152nd Legislative Day

June 9, 1992

Speaker McPike: "(The House) will come to order. The Chaplain for today is Reverend Steven Horn from First Christian Church in Casey, Illinois. Reverend Horn is the guest of Representative Weaver. The guests in the balcony may wish to rise and join us for the invocation."

Reverend Horn: "Let us join together in prayer. Merciful loving God, those whom You have blessed with the awesome responsibilities of government, earnestly seek guidance this day. We know, dear Lord, that You hear the prayers of those who love justice and strengthen those who strive for peace and equity in a violent, selfish world. If it is Your Holy Will, Almighty God, bless the decisions made here today. Remind Your faithful followers of their higher calling. Renew their commitment to the way of humility and awaken them from the self-giving and comfortable sleep of apathy. For You, alone, have made these men and women trustees of a great and priceless heritage. With the heavenly strength of Your Holy Spirit, save us all from the power of greed and let these, Your servants, turn, once again, to the ideals of fairness and concern for others. And when they leave here, may the world look upon them as honorable and trustworthy. things we lift up in the name of our Lord and Savior, Jesus. Amen."

Speaker McPike: "Led in the Pledge of Allegiance by Representative Kubik."

Kubik- et: "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. Mr. Black."

Black: "Yeah. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I have an

152nd Legislative Day

June 9, 1992

inquiry of the Chair, as soon as you're ready. Yes, could...could the Speaker enlighten me? There was a baseball game in St. Louis last night. It went on far past my bedtime. ...Could...could you enlighten us as to who might have won that double-header?"

- Speaker McPike: "As soon as we take the roll call, I'm go to suggest that Mr. Ropp keep his mouth shut because, you know, they were doing all right until he started talking about 'em."
- Black: "And we thank Mr. Ropp for that, most assuredly. Does that mean, evidently, that there was good news emanating from the city by the river?"
- Speaker McPike: "Well, maybe Representative Kulas, will be able to inform us as to what happened."

Black: "Thank you, thank you."

Kulas: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative Ropp is never here when you need him. I...I was gonna bring out a little broom to see if it's going to be a sweep or not, but I've got some extra...I've got tickets to tonight's game, if anybody needs 'em. You can't give 'em away."

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Kubik."

Kubik: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I... Incidently, I take it, because of Representative Ropp's transgression, you will never call upon him again for the Pledge of Allegiance. The Republicans are all here, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker McPike: "Thank you. Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Monique Davis is excused today."

Speaker McPike: "Thank you. Mr. Clerk, take the record. One hundred- seventeen Members answering the roll call, quorum is present. Mr. Ropp, you might as well not put on your flashlight because you would not be recognized. You might as well just turn it off, Mr. Ropp. Representative Lang."

152nd Legislative Day

- June 9, 1992
- Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We really would like to hear what

 Representative Ropp has to say. So, I would like to

 yield...I would like to yield the balance of my time to

 Representative Ropp."
- Speaker McPike: "You'll have to wait until someone else is in the podium. Representative Matijevich."
- Matijevich: "Speaker, I would ask unanimous consent for use of the Attendance Roll Call for that purpose, to waive the suspending...waive the posting notice on Senate Bill 1531.

 Waive the rule whereby a committee can meet...not meet while we're in Session so that the Rules Committee can meet immediately in the Speaker's Conference Room to hear Senate Bill 1531. It's been cleared by Representative Black."
- Speaker McPike: "With no opposition to the Gentleman's Motion, the Attendance Roll Call will be used, and the motion carries. Representative Granberg."
- Granberg: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. It's a..."
- Speaker McPike: "Just a minute. Could the Gentleman have the attention, please? Mr. Novak, could we have the...some attention, please? Yes, go ahead, Mr. Granberg."
- Granberg: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. It's my pleasure today to announce that on June 6, 1970, it is now the 22nd wedding anniversary of Representative Phil Novak, and have a cake on his desk to celebrate that occasion. So let's hear it for Representative Novak and his 22nd wedding anniversary. His...his ex-wife has kindly supplied the cake."
- Speaker McPike: "Consent Calendar. Second Reading."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Consent Calendar, Second Reading. Second Day.

