Bill, Mr.

  Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2074, a Bill for an Act to amend the Civil Administrative Code. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Currie."
- Currie: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. This Bill is not new to those of you who served in the last General Assembly. The Bill then sponsored by former Representative Loleta Didrickson is identical to the Bill that is today House Bill 2074. The point of the Bill is to ask the Department of Labor to help track the success of women and members of minority groups in the work force across the State of Illinois. I would be happy to answer your questions, we do a lot of work in the areas of affirmative action. We don't have a very good grasp on whether those

45th Legislative Day

May 7, 1991

efforts are succeeding and to what extent we need to do more or perhaps we even need at some date to do less. So, this is just an information gathering Bill, and it would help us determine how well, for example, women and minorities are faring in the skilled trades and other individual occupational categories across the State. So, I'd be happy to answer your questions and would appreciate your support for House Bill 2074."

Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Representative McGann. One minute. Representative McGann. No. Anyone. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this Bill, there are 105 'ayes' and 3 'nos'. House Bill 2074, having received a Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2104, Representative DeJaegher. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk. Read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2104, a Bill for an Act to amend the Prevailing Wage Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Representative DeJaegher."

DeJaeqher: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman...Mr. Speaker and Members of the General Assembly. There was an Amendment to House Bill 2104 which reinstitutes the TIF district. Amendment includes charges of an anti-kickback penalty to business offense with a maximum fine of \$5,000. Includes project financed under the Enterprise Zone Act under House Bill 2104 amends the Prevailing Wage Act. law to provide the Act, applies to to projects prevailing financed in whole or part with loans made available under the Illinois Enterprise Zone Loan Act or businesses who receive tax incentives under the Enterprise Zone Loan Act and basically this is the extent of the Bill."

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

45th Legislative Day

May 7, 1991

those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Representative Klemm. Mr. Klemm."

Klemm: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was just going to say, that really, this really inflates the cost of developing projects in the area. Now we're trying to have the economic development, we're trying to do the TIF, we're trying to do it for some good reasons. This Bill, really though, is well—intended, And the first part of the Bill is very good, but it's really got some problems in the effectiveness of the benefits of it, and I really don't think we can support it. Thank you."

Speaker McPike: "Representative DeJaegher to explain his vote." DeJaegher: "Mr. Speaker, Members of the General Assembly. support has the support of the labor organizations throughout the State of Illinois. It's basically a wild (sic well) defined Bill that basically protects employees, and with the Amendments, I feel that we have made the necessary change in it, so that basically not anyone should not have the adverse comment pertaining to this Bill. think that we have overcome some of the deficiencies that pertaining people addressed themselves to to this particular Bill and for that particular reason I ask for your support on House Bill 2104 as amended."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Saltsman."

Saltsman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. All that this Bill does your contractors that have their businesses in your area and puts them on a level ground for bidding for this construction work. If you want to have your contractors who have locked in agreements with your labor work force with your unions in your area, if you want someone else to come in and to be able to underbid them, then you vote against this Bill. But, if you want to put your contractor, where he's going to have the best chance of

45th Legislative Day

May 7, 1991

getting the bids off of this job, you better vote for this Bill because he's not going to have the same opportunity that he would have if we don't have the prevailing wage on them contracts. If you want right to work people to come in here from Iowa and do the work in your area, where these local incentives and state incentives are coming from, then you go ahead and vote for those scabs and vote for those people, those right—to—work people that come in from Iowa and from Kansas, like they did in my area about five years ago, and all your labor people in your area will be standing outside the gates watching those people work. This is a good Bill, it's job protection, and it does more to protect your contractor than it does the labor field. I urge your 'yes' vote on this Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Black, to explain his vote."

"Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. To explain my vote. Black: There is a good part of this Bill and that's the part protects people from intimidation. But there are some parts of the Bill that need a lot of work. You know, you're going to buy into the premise of an enterprise zone, in a TIF district, you're trying to encourage economic development in depressed areas. The way this Bill came out it isn't going to do that. This Bill is going to inflate the costs of development projects in these areas and since it is already a depressed area it probably isn't going to have anything, any net result, that we wanted out of a enterprise zone or a TIF Bill. I think we're close, but I think the Gentleman needs to do a little more work on the Bill and, Mr. Speaker, should the Bill get 60 votes, I would ask for a verification."

Speaker McPike: "Have all voted? Have all voted who wish?

Representative DeJaegher, for what reason do you rise?"

DeJaegher: "Out of the record, please."

45th Legislative Day

May 7, 1991

Speaker McPike: "No."

DeJaegher: "Postpone consideration?"

Speaker McPike: "The Gentleman asks postpone consideration, and it will be placed on the Order of Postponed. 1843. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1843, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Human Rights Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Kirkland."

Kirkland: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is a Bill that I took out of the record for Representative Homer, the other day. It really makes a technical correction, simply clarifying that state agencies, along with units of local governments and school districts do not commit a civil rights violation by utilizing conviction information obtained from the Department of State Police in evaluating qualifications and character of an employee or prospective employee. The Bill came from the Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority, and I move for its passage."

Speaker McPike: "Does anyone stand in opposition? The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this Bill there are 105 'ayes' and 3 'nos'. House Bill 1843, having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Human Services, Third Reading. House Bill 274, Jesse White. House Bill 329, Representative McAfee. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 329, a Bill for an Act to create a child care program. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Representative McAfee."

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

Bill is known as a Senior Citizens Child Care Support Act.

The Bill requires the Department of Aging to develop a

# 45th Legislative Day

local

level.

The

May 7, 1991

voluntary training program, in conjunction with the Department of Children and Family Services, to train senior citizens in the day care of children. I think, without the need for child care is one that all Legislators have heard about. The need for adults to care for young children while their parents work outside the home or seek job training has increased dramatically in the However, child care currently last decade. has significant staffing crisis. One, in Illinois, that is over 42% turnover. This Bill, basically seeks to address two needs. The need for qualified child care staff, who will remain in the field and the need for many older children, older citizens to supplement their income and to provide a necessary service. The intent of this Bill is to supplement the available human resources available, and I urge your favorable vote."

House. I rise reluctantly to oppose House Bill 329. For reasons, really of fiscal policy. Everyone in this House understands the difficult situation facing the State of Illinois this year...in putting together a budget. We're carrying over a number of Bills from the FY 91 fiscal year as we struggle together the FY 92 budget. In addition to which the revenues, in fact, just last month, during the month of March, were less than what we projected. The proposal here, while well—intentioned, would in fact impose a substantial cost upon the Department of Aging. In fact,

the Department estimates that the program would cost \$35,000. That, in addition to a cost that is impossible to estimate in terms of the 13 area agencies on aging who would be responsible for administering this program at the

Department does, indeed, support

Speaker McPike: "And on the Bill, Representative Hultgren."

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

45th Legislative Day

May 7, 1991

intergenerational programming, especially those that would provide additional income for senior citizens and so the Sponsor is to be commended, I think, for his idea. But, the Department and the aging network here in Illinois, have to set priorities within the constraints of the budget for programs based upon need. And the Department does not consider this particular initiative to be one of those priorities and therefore would ask that you take these matters into consideration, particularly the matter of the fiscal impact as you cast your vote on House Bill 329."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. commend Representative McAfee for presenting a Bill of this nature as his first Bill. I noticed the last speaker in opposition, rose and said that he had reluctantly. Because the fact of the matter is this is a good program and in those states where they have instituted this as a model program, they have found that senior citizens are very good at day care with young children. So, the fact that this is a mere cost of \$36,000, I don't think anybody has tried to determine the cost benefit ratio. This has got to be a benefit where we have seniors who may be in need of additional income that they be used day care to handle young Usually, children. Representative McAfee, on someone's first Bill, I do rise and joke around a little bit to make it a little more difficult and they get a little training in their first Bill, but this Bill is too important for that, and I would commend Representative McAfee and ask that, particularly on this side of the aisle, all join in a green light for him on his first Bill. And I think that others on the other side of the aisle will find that for that little amount that we can benefit from...from the Bill, the cost

45th Legislative Day

May 7, 1991

that much, that you will find that we as taxpayers benefit from it, and I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Bruce Richmond."

Richmond: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I also rise in support of this very fine Bill, and I do compliment Representative McAfee for bringing it before us. I heard it in Committee, I think it's an excellent idea. We're serving two very worthwhile issues here by supporting this Bill. The very young and the very old, and I think the measure of our society is how we treat both of those two categories of our population, and certainly I would urge that we all support this Bill, House Bill 329. Thank you."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Ryder."

Rvder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. When are we going to learn? When are we going to finally wake up and discover that the State of Illinois has budgetary problems? Now, this fine idea, and I complement the Speaker or the Sponsor for a good idea. It was a good idea last year when Mary Flowers sponsored it, and it didn't get out of the Senate. But I rise in objection to one of the previous speakers who spoke in favor of it, to say it's only going to cost a mere \$35,000 or whatever the figure is. It's that kind of logic that's got us in the deep hole that we're in now. \$35,000 is not the most expensive project that we're going to see, but it does' cost money. Money that we don't spend. I'm reluctant to oppose because it's a good idea, and it's a good Sponsor. But, folks, until we understand that we've got to pay the money that these programs cost, we're going to continue to have the druggist tell us they haven't been paid for five months. nursing homes tell us they haven't been paid for five months. That's the kind of attitude that we want to

45th Legislative Day

May 7, 1991

and if we want to see green lights on the other side of the aisle, then you tell us where you're going to get the money because it just isn't there."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Weaver."

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

McAfee: "Yes."

Weaver: "Representative, our analysis seems to indicate that some of the cost involved with this program will be passed on to the local areas on aging. Are you aware of that?"

McAfee: "Mr. Weaver, I'm aware that during the Committee when we had a 17 to 1 one vote that same question was asked, there was no answer given to as how it was going to be done. I may also point out to you that the early referral will be done through DCFS. So, a lot of the funding and a lot of the referral network has already set up within DCFS presently, not with the area agencies on aging."

Weaver: "Is there a line item increase in DCFS budget to take care of this?"

McAfee: "The first fiscal note that was prepared by DCFS also indicated that there would be a slight increase. However, as of this morning, when I met with Miss Susan Powell, in charge of Children and Family Services, her Department, she indicated to me that the network and the facilities were already set up which would not require any further increase."

Weaver: "Thank you much. Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. I think it's probably a good idea, and I think if the budgetary crunch wasn't as bad as it is currently, I would probably support this. But our analysis indicates that this is going to impact the local area aging councils, which under our current budgetary recommendations, are already taking a severe hit because of a cut back in DFI and Title 20 money.

45th Legislative Day

May 7, 1991

So, we're taking some local area senior groups that are already strapped for funds and passing on some additional expenses to them. In a better year this is a great program, and I would have no problems with supporting it, but as the previous speaker mentioned, we simply don't have the money at this time, and I think we need to shelve the Bill until we do."

Speaker McPike: "Representative DeJaegher."

DeJaegher: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. All of a sudden I can't understand why we're concerned about this alarming cost of \$38,000. This Bill was heard in the Aging Committee, the There was 17 'yes' votes 1 'negative' Aging Committee. So, by and large, those that were setting in on that committee today thought there was substance to this Bill. What we're doing is primarily addressing ourselves to the needs of two important segments, the minor and the senior citizen. It goes without saying, if you visit a senior person in their home oftentimes these people are looking for something to do. They make excellent care givers. It gives them an opportunity. It's a voluntary system, and basically, we have the referral system in place. the money that basically some of these things that we're about is completely misleading. talking We have an opportunity to make life just a little bit better, not only for the senior, but for the child itself, and let's forget about this \$38,000, if that cost is going to be placed upon us and vote accordingly on this Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Satterthwaite."

Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I know that this is a tight budget year and that all of us are quite concerned about not adding to the reponsibilities of any of our state or local agencies. However, I would indicate to the Members of the House that there are already

45th Legislative Day

May 7, 1991

funds for training senior citizens who need employment, and it would seem to me that the Department of Aging and the Department of Children and Family Services would be in a good position to try to implement this program through some of those funds that are already available to our community agencies. It is a needed program. As we all know, we having a great deal of pressure in our communities to provide for additional child care because those needs are so great. This is a proposition that can serve two purposes: one for the adequate care for young children and another for employment for seniors who need the additional income. I believe that the Gentleman has a good idea, I think that our agencies are in the position to be able to funds that are already available for senior employment to help to implement this. And I would urge the Members to support the Bill before us."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Homer."

Homer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Certainly, both sides would have to agree that there is a shortage in child care personnel. I notice one of the Members on the other side has a Bill to help address that critical shortage by enlarging the ratio of number of children that can be supervised by one That, I would submit, is an irresponsible method of addressing a problem that exists where we have children in need of care and too few funds and too few instructors to care for them. Here we have an opportunity to marry that problem with a logical solution where you have seniors who wish be productive, who are looking for to opportunities for employment, to volunteer, to engage in child care. Who has better expertise and experience than those same individuals who have probably raised their families and have had grandchildren to supervise? This Bill would set aside a program that would cost \$35,000. On

45th Legislative Day

May 7, 1991

a State budget of \$26 billion that's not a spit in the bucket. It's not the fine print on one of those lucrative contracts that go to ex-Cabinet officials, it's not even something that we ought to be debating here, it makes sense, it's a good program for children, it's a good program for seniors and to lambaste it on the idea that it's a budget breaker, is absolutely absurd. I hope that we join the Gentleman, and it is his first Bill, if you start out red, I just hope you end up on the right vote which is green."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Parke."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Parke: House. The previous speaker's attitude is the attitude that we tend to have when we have a lot of money in the bank, but his attitude is just mind-boggling when you look the amount of debt that this state has. Yes, it's \$35,000 this Bill, and \$50,000 for the next Bill and merely \$100,000 for the next Bill. What's wrong with this House? It's not the Bill we talking about, it's the concept we're talking about. This State does not have money, and you to constantly spend money. What the hell is wrong with us? It's time for us to start facing reality. W۵ don't have money. When are we going to start realizing that as a Body andstop nickel and diming this State? nursing homes can't pay their bills, when hospitals can't pay their bills, you're going to stand up and say it's only \$35,000. It doesn't have anything to do with the Sponsor. It doesn't have anything to do with the Bill. matter of concepts. I'm sick and tired of this Body saying it's 'only \$35,000, \$50,000 or standing and \$100,000.' When are we going to face reality, that it's time that we start cutting programs and it's time for us to start realizing we're broke? What Bills, what tax Bills

45th Legislative Day

May 7, 1991

are you going to sponsor to increase the taxes? What tax Bills? The previous speaker said it's only \$35. Well, I want to see you stand up and sponsor a tax Bill to pay for this nickel and diming that we're doing to this State. It's time for us to face reality. We don't have the money for these Bills. We should vote 'no'."

- Speaker McPike: "Representative Mautino moves the previous question. The question is, 'Shall the previous question be put?' All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The previous question is put. Representative McAfee to close. Representative Laurino in the Chair."
- McAfee: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We've heard a lot of rhetoric about costs and dollars, but we've forgotten one very important thing. We're sent here to deal with children as well as older people. This Bill takes care of both those situations and when we talk about costs, let's talk about the costs of 42% turnover in child care employees. That's a larger cost than \$35,000, a cost that you want to akin is maybe akin to one bureaucrat. I urge your favorable passage on this Bill, one that does everything for child care, for seniors and for children. Thank you."
- Speaker Laurino: "Representative McAfee moves for the adoption of House Bill 329. All those in favor indicate by voting 'aye', opposed 'nay'. The board is open. Representative Wennlund, for what reason do you rise?"
- Wennlund: "To explain my vote, Mr. Speaker. Just to remind the Members of the House, the Department of Children and Family Services has had this program in place for the last two years and none of the other local area councils on aging have taken advantage of it. And that is why the Department of Aging and the Department of Child and Family Services are opposed to the Bill. It is duplicative of existing programs that nobody has taken advantage of. The 'no' vote

45th Legislative Day

May 7, 1991

is the proper vote."

Speaker Laurino: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, This Bill having received 70 'aye', 30 'nay', 8 voting 'present', having received the Constitutional requirement is hereby declared passed. Page 31 in the Calendar appears House Bill 426. Does Representative White have leave of the House? Attendance Roll Call to have this Bill heard today on Third Reading. The Sponsor moves that the Bill be heard on Third Reading, using the Attendance Roll Call. Representative White. You object? Representative Black objects. So, we'll leave the Bill as it stands. House Bill 1160, Representative Richmond. House Bill 1195, Representative McGann. the record. Out of the record. House Bill 1644, Shirley Jones. the record. House Bill 1797, Representative Levin. Representative Levin. House Bill 1797. Read the Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1797, a Bill for an Act to amend the
Illinois Public Aid Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Laurino: "Representative Levin."

Levin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of This is one of the very few Bills that will, from day one, save the State of Illinois a substantial amount of money. This particular concept is currently in effect in states of Connecticut, Maryland, Michigan, Minnesota, Washington State and California and is also eligible for federal reimbursement under the Ryan White Care Act. Simply put, what this legislation does is it authorizes the departmentto pay for the insurance premiums of persons with AIDS, under the Cobra program. Rather those than individuals going on Public Aid and the State having to pick up an average cost of \$1 to \$2500 a month, the cost to

45th Legislative Day

May 7, 1991

the State, of picking up the insurance premiums is much, much less. In the states where it has been in effect it has saved many millions of dollars. It is, does provide for eligibility for reimbursement under the federal law and I have the analysis of both the Department of Public Aid and the Department of Public Health, and everybody thinks that this is a good idea. I simply ask for your support for this Bill which will save the State of Illinois between \$5 and \$10 million dollars."

Speaker Laurino: "Further discussion? Representative Pullen."

Pullen: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Sponsor a question."

Speaker Laurino: "He'll yield."

Pullen: "What is the eligibility involved in this? Is there an income...ceiling or floor...is this making anyone who has HIV eligible for the Department of Public Aid to pick up their insurance premium or would it be only those who meet certain income guidelines?"

Levin: "Let me find this."

Pullen: "Don't you know?"

Levin: "I don't know...I don't have a copy right...why don't we take it out of the record for right now and we'll get you an answer."

Pullen: "That's a good idea."

Speaker Laurino: "Further discussion? Seeing none.

Representative Levin to close."

Levin: "No, out of the record."

Speaker Laurino: "Out of the record? House Bill 1797 is out of the Record. House Bill 1804, Representative Levin. Out of the record. House Bill 1854, Representative Granberg. Is Representative Granberg on the floor? Out of the record. House Bill 1930, Representative Wyvetter Younge. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

45th Legislative Day

May 7, 1991

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1930, a Bill for an Act relating to Family Resource Development. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Laurino: "Representative Younge."

Younge: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 1930 would establish a family resource development center and state community college in East St. Louis. A family resource development center would be a center that would teach persons receiving public aid and general assistance how to develop the coping skills to be successful in private gainful employment. is...it would be a center that would teach women who are caught in the cycle of poverty how to rear their children, how to organize their homes and how not to be dependant or reliant upon public aid. The funds to pay for the center and the budget would be about a half million dollars, would come basically from federal programs of which help people to move to private gain for employment. There are new programs having to do with those people receiving food The paraprofessionals that would be trained under stamps. this program would be persons who were formerly receiving public aid, and it would be a center that would be a refuge for women who are now dependant on the state to move to private gainful employment and that, of course, is our goal and our objectives. This is the first part in demonstration in the East St. Louis area that would lead to an economic recovery for the families there, and we choose to start with the households to help them to organize their living arrangements so that we can get on with the business of moving people into self employment and private gainful employment, and I ask for the passage of this Bill."