 Senate Bill 1523, a Bill for an Act to amend the Probate

 Act. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1779, a Bill

152nd Legislative Day

June 9, 1992

for an Act authorizing the establishment of Adopt-A-Highway programs. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1861, a Bill for an Act to amend the Code of Civil Procedure. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1902, a Bill for an Act in relation to together with Committee Amendment #1 the powers and duties of the Department of Alcoholism and Substance Abuse. Second reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 1926, a Bill for an Act to amend the Uniform Commercial Code. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 2119, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Public Accounting Act together with Committee Amendment #1. Second Reading of the Bill. Senate Bill 2141, a Bill for an Act to amend the Nursing Home Care Act. Second Reading of the Bill. Bill 2190, a Bill for an Act concerning codification and revision of statutes. Second Reading of the Bill. Bill 2192, a Bill for an Act to amend the Legislative Reference Bureau Act. Second Reading of the Bill and Senate Bill 2217, a Bill for an Act concerning Educational Service Region Funds. Second Reading of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. Representative Young, in the Chair."

Speaker Young: "Committee Reports."

Clerk O'Brien: "'The Committee on Rules has met and pursuant to Rule 29(c)-3, the following Bills have been ruled exempt on June 9, 1992: Senate Bill 1531. Signed, John Matijevich, Chairman'."

Speaker Young: "Representative Matijevich, on a Motion to extend the posting requirement."

Matijevich: "...I would... What was that Motion,...Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Young: "Representative Matijevich moves pursuant to Rule

20(k), to suspend the posting requirements in Rule 20 in

relation to the following committee and or Bills or

152nd Legislative Day

June 9, 1992

Resolutions. The Committee is Executive, and the Bill is Senate Bill 1531."

Matijevich: "I would ask unanimous consent in the use of the Attendance Roll Call for that purpose."

Speaker Young: "The Motion passes by use of the Attendance Roll Call. Representative Black."

Black: "Was this...cleared with this side of the aisle?"

Speaker Young: "This is the Bill that was just heard in Rules."

Black: "It's been heard in Rules?"

Speaker Young: "Yes."

Black: "Reference to film office? Fine, thank you."

Speaker Young: "By use of the Attendance Roll Call, the posting requirement is suspended. To the Order of Second Reading, Special Orders of Business. We're going to call Bills that do not have Floor Amendments. On the Order of Government Administration, Senate Bill 744, Representative Currie. Representative Currie. Out of the record. Representative Black."

Black: "Yeah. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I rise to an inquiry of the Chair. ...I don't remember that you've suspended the Calendar or changed the Calendar or...we're under a Special Order of Business, and now you say you're going to another Special Order. Don't you have to waive the appropriate rules to do that? I mean, I've been waiting all day here for the Special Order at 12:00 noon. That's the only thing that's on the Calendar today."

Speaker Young: "Representative Black, you're right. There's only one Special Order on the Call today, but we do have General Orders of Business, and right now, we are on the Order of Senate Bills, Second Readings, that do not require Amendments."

Black: "Don't you have to suspend Rule 12 to move off...to take

152nd Legislative Day

- June 9, 1992
- something up on the Calendar that you don't have on the Calendar?"
- Speaker Young: "All of these Bills are on the Calendar, Representative Black."
- Black: "Not under Special Order. Tuesday, June 9th is a Special Order of Business. House Bill 3275, period."
- Speaker Young: "This is a Special Order, Representative Black.

 And the Special Order is all those Bills that are on a

 Special Order that do not require Second Reading

 Amendments."
- Black: "Well, then...then I rise to object simply because we don't have any such Special Order. Do you have a list of Bills? You got the computer printout of where we are?"
- Speaker Young: "Representative Black, this is a Special Call, not a Special Order."
- Black: "Well, I, think we're playing semantics here. You don't have anything on the Calendar, and I...I...I cannot, in good conscience, sit here and let you call Bills when we don't have a Calendar. We have no idea what you're going to call. If you don't have a computer printout of what you're going to call, how in the world can we even... How could anyone follow along with you?"
- Speaker Young: "Representative Black, the Parliamentarian would like you to look at House Rule 39 under Calling of Bills, 39(a)-4. (a)3, excuse me. Where it says, the Speaker, at his discretion, shall, upon commencing a given Order of Business, on the Order of Second Reading, call those Bills first to which Amendments and Motions to table Committee Amendments have not been filed with the Clerk. We are doing that to those Bills on Special Orders of Business."
- Black: "And...and then, I assume that only Bills without Amendments will be called."

152nd Legislative Day

June 9, 1992

- Speaker Young: "That is correct."
- Black: "Now, do we have any idea then what Order you're going to call them in, so we can get Sponsors in on the floor and..."
- Speaker Young: "We will call those Bills in numerical order down the Calendar."
- Black: "Printed on the Calendar in numerical order?"
- Speaker Young: "And the next Bill is on the Special Order of Professional Regulation, Senate Bill 1468, Representative Burke. Representative Burke. Representative Burke. Out of the record. Senate Bill...Representative Black."
- Black: "Oh, just another polite inquiry of the chair. It was my understanding you were just going to go down the Calendar, and now, all of a sudden, we're getting to Special Order of Business, Professional Regulation. We don't have any Special Order of Business, Professional Regulation, anywhere on this Calendar."
- Speaker Young: "This is a Special Call. We're doing numerical order of those Bills that are on Special Orders of Business, and the next Bill is Senate Bill 1499, Representative McGuire. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1499, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Vehicle Code. Second Read..."
- Speaker Young: "Out of the Record. Senate Bill 1511,
 Representative LeFlore. Out of the record. On the Order
 of Constitutional Officers, Senate Bill 1510,
 Representative Bugielski. Representative Bugielski.
 Representative Bugielski, Senate Bill 1510. Read the Bill,
 Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1510, a Bill for an Act to amend the

 Code of Civil Procedure. Second Reading of the Bill. No

 Committee or Floor Amendments."

152nd Legislative Day

June 9, 1992

- Speaker Young: "Third Reading. On the Order of Consumer Protection, Senate Bill 1567. Representative Lang. Out of the record. On the Order of Government Operation, Senate Bill 1638, Representative Regan. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1638, a Bill for an Act to amend the Comprehensive Health Insurance Plan Act. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee or Floor Amendments."
- Speaker Young: "Third Reading. Goin' back to Consumer

 Protection, Senate Bill 1519, Representative Capparelli.

 Representative Capparelli. Senate Bill 1519? Read the
 Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1519, a Bill for an Act to amend the
 Illinois Banking Act. Second Reading of the Bill. No
 Committee or Floor Amendments."
- Speaker Young: "Third Reading. On the Order of Health Care, Senate Bill 1657, Representative McAfee. Out of the record. On the Order of Criminal Law, Senate Bill 1695, Representative Phelps. Representative Phelps. Out of the record. On the Order of Government Operations, Senate Bill 1740. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1763, Representative Steczo. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1763, a Bill for an Act in relation to sexual assault. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee or Floor Amendments."
- Speaker Young: "Third Reading. On the Order of Agriculture and Environment, Senate Bill 1766, Representative Steczo. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1766, a Bill for an Act to amend the Public Utilities Act. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee or Floor Amendments."
- Speaker Young: "Third Reading. On the Order of Government

- 152nd Legislative Day June 9, 1992

 Operations, Senate Bill 1789, Representative McAuliffe.

 Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1789, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Municipal Code. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee or Floor Amendments."
- Speaker Young: "Third Reading. On the Order of Civil Law, Senate Bill 1803, Representative Homer. Representative Homer. Out of the record. On the Order of Government Operation, Senate Bill 1815, Representative Parke. Out of... Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1815, a Bill for an Act to amend the
 Illinois Insurance Code. Second Reading of the Bill. No
 Committee or Floor Amendments."
- Speaker Young: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1821, Representative Parke. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1821, a Bill for an Act to amend Acts in relation to support obligations. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee or Floor Amendments."
- Speaker Young: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1823, Representative Bugielski. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1823, a Bill for an Act to amend the Cook County Forest Preserve District Act. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee."

Speaker Young: "Are there any Motions filed?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Young: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker Young: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1828, Representative Hartke. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1831, Representative Laurino. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1846, Representative Parke. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1889, Representative Turner. Out of the record.

152nd Legislative Day

- June 9, 1992
- Senate Bill 1892, Representative Obrzut. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1897, Representative Regan. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1897, a Bill for an Act to amend the
 Children and Family Services Act. Second Reading of the
 Bill. No Committee or Floor Amendments."
- Speaker Young: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1907, Representative Hasara. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1964, Representative McAuliffe. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1964, a Bill for an Act in relation to Criminal Law. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee or Floor Amendments."
- Speaker Young: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1965, Representative Currie. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1965, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Public Aid Code. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee or Floor Amendments."
- Speaker Young: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1979, Representative Dunn. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1979, a Bill for an Act to amend the Code of Civil Procedure. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee or Floor Amendments."
- Speaker Young: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 2056, Representative Steczo. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 2056, a Bill for an Act in relation to the licensing of professional counselors and clinical professional counselors. Second Reading of the Bill.