Speaker Laurino: "Further discussion? Representative Black."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I think the Sponsor of this measure would

# 45th Legislative Day

May 7, 1991

agree with you. We've tried very, most diligently, in the past two weeks to work with her on a number of Bills and Amendments, and we have been pleased that we have been able to do so on many of them. I must, however, rise to object to this Bill and if you will bear with me, let me tell you The Sponsor says that it's to start a demonstration project that only affects East St. Louis, but nowhere the word 'demonstration project' clearly the Bill is illuminated. Let me tell you something else, a while ago some of you scoffed about; 'Well this is only \$35,000, it's only \$35,000 dollars.' Well, I think if you will look at the fiscal note on this Bill this is only about two and a half million dollars and it's for a project, however worthy, however noble the Sponsor's intentions are, it only impacts East St. Louis, it costs in excess of \$2.3 million dollars, money we don't have. money that is not in the Department of Public Aid's budget. Now, at some point, all of you have to ask yourself, how much 'merely money' can we pass out of here? It's been our intent to work with the Sponsor on legislation, we've done so in the last two weeks, but I must rise and ask you to take a look at If it is a demonstration project, it is not clearly stated in the Bill and the cost factor is simply out of the question in this budget year. It is for that reason, not the underlying premise of the Bill, not that at all, but if there is no other reason why I must stand and object to the it is for the price tag of over two million dollars that we do not have in a period of time where we are not paying our Medicaid providers or long-term care providers. Ladies and Gentlemen, we can't afford to play these games any longer. You must, and I respectfully ask you, you have to vote 'no' on a Bill, no matter how well-intentioned, that you simply can't afford."

45th Legislative Day

May 7, 1991

Speaker Laurino: "Further discussion? Seeing none,

Representative Younge to close."

Younge: "Could I take this Bill out of the record?"

Speaker Laurino: "You may. Would you like to do that?"

Younge: "Yes, I will."

Speaker Laurino: "Representative Younge, the Bill will be taken out of the record. Appearing on page 42, House Bill 2160, Representative DeLeo. Representative DeLeo asks leave of the House to have this Bill brought back to Second Reading. All those in favor indicate by saying 'aye', opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. The Bill will be put on Second Reading. Representative DeLeo. Mr. Clerk, are there any Amendments? Representative DeLeo."

DeLeo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Floor Amendment #1. proposed Amendment restores the training requirements for nurses aides and licensed shelter care facilities. Licensed shelter care facilities are the lowest level institutional care. They include nursing homes, which admit elderly and disabled patients. Nurses aides perform personal care tasks such as lifting, caring, bathing and feeding these patients. Because of concern of quality care of nursing homes residents receive as well as the safety of both patients and aides, the City of Chicago, Department of Aging, believes this training requirements should be reinstated. This is an Agreed Amendment. I checked with spokesman, on the Republican side, and I asked that this Amendment be adopted to House Bill 2160."

Speaker Laurino: "Representative, Amendment #1 was adopted in committee."

DeLeo: "This would be Amendment #2. Amendment #1 is the Bill deletes...we don't have it."

Speaker Laurino: "I don't believe the Amendment has been presented to the Clerk or distributed yet."

45th Legislative Day

May 7, 1991

DeLeo: "Can we take this out of the record, and we will find out what happened to this Amendment?"

Speaker Laurino: "House Bill 2160 will be taken out of the record. Representative DeLeo, would you come to the well, please? Quickly. House Bill 2163, Representative McGann. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2163."

Speaker Laurino: "2162, Representative. My glasses are not reading well."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2162, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Act on Aging. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Laurino: "Representative McGann."

McGann: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the Assembly.

House Bill 2162, as amended, amends the Illinois Act on Aging. It makes technical corrections. It adds that home delivered meals provided to eligible individuals by an area agency shall be deemed a necessary preventative service. And, we replaced on Amendment #2, 'area agency' with the nutrition...through a nutrition provider, funded by an area agency on aging'. That's what Amendment #2 does. This passed out of committee with 21 'ayes', 1 'present', placed on the Short Debate Calendar. I would ask support of House Bill 2162 and answer any questions. I would say that the Amendments came from the Department of Aging, so they are supportive of House Bill 2162. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Laurino: "Any discussion? Representative Pullen."

Pullen: "I'd like to ask the Sponsor a question or two please?"

Speaker Laurino: "He seems, that he agrees to answer your question."

Pullen: "Does the Bill still define 'home-delivered meals' as a 'necessary preventive service'?"

McGann: "Yes, it does."

Pullen: "And what is the implication, the legal implication or

45th Legislative Day

- May 7, 1991
- the fiscal implication of defining it as a 'necessary preventive service'?"
- McGann: "Because, it originally, in the Act itself, did not clearly define the home delivered meals and, therefore, in order to correct that we placed it in that it would be deemed a 'necessary preventive service' and it is truly nutrition provided...funded by an area agency on aging."
- Pullen: "What is the legal or fiscal implication of the term 'necessary' being put into law?"
- McGann: "To my knowledge, there has been no question at all as far as what the cost is because this is an ongoing program that's been going on, and it is just to correct it to make sure that it is very specific on those who would be eligible to have it."
- Pullen: "Does putting the term 'necessary preventive service',
  into law, with respect to home-delivered meals, remove any
  descretion from the General Assembly on appropriating money
  for this purpose?"
- McGann: "I didn't get that deep into it, Representative. I don't think that it would. It would still have to go through the appropriation process. If there are dollars available, there are dollars available. I would think that that would be it."

Pullen: "Does it have..."

McGann: "This would never...no question came up about this area that you're moving into at this time."

Pullen: "Does it have the effect of making this program an entitlement?"

McGann: "It would be an entitlement, I'm sure, to those that are deemed eligible. Yes."

Pullen: "Well."

McGann: "Such as it has been. It has been in this area."

Pullen: "To clarify my question. An entitlement would be a

# 45th Legislative Day

May 7, 1991

program where eligible people are entitled to it whether or not the money has been appropriated and would be able to claim it from the State. Is that what you mean this to become?"

- McGann: "Would you...Mr. Speaker, I didn't actually hear the question. Would you mind repeating the question, please?"
- Pullen: "An entitlement program, if this were to be making it an entitlement program...if this were to make it an entitlement program, it would mean that people who are eligible would be able to claim this benefit from the State even if no funds were appropriated. Is that your intention?"
- McGann: "Well, I don't know how else I can say it, but this has been going on for a number of years, and it has been an entitlement, and I believe that the funds on an annual basis would have to be appropriated, so that the providers could take care of these 'meals on wheels,' so to speak."
- Pullen: "Would eligible recipients have claim on the State if those were not appropriated?"
- McGann: "I don't know. I'm not a lawyer. I don't know what to answer that as far as we go down the road. We'd have to take another look at that as far as legal ramifications, everything is a legal ramification in this State, as far as anything that comes out of the General Assembly."
- Pullen: "Yes, it certainly is. Mr. Speaker, may I address the Bill, please? Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I certainly symphathize with the Gentleman's concern for home-delivered meals and for the recipients. In fact, I've delivered those meals, myself, when I have the opportunity to be home long enough to meet my place in the schedule. But I'm concerned about what the whole purpose is of this Bill. If this program has been going on already, it does not add home delivered meals as a state

45th Legislative Day

May 7, 1991

service, but referring to it as a 'necessary preventive service' implies to me that it is something...that this Bill is actually, would actually have the effect, whatever its intent that this Bill would actually have the effect of tying the Legislature's hands with respect to whether this particular program will go on or not, and I would, in the context of the state's current budget situation, when we need all the flexibility we can get in substantive law, I would urge a 'present' vote on this. Thank you."

- Speaker Laurino: "Further discussion? The Chair recognizes

  Representative Bügielski. For what reason do you rise,

  Representative?"
- Bugielski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just as a point of information, I wanted to make recognition of a group that's up in the balcony today, the Community Bankers Association of Illinois along with their President, Bill Williams, and I just wanted to welcome them here to Springfield."
- Speaker Laurino: "We'll recognize them, Representative Bugs.

  Thank you. Representative McGann, I see no further..."

McGann: "I would like to close."

- Speaker Laurino: "I was going to recognize you for that purpose, Sir."
- McGann: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the Assembly. The previous questioneer, in her questions that were never asked in Committee, were asked here today. I have some answers for her and other Members, so that we do not have to put 'present' votes on this Bill. This is from the Department of Aging. The Bill appears to be as amended. As amended...appears to approximate budget neutrality. This assumes that a community care program eligibility criteria would be used to determine eligibility for this fine group. Our best estimate is that these groups are about equal, so that any savings would be offset by any

45th Legislative Day

May 7, 1991

other cost. This is a clarification of an Act that's been in existence, it is revenue, pardon me, it is cost neutral, as stated by the Department of Aging, and I would suggest that they would be the best agency to ascertain if there was any additional costs. So, I would ask for an 'aye' vote. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members..."

Speaker Laurino: "Representative McGann moves for the adoption or passage of House Bill 2162. All those in favor indicate by voting 'aye', opposed vote 'nay'. The board is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. This Bill having received 103 'ayes', 1 voting 'no', 4 voting 'present'. Having received the required Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2227, Representative White. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2227, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Public Aid Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Laurino: "Representative White."

White: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House
Bill 2227 is a committee Bill that encompasses a lot of the
provisions that was asked for by many of the Members, such
as Representative Kubik, Representative Davis.
Representative LeFlore, Representative Mautino,
Representative Williams. It's a simple Bill. There should
not be any opposition to it, and I move for its adoption."

Speaker Laurino: "Is there any discussion? I see none.

Representative White moves for passage of House Bill 2227.

All those in favor indicate by voting 'aye', opposed vote 'nay'. The board is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take a record Mr. Clerk. This Bill having received 109 'ayes', 0 'nay' and 0 voting 'present'. Having received the required Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House

45th Legislative Day

May 7, 1991

Bill 2292, Representative Giorgi. Out of the record. House Bill 2452, Representative Currie. Out of the Record. House Bill 2464, Representative Walsh. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 2464, a Bill for an Act to establishing an adult day services. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Laurino: "Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "Mr. Speaker and Members. This Bill creates the Adult Day Services Resource Development Project Act. It requires the Department of Aging to contract with a private nonprofit organization for implementation of an adult day care demonstration project. It requires that the project's funding include both state and private or other public moneys as repealed or sunsets January 1, 1997. I'll be glad to answer the questions."

Speaker Laurino: "Further discussion? Representative Wennlund."
Wennlund: "Now neutral."

Speaker Laurino: "Representative Wennlund."

Wennlund: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the This is another good idea, and it's certainly a necessity to help create adult day care services in Illinois, but, here again, we talked about a \$35,000 project. Then it went to a two and a half million dollar project, and now we've got another \$100,000 project and pretty soon we start talking about serious money here. a year when \$660,000,000 in Bills will go unpaid. This is not the time to implement new programs that this State cannot afford. This is not the time, in Illinois, to implement new programs when we can't pay health care providers who provide care for senior citizens in Illinois, who provide care for the indigent. They are going to go unpaid. Pretty soon they're not going to be treated Those services won't be available to the senior anymore.

45th Legislative Day

May 7, 1991

citizens, to the indigent, to the poor, to those on public aid. Because we have burdened the State of Illinois and the future generations in Illinois with a mounting debt that we cannot afford to pay and nobody is willing to increase taxes to provide these programs. Another program we simply cannot afford. It's a wonderful idea and there are many wonderful ideas in this General Assembly, but we've got to draw the line someplace and stop spending in Illinois. Unfortunately, this good idea...I ask my collegues in this House to vote 'no' because we cannot afford it."

Speaker Laurino: "Further discussion? Representative Ropp."

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

Speaker Laurino: "Indicates he will."

Ropp: "Representative, this is an issue that I'm sure you're very much interested in, as we all are, according to our analysis, this is to be a demonstration project. Is that correct?"

Walsh: "That is correct."

Ropp: "Okay, usually when you have a demonstration project, you attempt to find out something new as to whether or not it will work or not. You attempt to change the course of the norm and to venture off into a new horizon. This program in my own district is already going. It's working, it's successful. There is no need for a pilot program, it works."

Walsh: "Well, the point of this whole Bill is to expand the program. Right now we're suffering from a process where we're going to see in the future a greater number of people fall into this age group, and if we're not attempting, with some programs such as this pilot program, to create new areas, to go into new territory, to find new ideas, we're going to stagnate. What we need to do here and what we're

45th Legislative Day

May 7, 1991

trying to do here is find new avenues, involve private business in the process, and that's one of the points that this private program, this pilot program does. It attempts to involve business in this process."

Ropp: "Yes, but pilot programs are new and innovative and something...this program is already working, it's a good program, its successful, it is providing opportunities for many adult seniors who are needing assistance and this works. This program, as you're indicating, really isn't a pilot program, in my judgment or some of the rest of us, it's really of an...expansion of presumably a need, and it's not really a pilot program which would cause some to maybe support it more for the pilot program versus just an expansion of maybe a needed program that we really at this time can't afford. Thank you."

Speaker Laurino: "Further discussion? Representative Hultgren,
Pedersen."

Pedersen: "Will the Sponsor yield?

Walsh: "Yes."

Pedersen: "Representative, what is the intent of this program?

Are we talking about helping the people who are really poor and have to be subsidized so that they can afford to put a parent in a day care center site or is it just kind of across the board thing? Anybody that's handy?"

Walsh: "It's basically across the board, but the point is what we're seeing here is an attempt to do what has been done in the child care area, where we have points of interest in relationship to the individual who is presently doing this now in a home. Be it a daughter, who would be a wife of a homemaker and presently going out seeking employment is unable to then care for this homebound parent. What this point is is to be able to work this program into a degree where industry and business will become involved in it the

- 45th Legislative Day May 7, 1991 same way that they are involved with the day care system today."
- Pedersen: "But there's nothing to prevent business from doing this on their own now, is there? I mean, it's a free country, they don't have to have a government program."
- Walsh: "No, they certainly don't, but what this is is a program to stimulate the whole process, and it's a pilot program, it sunsets in '97, all we're trying to do is get it off the ground, get it operational, as a program pilot, so can be patterned then, co there can be other programs patterened from this. That's the whole objective."
- Pederson: "Well, we are talking about a form of subsidy though, are we not?"
- Walsh: "Well, no it isn't entirely a subsidy, you're talking about a match. We're talking about a match here."
- Pederson: "To the bell, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I mean what we're really talking about here is another area where we kind of try to help by people giving them federal...or state money, that people are always looking for someone to help pay their bills. I think it has already been said that we have these kind of adult day care centers all over the state now, some of them survive, some of them do not. But to get the government into it, which really is in the long run what really we're talking about, is another government subsidy, so that, you know, some people will benefit at the expense of somebody else. There's no limitation here for hardship or, you know, the poor, just another handout, so I would recommend that we vote 'no' on this Bill."

Speaker Laurino: "Further discussion? Representative Hultgren."
Hultgren: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor.yield?"
Speaker Laurino: "Indicates he will."

Hultgren: "Representative Walsh, let me take you back, if I can,

45th Legislative Day

May 7, 1991

a couple of weeks to when this Bill was heard in the Aging Committee and you'll recall at that time, I had some you. In fact, the questions that I for questions addressed, I think both to you and to the representative of the Department who was testifying at the same time, and at that time I indicated that, I think, I still had some doubts in my mind based upon your explanation and let me, if I can, renew that line of questioning now. You intend, with this legislation, to expand the availability of adult That's, I believe, a correct summary of your day care. testimony in the Committee and your explanation today. Is that right?"

Walsh: "That is correct."

Hultgren: "Now, at that same time Jean Blazer, who was testifying for the Department, and I hope I don't misstate, indicated that the Department, too, wanted to insure that there was ample day care, but in fact the Department was funding all of those who apply and qualified. Is that a fair summary of her statements at that time?"

Walsh: "That is, certainly is."

Hultgren: "Now, how are you with this legislation going to expand day care opportunities for senior citizens beyond what is already being done by the Department?"

Walsh: "Well, that basically is the definition here. It's a pilot project. What we're doing is we're going to establish, it drawn out according to the guidelines of this Bill, to expand the program to make it available across all segments of the population so..."

Hultgren: "Do you understand the Department already has a program, in fact, they have requested five million dollars in this year's budget to operate that continuing program.

How is this pilot project going to expand beyond the project that the Department already runs? How is it going

45th Legislative Day

May 7, 1991

to add additional day care slots anywhere in the State of Illinois?"

- Walsh: "Well, I think if you'll review their program, their's is very targeted. This is over a great expanse. We're not trying to target this program to any specific sector as far as the aid that's going to be given here is concerned and again the moneys are strictly to develop. Once it's developed, then, eventually, it's going to move on its own."
- Hultgren: "Are you proposing that the cost of this program, a \$100,000 be in lieu of the...at least in partially in lieu of the five million dollars the Department has requested?"
  Walsh: "No."
- Hultgren: "So, in other words, are we going to be substituting day care slots in your pilot program for day care slots that are already provided in the Department's program?"
- Walsh: "This is...this is a figure that was arrived at through the Department as far as what they had anticipated that this type of project would cost. We're not trying to substitute anything."
- Hultgren: "So, it'll be in addition to the five million dollars the Department is already been spending?"

Walsh: "That's correct."

Hultgren: "Well, Mr. Speaker to the Bill. The Sponsor has quite candidly said that the \$100,000 cost of this program will be in addition to the five million dollars the Department has requested in the Governor's budget for adult day care in the State of Illinois this year. I think that we can say the same thing about this \$100,000 as we said about the prior million and a half dollars as we said about the prior \$35,000, certainly all of us here, on both sides of the aisle, Republicans, Democrats, conservatives and liberals, would like to expand the elder care opportunities in the

45th Legislative Day

May 7, 1991

State of Illinois, but we're already spending five million dollars. This is an additional \$100,000 and someplace, sometime, we need to face that the fiscal realities that confront the State of Illinois as we put together our FY 92 budget. As one of the speakers said earlier this afternoon, 'We're broke,' and this program isn't going to help. Thank you."

Speaker Laurino: "Further discussion? Seeing none, the Chair recognizes Representative Walsh to close."

Walsh: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. When this Bill left committee, we left with a '14' to '0' vote, and we did have 5 'presents'. So we had people who were there in that committee who were interested in seeing this developed also. And this is a program as I mentioned before, that will sunset in '97, and as far as the funding concept is concerned what we're attempting to do here is utilize one dollar of state money for each two dollars of private or other public moneys. And, again I would like to remind everyone that this is project of course is stated right in the Bill that it shall be funded through the state budget subject to the availability of funds. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

noSpeaker Laurino: "Representative Walsh moves for the adoption of...or passage of House Bill 2464. All those in favor will indicate by voting 'aye', those opposed will vote 'nay'. The board is open. Representative Black, to explain your vote."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I have an adult day care center two and a half blocks from my district office.

If you've never been in one, I would urge that you vote 'present'. If you've never been in an adult day care center, then vote 'present'. This lady has spent 18 months of her life trying to get this established and those of us

45th Legislative Day

May 7, 1991

in state government have made it virtually impossible for her to do the job she wants to do. If you add another layer of government, you aren't going to solve this problem, you're simply going to make it worse. I ask go back home and visit an adult day care center and see Their problems are caused by what their problems are. overlapping of government regulatory agencies. Believe me, there six times. She runs a tremendous I've been operation. We need that operation. In all due respect to the Sponsor, he isn't going to help the situation by adding yet another layer of government. You're going to drive more people out of this business, not attract more people If you've never seen one, then at least vote 'present'. Let those people out there do their let's stop throwing opstacles in the form of more and more government in their way."

Speaker Laurino: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. Mr. This Bill having received 65 'aye', 19 'no' and Clerk. voting 'present'. Having received the required '25' Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Bill 2466, Representative Rotello. Out of the record, Mr. Clerk. House Bill 2508, Representative Curran. record, Mr. Clerk. We'll now proceed to Constitutional Officers, Third Reading. Appearing on page 30. House Bill Representative McNamara. Representative Munizzi, do you have something that you would like to discuss with the Representative McNamara on the floor? Out of the Chair? 1564, Representative record. House Bill Preston. Representative Preston? Out of the record. House Bill 1948, Representative Keane. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1948, a Bill for an Act to amend the Cemetery Care Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

45th Legislative Day

May 7, 1991

- Speaker Laurino: "Representative Keane."
- Keane: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Could I ask leave to bring the Bill back to Second Reading for an Amendment?"
- Speaker Laurino: "The Gentleman asks leave of the House to bring
  House Bill 1948 back to Second Reading for the purposes of
  Amendment. Does he have leave? All those indicate by
  saying 'aye', opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. Leave is
  granted. It will be put on Second Reading, Representative.
  Floor Amendment #1 is being offered by Representative
  Keane. Representative Keane."
- Keane: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Floor Amendment #1 deletes out the smaller cemeteries from the provisions of the Bill and I would move for its adoption."
- Speaker Laurino: "Any discussion? Seeing none, Representative
  Keane moves for the adoption of Amendment #1 to House Bill
  1948. All those in favor indicate by saying 'aye',
  opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment is
  adopted. Further Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Laurino: "Third Reading."
- Keane: "Mr. Speaker, I would ask leave to have the Bill heard on Third."
- Speaker Laurino: "The Gentleman asks leave for this Bill being heard on Third Reading. Does he have leave? All those in favor indicate by saying 'aye', opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. The Bill will be heard on Third Reading, Representative. Proceed."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1948, a Bill for an Act to amend the Cemetery Care Act. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Keane: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Bill increases the fees the Comptroller charges for auditing cemetery care funds. This is the first time...these fees have been increased in a great amount of time...a great deal of time. It's an audit

# 45th Legislative Day

May 7, 1991

commission Bill. It still does not cover the full cost of the Comptroller's audits, but it helps to alleviate some of the cost to the State. The Amendment we just adopted reduced, knocked out, smaller cemeteries that could not afford it. I would ask for a favorable Roll Call."