 Amendment #1 was adopted in committee."
- Speaker Young: "Are there any Motions filed?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed. No Floor Amendments."
- Speaker Young: "Representative Steczo."
- Steczo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would move to table Amendment

152nd Legislative Day

June 9, 1992

#1."

Speaker Young: "Would you take this Bill out of the record?" Steczo: "Sure."

- Speaker Young: "Out of the record. Senate Bill 2068,
 Representative DeJaegher. Out of the record. Senate Bill
 2076, Representative Lang. Out of the record. Senate Bill
 2128, Representative McGann. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 2128, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Purchasing Act. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee or Floor Amendments."
- Speaker Young: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 2131, Representative McGann. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 2131, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Purchasing Act. Second Reading of the Bill.

 Amendments #1 and #2 were adopted in committee."

Speaker Young: "Are there any Motions filed?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Young: "Are there any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

- Speaker Young: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 2134, Representative the record. Senate Bill 2138. Out of McAfee. Representative White. Out of the record. Senate Bill 2139, Representative Giorgi. Out of the record. Senate Bill 2155, Representative Ryder. Out of the record. Senate Bill 2159, Representative Preston. Representative Representative Preston. Read the Bill, Mr. Preston. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 2159, a Bill for an Act to amend the Juvenile Court Act of 1987. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee or Floor Amendments."
- Speaker Young: "Third Reading. Would you bring the Bill back to Second, Mr. Clerk? Representative Preston."

152nd Legislative Day

June 9, 1992

Preston: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. ... If that Bill has been brought back to Second, I'd like to leave it on Second Reading."

Speaker Young: "The Bill will remain on Second Reading. Senate Bill 2167, Representative Ronan. Out of the record. Senate Bill 2169. Representative Cronin. Out of the Senate Bill 2170, Representative Cronin. Out of record. the record. The Clerk is keeping three lists. One list will be Senate Bills on Consent Calendar lists. that need an Amendment. If you have a Bill on the Consent Calendar that needs an Amendment, would you put your name on that particular list? The second list is Senate Bills on Third Reading that need to be brought back to Second for purposes of an Amendment. If you have a Senate Bill on Third Reading that needs an Amendment, please come to the well and put your name on the list. And the third list is Senate Bills on Second Reading that need an Amendment. you have a second Bill...a Senate Bill on Second Reading that needs an Amendment, please come and advise the Clerk. Representative Homer."

Homer: "Mr. Speaker, I...I hate to take the time of the Body for this matter, but I was...I was watching the Cub-Cardinal game last night. There was a twilight double-header, and when I went to bed, it was, I think, about the twelfth inning. It was 1-to-1, and I didn't hear how that game turned out nor the...the other game that followed, and I wondered if Representative Flinn or Representative Black had heard. I would like a report."

Speaker Young: "I think Representative McPike is about to take the Chair. Perhaps you'd save that for Representative McPike. Representative Ropp."

Ropp: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just for a...for the

152nd Legislative Day

June 9, 1992

Representative's interest. I don't even think he's interested in the game anyway. He's not a baseball fan, so it probably wouldn't make any difference who won. But the point is, you look at where the standings are, who's near the top or at the top of the league and...I guess we're really pleased and proud that the...It takes someone like the Chicago Cubs to be in the bottom holding up the rest of the league, and we take our hats off to them because they're holding up the rest of the league at the very bottom."

Speaker Young: "Representative Curran."

Curran: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wish to announce for all the members of the State Government Administration Committee that the State Government Administration Committee will not meet tomorrow. All our business has been accomplished. Thank you."

Speaker Young: "Representative Richmond."

Richmond: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to notify the members of the House Agriculture Committee that the meeting scheduled for tomorrow has been cancelled. The Ag Committee meeting has been cancelled for tomorrow."

Speaker Young: "We are now going to the Order of Third Readings.

Third Reading, Government Administration. Senate Bill 698,
Representative Steczo. Out of the record. Under the Order
of Children and Family Law, Third Reading, Senate Bill 934,
Representative Preston. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 934, a Bill for an Act to amend the Marriage and Dissolution of Marriage Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Young: "Representative Preston."