- Speaker Laurino: "Any discussion? Seeing none, the Gentleman asks for...Representative Tenhouse."
- Tenhouse: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the General
  Assembly. I just would like to concur and thank
  Representative Keane for his cooperation. I was one of the
  'present' votes in committee. I would urge that everyone
  support this Bill on Third Reading."
- Speaker Laurino: "Representative Keane moves for the adoption of House Bill 1948. All those in favor will indicate by voting 'aye', those opposed will vote 'no'. The board is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. For what reason do you arise, Representative Parke?"
- Parke: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I thought perhaps there might be some interest in letting you know, that from my district area, the Humana Senior Citizens are up in the gallery, I just wanted to welcome them all."
- Speaker Laurino: "This Bill having received 106 'ayes', 0 voting 'no' and 0 voting 'present', having received the required Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2417, Representative Keane. Out of the record. House Bill 204 on page 5, Agriculture and Environment. Out of the record. We will proceed to page 41 under Banking, Third Reading. House Bill 1911, Representative Capparelli."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1911, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Banking Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

45th Legislative Day

May 7, 1991

Speaker Laurino: "Representative Capparelli."

- Capparelli: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 1911 amends the Illinois Banking Act to allow the board of directors of a bank by unanimous consent to transact business by telephone conversation or tele conference. It permits the board members who would otherwise be unable to participate in meeting to do so without the loss of interaction among board members in the deliberation on any matters considered. I would...it was voted this one out by 14 to 0, I don't think there is any problems. I ask for a favorable RollCall."
- Laurino: "Further discussion? Seeing Speaker none, Representative Capparelli moves for the adoption of House Bill 1911. All those in favor indicate by saying all those opposed vote 'nay'. The board is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. This Bill having received 105 'ayes', 0 voting 'nay' and 2 voting 'present'. Having received the required Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2135, Representative Santiago. Representative Santiago. Out of the record. Representative Keane in the Chair."
- Speaker Keane: "Economic Development, Third Reading.

  Representative Steczo, House Bill 119. Mr. Clerk, read the
  Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 119, a Bill for an Act to amend the Civil Administrative Code. Third Reading of the Bill. Representative Steczo."
- Steczo: "Mr. Speaker, I'd ask leave to bring House Bill 119 back to the Order of Second Reading for the purposes of an Amendment."
- Speaker Keane: "The Gentleman asks leave. Is there leave? Leave being granted, the Bill is on Second Reading."

45th Legislative Day

- May 7, 1991
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #4 is being offered by Representative Harris."
- Speaker Keane: "Representative Steczo, do you wish to handle that Amendment?"
- Steczo: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, thank you. I had agreed with Representative Harris that the Amendment would be adopted.

  The Amendment itself limits the loans that are...for which people are eligible under this Bill to businesses employing two or more people, and I would move for its adoption."
- Speaker Keane: "The Gentleman asks leave...adoption of Amendment #4. Is there leave? All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and Amendment #4 is adopted.

  Any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #5, offered by Representative Dave Harris."
- Speaker Keane: "The leave for Representative Steczo to handle the

  Amendment leave and Representative Steczo. On Amendment 
  #5."
- Steczo: "Mr. Speaker, I am not familiar with what Amendment #5 does, and Mr. Harris is not on the floor. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Harris is not on the floor, and I have not seen Amendment #5."
- Speaker Keane: "We can take the Bill out of the record until..."

  Steczo: "No. Just table the Amendment and if needs to be changed, if it needs to be changed we'll change it in the Senate. Oh, no, I'll...I've...Mr. Harris spoke to me about this and I will...I will accept this Amendment, Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker Keane: "Representative Steczo moves the adoption of Amendment #5. Representative Black. Representative Black, for what purpose do you rise? All those in favor say 'aye', all opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Amendment #5 is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

45th Legislative Day

May 7, 1991

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Keane: "Third Reading. The Gentleman asks leave to hear the Bill on Third Reading. Is there leave? Leave being granted. Representative Steczo."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 119, a Bill for an Act to amend the Civil Administrative Code of Illinois. Third Reading of the Bill."

Steczo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. House Bill 119 had its genesis last October, when then-Lieutenent Governor Ryan, held a business roundtable in the 78th District and among the discussions we had that day, were small business owners who came to the roundtable and said, 'You know, we have a problem, and that problem is, we would need funds, we're trying to find loans, especially in minority and female business area. We have problems with We've been in collateral because we're small business. business for a number of years, we're making a little bit of money, but because we simply don't have the ready collateral available, the banks are saying 'no'. They are not allowing us any money or any consideration for the blood, the sweat and the tears that we provide getting our businesses off the ground and in attempting to try to make them successful.' So, what House Bill 119 does, Speaker, is to establish a pilot program where loans can be made to minority and female owned business, to businesses where credit is not otherwise available, not to \$25,000 and for a business that has been in operation for least three years to be able to get loans consideration for loans, depending on whatever rules and regulations the Department of Commerce and Community Affairs would establish with no collateral. By taking into consideration, the history and their business practices et cetera, et cetera. Mr. Harris has recommended a couple

45th Legislative Day

May 7, 1991

loans that said that the loans...the couple Amendments that say loans shall be made to...to business as employing two or more people, and he suggests that the loans shall apply only to the acquisitian of durable goods or structural improvements. I think those are great...great Amendments. Let's try to tie this thing together and, Mr. Speaker, it is a good Bill. It makes people feel that their time and their effort, blood, sweat and tears are worth something, and I would move for passage of House Bill 119. I would be willing to answer any questions the Members might have."

Speaker Keane: "Any discussion? Representative Ropp."

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

Speaker Keane: "He indicates he will."

Ropp: "Representative, isn't this kind of a mini situation that we have seen a on larger scale in the United States as the result of the collapse of many savings and loans?"

Steczo: "Representative Ropp, I don't think so. No."

Ropp: "Well, didn't most of those establish credit without any collateral?"

Steczo: "Oh, perhaps in the case of large corporations that have been worth billions and billions of dollars. What we're saying here is that there are small business people who have worked, that have been in business for at least three years, so they have a business track record to deal with, they've sunk their blood, sweat and tears into a business. trying to expand it...the Amendments call for an expansion of the business and in some cases they simply get consideration because they have no ready. can't The maximum allowed in the loans is \$25,000. collateral. Now I was talking to DCCA. DCCA said, 'Well, there have problems, there's some questions about been some non-collateralized loans.' My response to DCCA is, 'These people, the limited number that there would be, would

45th Legislative Day

May 7, 1991

probably be a better risk to DCCA than many of the new business start-ups that have no experience."

Ropp: "Well, it certainly would be a small amount of is not that much, but it just seems as if there wouldn't be a banker alive that would expect to stay in business very long if he gave very many loans out without any collateral of any kind. It seems like we want business practices to occur throughout the state, but we will allow the State to get into very, somewhat unsecure loans, and why would the state want to do that, and I know that we're symphathetic to these people, but why wouldn't a bank be willing to give them credit? That's what they're in the business for, rather than have the State of Illinois be the one to provide the risk collateral at taxpayers expense. It just doesn't make sense even though its a laudable kind of a thing, to let somebody to try to expand their business, but I can't imagine that in this day and age, we would be in a position where we would want to really say to many people who have been in business, maybe only three years, that we will, in fact, give you \$25,000 without any collateral. Amendment would be established that would at least say...if they have been in business three years then put up their business. That would at least be some collateral. Any Then why is it that we don't want banker would say that. the State to do the same thing?"

Steczo: "But, Mr. Ropp, just to answer your question. There are some situations where, you know, evidently people do not have bricks and mortar to be able to put up as collateral. So in those situations, as was pointed out to us, and as was pointed out to the Lieutenant Governor last year, it has just been impossible for them, as good of a risk as they may be, these may be five star, four star individuals

45th Legislative Day

May 7, 1991

who, under most circumstances, would have no problem. me also point out to you that the fact that DCCA is going to be devising the rules and the regulations which suggests that only a small select number and the...best available will even have an opportunity to be considered for this project. I would suggest to you that...if a business has collateral and they go to DCCA for the loan and are making application under this kind of a program, think there is something shady going on. But we have to realize the legitimate interests of some of these business people who wish to expand, you know, who wish to buy durable goods, and who right now cannot do it. suggest, too, that...that no offense to the banking industry, that, you know, sometimes even the best risks don't have a chance to get loans because of some of the criteria that the banks use. Even a person... I won't say it, but...they have, they have, they have, sometimes, really strict guidelines that are rather severe and really restrict people, and we're dealing with a subject matter here that where...where people traditionally have had difficulty getting loans."

Ropp: "Why would you consider putting like a, maybe a, three or four-year pilot study on this kind of a project."

Steczo: "That's what this is. That's what this is."

Ropp: "How many years?"

Steczo: "It's...it's a pilot program."

Ropp: "Well, how long does it go? Does it terminate after three years so we can find out whether or not it's a good pilot?"

Steczo: "No, Representative Ropp, though if that's your wish, I can take care of that in the Senate with no problem. I mean...the...the whole idea here is to try to establish something that would allow some people a chance, allow DCCA to figure out how...you know...how...how well it works,

45th Legislative Day

May 7, 1991

and...I'd be willing to do that in Senate if you would
wish."

Ropp: "Well, I think you ought to have some kind of a...sunset provision on this so that we, as the legislative Body, can take a look at it to see if we've got pretty good compliance, if the no-collateral provisions are working satisfactory, and we're seeing business expand, people becoming employed, and new entrepreneurs being established. I think we ought to be apprised of that, rather than to just have this as somewhat of an endless kind of a program, and I would certainly urge you to do that. Thank you."

Speaker Keane: "Any further discussions? Representative Robert
Olson."

Olson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To this Bill, I don't have any questions of the Sponsor. I think he's answered most of the things that were on mγ mind and...in recent...latest discussion there, but as I understand it, here is a small business who has been in business for three years and they're needing additional capital. they...they have to probably been dealing with a local banker, a local banker provided probably the seed money for this business. He's probably extended other money to this business. But all of a sudden, for some reason, that local banker says, 'This has, this has went too far. We're as...we're as far as we can go with you.' Now, we're going to take and make a loan through DCCA to a local business in a community where the local banker has went the last mile. In the banking industry that would be called a high-risk loan. I've also noted with DCCA as I've introduced constituents to them over the years that they're not the most open armed when it comes to lending money. I think this is a Bill that is not needed. I think it's putting at risk, taxpayers' money, and I would urge a 'no' vote."

45th Legislative Day

May 7, 1991

Speaker Keane: "Any further questions? There being none, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All those in favor 'aye', all opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill 'aye', 35 voting 'no', 70 voting 3 'present', and House Bill 119, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 570, Representative Giglio. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 570, a Bill for an Act in relationship to critical trends and alternative futures. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Keane: "Representative Giglio."

you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies, and Gentlemen of the Giglio: "Thank House. What this Bill does is creates the Critical Trends Assessment Act, and it sets up a department that looks into the future as to what alternatives and what direction the State of Illinois is going. This is an advisory There's members appointed by each leader and commission. by the Governor's Office, and what...what we're doing, like...six other states that have it already and a number of states like New York, Michigan and Ohio are doing the same thing, is they're setting up these commissions and to see exactly which way their state should go, getting the data from all over, and trying to put something forth where the legislative body could do something and prepare the state and the people in the state for what's coming down the line. One thing about this Bill is that we opened it up where we could accept volunteer contributions from different foundations whereby if they were real interested in a particular area, they would donate the money and our people would do the work. If there's any questions, I'd be

45th Legislative Day

May 7, 1991

happy to answer. There was one Amendment. We took out the word 'political', and that's it. So, if not, I would ask for your favorable support."

Speaker Keane: "Representative Wennlund."

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

Speaker Keane: "He indicates he will."

- Wennlund: "Representative Giglio, what's the, the real purpose behind creating yet another commission in Illinois? What political trends are we, are we looking for, or looking to identify with this Bill?"
- Giglio: "Well, I'll give you one that's...that's affects your area and ours right now is the third regional airport. You talk about that and you talk about a trend for the next ten, 15, 20 years. Wherever that airport goes, especially in my area, the housing, the infrastructure, the schools, and everything else that goes with it, this would be a tremendous job for...for a commission like this to...to...to put whatever they have to put in place to provide for the future, and this is one good example."
- Wennlund: "Well, there's already a commission to study the third airport, and then that's been underway for several years, I...I just don't understand the..the need to create yet another...another commission that eventually is going to need staff. It's going to need money. It's going to need funding to continue to carry on. I, you know, what..what critical trends..."
- Giglio: "Well, Representative Wennlund, let me just say this, you know the good Lord has created certain people with...with certain talents in this world, and there are people out there who work for the universities and who have this...these visions and who know, and they study, and they read, not only about what's going on in our country but about what's going on all over the world, and these people

# 45th Legislative Day

May 7, 1991

are the people that we some...the majority of the time go to and ask for help to see which way trends are going. Just like after World War II in our area, what happened to the City of Chicago? Which way...what's going on now with steel industry in, in our whole state? happening to our state now when we went from manufacturing when those workmen's Ccp and state unemployment comp laws were put into effect? Now we have a service state. I mean, there's people that...that have this vision, that...that do all these readings, that work for the universities, that are on these commissions, and I think it would be a great asset to people like yourself and people in the Senate to work with these people to know what direction we should go as far as legislation."

- Wennlund: "But isn't that what we have the Legislative Research
  Unit for and...and the Economic and Fiscal Commission? I
  mean, we ask the Legislative Research Unit to do research
  on all types of...of critical trends and what...what's
  going on out there in the State of Illinois."
- Giglio: "Well, these people work on a year-to-year basis, and I think it was asked by one of the Representatives in Committee about the Citizen Assembly. There is one that they thought it was a duplication. This goes beyond that. This is not on a year...year basis like these commissions do. This goes on for five or ten years to prepare us for the future, and that's, that's what this Act would do."
- Wennlund: "Thank you. To the Bill. Several years ago this General Assembly made a real wise decision. What it did was it got rid of all the commissions in the State of Illinois that were all duplicative of each other's efforts. They duplicated the efforts of the Legislative Research Unit. They duplicated efforts of the staffs of many universities in Illinois. They saved the taxpayers of

## 45th Legislative Day

May 7, 1991

Illinois when they were eliminated thousands and millions of dollars. Now is not the time, in a crucial budget, year to create yet another commission that's going to need yet another staff, that's going to need more paperwork, and more dollars to do the research, in a year when we cannot afford to pay \$660 million dollars for health services that have been provided to the poor, the indigent, and the senior citizens in Illinois. I understand the Sponsor's purpose, but I think those commissions are already in place. It would completely destroy our policy of years ago to eliminate all the hundreds of commissions that Illinois had and resulted in a great savings to the taxpayers of Illinois. This year is not the year to create yet another commission, and here we go again. You know, we started with \$35,000, then it was \$100,000 for this program, and a half million for this program. Who knows what this one's going to cost. It's bad policy this year to be creating yet another commission and yet another expense for the taxpayers of Illinois. I think it's bad policy, and I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Keane: "Representative Regan."

Regan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. To the Bill. I think that the critical trend that we're addressing here, and it's quite evident, is the fact that we spend too damn much money. This is an additional amount of money, money that's could be used for education, for the seniors, for meals on wheels, and we want to study critical trends. I suggest again the critical trend in Illinois is we spend too much money."

Speaker Keane: "Any further discussion? There being none,
Representative Giglio to close."

Giglio: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I think the people on the other side of the aisle

45th Legislative Day

May 7, 1991

that spoke would think about if this commission was in force perhaps ten years ago, perhaps we wouldn't be in the financial position we are today. I think that if you look at the other states that are concerned, places like Florida that has problems with their...with their senior citizens, with their water, with the ...with the overcrowdedness, this commission would...would be able to look at that, and I think the State of Illinois needs a commission like...like this, and as far as the money, the money can come from the private foundations that are just as concerned about their businesses or their concerns about the environment or what...or whatever...whatever their foundation is for. So I think it's...it's good direction, and if we're going to keep up with the other 50 states in our country and be ahead of those 50 states, I think this is a worthwhile commission. So I would ask for your favorable support."

Speaker Keane: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill there are 58 voting 'aye', 47 voting 'no', 3 voting 'present', and Representative Giglio."

Giglio: "...Postpone Consideration."

Speaker Keane: "Leave for Postpone Consideration. The Bill is on Postpone Consideration. House Bill 875, Representative Obrzur...Representative. House Bill 877, Representative Younge. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 877, a Bill for an Act in relationship to job training. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Keane: "Representative Younge."

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

Speaker Keane: "The Lady asks for leave to return the Bill to the

45th Legislative Day

May 7, 1991

Order of Second Reading for purpose of an Amendment. Is there leave? Leave being granted, this Bill is on Second Reading. Mr. Clerk, are there any Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Wyvetter Younge."

Younge: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Floor Amendment #1 would authorize the Illinois Department of Public Aid to establish in the township in East St. Louis, a...an employment and training program which complies with the requirements of the food stamp and training program for individuals who receive general assistance, and I move for the adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker Keane: "Is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt...' Representative Black."

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

Speaker Keane: "She indicates she will."

Black: "Is the, should the Amendment be on the board? Is this

Floor Amendment #1? Okay. Thank you. Representative, is

this the Amendment that has been worked out with the

Department, I believe even the Governor's people?"

Younge: "Yes."

Black: "Alright. So, in other words...this Amendment really becomes the Bill, is that correct?"

Younge: "That's correct."

Black: "Okay. Thank you."

Younge: "Any further discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt Amendment #1 to House Bill 877?'

All in favor say 'aye', all opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and Amendment #1 is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Keane: "Third Reading. The Lady asks for immediate

45th Legislative Day

May 7, 1991

consideration of House Bill 877. Is there leave? Leave being granted, Representative Younge."

- Younge: "Thank you. As a result of Director Bradley's visit to

  East St. Louis, it was established that there were about
  4,600 people on general assistance, many of whom would be
  working if there could be some cooperation between the
  state and between the township to find gainful employment
  for these people. This Bill's purpose is to set into
  motion a program that would obtain the cooperation of the
  Department of Public Aid and the local township to actually
  find and do the training necessary to put these people to
  work, and I would appreciate your passage of this Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 877, a Bill for an Act in relationship to job training. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Keane: "Is there any discussion? The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill there are 106, Representative Black."
- Black: "Now, with this, with this overwhelming total is this the Sponsor's first Bill?"

Speaker Keane: "I don't know. I'll..."

Black: "Alright, whatever."

- Speaker Keane: "Being...being a new novice here myself. Have all, The Clerk...Mr. Clerk, take the record. There are 106 voting 'aye', none voting 'no', none voting 'present', and House Bill 877, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Let the record show that Representative Balanoff if he was present would have voted 'aye'. Next Bill is House Bill 833, Representative Wyvetter Younge. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "On the Order of Second Reading, House Bill 833, a

  Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Municipal Code.

45th Legislative Day

May 7, 1991

- Second Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Keane: "Mr. Clerk, Mr. Clerk, 883, I apologize, 883."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 883, a Bill for an Act to provide work study programs. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Keane: "Representative Younge."
- Younge: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. May this Bill be brought back to Second Reading for purposes of Amendment?"
- Speaker Keane: "The Lady asks leave to return the Bill to the Order of Second Reading for purposes of Amendment. Is there leave...leave...Representative Black. Leave being granted, the Bill is now on Second Reading. Representative, Mr. Clerk. Any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Wyvetter Younge."
- Younge: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Floor Amendment #1 would replace Central Management Service with the Department of Commerce and Community Affairs as the lead organization that would establish the business, and I move for the adoption of the Amendment. This is a Central Management Services Amendment."
- Speaker Keane: "Is there leave...Pardon me, is there any discussion on the Amendment? There being none...There is, Representative Black."
- Black: "Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure that we object to the Amendment. We haven't really had time to look at it yet.