Preston: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. What Senate Bill 934 does is really to make

152nd Legislative Day

June 9, 1992

automatic what is, right now, done in dissolution of marriage proceedings as a pro forma Motion. It says that upon the filing of the...upon service of summons and upon service of the complainant in dissolution of marriage proceeding that automatically there is а given...There is automatically a requirement that both of the parties not transfer properties so as to defraud one another; that they not sell their furniture; that they not have to remove their savings accounts so that the...the that...those funds. And that, spouse can't reach typically, in divorce proceedings, today, is done by Motion. So, what the current process is when a divorce case is filed, the attorney for one of the parties will go in and ask the judge to order that the opposite party not be permitted to dispose of property belonging to the couple; the judge...and then the attorney for other...for the spouse will ask that the order be made mutual so that both parties are prohibited by court order from disposing of marital property. That's the current procedure. This would make it automatic upon service of summons in a divorce proceeding you're automatically precluded from disposing of the marital property by selling stock and taking the money, or selling the boat, or selling the second home, or selling the first home. You can't do that without court order. This makes very good sense. The bar associations are in favor of it. The Divorce Lawyer Associations, for both husband and wives, are in favor of it. It's the way it ought to be. I'd be glad to answer any questions and ask for your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Young: "The Gentleman has moved for passage of Senate
Bill 934. And on that question, Representative Wennlund."
Wennlund: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

152nd Legislative Day

June 9, 1992

Speaker Young: "He indicates he will yield."

- Wennlund: "If one of the parties to a divorce proceeding is a real estate developer and has seven or eight model homes, would he be automatically enjoined from...from selling or disposing of those?"
- Preston: "This really applies to property that is marital property. But to get around any ambiguity in it, all the person would have to do (which is really what you have to do today when this motion is made in court, which is made pro forma in every divorce proceeding other than an agreed divorce that I've ever heard of), you'd ask the court to exclude that property that you don't want to be restrained from disposing of, and if it's not marital property, that...that order will be granted."
- Wennlund: "Well, if a defendant in a divorce proceeding runs a hardware store, once the divorce proceeding is filed, he, then is going to have to take the initiative to go into court, on a petition, to be able to sell one screwdriver in a hardware store?"
- Preston: "Well, not... I have to answer that question 'yes' and 'no'. That doesn't change from current practice because, again, under existing...today's practice, without this, a party to a divorce proceeding would go into court and ask that the opposite party, the spouse, be precluded, restrained, from disposing of property... And that's what happens today. That person at that time would say, 'Well, your honor, I run a hardware store. You don't want me to go out of business.' And the judge will say, 'You're correct.' Of course, in the regular course of business you can sell your...your hardware goods...buy and sell your hardware goods in the regular course of business. If you're a real estate developer, you can buy and sell

152nd Legislative Day

June 9, 1992

your...your real estate, but you cannot dispose of marital property, and that order will be made today reciprocally on both parties. This just says you don't have to go to court because, in the vast, vast majority of cases, it's not like the situation...the two situations you gave. Most people are not real estate developers. Most people do not run hardware stores. But in those cases, they'd want...they'd certainly want a court order to be clear that it is not marital property they're disposing of."

Wennlund: "Well, my concern is, is that...it appears from the face of the Bill, that upon the service of summons the defendant in a divorce proceeding would be automatically enjoined from disposing of any property. So if they serve the owner of the hardware store at his hardware store, he's going to have to close down until he can get into court on a petition to permit him to conduct business in the ordinary course."

Preston: "The purpose/intent and I believe, Representative, the wording of the Bill, talks about any...extraordinary sales of property. It...it doesn't mean that the...you know, ordinary course of business-type transactions. But, yes, in a divorce proceeding we do wanna to make certain, as is current practice, that there's no disposal of marital property. That's all this really gets to now. In...in most cases, it means that you don't have to go into court. Which, today, in almost every case, you do have to go into court to get an order restraining the disposal of property."

Wennlund: "But this shifts the burden. Is that correct? It shifts the burden from...normally, for instance the plaintiff in a divorce proceeding would have to go in to get a restraining order to prevent a defendant from

152nd Legislative Day

June 9, 1992

disposing of any property. This shifts the burden...to the defendant asking him to come into court for permission to sell or dispose of any property in the ordinary course of business."