  I will object to the Sponsor taking this back for immediate consideration on Third."
- Speaker Keane: "The Lady has moved the adoption of Amendment #1 to House Bill 883. All those in favor say 'aye', all opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and Amendment #1 is adopted. Any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Keane: "Third Reading. House Bill 1105, Representative

45th Legislative Day

May 7, 1991

Mulcahey. Out of the record. House Bill 1134,
Representative Tenhouse. Out of the record. House Bill
1176, Representative Deuchler. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1176, a Bill for an Act to amend the
Civil Administrative Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Keane: "Representative Deuchler."

Deuchler: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 1176 relates to the problem that some of our old and deteriorating downtown business areas and the small businesses located there. DCCA has grant and low interest loan programs designed to aid small businesses. This Bill would set a new criteria for the downtown areas and make them available for targeted funding. If there are any questions, I'd be glad to answer them."

Speaker Keane: "The Lady moves the passage of House Bill 1176.

Is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill there are 107 voting 'aye', none voting 'no', and none voting 'present', and House Bill 1176, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1524, Representative Mautino. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1524, a Bill for an Act to amend the

Upper Illinois River Valley Development Authority Act.

Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Keane: "Representative Mautino."

Mautino: "Thank...wrong Bill. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #1 became the Bill to 1524. What the Amendment does is remove a provision embodied in the Upper Illinois River Valley Development Authority Act. The initial legislation

45th Legislative Day

May 7, 1991

authorized bonds to be sold with the moral obligation of the State of Illinois. What the Bill as amended does provides that that section shall not apply to any bonds or notes as which the Authority shall have determined in the resolution authorizing the issuance of the bonds or notes that the Authority should not apply. For example, if a project were to come before the Authority, backed up by securities, land, equipment, property, et cetera, it would then waive the provisions that the state has a moral obligation for the bond, and I move for its passage."

Speaker Keane: "Is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill there are 106 voting 'ave', none voting 'no', and none voting 'present', and 1524, having received the House Bill required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1576, Representative Wyvetter Younge. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1576, a Bill for an Act to amend the Minority and Female Business Enterprise Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Keane: "Representative Younge."

Younge: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 1576 amends the Minority and Female Business Enterprise Act to authorize the assignment of the proceeds of contracts awarded under the Act for the purposes of obtaining financing. In the debate or an earlier Bill it was clear that minorities and females have little collateral, and this Bill would establish the fact that the contract itself could, can be collateral which could be used to secure the bank note. It is a, a Bill that is supported by the Central Management

45th Legislative Day

- May 7, 1991
- Services, and it is not opposed by DCCA, and I move for the passage of the Bill."
- Speaker Keane: "Is there any discussion? There being none, the question is...Representative Black."
- Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I would just rise in support of the Lady's Bill. If you look at this very carefully, I think it's a, a way to creatively finance a small business and doesn't involve government funding. I congratulate the Lady for a very creative Bill. I'm glad to vote with her."
- Speaker Keane: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill there are 106 voting 'aye', 2 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present', and House Bill 1576, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1580, Representative Wyvetter Younge. Out of the record. House Bill 1876, I'm sorry, 1867, Representative Steczo. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1867, a Bill for an Act to amend the Farmland Preservation Act. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Keane: "Representative Steczo."
- Steczo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I ask leave to bring House Bill 1867 back to the Order of Second Reading for the purposes of Amendment, please."
- Speaker Keane: "The Gentleman asks leave to return the Bill to return the Bill to Second Reading. Is there leave? Leave being granted, the Bill is now on Second Reading. Mr. Clerk, any further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Steczo."
- Speaker Keane: "Representative Steczo."

45th Legislative Day

May 7, 1991

Steczo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. As I had agreed in the, in committee, Amendment #1 deletes the, deletes the language in the Bill which specifies that it relates to property intended for residential development. So with this Amendment adopted, this Bill will be applicable only to farmland located within a municipality. I move for its adoption, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Keane: "Representative Wojcik."

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

Speaker Keane: "He indicates he will."

Wojcik: "Representative, does this remove the opposition of the Farm Bureau?"

Steczo: "I don't think so."

Wojcik: "...the...their opposition would still be intact then, with your new Amendment?"

Steczo: "Well, because farmland is still left in the, in the, in the Bill. However, with this Amendment it restricts it tremendously so I would hope that their...their opposition would be lessened, but I can't speak for the Farm Bureau, Representative Wojcik."

Wojcik: "Thank you."

Speaker Keane: "Representative Balanoff."

Balanoff: "Mr. Speaker, for a question. If the...the...and I don't understand exactly what it's about, it says, 'Farm Land Preservation Act'. In that Act right now, what is...what is the purpose of that Act?"

Steczo: "The...the purpose of the Act is to, is to preserve farm land, and are we speaking to the Amendment now, Representative Balanoff, or to the Bill?"

Balanoff: "To the Bill."

Steczo: "Well, this is the Amendment. First we have to adopt the Amendment before we can proceed."

Balanoff: "Oh."

45th Legislative Day

May 7, 1991

Steczo: "So, could you hold that?"

Speaker Keane: "The question is, 'Shall the House adopt Amendment #1 to House Bill 1867?' All those in favor say 'aye', all opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and Amendment #1 is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Keane: "Third Reading. The Gentleman asks unanimous leave to hear the House Bill 1867 on the Order of Third Reading. Is there leave? Leave? Representative Steczo.

Mr. Clerk, read the Bill a third time."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1867, a Bill for an Act to amend the Farmland Preservation Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Keane: "Representative Steczo."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 1867, as amended, Steczo: amends the Farmland Preservation Act to deal with farmland located within a municipality...period. The Amendment took care of the rest of the...the provisions. And what has happened, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, in the history of the Farmland Preservation Act, perhaps to answer Representative Balanoff's question, in advance here. It was intended to preserve farmland and a...and a...and a scheme was set up to...to be able to do that, so when property was going to be built upon, or when property was going to be sold, there were provisions that exempted that property from...the from...from being built upon because of farmland preservation. Originally, the Bill was supposed only with state projects and state-related deal projects, however, it's been interpreted a little bit more liberally. So, what...what has happened, farmland...or land that is farmland, has annexed into municipalities, and the municipality wants to...to extend sewer and water So we have in those situations, we have in that lines. situation, another situation which has occurred which

45th Legislative Day

May 7, 1991

disallows a property owner from having sewer and water lines and other things brought to their...brought to their property, for building for other purpose because...because they happen to fall under the Farmland Preservation Act. That's not, we think, that goes beyond the scope of what the Act was intended to do, and because the land is in a municipality, it certainly should have access to the same amenities that other people in a municipality have. So I would...this...this Bill seeks to make that change. It was approved by the Committee 14 to nothing, and I would answer any questions that the Members might have, Mr. Speaker. I would ask for a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Keane: "Representative Ropp."

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

Speaker Keane: "He indicates he will."

Ropp: "Representative, we're a little bit confused over here.

Could you be a little more specific and give us some examples? For example, if the City of Springfield chose to annex a section of land just to the west of this, is that what you have reference to?"

Steczo: "Mr...Mr. Ropp, the way I understand it...if...if I am allowed annexation into the City of Springfield..."

Ropp: "Are you...are you the landowner that wants to become a part of the..."

Steczo: "I am a landowner, and I wish to become part of the City of Springfield."

Ropp: "At your request?"

Steczo: "At my request."

Ropp: "Okay."

Steczo: "And I would like to have, I would like to build a house on my property. I might want to sell my property for development. I would want to do something, you know, something on that order."

45th Legislative Day

May 7, 1991

Ropp: "Could you subdivide it?"

Steczo: "I could, sure. I'm in...I'm part of the municipality.

Once I am part of the municipality, I can do whatever the municipality allows me to do technically with my property."

Ropp: "Okay, would you still be able to continue to farm it?"

Steczo: "Sure."

Ropp: "Okay."

Steczo: "Sure."

Ropp: "Okay, so the...give me then the next step, the intent of what you're trying to do, coming in to being a part of a municipality of an agricultural..."

Steczo: "First...first, I will...I will, preface my answer by saying that there's only one reason, probably, that I want to become part of the municipality. I want services. I may want to subdivide my property. I may want So, in cases like to build on my property. where...where I have annexed or in situations where...where the land is subject...subject to the Farmland Preservation Act, I may wish to have sewer lines extended. I may wish to have water lines extended on my property, but the Act right now does not allow me to do that."

Ropp: "Okay, what...what point in time would the zoning ordinances come in to play with the Farm Preservation Act?

Is there a potential conflict?"

Steczo: "I don't think so, no."

Ropp: "Well, if I would want to use, if I want water to come out and want to set up homes, I couldn't really do that unless that was zoned from agriculture to residential, single family dwellings."

Steczo: "And, the question would be that would not happen until you were already in the municipality. The municipality wouldn't zone your property really until you were, you were a part of it."

45th Legislative Day

May 7, 1991

Ropp: "Well, okay, which...doesn't...first in this case becoming a part of the municipality, that's a first request that I as a farm owner would want. Isn't that correct? And after I..."

Steczo: "Right."

Ropp: "...become a part of the municipality, then I would be subject to the zoning provisions of that local municipality."

Steczo: "That is true."

Ropp: "Okay, and then..."

Steczo: "And then...and then after I become..after I under...the the...under the scope of the municipal zoning laws, then I may want to do something with my property, and I, and I'm prohibited from doing it then, and so what up with is a patchwork quilt saying in any municipality where the codes and the ordinances and everything else specify that certain things have to take place, healthwise and otherwise, and you have, you may have 90 percent of the municipality on...on ...on sewers and the other 10% on septic tanks, which...which certainly should not be allowable and, in fact, I'm a taxpayer. I'm paying property taxes to that municipality, and I'm not allowed to be able to...to...to get community services or municipal services provided to me because of the...because of the Act."

Ropp: "Okay. Okay, so now you are, in fact, attempting to help that particular property owner wanting to become a part of the municipal..."

Steczo: "That already has become, that already has become. That not wishes to become, already has become."

Ropp: "Okay. Alright, thank you."

Speaker Keane: "Any further discussions? Representative Klemm.

This Bill is on Short Debate, Ladies and Gentlemen."

45th Legislative Day

May 7, 1991

Klemm: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield for a short question?"

Speaker Keane: "He indicates he will."

Klemm: "I have a municipality that annexed 900 and some acres of prime farmland going from one major north and south highway to another north and south highway in McHenry County. Then this would say that if this were passed that we would exempt that property from this Farmland Protection Act. Is that correct?"

Steczo: "It says that farmland located within a municipality is exempted, yes."

Klemm: "Right. Now, present law, wouldn't that, under the present law, say that those people who now have this almost a thousand acres that's all farmland right now, is now in the municipal corporate limits of this small, little 5,000 population city. They could develop that if they got some approval from the Department of, what, Agriculture right now, isn't that current law?"

Steczo: "I believe, I believe it may be Agriculture, yes."

Klemm: "So, actually..."

Steczo: "If they handle farmland preservation."

Klemm: "But if the Department of Agriculture would say this is such prime farmland, it's really not, you know, ready for that development, they could turn it down then under current law. Wouldn't that be correct?"

Steczo: "Yes, they, they could turn it down. I guess the, the basic question..."

Klemm: "So, so don't we have the safeguards already whereas if this were to be passed, that 9 or 100 acres or more would just be another big development without any preservation whatsoever because we wouldn't have any safeguards any more?"

Steczo: "I'm wondering, Representative Klemm, if the people in,

45th Legislative Day

May 7, 1991

in that 900 acres `or the property owners sought annexation."

Klemm: "Oh, I would think they want to develop it and blacktop it and get the best dollar they could irrespective of what the land could be used for."

Steczo: "But the...the...the question is, and I think the...the critical question here is, that if the land is annexed into the municipality as annexations or citizens of any municipality throughout the state have, they should have the right to receive services for which they pay taxes."

Klemm: "Well, well, they can do that if they have the approval to get it out of the farmland under our Farmland Preservation Act. If we want to get away from any farmland around the five collar counties, then this Bill would allow that to be done, and we can just keep moving it out, pushing the farmland further west, if you will. However, if you want to preserve the farmland that's already there, then this Bill will defeat that purpose, wouldn't it?"

Steczo: "Not necessarily, no. I mean..."

Klemm: "Well, pretty much so."

Steczo: "The...the testimony that was...that was brought to light in committee..."

Klemm: "By whom?"

Steczo: "By the Illinois Municipal League and some others..."

Klemm: "Oh, well. I can understand they would support this."

Steczo: "Indicated to us that the...that the...that the Act right now is...is being interpreted far beyond the way it was intended to...to...the kind of farmland it was intended to save. The...the Act originally was supposed to deal specifically with state-related projects, however, it's been interpreted far beyond that over the course of time."

Klemm: "Then I can understand the municipalities and the developers not wanting it when, when we're talking about

## 45th Legislative Day

May 7, 1991

small acreages of 100 acres here, 40 acres, et cetera, et cetera, which development seems to have been the process before, but now what we're doing is the municipalities at least in McHenry County are going after large chunks. I don't mean just the Farmer Browm's farmland that's adjacent to the city limit. They are going, when you take 1,000 acres with no plan whatsoever, no plan of what it's going to be used for, and annex it just to get the land grab, that's what's happening, and this is why I think the limitations that we had would be protective, and this would hurt those cases, not the small ones that I think you perceive it to be. I would support that, but when I see municipalities going for 1,000 acre chunks at a time, I think it's, this hurts that. That's all."

Steczo: "Thank you."

Speaker Keane: "Representative Hartke for the Short Debate Bill."

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

Speaker Keane: "He indicates he will."

Hartke: "Terry, I must admit here, I'm...I'm lost in this.

You're wanting to eliminate the Farm Preservation Act from
the Municipal Code, is that correct?"

Steczo: "The Bill simply says, Representative Hartke, that it exempts farmland located within a municipality."

Hartke: "Okay. Do these individual owners of that farmland have a determination whether they will or will not be taken into the city limits?"

Steczo: "Generally, Representative Hartke, it's...it's always a request made by the property owner to become part of the municipality and...and pay the taxes and...and receive municipal services."

Hartke: "This is within their mile and a half zoning?"

Steczo: "Well, annexation means that you become part of the

45th Legislative Day

May 7, 1991

municipality, per se."

- Hartke: "Okay, and so it would be up to the individual farmers then if they wanted to be annexed to the city?"
- Steczo: "That's correct. And...and thereby should, because they're become...they've become taxpaying members of the...of the municipality, they should be allowed to receive the services that others, other taxpayers in the municipality receive as well."
- Hartke: "So what you're saying, if the farmer decides that he would like to be annexed to the city and create a subdivision or sell his property to someone who...who wants to develop a subdivision..."
- Steczo: "Well, Representative Hartke..."
- Hartke: "This...this would then eliminate the Farmland Preservation Act which now is a barrier for him to be able to sell his property to someone."
- Steczo: "No, under...under the current law, keep in mind that residential development has been taken out by Amendment #1, but under the present law, if I'm...if I live on a piece of land and I annex it to the municipality so I could get sewer, you know, sewer and water to my property, I'd prevent it from doing that under the Farmland Preservation Act. This has actually nothing to do about the potential of building or residential subdividing or anything else. While it's certainly possible, if...if Effingham wanted to move the...the sewer line out to my property, I may be prevented from doing that, although I'm going to be paying, you know, for sewer and water."
- Hartke: "What was the concept behind the Farmland Preservation

  Act to start with?"
- Steczo: "Well, the concept originally was in the case of state projects and state-related activities, when those were being considered, to also consider whether...whether the

45th Legislative Day

May 7, 1991

state was going to be taking prime farmland. The law by rule has been extended far beyond that but that was the original intention."

Hartke: "It was to preserve good farmland and remain it in food
 production."

Steczo: "In state undertakings."

Hartke: "Okay, does this then exempt good, prime farmland and says only secondary ground such as..."

Steczo: "No, all this says is that if you're located within the municipality, if you are located in the municipality, you should be able to...to receive the services that are...that you pay taxes for...and often there's a conflict between that and the...the Farmland Preservation Act. So this says in those cases where you are part of a municipality you should be exempted from the provisions of the Farmland Preservation Act. It seems fair to me. If I'm paying taxes for the services anyway, I should get 'em."

Hartke: "Representative, do you have any idea where Farm Bureau is on this?"

Steczo: "I would think, Representative Hartke, I don't know.

I...I, would presume they are opposed. I'm not sure how vigorously, especially with Amendment #1. It may have lessened their opposition somewhat, but I really don't know."

Hartke: "To the Bill, I...I see the need for municipalities to be able to expand their boundaries, to develop adequate subdivisions, residences, and so forth, to put them in municipalities, so that municipalities can provide the service, but I have mixed emotions whether this is the right move and the way to do it. I'm not sure if I'm opposed or...or what for this Bill, but thank you for answering the questions."

Speaker Keane: "Representative Steczo for a Short Debate, close."

45th Legislative Day

May 7, 1991

- Steczo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. would...I would just...just indicate that...that when the Farmland Preservation Act was passed, as I had indicated during debate, it was passed to address state undertakings When the state was going to take property, if the state was going to build, they should take...take care not to take prime farmland. But what has happened, since the rules have been expanded, and I...I, stress the fact that they've been rules that have been expanded and interpretations, if...if we buy property and we annex to a municipality, and we want something as slight as having sewer and water lines run to our houses, it's impossible to do under the...the Act as it's being construed now. So all this says that in those cases where farmland is in. the municipal boundaries that it's, it's exempted from the Farmland Preservation Act. This Bill was committee. It was approved 14 to nothing. It was put on Short Debate, and I think that, Mr. Speaker, it's fair, it's equitable, and really should be no problem if we, if we really think about it. So I would just ask for 'yes' votes and...and approval of House Bill 1867."
- Speaker Keane: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. Representative Steczo."
- Steczo: "At the proper time, Mr. Speaker, Postponed Consideration."
- Speaker Keane: "Okay. On...there are 48 voting 'aye', 48 voting 'no', 9 voting 'present', and the Sponsor requests Postponed Consideration. Is there leave? Leave, and the Bill is on Postponed Consideration. House Bill 1968, Representative Ronan. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

45th Legislative Day

May 7, 1991

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1868. House Bill 1968, a Bill for an Act to amend the University Retail Sales Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Keane: "Representative Ronan."

Ronan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. House Bill 1968 does amend the University Retail Sales Act. This piece of legislation that was brought to my attention by the Retail Merchants' Association. What we're trying to do is add provisions imposing additional limits on competition in communities, private retail merchants encounter from retail operations that are conducted by or on a university property. Be glad to answer any questions concerning the legislation."

Speaker Keane: "Is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye'. All those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill there are 107 voting 'aye', none voting 'no', none voting 'present', and House Bill 1968, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2005, Representative Edley. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2005, a Bill for an Act to amend the Civil Administrative Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Keane: "Representative Edley."

Edley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the General Assembly. This Bill simply provides that the four regional tourism councils hold their meetings and make their records available to the public. This is a sunshine Bill, legislation dealing with these councils, and I would ask for your favorable support."

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

45th Legislative Day

May 7, 1991

question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill there are 106 voting 'aye', none voting 'no', 1 voting 'present', and House Bill 2005, having received the required Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2362, Representative Granberg. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2362, a Bill for an Act concerning economic support of business. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Keane: "Out of the record. House Bill 2378,

Representative Balanoff. Representative Balanoff, do you
wish to call your Bill? Out of the record. House Bill
2396, Representative Pedersen. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2396, a Bill for an Act to amend the Business Corporation Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Keane: "Representative Pedersen."

Pedersen: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is a technical Amendment. It's an Amendment that in committee I agreed that I would not allow to be amended just so that we can correct a...a minor deal. It passed. It passed out of the committee unanimously. All it really does is allow firms that are in the financial services businesses to...to use words like employee benefit in the title of their business, in the name of their business, without having to include the word 'consultation' in it, and that's all there is to it. I would ask that you...that you pass this Bill."