"Representative, let me answer it this way. I don't Preston: You've...you've handled that's exactly correct. divorce cases. Every single divorce case where there is property, regardless of who it is you represent, my guess is you ask for a court order...you go into court and ask for a court order regarding the disposal of marital assets, and this just says you don't have to go do that now. You do have to, perhaps, go in and ask for a court order to exempt certain property from the...this order. But that's in a really, relatively, rare number of cases. overwhelming number of cases, today, you have to go into court, regardless of who you represent, to ask that marital assets not be disposed of by only one party. This says you don't have to do that anymore. It really cuts down on the lawyer's work and the expenditure of money by the litigants in most cases, not all."

Wennlund: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Young: "Representative Johnson."

Johnson: "You'll have to excuse me, Representative. I...with all the noise in here, I can't...I didn't hear what the Bill did, what the Amendment does, and I wonder if you could explain that again because I think I might have a couple of questions about it...Almost impossible to be a Legislator in this chamber today because I can't hear anything that's going on."

Preston: "Yes, Representative Johnson. What this Bill does, it says, 'Upon service of summons and complaint in a divorce actin, there's an automatic restraint...restraining order

152nd Legislative Day

June 9, 1992

against disposal of marital property.' Today you have to go into court for it. This says, 'Both parties are automatically restrained once summons has been served.' That...agaist disposing of marital assets. And if there's some assets that you're up in the air about, you have to have an order exempting those assets from the disposal."

Johnson: "Tell me what the Amendment does with respect to cohabitation?"

Preston: "I'm sorry. I'm not aware of that..."

Johnson: "Okay, well, the...the Digest says that Amendment #1
 deals with an issue of cohabitation, but, apparently, that
 isn't..."

Preston: "No, I don't believe that Amendment was put on here.

It's not in our file."

Johnson: "Okay, that's fine."

Speaker Young: "Representative Lang."

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of Senate Bill 934. This is a Bill that, basically as it is, passed the House last year and passed the Senate. The Governor vetoed it because of a controversial section. That controversial section, relative to marital property, has been removed from this Bill. So, if anybody's telling you this is the same Bill the Governor vetoed, it is not. They removed the section of this Bill that was controversial and all other sections, when it passed the House and Senate last year, were not controversial. So it's the same Bill. I support Representative Preston in his arguments and ask for green votes."

Speaker Young: "Representative Preston, to close."

Preston: "I...I think it's been discussed, Mr. Speaker, and I just ask for your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Young: "The question is, 'Shall the House pass Senate

152nd Legislative Day

June 9, 1992

Bill 934?' All those in favor vote 'aye'. Those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open, and this is final passage. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 115 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. Senate Bill 934, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of Municipal, City and Conservation, Senate Bill 911, Representative Hoffman. Representative Hoffman. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 911, a Bill for an Act to amend the Park District Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Young: "Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman, M.: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen. All this Bill is doing is it's extending a deadline from March 15th to October 15th on the horse Racing tax allocations and adding several more locations that are now on there to be allowed to get some park district funds from the OTB parlors that are opening up. And I believe it's been agreed on both sides of the aisle, the dates, and also the locations."

Speaker Young: "The question is, 'Shall the House pass Senate Bill 911?' On that question...on that question, all those in favor vote 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open, and this is final passage. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 113 voting 'yes', 2 voting 'no' and 2 voting 'present'. Bill 911, having received the required Senate Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The Order of Civil Law, Third Reading. Senate Bill 460, Representative Giorgi. Out of the record. On the Order of Professional Regulation, Third Reading. Senate Bill 626, Representative Mautino. Out of the record. On the Order

152nd Legislative Day

June 9, 1992

- of Revenue, Third Reading, Senate Bill 318, Representative Keane. Out of the record. On page 3 of the Calendar, under Senate Bills, Third Reading. Senate Bill 698, Representative Steczo. Out of the record. On page 4 of the Calendar, Senate Bill 132, Representative Black. And we have gone to the Order of Senate Bills, Second Reading, page 4 of the Calendar, (Senate Bill 132) Representative Black. Representative Black.
- Black: "Mr. Speaker, I think that Bill's on the Interim Study

 Calendar. And I... That's probably where it should stay."
- Speaker Young: "On page 4 of the Calendar, Senate Bill 744,
 Representative Currie. Out of the record. Senate Bill
 963, Representative Steczo. Out of the record. Senate
 Bill 1499, Representative McGuire. Out of the record.
 Senate Bill 1510, Representative Bugielski. Has already
 been moved to Third Reading. Senate Bill 1567,
 Representative Lang. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1567, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Vehicle Code. Second Reading of the Bill.