Speaker Keane: "Representative Lang."

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

Speaker Keane: "He indicates he will."

Lang: "Representative, this appears to me to be a vehicle Bill.

What are your plans for this Bill in the Senate?"

## 45th Legislative Day

- May 7, 1991
- Pedersen: "I've already mentioned that when in, in the cCommittee
  that I had agreed that there would be no Amendments to this
  Bill. It is not a vehicle. It's just designed to do a...a
  minor correction to...to encourage freedom of speech in the
  name of your business."
- Lang: "I'm sorry, to encourage freedom of, can you tell me what this Bill is going to do? I don't yet know what this Bill is going to do."
- Pedersen: "Well, here's, here's an example. I'd like to, I'd like to call my company the Employee Benefits Limited and without having to include the word 'consultation' in there.

  Now I'd have to include consult...consultant in there."
- Lang: "Well...I, I'm not following what you're telling me. Can you try again?"
- Pedersen: "If I wanted to call my company, I'm in the financial services businesses, I wanted to call my company 'Employee Benefits Limited'. Currently I would have to include the word 'consultant' in there, in the...in the name of my business, and I might not like to do that."
- Lang: "Well, frankly, Representative, thank you for answering my questions. I don't see that in the Bill. I don't see what this Bill does. It appears to me to be a shell Bill, and I, for one, am going to vote 'present' because I don't know what you're trying to do here."
- Pedersen: "It's okay if I close?" I, as I mentioned earlier, it's a very technical, little thing that we're trying to correct."
- Speaker Young: "Excuse me, Representative McCracken has a question. Representative McCracken."
- McCracken: "We aren't crafty enough to have vehicle Bills on this side of the aisle. This is really all it appears to be, Representative Lang, it is not a vehicle, and as a matter of fact, until it was raised in committee, I'll bet

45th Legislative Day

May 7, 1991

Representative Pedersen hadn't even considered that possibility. It is all that he says it is and nothing more. He wants to be able to use that in a corporate name which is not allowed now. Is that correct, Sir?"

Pedersen: "That is, that is correct."

McCracken: "And that is all it does. He doesn't want any more out of it."

Speaker Young: "Representative Pedersen."

Pedersen: "Yes, and I can assure the...the House that I don't want any Amendments on this Bill. I just want it to go through the way it is, and...and if it gets to the Senate and someone wants to amend it, I will oppose it, and I urge a favorable vote on this Bill."

Speaker Young: "Alright, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 2396 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. This is final passage. Have all voted who wish? Representative Wojcik."

Wojcik: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I see all these 'present' votes up there, but I think the Gentleman is on record as stating it is not a shell Bill. It's not a vehicle Bill. He will not accept an Amendment. I think let's give him the fairness of his honesty, and let's see more green votes up there."

Speaker Young: "Representative Homer to explain his vote."

Homer: "Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker, an explanation of my vote.

I...I have taken another look at the Bill myself, and it does strike out the word, 'benefit' on the first page which I guess allows now a...an association or corporation to utilize the word 'benefit' in the title of their organization. I don't understand the importance of that, but the Gentleman is certainly one of integrity, and based upon his assurance this is not a vehicle Bill and that that's the sole purpose of it, nomenclature, I'm prepared

45th Legislative Day

May 7, 1991

to change my vote to 'yes'."

- Speaker Young: "Representative Lang."
- Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I concur with Representative

  Homer. I've...I've looked at this Bill again and I

  would...I'm going to change my vote to 'aye' as well."
- Speaker Young: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 100 voting 'yes', none voting 'no', 7 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2611, Representative Mautino. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2611, a Bill for an Act to amend the Rural Bond Bank Act. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Young: "Representative Mautino."
- Mautino: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The Amendment of 2611 has become the Bill. It is identical to the language that was just established for the Upper Illinois River Valley Development Authority providing for security, property, et cetera to be the mainstay of the bond authorization as opposed to the moral obligation of the state. The Amendments to both Bills are identical. We move for their adoption and passage of 2611. Happy to answer any questions."
- Speaker Young: "The Gentleman has moved for passage of House Bill 2611. On that question, the Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black."
- Black: "Just a very quick question of the Sponsor, Mr. Speaker."

  Speaker Young: "He indicates he'll yield."
- Black: "Thank you, Representative, I...I think all we have is a question over here. You're exempting the state from any obligation of these bonds."
- Mautino: "The current law is the state's moral obligation. This says land, property, et cetera, can be used in lieu of

45th Legislative Day

May 7, 1991

moral obligation of the state."

Black: "So...so, in other words, we get the state out of any potential liability."

Mautino: "Good security."

Black: "I think that's an excellent idea."

Mautino: "Same Amendment that was on 1524. It was the Mautino-Black Amendment in Committee. You'll recall it, I'm sure."

Black: "Thank you, thank you."

Speaker Young: "Further questions. Representative Mautino to close."

- Mautino: "That's exact...Thank you, Mr. Speaker. That's exactly
  what the Bill does, provides security in lieu of the state
  moral obligation. I move for its passage."
- Speaker Young: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 2611 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? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 105 voting 'yes', none voting 'no', and none voting 'present'. House Bill 2611, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the same Order appears House Bill 2378, Representative Balanoff. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2378, a Bill for an Act to amend the

  Humane Care for Animals Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

  Speaker Young: "Representative Balanoff."
- Balanoff: "It...I want to bring it back to Second for the purposes of an Amend...for purposes of a couple of Amendments."
- Speaker Young: "The Gentleman asks leave of the House to return

  House Bill 2378 to Second Reading for purposes of an

  Amendment. Does he have leave? Leave is granted. Second

45th Legislative Day

May 7, 1991

Reading."

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

Speaker Young: "Representative Lang."

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Amendment #1 was proposed to me by the Illinois Citizens for Humane Legislation. This is a group concerned with animal rights and animal protection, and Amendment #1 deals with pet shops. The idea is to help consumers make an informed purchase and to reduce illegitimate sales of sick animals. This legislation will enable consumers and pet owners to make sure their pet is healthy and of good background before they purchase the pet. It would require the posting of certain information about the dog or cat before the purchase: age, sex and weight, breed, record of vaccinations, record of any illnesses, the name of the breeder, et cetera, and the purpose of this is to protect purchases, purchasers of animals from pet shops, and I move its passage."

Speaker Young: "The Gentleman moves for the passage of Floor

Amendment #1 to House Bill 2378. On that question, the

Gentleman from Effingham, Representative Hartke."

Hartke: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Young: "He indicates he'll yield for a question."

Hartke: Representative Lang, looking at this Bill, in somewhere
 in it does it require that these be all purebred animals?"
Lang: "No."

Hartke: "So if you have a 'hoosier', how would they know what breed it is?"

Lang: "I didn't hear your question."

Hartke: "I said, 'If you had a 'hoosier' dog, what breed would it
he?'

Lang: "I have no idea what you're asking me."

Hartke: "Well, 'Who's your' mother? "Who's your' father?"

45th Legislative Day

May 7, 1991

- Lang: "Seriously, I...how would you know what age this animal is if they're not purebred, there are no breeding records with the animal, and the pet shop is trying to sell an animal. Where did that animal come from, and I guess that's what you're trying to address. If these dogs, are they picked up at the city pound?"
- Hartke: "I presume, I don't think any animals are sold at pet shops that are picked up at a city pound."
- Lang: "Then they would be some breeding records behind them, age, sex, weight, and so forth, but it doesn't say that in the Bill."
- Hartke: "My understanding is that when pet shops sell a dog or a cat, they have the information as to the, the, whatever breeding information is available, they would have."
- Lang: "Then what's the purpose of the Bill?"
- Hartke: "The purpose of the Bill is that that information is not posted so that the purchaser doesn't have the breeding information, doesn't have the information about vaccination, doesn't have the information about the prior health of the animal prior to purchase."
- Lang: "So you would require on every cage or...or area that the dog or animal or bird or whatever is sold to have this posted on the window?"

Hartke: "That's correct."

Lang: "And if they don't know all this information, then it's illegal to sell the dog or cat or animal?"

Hartke: "That's correct."

- Lang: "Well, to the Bill. I don't know what...how big this problem is...but I really don't think it's necessary at all that we pass this type of legislation."
- Speaker Young: "Further questions. The Gentleman from Will,
  Representative Wennlund."
- Wennlund: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

45th Legislative Day

May 7, 1991

- Speaker Young: "He indicates he'll yield for a question."
- Wennlund: "Representative Lang, in the event that the pet shop owner does, does not, in fact, disclose to the customer, for instance, the name and address of any person who owned or harbored the dog between its birth and the point of sale, would that be a Class 3 felony?"
- Lang: "I'm not certain, Representative, what the penalties are in the Animal Welfare Act. I don't have those in front of me, but these, a violation of this would be a violation of the Animal Welfare Act, and whatever penalties are in that Act would apply."
- Wennlund: "In the event that the pet shop owner doesn't have this information, what is he to do, not sell the...the pet, the dog or cat?"
- Lang: "I think the proponents of this legislation are interested in making sure that the pet shop owner has this information so that the pet shop owner can provide to the purchaser, the consumer, the necessary information to make an informed choice."
- Wennlund: "Is, is this another labeling initiative of the Public Action Council?"
- Lang: "No, it is not."
- Wennlund: "Alright, does...does...does the Animal Welfare Act, does, does it require that...that...that dogs, or cats, be tagged with a tag that has this information on it?"
- Lang: "Is this my first Bill? Would you ask me that question again?"
- Wennlund: "Well, Representative Hartke had some very, very serious problems with the Bill, and...and I'm concerned with, with some other aspects from a business standpoint, and what is the pet shop owner to do if he doesn't have that information? Not sell the dog? And if he does violate the Act, there...there's penalties under the...the

45th Legislative Day

May 7, 1991

Animal Welfare Act."

Lang: "I presume that if the, the intent would be that if the pet shop owner doesn't have the information, I think he could post a notice saying he doesn't have it. But then the consumer could decide whether they were going to buy that pet under those circumstances or not."

Wennlund: "Thank you. To the Bill. Well, we spent a couple and a half million dollars for this project and that project, \$35,000 for another one, \$100,000 for another one, and they didn't seem to be very important. Ι suggest that Representative Hartke was correct in his comments that..that this is a Bill that has not yet seen its time, is another step forward and another again infringement on even pet store owners and catteries, they are, to be able to operate in the State of Illinois, and I think this is just a bad precedent for the General Assembly to set."

Speaker Young: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Preston." Preston: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in support of the Gentleman's Amendment. This Amendment, once adopted and once it's passed into law, promote responsible pet shop ownership. That is not where we are today in Illinois. Illinois is one of chief offenders in the sale of puppy mill puppies, of cat mill kittens. We sell...we allow pet shops to sell animals that are mistreated, that are bred in unhealthy conditions, that are bred without concern for the animals who are the, the parents of the offspring who were sold in pet shops, and that is not what responsible pet...pet operations, pet shops should be about, and it's not what responsible pet ownership should be about. This Bill is trying to clean up an industry that is in a shambles in this state. Other states have moved to do this, and it's about time that

45th Legislative Day

- May 7, 1991
- Illinois followed suit, and this Amendment will go a long way in doing that."
- Speaker Young: "The Gentleman from Warren, Representative Hultgren."
- "Will the Sponsor of the Amendment yield? Hultgren: Representative Lang, we recently were the...I quess godparents in my household, of...of six Dalmatian puppies, and over the period of time between the Thanksgiving and Christmas, we found homes for each of those six puppies. If this Amendment were added to House Bill 2378, would it apply in that situation of a casual sale? Would we be dog dealers for the purposes of, of, of this Act, for that...those casual sales?"
- Lang: "The answer is 'no', it would not apply."
- Hultgren: "And...and where...where are we...where would we be excluded? I'm...I'm looking at the Amendment, and I don't see anything that would specifically rule out that casual or occasional sale."
- Lang: "Well, the casual or occasional sale is not a pet shop operator, dog dealer, or cattery operator. Those are the only entities..."
- Hultgren: "Are...are those, are those terms defined elsewhere in Chapter 8?"
- Lang: "My understanding is they are, but I don't have Chapter 8 in front of me."
- Hultgren: "Well, let me, let me check that, and, thank you."
- Speaker Young: "The Gentleman from McLean, Representative Ropp."
- Ropp: "Mr. Speaker, would the Sponsor yield?"
- Speaker Young: "He indicates he'll yield for a question."
- Ropp: "I, I know it's not your first Bill. I know that. Is the Department of Agriculture have any reaction to this Bill?"
- Lang: "No."
- Ropp: "Who administers thisprovision of the law?"

45th Legislative Day

May 7, 1991

- Lang: "Again, I would have to refer to the Animal Welfare,

  Welfare Act. Whoever administers that would administer

  this."
- Ropp: "Well, I think the Department of Agriculture administers the Pet Shop Dealers Act and that seems like what you would, what you are attempting to do here, isn't it?"
- Lang: "It's perfectly okay with me if the Department of Agriculture wants to take care of this problem."
- Ropp: "Well, does that say so in the Bill?"
- Lang: "It just refers to the Animal Welfare Act. Whatever is in there is what we're referring to. I don't know what's in the Animal Welfare Act."
- Ropp: "Well, it seems to me like you, what you are attempting to do, which I think is halfway laudible anyway, is to establish some guidelines for the health and the safety of the animal and that the Department of Agriculture administers that provision. I don't know why we don't have some response from them as to whether or not this is okay or a problem or...because I'm sure they're the ones...you mean we've got two agencies that are dealing with pet shops in Illinois?"
- Lang: "That may be. I'm not sure. Why, my suggestion is, Representative, that we just send this over to the Senate and if necessary we'll gut it over there and start all over. I'll be happy to work with Members your side of the aisle who are against this or have concerns about it. We'll write it in a way that's protective."
- Ropp: "...I've just...word from above has just come down. The

  Department of Agriculture is opposed to this. Why would

  they be opposed to this?"
- Lang: "I have no idea."
- Ropp: "Would you like for them to come over and tell you?"
- Lang: "Not particularly, no."

45th Legislative Day

May 7, 1991

Ropp: "It seems to me like if...if we're trying to deal with the Animal Welfare Act, that it is once again an attempt for two or more agencies of state government to get involved in one particular purpose, and I just don't think that we need another agency to get involved in doing something that we already have on the books, the Department of Agriculture that provides for the care, the safety, and the health, and the operation and licensing of pet shop operators."

Speaker Young: "The Gentleman from Fulton, Representative Homer."

Homer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move the previous question."

Speaker Young: "Representative Lang to close."

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

Speaker Young: "The question is, 'Shall Floor Amendment #1 to
House Bill 2378 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye',
those opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have
all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this
question there are 71 voting 'yes', 29 voting 'no', 3
voting 'present', and Floor Amendment #1 is adopted.
Further Amendments."

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

Speaker Young: "Representative Turner. Oh, Curran, Representative Curran."

Curran: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This, this Amendment simply allows the Solid Gold Futurity Horse Show which has as its proponents many of the...of the Members of the House and Senate and also the...the former attorney for the Department of Agriculture who is the founder of this show...this Amendment simply allows that show to continue. It adds the words, 'and horse shows' to the underlying portion of this Act. It's a harmless Amendment, makes this Bill more equitable for those of us who support the Solid Gold Futurity which...which brings in

45th Legislative Day

May 7, 1991

many hundreds of thousands of dollars into the Springfield community. I ask for its...I move for its adoption."

- Speaker Young: "The question is, 'Shall Floor Amendment #2 to
  House Bill 2379 be adopted?' Representative Black."
- Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I'm...I'm sure that
  the Sponsor has given an outstanding explanation. We...I
  don't think we have any problems with the Amendment, but I
  don't think we have it."
- Speaker Young: "You're correct, Representative Black, this Amendment has not been printed and distributed. Representative Balanoff. Take the Bill out of the record. On the Order of Education/Finance, appears House Bill Representative Steczo. Out of the record. House Bill 827, Representative Satterthwaite. Out of the record. House Bill 899, Representative Giglio. Out of the record. House Bill 1097, Representative McNamara. Out of the record. House Bill 2042, Representative Steczo. Out of the record. House Bill 2360, Representative Keane. Representative Jim Keane, House Bill 2360. Out of the record. House Bill 2399, Representative Phelan. Out of the record. We'll now go to the Order of Housing, Third Reading. House Bill 278, out of the record. House Bill 785, Representative Levin. Out of the record. House Bill 1038, Representative Wyvetter Younge. Out of the record. House Bill 1323, Representative Mautino. Out of the record. House 1615, Representative Davis. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk. I think that's 1615."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1615, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Housing Development Act. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Young: "Representative Davis."
- Davis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This piece of legislation merely asks that priority

# 45th Legislative Day

May 7, 1991

be given to those veterans who are serving or have served in the Persian Gulf on those mortgages. Those veterans who return home and apply for mortgages, they're being asked to give priority to those who served in the Persian Gulf, and we ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Young: "The Lady moves for passage of House Bill 1615.

On that question, the Gentleman from Vermilion,

Representative Black."

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

Speaker Young: "Indicates she'll yield for a question."

Black: "Representative, in committee you indicated that you would amend this Bill on Second Reading to extend your deadline date beyond March 1991 since there are still several thousand troops in the Middle East. Do you intend to do that?"

Davis: "Well, after reading it, Representative, if you read the Bill it says those who served during that period which would include those who are released in three years from today but who served also during that period."

Black: "No, I don't think it says that at all."

Davis: "It's supposed to."

Black: "It says 'veterans'...it says, 'veterans serving between

August of 1990 and March 1991'"

Davis: "Okay. So if they served from August 1990, that's when the action began over there, 1990, August. So any service at all that included that date. So, Representative, after..."

Black: "Well, in...in other words, if...if they...if a National Guardsman was activated but not sent over until two weeks ago to replace those active duty troops coming home, he isn't going to be covered."

Davis: "He's not going to be prioritized. He will still

45th Legislative Day

May 7, 1991

certainly have an opportunity. We're speaking, Representative, to those who were actually in the heat of battle. We're...we're asking for special consideration for those veterans who were in the heat of battle in the Persian Gulf."

Black: "Well."

Davis: "Now, we know there's still danger over there. We know that there are many going over and coming back, but this particular piece of legislation, Representative, was simply to make things a bit easier and to give them priority on those loans when they applied for...from IDHA. Now if you would prefer that we...that's the reason we didn't put the Amendment. After reading it we thought that it...it served our purpose."

Black: "Well, I...I understand, Representative, and I don't have any difficulties with what you're attempting to do. You said you were going to amend the Bill on Second Reading. You are now not doing that. Two of our people have been killed over there this week. Now, if you say you're going to amend the Bill in committee, then you ought to amend the Bill on the floor. If you've changed your mind, then let us know you've changed your mind."

Davis: "Well, you're absolutely right. We should have let you know that we didn't think it was necessary to add that Amendment after reading the Bill and finding that it stated, 'all those who served from August 1990'. Now this certainly doesn't eliminate anyone who served later, but it merely prioritizes or gives priority to those who do serve or have served in that period."

Speaker Young: "The Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Klemm."

Klemm: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Lady yield for a question?"

45th Legislative Day

- May 7, 1991
- Speaker Young: "Indicates she'll yield for a question."
- Klemm: "Does anybody else have any priority in acquiring mortgages in Illinois?"
- Davis: "Mis...Representative, I have no idea."
- Klemm: "Do other veterans from other conflicts receive any priority?"
- Davis: "Some, in some cases they do, especially with the...the veterans, you know, what is that program where veterans can purchase homes under the GI Bill? That's a preference, yes."
- Klemm: "And you're, you're, you're having this chamber to believe that all veterans except for those between August 1990 and '91 have priority on...on receiving mortgages?"
- Davis: "No, Representative, that's not what we're saying at all.

  Not at all."
- Klemm: "Well, what's the GI Bill you were trying to tell me all other veterans are covered under?"
- Davis: "What I'm saying to you is under the GI Bill many veterans have, I mean that's how they can borrow money to buy homes."
- Klemm: "Are the veterans under the Vietnam War covered for prioritizing for mortgages that you know?"
- Davis: "Not on this particular piece of legislation, but that's an excellent idea, Representative."
- Klemm: "Is it current law? It's not."
- Davis: "I, Representative, this piece of legislation covers a small group of people for a small period of time."
- Klemm: "I understand. Why would you..."
- Davis: "And I certainly recognize the interest you might have for Vietnam veterans. I have no objections to it, and if you put the Bill forward, I'll vote for it."
- Klemm: "Well, since this Bill is going to be amended, I had heard on Second Reading, we were going to put Amendments to

# 45th Legislative Day

May 7, 1991

include all veterans then and not just single out veterans in a hundred hour war. There are veterans in Vietnam and Korea and those things, and if you want to look at veterans, I think we should look at a lot of them."

Davis: "Would you be interested in knowing that the Vietnam veteran, the Vietnam War was never declared a war, therefore, they don't get many benefits they should get?"

KLemm: "Well, I don't think this was declared a war either."

Davis: "Pardon?"

Klemm: "This was not the...Desert Storm was not declared a war.

We did not declare war. There was a United Nations .

Resolution, if you know."

Davis: "Well, there was a war declared."

"Well, okay. To the question, Mr. Speaker. Klemm: I'm not prepared to debate whether we were at war or not, but I just think that all of us are concerned, not only with the veterans of Desert Storm, but also all the veterans, and if you're going to give preferential treatment for mortgages for veterans, I think we should at least slow up a moment as we're doing on license plates and other, other issues that we have collectively on both sides of the aisle tried to address the veterans' issues, that we should probably do Now I know the euphoria of the Desert victories and success are, are wonderful, and I oppose that. I'm just concerned that we start picking and choosing veterans, men and women who have...who have of themselves to protect us so that we exclude them. So I would think, I would rather see a Bill that would include all veterans."

Davis: "Thank you, Representative. This is just for those who served in active duty."

Speaker Young: "Excuse me, Representative. He was making a statement, not a question."

45th Legislative Day

May 7, 1991

Davis: "Oh, okay."

Speaker Young: "The Lady from Kane, Representative Doederlein."

Doederlein: "...Gentlemen of the House. I believe that we are all for the veterans, and we certainly want to give them everything that we can. After all they did a lot for us in this war. It was, we voted out this Bill out of committee, unanimously, with the idea that it would be expanded to include all the veterans, and I think that since you made that statement, I think we should put that in. Could you take it out of the record and, and adapt that Amendment

Davis: "Well, Representative, it would be very difficult to include all veterans and then have some..."

Doederlein: "No."

Davis: "...portions left for those who have not served."

that you said you were going to?"

Doederlein: "You made...you made a promise in the committee that you would expand that to allow the veterans that are still over there to have that priority also."

Davis: "The question is, Representative, the question in Committee was, 'Are we only talking about those who have served during the war?' Well, anyone who served during the August 1990 period served in the war. So after reading the Bill, Representative, it did exactly what the Committee Members wanted it to do. I saw no reason, nor did my research staff see any reason, to add the Amendment. Now if you just want me to put some more paper up here, we will do it, but I don't think it's necessary."

Doederlein: "We'd like it...to see you keep your word."

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

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

Speaker Young: "She indicates she'll yield for a question."

Wennlund: "The...the one concern I...I have, Representative, is

45th Legislative Day

May 7, 1991

that, that the language of the Bill does, does not limit it to Illinois residents, and under the terms of the Bill a resident of the State of Indiana or Wisconsin or Ohio or any other state could apply for a mortgage and get priority because he was in active duty in the naval or military service of the United States during that time period, between August of '90 and March of '91. It's a good idea. There's no question about it."

Davis: "Representative, Representative. The legislation that is in that Section of the Code already limits those loans to people of, who are residents of Illinois."

Wennlund: "Doesn't, doesn't say it here."

Davis: "Well, it shouldn't say it there because we're merely mend...amending a portion of the existing Code. I'm sure you've heard of this, this department already. Right?"

"Well...well...absolutely, but...but...you've to reprint the...the entire section. and there is no limitation to Illinois residents. I suggest that... I agree with previous speakers that...this...this certainly ought to be limited to Illinois residents and it ought to be cleaned up before it moves out of this House on Third Reading, and if you want to pull it out of the record and file an Amendment and send it oon...it's an excellent idea. No question about it. I...I think everybody agrees with it, and...and everybody's going to vote for it, but I think it needs some clean up before it goes out of here."

Davis: "Representative, I take this out of the record. I'm going to add the Amendment. Would you meet me up here and help me draft it?"

Wennlund: "Sure. Be glad to."

Davis: "Thank you."

Speaker Young: "Out of the record. House Bill 2067, Representative Capparelli. 2067. Read the Bill, Mr.

45th Legislative Day

May 7, 1991

Clerk."

- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2067."
- Speaker Young: "Just one second, Mr. Clerk. Before you read the Bill, Representative Jones for an announcement."
- Jones: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. to House Rules, the House Reapportionment Committee will meet this evening in Skokie. The following Members who are on the committee will be leaving approximately at o'clock to attend the hearing: L. Jones. Schakowsky. Balanoff. Preston. Levin. Stephan. Ann Deuchler. Kubik. Schoenberg. Parcells. Leitch McCracken. Kirkland. B. Pedersen and Representative Penny Pullen. Thank you."
- Speaker Young: "House Bill 2067, Representative Capparelli. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2067, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Vehicle Code. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Young: "Representative Capparelli."
- Capparelli: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 2067, the Amendment makes a technical change by altering the width and the length on towing a mobile home modular unit. The width of a unit may be 16 feet, that's from 14 feet, 15 feet, last year, and up to 99 feet. DOT signed off on this. I don't believe there's any problem. I would ask for a favorable Roll Call."
- Speaker Young: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 2067 pass?'

  And on that question, the Gentleman from Vermilion,

  Representative Black."
- Black: "Yeah. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
- Speaker Young: "He indicates he'll yield for a question."
- Black: "The...you'indicated that the Department had signed off on this. We're not aware of that. Have they...are they on

45th Legislative Day

May 7, 1991

the floor? Could they come and talk to us?"

Capparelli: "I made the Amendment. It was 16, 4 inches. They asked me to take the four inches off, which I did in my Amendment, and they said they were with it."

Black: "Alright. What...let me ask you one question. Could the

Department do this? I was under the impression they could

do this by rule and/or permit. You know, you could haul

whatever."

Capparelli: "You have to get their, a permit from them. Last year the law stated that it only could be 15, was it 16, no it was 15 feet. This year because the modular units now have a little fence on it, and they're a little wider, they wanted 16, 4, but the DOT came and asked me to make it 16 feet. I went back to the manufacturers. They said okay, and I talked to Bill Fleischli, and he said fine. That was his Amendment."

Black: "This is still subject to the...you know, if it's high winds on an interstate or anything like that?"

Capparelli: "Absolutely."

Black: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Young: "Further discussion? Representative Capparelli to close."

Capparelli: "I would ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Young: "And the question is, 'Shall House Bill 2067 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? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 80 voting 'yes', 4 voting 'no', 18 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Now on the Order of Government Operations, Third Reading. On that Order appears House Bill 682, Representative Johnson. Read

45th Legislative Day

May 7, 1991

the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 682, a Bill for an Act concerning athletic associations. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Young: "Representative Johnson."

- Johnson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. This Bill came out with bipartisan sponsorship in support in a 10 to 1 vote in Judiciary I Committee, and would...I'd be glad to respond to questions if people want, but basically the Bill would provide for a set of guarantees of fairness and due process for institutions, individuals and coaches in this state who are subject to investigation by collegiate athletic associations, fundamentally assure that the guilty are convicted and that the innocent aren't convicted, and that's what we're all about in this process. I think it's a fair Bill. A number of other states across the Union are passing it, and I would ask for your support."
- Speaker Young: "The Gentleman has moved for passage of House Bill 682. On that question, is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 682 pass?'. All those in favor vote 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. This is final passage. Representative Dunn to explain his vote."
- Dunn: "Yes, yeah. Just to state for the record that this is a bad Bill, and there are a lot of good reasons to oppose this bad legislation, and I...this is a silly thing for us to do."
- Speaker Young: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 101 voting 'yes', 3 voting 'no', and 5 voting 'present'. This Bill having received the required Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 700, Representative Hannig. Read the Bill, Mr.

45th Legislative Day

May 7, 1991

- Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 700, a Bill for an Act to amend the State Attorneys Apellate Prosecutors Act. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Young: "Representative Hannig."
- Hannig: "Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House.

  This Bill would increase the number of investigators that this State Agency could have from 8 to 12. The agency has gotten a federal grant to fund these positions, and so there would be no state moneys involved of any kind, but they do need this statutory authority in order to take advantage of that federal money. So, we're simply trying to give them that advantage to maximize some of our federal funds, and I'd ask for your 'yes' vote."
- Speaker Young: "The Gentleman has moved for passage of House Bill 700. On that question, is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black."
- Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
- Speaker Young: "Indicates he'll yield for a question."
- Black: "Thank you. Representative, I know you don't intend to imply that as long as it's federal money it doesn't cost anything because we all know where that money comes from.

  I, my concern is, under existing law, all of these people have full police powers, is that right?"
- Hannig: "Yes. That's correct."
- Black: "And so these people, then, obviously, would have full police power?"
- Hannig: "Yes."
- Black: "Do you know how many different agencies in the State of Illinois now have full police power?"
- Hannig: "I really couldn't answer that, Representative. I know that there are a number."

45th Legislative Day

May 7, 1991

- Black: "I think it's over 22."
- Hannig: "This is the agency that represents the State's Attorneys on appeal, and they would use these investigators to try to substantiate these..."
- Black: "Well, I understand that. Do you realize that when we give these people full police powers, unless I'm way off base, they have the right to stop you on your way home and give you a speeding ticket, which has nothing whatsoever to do with their assigned duties."
- Hannig: "Representative, generally these are investigators.

  They're assigned to cases, criminal cases, that are on appeal, and they're trying to run down information.

  They're really not out there writing tickets."
- Black: "I understand that and I have no problem with it. The only problem is when we give them full police power, like we did the Department of Conservation police a few years ago, my constituents now get speeding tickets on state roads by Department of Conservation police officers, and these people can do the same thing."
- Hannig: "Representative, they've already got the authority, we're just increasing the head count from 8 to 12."
- Black: "I know. I know. You're right. I apologize, Mr. Speaker. I was off on a tangent that I think we're giving too many people police power, but the Gentleman is right, they already have the authority, and if we add 4 they'll have it, so I guess you'll have to do whatever you want to do."
- Speaker Young: "Further discussion? Representative Hannig to close."
- Hannig: "I just ask for a 'yes' vote."
- Speaker Young: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 700 pass?'

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

  Voting is open. This is final passage. Have all voted who

45th Legislative Day

May 7, 1991

wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. Representative Hultgren votes 'aye'. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 105 voting 'yes', 2 voting 'no', 3 voting 'present'. House Bill 700, having received the required Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 933, Representative Schakowsky. Out of the record. House Bill 1165, Representative Burzynski. There you are, Representative. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1165, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Vehicle Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Young: "Representative Burzynski."

Burzynski: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. What we have is 1165 to amend the Illinois Vehicle Code requiring persons age 18 and older who have never had a driver's license to obtain an instruction permit for at least 3 months prior to applying for a driver's license. What we're trying to do is cut back on the number of individuals who are failing their drivers exams the first go around, reduce the workload within the Secretary of State's office, increase the safety for examiners and others, and encourage more training. I would encourage a favorable vote on this."

Speaker Young: "The Gentleman moves for passage of House Bill 1165. On that question, Gentleman from Effingham, Representative Parke."

Parke: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Young: "Indicates he'll yield for a question."

Parke: "Representative, you indicated that we have a number of people failing the test the first time. What percentage of those individuals who are taking the test failed?"

Burzynski: "My understanding is approximately 17 percent of all individuals taking their driving test the first time,

45th Legislative Day

May 7, 1991

fail."

- Parke: "And your indication that extending this requirement to get the permit earlier, would do what?"
- Burzynski: "Well, I think that if we encourage people to have a 3 month waiting period before taking their initial driving test, that they will be out on the road more often with someone who is qualified, and therefore will increase their ability, their driving ability."
- Parke: "You're asking that they get this permit when they're 15 years and 9 months?"
- Burzynski: "No. This does not apply to those under age of 18."
- Parke: "What about over the age of 18? Senior citizens who are first time drivers and so forth?"
- Burzynski: "Yes, we're encouraging them to apply for the permit

  and to utilize that driving permit for a period of three

  months before taking their initial driver's test."
- Parke: "Okay. Another question. Maybe 17 percent are supposed to fail. You know, if they don't know the correct answers and so forth, maybe they should fail."
- Burzynski: "Well, we're not talking about the written part of the exam. You must pass the written part of the exam prior to obtaining your driver's permit."
- Parke: "Are they failing the driving portion or the written portion?"
- Burzynski: "That's correct. They're failing the driving portion of the test."
- Parke: "Do we find that many drivers education schools and/or high schools do not have the time because of the time constraints of the number of students that they fail to become...some experienced drivers?"
- Burzynski: "Well, this really doesn't apply to those students that are in high school taking drivers education courses. This primarily applies to those over the age of 18 who are

45th Legislative Day

May 7, 1991

failing those exams and also putting at risk the examiners as well as the pedestrians during those initial driving exams."

Parke: "Okay, but what about widows who have never driven, so you are requiring them now, 3 months prior to them ever getting a license, that they should, they may not have 3 months.

They need to learn to drive quicker than that."

Burzynski: "Well, I think if they would take a certified driving exam, we might be able to work that out."

Parke: "Your Bill says that it must apply what...90 days prior to them..."

Burzynski: "That's correct."

Parke: "We're encouraging them to have some on the road skills and driver's training. Thank you."

Speaker Young: "Further discussion? The Lady from Sangamon, Representative Hasara."

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

Speaker Young: "Indicates he'll yield for a question."

Hasara: "Representative, is this your first Bill?"

Burzynski: "Yes, it is."

Hasara: "I know you've been waiting for this for several weeks now. I do have a couple questions. I noticed in our analysis that it mentions that there have been accidents in your district. Could you elaborate on what kind of accidents, and who's causing them?

Burzynski: "Yes, thank you. we've had some severe accidents from individuals in our district, particularly those who are in attendance at one of our local, or at our local university and taking their driver's exams, and so they're having a little bit of a problem passing those tests. We want to encourage them to get out on the streets with a qualified driver before taking those examinations."

Hasara: "Okay, let's see, what else do I need to know about this

45th Legislative Day

May 7, 1991

Bill, Representative? You don't think this is discriminating against people over 18?"

Burzynski: "I certainly do not. I don't think it's a discriminating type of Bill. Legislation requiring those over 18 to try and encourage them to get advanced training in this area, no more than it would be discrimination against those of...under the age of 16."

Hasara: "Representative, did you pass your driver's test on the
first try?"

Burzynski: "Yes, I did."

Hasara: "How old were ya?"

Burzynski: "16."

Hasara: "Okay, so you're asking someone else to do something that
you really didn't have to do, is that correct?"

Burzynski: "That's correct, but I did have quite a bit of behind-the-wheel experience prior to that time."

Hasara: "Okay. Well, thank you, Representative, and good luck on this wonderful first Bill."

Burzynski: "Thank you."

Speaker Young: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Wojcik."

Wojcik: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members. Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Young: "Indicates he'll yield for a question."

Wojcik: "You have that look in your eyes, Representative, but this is going to be legitimate. You know, we have been speaking so much the past few weeks about costs and mandates, it seems to me that if we're going to have these driver instruction courses, there's going to be a cost incurred. Is there a cost?"

Burzynski: "No, there is no cost to the Secretary of State's office, or to the state."

Wojcik: "So, they would be going through the Secretary of State for these instructions?"

Burzynski: "Pardon?"

45th Legislative Day

May 7, 1991

Wojcik: "Would they be going through the Secretary of State for the instructions, for the driver instructions?"

Burzynski: "No, they would not."

Wojcik: "Well, where will they be getting these instructions?"

Burzynski: "Either through a private entity or otherwise as far as the driving permit itself, they can drive with anyone who is a licensed driver, so long as they have a permit."

Wojcik: "But if we're going to a driver instructor, there's a cost incurred, is that correct?"

Burzynski: "By the individual."

Wojcik: "By the individual. Do you know approximately what that cost would be?"

Burzynski: "No. I do not."

Wojcik: "Do you know approximately the age bracket that would be involved with these driver tests?"

Burzynski: "No, I do not. I would assume that we're talking about anyone who has never had the opportunity to possibly take a course while in high school and who also might need to pass the driver's exam."

Wojcik: "And your assumption is that we have 18 percent are out there that would need something like this?"

Burzynski: "Yes. 18 percent of those taking the test."

Wojcik: "To the Bill. I would say that, since it's the Sponsor's first Bill, and since he truly believes that we need something like this, perhaps we should look at it whether it's going to be costly or a mandate or just another enforcement on someone's private privileges. So, I think we should vote favorable of this."

Speaker Young: "The Gentleman from Fulton, Representative Homer."

Homer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Young: "Indicates he'll yield for a question."

Homer: "Would you explain again briefly the reason you have this Bill? Is this a Secretary of State initiative?"

45th Legislative Day

May 7, 1991

Burzynski: "No, it is not a Secretary of State initiative, however, several examiners within my district have expressed a concern in relationship to this type of legislation."

Homer: "What is that concern?"

Burzynski: "That concern is...is that they are somewhat concerned about the fact that they're providing examinations to those that have never been behind the wheel before, and they're coming in, taking their driving portion of their exams having never been behind the wheel of an automobile."

Homer: "Well, let me...you know, let me ask if my understanding is correct. The law that...when I was 16, on my birthday, my dad took me to the Secretary of State's office, and I passed my driving test. It was a highlight, I couldn't wait for that day to come. Now, since then, the law was changed to say that before someone under 18 could take an exam and get a license, they had to first complete a driver's, approved driver's training program. Correct?"

Burzynski: "That's correct."

Homer: "But once they turned 18, they could apply for a license without having had a permit or that training course, correct?"

Burzynski: "That's correct.

Homer: "Alright, now you want to say that after they're 18, that they, before getting a license would have to have a permit for at least 3 months?"

Burzynski: "That's correct."

Homer: "And the reason you want to do that is what?"

Burzynski: "Well, I think one of the things we need to do is to improve the quality of drivers as well as to provide safety, and that's what we're trying to do with this particular piece of legislation. Encourage those people to get out. Also we want to reduce some of the cost of the

45th Legislative Day

May 7, 1991

examinations, and I think that if we've got 17 percent of the people failing their driving portion of their exams the first time, this could reduce some of the cost of providing those examinations two and three times."

Homer: "But, what if you have a situation where, you know, wasn't that uncommon years ago where, for example, a wife never got her license because the husband always drove. Now, he dies, she's a widow, she needs to get her license. Even if she were 50 years old or 60 years old, she would first, under your Bill, have to get a permit for 3 months, correct.?"

Burzynski: "That's correct, unless they would take another certified driving examination. Of course, that's not in my Bill, though. I'm sorry."

"Well, thank you. Mr. Speaker, to the Bill, I regret that Homer: this is the Gentleman's first Bill. He's certainly a worthy Legislator, and is going to be a very able Member of this Body I'm sure for years to come, but I think this is an ill-advised first Bill. It imposes a new and stringent requirement upon drivers over the age of 18 years to have a drivers' permit for three months before they can take the driving test. Now, if they take the driving test, and as the Gentleman said 83 percent of them pass that test, then they have shown themselves to be competent drivers. then, punish those 83 percent of people who are adults, over the age of 18 to require an arbitrary 3 month period of time to have a learner's permit? I would think there are many people over 18 who, even if they had such a permit, would perhaps have trouble finding someone to assist them in driving for the purpose of utilizing that I see no need, we've already changed the law over permit. the years to make the requirements more stringent. I think this could be seen as an owner's provision that would be

45th Legislative Day

May 7, 1991

punitive perhaps to widows or to others who find themselves in a situation where they, for the first time in their lives need a driver's license, and now all of a sudden in addition to whatever personal loss they may have suffered in that situation, we're going to impose some arbitrary requirement on them that they obtain a learner's permit, when as the Gentleman said, 83 percent of 'em have shown statistically to be capable of driving without such a permit. So, I hope that the Gentleman will present us another first Bill that we can support, but as for me I am going to have to reluctantly vote against this first Bill."

- Speaker Young: "The Gentleman from Warren, Representative Hultgren. Further discussion? Representative Burzynski to close."
- Burzynski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I certainly appreciate the concerns of those that've spoken either in opposition to or in support of this particular piece of legislation. I do think that it is a necessary piece of legislation to ensure that we have safety on our streets, and my intent certainly is not to discriminate against those who need to have their driver's license, but I would like to go ahead and call for the Roll Call on this vote. If this vote, particular vote fails, we will try and work later on with the Secretary of State's office. However, I would encourage an 'aye' vote. Thank you."
- Speaker Young: "The Gentleman moves for passage of House Bill 1165. 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 Burzynski to explain his vote."
- Burzynski: "Take the record, Mr. Speaker, please."
- Speaker Young: "Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record."

45th Legislative Day

May 7, 1991

Burzynski: "Thank you."

- Speaker Young: "On this question, there are 69 voting 'yes', 27 voting 'no', 12 voting 'present'. House Bill 1165, having received the required Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1446, Representative Ryder. Out of the record. House Bill 1506, Representative Pullen. Out of the record. House Bill 1960, Representative Ronan. Out of the record. House Bill 1995, Representative Bob Olson. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1995, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Vehicle Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Young: "Representative Olson."

- Olson, B.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Fellow Members, House Bill 1995 amends the Illinois Vehicle Code. It basically does two things. It clarifies a definition of 'person', and also it increases the fee that the Secretary of State may charge for non-sufficient fund checks, from \$10 to, excuse me, from \$5 to \$10, be happy to answer any questions."
- Speaker Young: "Gentleman has moved for passage of House Bill 1995. On that question, is there any discussion?"
- Olson, B.: "Just ask for a favorable vote. Thank you."
- Speaker Young: "Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 1995 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? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 111 voting 'yes', none voting 'no', and none voting 'present'. This Bill having received the required Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2335, Representative Currie. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk.
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2335, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Human Rights Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Young: "Representative Currie."

45th Legislative Day

May 7, 1991

Currie: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. House Bill 2335 would require the Human Rights Commission to publish its decisions within 120 days of the time that the parties are served with the actual 'yes' or 'no' vote of the commission. The point of this proposal is to assure that there's uniformity of precedent and that people who work on issues before the Human Rights Commission can have the advantage of the reasoning behind commission opinions. I'm aware of no opposition to the Bill, and I would appreciate your support."

Speaker Young: "The Lady moves for passage of House Bill 2335.

On that question, is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is 'Shall House Bill 2335 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? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 109 voting 'yes', none voting 'no', and none voting 'present'. House Bill 2335, having received the required Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2349, Representative McGuire. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk.

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2349, a Bill for an Act in relation to state employees. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Young: "Representative McGuire."

McGuire: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I believe there's a third Amendment to this Bill that I don't know if you have received. If you have not, I'd ask for it to be postponed 'till the next time. Do you have a third Amendment up there?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No."

McGuire: "Okay, could we then take it out of the record for the time being?"

Speaker Young: "Out of the record."

45th Legislative Day

May 7, 1991

McGuire: "Thank you very much."

- Speaker Young: "House Bill 2361, Representative Keane. Out of the record. House Bill 2407, Representative Ryder. Out of the record. House Bill 2416, Representative Keane. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk.
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2416, a Bill for an Act to limit the creation of organizational units by state. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Young: "Representative Keane."

- Keane: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. 2416 is an Audit Commission Bill. It's very simple. What it does is it says that a state agency cannot create or...a joint venture corporation or partnership with another entity that expands the powers and duties or responsibilities of that state agency, unless they come to the General Assembly and get specific permission. We found instances where, in the Audit Commission, where State Agencies have, by setting up a third agency or by interacting with...by developing a shell agency..."
- Speaker Young: "Excuse me, Representative Keane. Did you intend to adopt Floor Amendment #1 to this Bill?"
- Keane: "I'm sorry, I thought that was adopted. I would ask leave to return the Bill to Second Reading for purposes of Amendment."
- Speaker Young: "Read the Bill on Second Reading, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2416, a Bill for an Act to limit the creation of organizational units by state. This Bill has been read a second time previously. Amendment #1, offered by Representative Keane."
- Keane: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Amendment #1 was an Amendment I arrived at in agreement with some of the private agencies who are worried about the more expansive language. What we did in effect was strike the words 'exercise' and

45th Legislative Day

May 7, 1991

'enhances', and I'd move the adoption of Amendment #1."

Speaker Young: "The Gentleman moves the adoption of Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 2416. 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 O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Young: "Third Reading. Representative Keane now asks leave of the Body to read the Bill on Third Reading."

Keane: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Young: "With use of the Attendance Roll Call, leave is granted. Third Reading."

Keane: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The analysis I gave earlier was the same one. It basically says no state agency can participate in the formation or creation of any corporation or any other entity which enhances, which expands, I'm sorry, which expands the responsibilities and duties of that agency, unless they get prior permission from the General Assembly. I'd be happy to answer any questions and ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Young: "Gentleman moves for passage of House Bill 2416.

On that question, the Gentleman from Will, Representative
Wennlund."

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

Speaker Young: "Indicates he'll yield for a question."

Wennlund: "Representative Keane, the language of the Bill says that a state agency cannot enter into any type of...or participate with any other corporation. It says 'any corporation'. Presumably that would mean any municipal corporation, even?"

Keane: "That's correct."

45th Legislative Day

May 7, 1991

Wennlund: "Like the City of Chicago, even?"

Keane: "That's correct. They cannot do that where it expands the powers, duties and responsibilities of the state agency."

Wennlund: "What specific instance or instances can you point to that, where this in fact has taken place?"

Keane: "Probably the best instance has been in the university systems where through the use of alumni associations or foundations, the states have done things that they cannot do as a state agency. A good example of this was SIU wanted to build dorms, married dorms, this was years ago in Carbondale. The General Assembly said no. through an agreement with their foundation, had the foundation buy the land build the dorms, they sub leased them. Interestingly enough, when the dorms were built, the foundation went to the local government and said that exempt, they went to the assessor and said you can't tax this land because the state owns it. When we told them that they couldn't do that, they said, you cannot stop it because the foundation is not a state agency. So this intended legislation is to stop that type οf practice...unless they come and get our specific approval."

Wennlund: "Would...But the powers of these state agencies are limited by statute to begin with."

Keane: "That hasn't stopped them from doing things beyond their limitations."

Wennlund: "Would this prevent a relationship between the Historic Preservation Agency and the Illinois Historic Society, for instance? Which is a corporation, and the word 'any corporation' includes all of them from municipal corporations to a charitable corporation like the Illinois Historical Society."

Keane: "Basically, we're not trying to take any powers away from them. What we are trying to do is keep them from utilizing

45th Legislative Day

May 7, 1991

a third or another agency, and end up exercising more powers than they can. What we find has happened is, is that if...if agencies of state government cannot do things that they want to do, they will find a...either create, what in the university—systems we call university related organizations, or they'll create an organization out in never—never land with a private or a semi—private organization, and then give the state, have the state transfer more power to them than the state agency has to give."

Wennlund: "Thank you very much."

Keane: "You're welcome."

Speaker Young: "Further discussion? Hearing none, Representative Keane to close."

Keane: "Just favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Young: "Alright, the question is 'Shall House Bill 2416 pass?'. All those in favor vote 'aye', those opposed vote Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 110 voting 'yes', none voting 'no', and 1 voting 'present'. This Bill having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2538, Representative Cowlishaw. Out οf the record. House Bill 2602, Representative Ryder. Representative Ryder? House Bill 2602? Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk.

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2602, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Vehicle Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Young: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill would make it unlawful to fail to surrender to the Secretary of State a license or permit that had been issued by mistake or fraud. I'd be glad to answer any questions and ask for your approval."

Speaker Young: "The Gentleman moves for passage of House Bill

45th Legislative Day

- May 7, 1991
- 2602, and on that question, is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Williams."
- Williams: "Yes. Would you describe briefly the criminal penalties in this particular piece of legislation?"
- Ryder: "This, it would be a Class A misdemeanor on the first violation, second and subsequent violations would be a Class 4 felony."
- Williams: "What if, what is the, in terms of the Class 4 felony,
  in particular, what exactly does that entail in terms of
  jail time, fines et cetera?"
- Ryder: "A Class 4 felony would be one to three years, and a fine up to \$5000."
- Williams: "Now, when you say it is a violation of this section, if you just, you mean to say that if you just display or have displayed or even in your possession any cancelled, revoked or suspended license, would you be guilty under this particular piece of legislation?"
- Ryder: "Representative, that's current law. The law that is created by the Bill that I wish to add at this point, is the failure or refusal to surrender to the Secretary of State a license that has been issued by mistake or fraud."
- Williams: "Does this require that you knowingly refuse the license that's been issued by mistake as required in Section 2 and not in Section 4? Does it say, for instance, that someone issued one by mistake and they didn't know that they had acquired it by mistake, and they refused, would they still be guilty?"
- Ryder: "Representative, in order to fail or refuse to surrender, it implies that you know that the license was issued by mistake or fraud."
- Williams: "No. It only requires that you don't do it."
- Ryder: "Correct. I'll accede to your interpretation."

Williams: "Thank you."

45th Legislative Day

May 7, 1991

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

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

Ryder: "Certainly."

Dunn: "If a driver's license happens to get issued to me, and it has my birthdate listed incorrectly, it has been issued to me with a mistake on it. Is that right?"

Ryder: "That is correct. I don't believe that means that it was issued by mistake."

Dunn: "It does what?"

Ryder: "It contains erroneous information. That's not what the language says, Representative. The language says, and means to say, that if a license has been issued by mistake or by fraud, and if the Secretary of State asks for it to be returned, and therefore that you failed to..."

Dunn: "Well, let me finish my question."

Ryder: "You certainly may."

"If the, a license gets issued and my birthdate is wrong, Dunn: and supposing I don't notice that, and I drive around with that license for 120 days. Now I have a license issued by mistake, which falls into the category of Section 4 of this Bill, and I have failed to surrender, and I'm driving around, don't even know what I've got in my wallet. trust the Secretary of State to issue it correctly, I didn't look, didn't notice, and so now I have driven around for 60 days with a license issued by mistake and I have failed to surrender it. There is no provision in Section 4 that I knowingly or intentionally do this, so I am guilty of Class A misdemeanor the first time I do that, which probably is the first day, and the second day I drive around with that, I'm guilty of a Class 4 felony. That seems a little strict to me."

Ryder: "Well, if that was a question I'd be glad to try to answer

45th Legislative Day

May 7, 1991

it. I didn't hear the question that was part of that, Representative, but let me suggest to you that what we're simply trying to say is that in the event a license is issued by mistake or by fraud, and the Secretary of State says give it back. If you fail to do that, then you have committed the offense in the license...in the...article. You have misread the penalty provisions which calls for convictions of...for the second or subsequent. In the situation that you described, there's no convictions for the first."

Dunn: "Does the, you may be right. Section 4 does say that failure to surrender upon demand, so are you saying that there is a condition preceding that there must be a demand of you to return it?"

Ryder: "That's what the law says now..."

Dunn: "That makes the Bill a little better, I still think I'm against it, the penalty's too stiff."

Ryder: "Representative, the penalties are as they are for the underlying Bill. We're simply adding an additional condition that requires a request first."

Dunn: "That doesn't mean I like 'em in the underlying Bill, either. I don't want to prolong this, as a matter of fact I can barely remember whether it's still Tuesday in here, so I just bring my remarks to a close and urge a 'no' vote on this Bill."

Ryder: "Thank you."

Speaker Young: "Further discussion? Representative Ryder to close."

Ryder: "Thank you. I'd ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Young: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 2602 pass?'

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,

45th Legislative Day

May 7, 1991

there are 89 voting 'yes', 2 voting 'no', 14 voting 'present'. House Bill 2602, having received the required Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. We now go to the Order of Insurance. Third Reading. Insurance. The first Bill on the Order is House Bill 125, Representative Keane. Out of the record. House Bill 129, Representative Mautino. Out of the record. House Bill, read House Bill 129, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 129, a Bill for an Act to amend the State Employees Group Insurance Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Young: "Representative Mautino."

Mautino: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. As amended, with the two Amendments, the three Amendments that have been adopted to the legislation, let me explain to you what each of them do. What we had when we enacted the local government health care plan, we provided that 100 % of the employees of a local government or association would have to agree to join. Otherwise, they could not join. What this Amendment does is state that if, in fact, you are the spouse of an individual who has coverage, then you cannot stop the other members of the association or the group from joining the local government health plan. also provides that the township officials of Illinois, which is units of local government, be authorized to the local...participate in the local government as well health program, and number three, it provides that provision is changed from 100 percent to 85 percent, rather than all the employees in the group to join. I know of no opposition, the Amendments were drafted in accordance with CMS who operates the plan. It has the agreement of AFSCME, township officials of Illinois. I know of no opposition. It has a ton of Sponsors, and I move for its passage."

45th Legislative Day

May 7, 1991

Speaker Young: "The Gentleman moves for passage of House Bill 129. On that question, the Gentleman from Fulton, Representative Homer."

Homer: "Will the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Young: "Indicates he'll yield for a question."

Homer: "Representative Mautino, this essentially allows a covered spouse to opt out of a state insurance plan if they're covered under some other plan?"

Mautino: "Yes, for example, if the spouse works for a mental health facility or a local CAPP agency, a husband may work for Caterpillar. Because Caterpillar has better coverage, she, therefore, would not want to join in the local government health care plan. That Amendment provides that that individual doesn't have to be covered. That addresses the 100 % of the employees of the local agency."

Homer: "Does that have a cost impact on the plan?"

Mautino: "None whatsoever because this is paid for by the employees of the group that want to come in."

Homer: "Sounds like a good Bill."

Mautino: "It is a good Bill."

Speaker Young: "Further discussion? Representative Mautino to close."

Mautino: "I think everybody understands exactly what it does, and
I move for its adoption."

Speaker Young: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 129 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? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 107 voting 'yes', none voting 'no', and none voting 'present'. House Bill 129, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 254, Representative Woolard. Representative Woolard? Read the Bill, Mr.

45th Legislative Day

May 7, 1991

Clerk.

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 254, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Insurance Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Young: "Representative Woolard."

Woolard: "Yes. This is an Agreed Bill at this point. Everyone that has had any concerns at all about the insurance, mine subsidence insurance fund, has agreed to the language that we've established, and I think that this came out of committee with a little bit of concern, but at the time that we got to the floor, we told 'em we'd be working with the Department of Insurance, the Mine Subsidence Insurance Fund and the insurance industry, and at this point we're all in agreement, and I would appreciate a favorable vote."

Speaker Young: "The Gentleman moves for passage of House Bill 254. On that question, the Gentleman from Will, Representative Wennlund."

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

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

Wennlund: "Representative Woolard, did the Amendment remove the objection of the insurance industry, the Mine Subsidence Insurance Fund, and the Illinois Insurance Conference?"

Woolard: "Very definitely did, yes."

Wennlund: "...It sounds like a great Bill to me. I just knew that they had previously voiced objection to it and wasn't sure whether the Amendment, in fact, removed their objection."

Woolard: "Yes, it did."

Wennlund: "Thank you very much."

Woolard: "Thank you."

Speaker Young: "Further discussion? Representative Woolard to close."

Woolard: "Would appreciate your favorable vote."

Speaker Young: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 254 pass?'

45th Legislative Day

May 7, 1991

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? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 105 voting 'yes', none voting 'no', none voting 'present'. House Bill 254, having received the required Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1204, Representative Mautino.

Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk. Out of the record. House Bill 1299, Representative Ronan. Out of the record. House Bill 1466, Representative Mautino. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1466, a Bill for an Act to amend the

Comprehensive Health Insurance Plan Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Young: "Representative Mautino."

Mautino: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Representative Regan and I are members of the CHIP Board. This legislation delays for one year the sunset date on the anti-dumping provision in our CHIP program. That's basically...that's what the Bill does. I don't know of any opposition and be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Young: "The Gentleman moves for passage of House Bill 1466. On that question, is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is 'Shall House Bill 1466 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? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 106 voting 'yes', none voting 'no' and none voting 'present'. House Bill 1466, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1470, Representative Hultgren. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk.

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1470, a Bill for an Act to amend the

45th Legislative Day

May 7, 1991

Illinois Insurance Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Young: "Representative Hultgren."

Hultgren: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This measure amends the Insurance Code to provide that with homeowner's insurance the insurance company would pay for the cost of both the policyholder's appraisal and the umpire's appraisal, if the policyholder's full amount of appraised loss is upheld by the agreement of the insured. This measure came out of the Insurance Committee with a unanimous vote, and it is supported by the Department, as well as by the industry, Allstate, and the Illinois Insurance Conference. I don't believe there's any opposition to the Bill as amended and would ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Young: "The Gentleman moves for passage of House Bill 1470. On that question, is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is 'Shall House Bill 1470 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? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 105 voting 'yes', none voting 'no', and none voting 'present'. House Bill 1470, having received the required Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1512, Representative Mautino. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk.

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1512, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Health Facilities Planning Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Young: "Representative Mautino."

Mautino: "Inquiry of the Clerk, Mr. Speaker, if I may. Was

Amendment #1 adopted to that proposal?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #1 is on the Bill."

Mautino: "That was the Mautino Black Amendment? Okay, fine.

45th Legislative Day

May 7, 1991

It's on the Bill. I just checked with the other side of the aisle. 1512, Mr. Speaker, as amended, establishes a floor, which is \$800,000 for the bonded projects under the Illinois Health Finance Act and the certificate of need. Currently, the provision is \$2,000,000, and the Amendment addresses that question by bringing the floor back until the information is provided by hospitals concerning the survey for the rationale on the purchase of equipment under \$2,000,000. What this does is bring it to the previous level. I move for its passage."

Speaker Young: "The Gentleman moves for passage of House Bill 1512. On that question, the Gentleman from Grundy, Representative Weller."

Weller: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Young: "Indicates he'll yield for a question."

Weller: "Okay. Representative, over here. Representative, Dick.

My understanding is this Bill changes the dollar thresholds
that were established by the General Assembly in 1988, when
it reverses it from \$2,000,000 million down to \$800,000?"

Mautino: "That's correct."

Weller: "Okay. Is this legislation part of any negotiations of any..."

Mautino: "Yes, it is."

Weller: "What's the status of these negotiations?"

Mautino: "If this Bill were to pass out of the House,
Representative Black and I have agreed to hold it into the
Senate and present a Resolution for the completion of the
survey. Currently, if this legislation doesn't pass, then
all the discussions will go bye-bye, and that's not right
and correct, and we have agreed, you can check with
Representative Black, everything I've said is exactly as it
is, and we ask you to pass it. The Reference Bureau

45th Legislative Day

- May 7, 1991
- tomorrow will have the Resolution. We will both be presenting, so these discussions can go ongoing."
- Weller: "So you feel this passage of this legislation is necessary as an incentive to keep these discussions underway?"
- Mautino: "In the General Assembly we'd have two competing forces, and there's not a hammer out there, discussion stops immediately. Yes, Sir."
- Weller: "Would this...do you feel this legislation can save money for hospitals in the long run?"
- Mautino: "In the long run yes, it will, Sir."
- Weller: "Okay. Thank you. Ladies...okay. Thank you,
  Representative."
- Speaker Young: "Further discussion? Representative Mautino to close."
- Mautino: "I think the response to Representative Weller's and the agreement of the truthfulness of the statement by Representative Black and I are exactly as is presented here. We move for its passage."
- Speaker Young: "Question is 'Shall House Bill 1512 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. This is final passage. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 105 voting 'yes', none voting 'no', 2 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the required Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1528, Representative Curran. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk.
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1528, a Bill for an Act to amend the State Employees Group Insurance Code. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Young: "Representative Curran."
- Curran: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 1528 extends survivor's insurance

45th Legislative Day

May 7, 1991

benefits to surviving spouses who don't yet get an annuity or insurance benefits because they happen to be less than 55 years old. Doesn't make any sense to me, that a surviving spouse at age 53, or 51, or 49, after going through the trauma of losing their spouse, should then go through the extra trauma of finding out that they're not available to receive state insurance, even if they pay for it, which, of course, would happen under the provisions of this Act. This Bill passed 23 nothing outta (sic out of) committee, be glad to answer any questions, and I'd appreciate a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Young: "The Gentleman moves for passage of...of House
Bill 1528. On that question, the Gentleman from Vermilion,
Representative Black."

Black: "Yep. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I think this is pretty much an Agreed Bill but just a reminder, to the Sponsor, we think there's a drafting error in this. Didn't you mean to say 50 years old, and the Bill says 55 years old? So, we're incorrect, you want it to be 55?"

Curran: "In the analysis, it says 55."

Black: "Okay, we can work it out."

Curran: "And in the Bill it says 55."

Black: "Yeah, our staffer thought you had intended that it be 50."

Curran: "No, what right now happens is that if you are 55 years of age or older, your spouse dies, you following me, now?

Black: "Okay, yeah, we'll talk about it, it's no problem. Let's
 roll it."

Curran: "Okay."

Black: "Alright."

Speaker Young: "Further discussion? The Lady from Lake,

Representative Frederick."

Frederick: "I'm sorry, I'm having trouble. Thank you, Mr.

45th Legislative Day

May 7, 1991

Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Young: "Indicates he'll yield for a question."

Frederick: "Representative Curran, is there any limitation on how long a surviving spouse can be included in this insurance policy? For example, if they remarry, are they automatically off? Or..."

Curran: "Representative, I...would you ask the question again?"

Frederick: "Yes. I just said, are there any limits on how long a surviving spouse may remain on, covered by this policy.

For example, if the surviving spouse remarries, then are they automatically off the policy, or does (sic) are they allowed to continue?"

Curran: "If my memory is correct, the surviving spouse who remarries then loses this option. If my understanding of this Bill is correct, what this would do, was provide option to someone who is less than 55 years of age. The genesis of this legislation came as a result of conversation from former Representative Josephine Oblinger, who visited my office about 2 months ago and suggested this. I then visited her about 2 weeks ago in her office the Department on Aging, showed her this legislation, she said it is what she intended, but in answer to your question, I don't think it changes the fact that, if a surviving spouse would, were to remarry, they would lose this option. This simply works at an earlier age for surviving spouses."

Frederick: "Oh."

Curran: "I don't see why a surviving spouse at 54 years of age should be treated any different than a surviving spouse at 56 years of age."

Frederick: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Young: "Further discussion? Representative Curran to

45th Legislative Day

May 7, 1991

close."

- Curran: "I think this has been well explained. This Bill came to me as an idea from former State Representative Josephine Oblinger. Representative Parke and I have Sponsored it now, it came out of committee 23 to nothing. I ask for a favorable Roll Call."
- Speaker Young: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 1528 pass?'

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

  Voting is open. This is final passage...removing those

  Members of the Reapportionment Committee who have gone to

  the hearing from the Rolls. Please do not vote their

  switches. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the

  record. On this question, there are 96 voting 'yes', none

  voting 'no', and none voting 'present'. This Bill, having

  received the required Constitutional Majority is hereby

  declared passed. House Bill 1603, Representative Mautino.

  Out of the record. House Bill 1604. Read the Bill, Mr.

  Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1604, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Insurance Code. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Young: "Representative Mautino. Representative Mautino."

  Mautino: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the
  House. Representative Parcells is not here. This is the
  agreed Bill between the Chairman and the spokesman of the
  Insurance Committee. As one of the vehicles for the
  rewrite of the Insurance Code under the Sunset Provision.
  It is a shell Bill at this time, we would like to send it
  to the Senate. I don't know of any opposition, I believe
  Representative Parke agrees with me that there's nothing
  else in the Bill, but it will be used for the rewrite."
- Speaker Young: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Parke."

  Parke: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Again, this is a vehicle that must be out for the

45th Legislative Day

- May 7, 1991
- rewrite of the Insurance Code, and so, therefore, with the assurance from the Sponsor that that's what it's used for, we will not oppose."
- Speaker Young: "The Gentleman from Will, Representative Wennlund."
- Wennlund: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Was Amendment #1 tabled?"
- Speaker Young: "No, Amendment #1 was neither tabled nor adopted.

  There has been an Amendment filed to House Bill 1604."
- Mautino: "Excuse me, Mark. Mark. Mr. Speaker, whose Amendment is it?"
- Speaker Young: "It's a Laurino Amendment."
- Mautino: "Oh, that was filed after the Bill had moved to Third, if I remember correctly, and I'm not taking it back. I'm not going to take it back."
- Speaker Young: "That is correct. The Amendment was filed after this Bill moved to Third Reading, and it is not on the Bill. The Gentleman from Warren, Representative Hultgren."
- Hultgren: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question. The Insurance Code rewrite, is that, will there be any substantive change in the law, or is that simply a recodification of existing law?"
- Mautino: "There may be some changes I'm not aware of. We're starting to meet as of tomorrow, that's why we're leaving 1603 here and sending 1604 to the Senate. It has a sunset provision on 14 Articles, and we have to either extend them or make whatever changes, and that's exactly what this vehicle's being used for."
- Hultgren: "Thank you."
- Speaker Young: "Further discussion? The question is, 'Shall House Bill 1604 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? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there

45th Legislative Day

May 7, 1991

are 95 voting 'yes', none voting 'no', none voting 'present'. House Bill 1604, having received the required Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1618, Representative Granberg. Out of the record. House Bill 1864, Representative Ryder. House Bill 1864. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk.

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1864, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Insurance Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Young: "Representative Ryder."

you, Mr. Speaker. This amends the Illinois Ryder: "Thank Insurance Code to remove a requirement, the worker's compensation insurance policy sold by a non-resident producer must be countersigned. As it now workmen's compensation policies sold from an out of state do not have to be countersigned in order to sell the policy. This does put us in compliance...compliance is not the right word, this does put us in the same posture as out-of-state carriers. I believe it has been agreed to by the insurance industry, and I know of no opposition to it, however I'd be glad to answer any questions."

Speaker Young: "The Gentleman has moved for passage of House Bill 1864. On that question, the Gentleman from Bureau, Representative Mautino.

Mautino: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. To the best of my knowledge, there's no opposition to this legislation, and we agree with it, and I also stand in support."

Speaker Young: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Fulton, Representative Homer."

Homer: "Question for the Sponsor. Representative Ryder, would you one more time explain what you're doing in this Bill?"

Ryder: "Representative, on workmen's compensation policies that are sold by a non-resident of Illinois, currently requires Illinois insurance agents to countersign on those policies.

# 45th Legislative Day

May 7, 1991

The reciprocal, however, is not the case. If an Illinois sells an out-of-state policy, the Illinois person out-of-state does not require person...agent, countersignature. Those people in the insurance industry, meaning those people who are protected countersignature, indicate that the countersignature is not needed and therefore have asked me to present legislation that would remove the necessity of the countersignature."

Homer: "So, this reference in your Bill to Article 29, if that's the correct reading of that Roman numeral, what is that Article? Is that for sale by local agents of policies out of state?"

Ryder: "Yes. I believe that's correct."

Speaker Young: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Madison, Representative Wolf."

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

Rvder: "Certainly."

Wolf: "Representative Ryder, did I understand you to say that the insurance industry has no objections to the Bill?"

Ryder: "Representative, I know of no objections to the Bill, either with the insurance industry through its companies, or the independent insurance agents who are the folks that asked for this."

Wolf: "That was going to be my next question. In other words, the Independent Insurance Agents Association also has no opposition to the Bill?"

Ryder: "Well, not only do they not have opposition, they are in support of the Bill and asked me to Sponsor it."

Speaker Young: "Further discussion? Representative Ryder to close."

Ryder: "I'd ask for a favorable Roll Call."

45th Legislative Day

May 7, 1991

- Speaker Young: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 1864 pass?'

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

  Voting is open. This is final passage. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 95 voting 'yes', none voting 'no', and none voting 'present'. House Bill 1864, having received the required Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2094, Representative Mautino. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2094, a Bill for an Act to amend the Health Maintenance Organization Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Young: "Representative Mautino."

- Mautino: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. 2094 is an expansion into the HMO provisions of the Insurance Code, identical to what has been adopted in the 86th General Assembly for the private insurance carriers. It covers what is commonly referred to as no no gain provision, when there is an existing loss. condition, it is carried over to the policyholder and the company that submitted that policy for a specific period of In the Insurance Code, you must provide this if you're changing insurance companies for the benefit of the Also, now, with the enactment of policyholder. legislation, the same provisions would be for an HMO, who's operating for the benefit οf the consumer, policyholder, and I move for its adoption and passage."
- Speaker Young: "The Gentleman's moved for passage of House Bill 2094. On that question, is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 2094 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open, and this is final passage. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the

#### 45th Legislative Day

May 7, 1991

record. On this question, there are 94 voting 'yes', none voting 'no', and none voting 'present'. House Bill 2094, having received the required Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2105, Representative Balanoff. Out of the record. On this same Order, House Bill 1299, Representative Ronan. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk.

- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1299, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Insurance Code. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Young: "Representative Ronan."
- Ronan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I understand that there's a technical Amendment that has been filed that I'd like to add to the Bill. Is there an Amendment up there, Chuck? Thank you."
- Speaker Young: "Take the Bill back to Second Reading and read the Bill on Second Reading, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1299, a Bill for an Act to amend the Insurance Code. This Bill has been read a second time previously. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Ronan."
- Ronan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Floor Amendment #1 changes one word on line 31 of the first page of the Bill, changing the word 'those' with the word 'that'. Be glad to answer any questions if anyone has questions."
- Speaker Young: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 1299. 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 O'Brien: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Young: "Third Reading. Representative Ronan now asks leave of the Body to hear the Bill on Third Reading. By

45th Legislative Day

- May 7, 1991
- use of the Attendance Roll Call, leave is granted. Third Reading.
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1299, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Insurance Code. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Young: "Representative Ronan."
- Ronan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 1299 as amended merely changes the date of participation in this program.

  This Bill was prepared by the Illinois Farmers Association, and it makes the effective date move from October 31, 1992 rather than December 31, 1991. Glad to answer any questions concerning the legislation."
- Speaker Young: "The Gentleman moves for passage of House Bill 1299. On that question is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 1299 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? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 95 voting 'yes', none voting 'no', none voting 'present'. House Bill 1299, having received the required Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. On the Order of Insurance Second Reading appears House Bill 1407, Representative Bugielski. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk.
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1407, a Bill for an Act to amend the State Employees Group Insurance Act. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee or Floor Amendments."
- Speaker Young: "Are there any Motions filed?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed."
- Speaker Young: "Third Reading. On the Order of Government Operations, Second Reading, appears House Bill 1011. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk.
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1011, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Vehicle Code. Second Reading of the Bill. No

45th Legislative Day

May 7, 1991

Committee Amendments.

Speaker Young: "Any Floor Amendments?"

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

McNamara."

Speaker Young: "Representative Black."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. This came up a little earlier this morning, and I think your side of the aisle is in agreement that this Amendment is technical in nature. It's a Barnes-McGann-McNamara Bill, and with leave of the House, I'd like to move this to Third Reading as Representative Barnes has been ill, we think the Amendment is agreed, we'd like to put the Amendment on the Bill, and we'd like to move the Bill to Third Reading."

Speaker Young: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Floor

Amendment #1 to House Bill 1011. On that question, is
there any discussion?"

Black: "You really don't want to know."

Speaker Young: "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.

Speaker Young: "Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Young: "Third Reading. The Members are to be reminded that tomorrow morning at 9:00 o'clock there'll be a briefing by Superintendent Leiniger on House Bill 885 on the House Floor. That's 9:00 o'clock sharp on the House floor. Agreed Resolutions."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 423, offered by Representative Doederlein; 425, Rice; 426, W. Peterson; 427, Granberg; 428, Granberg; 429, Granberg; 430, Stern; 431, Speaker Madigan; 432, McGann; 433, Matijevich; 434, Matijevich; 435, Hicks; 436, Phelan. House Joint Resolution 40,

- 45th Legislative Day May 7, 1991

  offered by Representative Tenhouse, and Senate Joint

  Resolution 50, offered by Representative Churchill and

  Capparelli."
- Speaker Young: "Representative Matijevich moves the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. All those in favor say 'aye', those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it and the Agreed Resolutions are adopted.

  General Resolutions."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Joint Resolution 39, offered by Representative Wyvetter Younge, and House Joint Resolution 41, offered by Representative Woolard and White."
- Speaker Young: "Committee on Assignment. Senate Bills, First Reading."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 51, offered by Representative Weller,

  a Bill for an Act relating to county superintendent of
  highways. First Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Young: "Introduction (sic and) First Reading (sic of)
  Bills."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2645, offered by Representative Wolf,
  a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Pension Code.
  First Reading of the Bill. Representative Matijevich moves
  that the House stand Adjourned. Representative Dunn, for
  what purpose do you seek recognition?"
- Dunn: "Well, we thought we weren't going to get out of here until 6:00 o'clock, and I want to express my appreciation to you for letting us out early once again. You deserve a round of applause."
- Speaker Young: "Representative Dunn, if you stay for the First Special Session, as you should, you won't get out at 6:00.

  Representative Matijevich now moves that the House stand Adjourned until the hour of 11:00 a.m. tomorrow. All in favor say 'aye', opposed say 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it and the House stands Adjourned. The First Special Session of

# 45th Legislative Day

May 7, 1991

the 87th General Assembly is now called to order. The Roll of the Regular Session will be used for the attendance of the Special Session. Representative Matijevich now moves that the First Special Session stand Adjourned 'till 11:05 tomorrow morning. All those in favor say 'aye', those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the First Special Session now stands Adjourned, and we still made it."

DOCUMENT NAME	REQ STORE OPER GROUI		D DATE	СОРУ	D WIDTH	DEPTH	ERROR
T050991 T050791	140 140	O pj O pj	08/24/92 08/24/92	1	66 66	78 78	

REPORT: TIFLDAY PAGE: 001

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

92/08/26 09:00:42

# MAY 07. 1991

HB-0012 SECOND READING	PAGE	27
HB-0067 SECOND READING	PAGE	20
HB-0119 RECALLED	PAGE	72
HB-0119 THIRD READING	PAGE	72
HB-0119 THIRD READING	PAGE	74
HB-0129 THIRD READING	PAGE	143
HB-0143 SECOND READING		
	PAGE	29
HB-0254 THIRD READING	PAGE	145
HB-0329 THIRD READING	PAGE	43
HB-0426 SECOND READING	PAGE	5
HB-0452 SECOND READING	PAGE	29
HB-0570 THIRD READING	PAGE	79
HB-0570 POSTPONED CONSIDERATION	PAGE	83
HB-0682 THIRD READING	PAGE	123
HB-0700 THIRD READING	PAGE	124
HB-0706 SECOND READING	PAGE	12
HB-0738 SECOND READING	PAGE	30
HB-0742 SECOND READING	PAGE	12
HB-0742 OUT OF RECORD	PAGE	12
HB-0832 SECOND READING	PAGE	3
HB-0832 OUT OF RECORD		
	PAGE	4
HB-0877 HELD ON SECOND	PAGE	83
HB-0877 THIRD READING	PAGE	85
HB-0879 SECOND READING	PAGE	24
HB-0883 RECALLED	PAGE	86
HB-0883 THIRD READING	PAGE	86
HB-0915 SECOND READING	PAGE	8
HB-0962 RECALLED	PAGE	8
HB-0962 THIRD READING	PAGE	38
HB-1011 SECOND READING	PAGE	30
HB-1011 SECOND READING	PAGE	158
HB-1011 OUT OF RECORD	PAGE	30
HB-1014 THIRD READING	PAGE	32
HB-1078 SECOND READING	PAGE	4
HB-1079 SECOND READING	PAGE	
HB-1165 THIRD READING		4
HB-1176 THIRD READING	PAGE	126
	PAGE	87
HB-1198 SECOND READING	PAGE	30
HB-1207 SECOND READING	PAGE	12
HB-1243 SECOND READING	PAGE	26
HB-1299 HELD ON SECOND	PAGE	157
HB-1299 THIRD READING	PAGE	158
HB-1397 SECOND READING	PAGE	31
HB-1407 SECOND READING	PAGE	158
HB-1466 THIRD READING	PAGE	146
HB-1470 THIRD READING	PAGE	146
HB-1512 THIRD READING	PAGE	147
HB-1524 THIRD READING	PAG€	87
HB-1528 THIRD READING	PAGE	149
HB-1576 THIRD READING	PAGE	88
HB-1604 THIRD READING	PAGE	152
HB-1615 THIRD READING	PAGE	114
HB-1685 THIRD READING	PAGE	37
HB-1688 SECOND READING	PAGE	31
HB-1797 THIRD READING	PAGE	
HB-1843 THIRD READING		52
HB-1843 THIRD READING	PAGE	39
	PAGE	43
HB-1843 OUT OF RECORD	PAGE	39
HB-1864 THIRD READING	PAGE	154
HB-1867 RECALLED	PAGE	89
HB-1867 THIRD READING	PAGE	89
HB-1867 THIRD READING	PAGE	91
HB-1867 POSTPONED CONSIDERATION	PAGE	100
HB-1868 THIRD READING	PAGE	101

REPORT: TIFLDAY PAGE: 002 STATE OF ILLINOIS 87TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES DAILY TRANSCRIPTION OF DEBATE INDEX

# 92/08/26 09:00:42

MAY 07 • 1991

H8-1908	SECOND READING	PAGE	4
HB-1911	THIRD READING	PAGE	71
HB-1930	THIRD READING	PAGE	54
HB-1935	SECOND READING	PAGE	25
HB-1945	SECOND READING	PAGE	31
HB-1948	RECALLED	PAGE	70
HB-1948	THIRD READING	PAGE	69
H8-1948	THIRD READING	PAGE	70
HB-1995	THIRD READING	PAGE	134
HB-2005	THIRD READING	PAGE	101
HB-2026	SECOND READING	PAGE	22
	SECOND READING	PAGE	23
HB-2067	THIRD READING	PAGE	121
HB-2074	THIRD READING	PAGE	39
HB-2094	THIRD READING	PAGE	156
HB-2104	THIRD READING	PAGE	40
HB-2104	POSTPONED CONSIDERATION	PAGE	43
HB-2151	SECOND READING	PAGE	26
HB-2160	RECALLED	PAGE	56
HB-2160	OUT OF RECORD	PAGE	57
	THIRD READING	PAGE	57
HB-2165	THIRD READING	PAGE	38
HB-2177	SECOND READING	PAGE	7
HB-2181	SECOND READING	PAGE	31
HB-2197	SECOND READING	PAGE	4
HB-2227	THIRD READING	PAGE	61
	SECOND READING	PAGE	13
HB-2309	SECOND READING	PAGE	31
HB-2325	SECOND READING	PAGE	19
HB-2335	THIRD READING	PAGE	134
	THIRD READING	PAGE	135
HB+2349	OUT OF RECORD	PAGE	135
	THIRD READING	PAGE	103
HB-2362	THIRD READING	PAGE	102
	OUT OF RECORD	PAGE	102
	SECOND READING	PAGE	32
	HELD ON SECOND	PAGE	106
	OUT OF RECORD	PAGE	114
	RECALLED	PAGE	136
	THIRD READING	PAGE	136
	THIRD READING	PAGE	137
	THIRD READING	PAGE	62
	SECOND READING	PAGE	20
	SECOND READING	PAGE	11
	SECOND READING	PAGE	12
	THIRD READING	PAGE	139
	THIRD READING	PAGE	105
	FIRST READING	PAGE	160
	OUT OF RECORD	PAGE	56
	FIRST READING	PAG€	160
HR-0228		PAGE	2
HR-0228	RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	2

# SUBJECT MATTER

HOUSE TO ORDER - SPEAKER MCPIKE	PAGE	1
PRAYER - FATHER KRAFT	PAGE	1
PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE	PAGE	1
ROLL CALL FOR ATTENDANCE	PAGE	1
REPRESENTATIVE LAURING IN CHAIR	PAGE	51
REPRESENTATIVE KEANE IN THE CHAIR	PAGE	72
REPRESENTATIVE YOUNG IN THE CHAIR	PAGE	103
AGREED RESOLUTIONS	PAGE	159
GENERAL RESOLUTIONS	PAGE	160

REPORT: TIFLDAY PAGE: 003

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

92/08/26 09:00:42

MAY 07. 1991

# SUBJECT MATTER

<b>ADJOUR</b>	NMENT			PAGE	160
FIRST	SPECIAL	SESSION		PAGE	160
FIRST	SPECIAL	SESSION	THEMANUOLDA	PAGE	161