 Amendment #1 was adopted in committee."
- Speaker Young: "Representative...is (sic-are) any Floor Amendments filed?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed. No Floor Amendments."
- Speaker Young: "Third Reading. Going back to Senate Bill 1499, Representative McGuire. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1499, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Vehicle Code. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee or Floor Amendments."
- Speaker Young: "Third Reading. On page 5 of the Calendar, Senate Bills, Second Reading. Senate Bill 1740, Representative McPike. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1763, Representative Steczo. It's already been moved to Third.

152nd Legislative Day

- June 9, 1992
- Senate Bill 1766 has already been moved to Third. Senate Bill 1783, Representative Weller. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1783, a Bill for an Act to amend the State Printing Contract Act. Second Reading of the Bill.

 No Committee Amendments."
- Speaker Young: "Are there any Floor Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Weller."
- Speaker Young: "Representative Weller."
- Weller: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Floor Amendment #1 is just a technical Amendment. It makes the Bill effective January 1, 1993. I ask for your support, and I ask for its adoption."
- Speaker Young: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1783. On that question, is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall the Amendment be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye'. Those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments."
- Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Young: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1789 is already moved to Third (Reading). Senate Bill 1803, Representative Homer. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1815 and 1821 have moved to Third (Reading), as well as Senate Bill 1823. Senate Bill 1828, Representative Hartke. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1831, Representative Laurino. Representative Laurino. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1831, a Bill for an Act to amend the Counties Code. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee."

152nd Legislative Day

June 9, 1992

- Speaker Young: "Are there any Floor Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed. No Floor Amendments."
- Speaker Young: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1846, Representative Parke. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House (sic Senate) Bill 1846, a Bill for an Act relating to public community college system. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee or Floor Amendments."
- Speaker Young: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1889, Representative Turner. Out of the record. Representative Black."
- Black: "Yes, thank you very much. An inquiry of the Chair. Did

 I hear you say we weren't going to come back to any of
 these Bills?"
- Speaker Young: "They may never get another chance."
- Black: "All right. Then let's move right along, expeditiously."
- Speaker Young: "Senate Bill 1892, Representative Obrzut. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1892, a Bill for an Act to amend the

 Consent by Minors to Medical Procedures Act. Second

 Reading of the Bill. No Committee or Floor Amendments."
- Speaker Young: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1897 has moved to Third Reading. To the Bill 19...Senate Bill 1897... Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk. Senate Bill 1897 is already moved to Third Reading. Senate Bill 1907, Representative Hasara. Out of the record. Oh, read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1907, a Bill for an Act to amend certain acts in relation to worker's compensation claims by state employees. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee or Floor Amendments."
- Speaker Young: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1939, Representative McPike. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1964 has already moved to Third Reading. Senate Bill 1965 has moved to Third (Reading). Senate Bill 1979 has moved to Third (Reading).

152nd Legislative Day

- June 9. 1992
- Senate Bill 2056, Representative Steczo. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 2056, a Bill for an Act in relation to licensing of professional counselors and clinical professional counselors. Second Reading of the Bill.

 Amendment #1 was adopted in committee."
- Speaker Young: "Are any Floor Amendments filed?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment 1, there's a motion to table

 Committee, Amendment 1 by Representative Steczo."
- Speaker Young: "Representative Steczo, on the Motion."
- Steczo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. This
 Amendment was adopted in committee, and, as it turned out,
 went a little further than was intended. So I would, at
 this time, move to table Amendment #1."
- Speaker Young: "The Gentleman moves to table Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 2056. On that Motion, Representative Black."
- Black: "Yeah. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Will the Gentleman tell us who sponsored the Motion? Was this your Amendment, Terry?"
- Steczo: "Yes, Sir. My Amendment. My Bill. So, I'm choosing to table."
- Black: "All right. Thank you."
- Speaker Young: "The question is, 'Shall Committee Amendment #1 be tabled?' All those in favor say 'aye'. Those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment is tabled. Any further Motions filed?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "No further Motions. No Floor Amendments."
- Speaker Young: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 2068, Representative DeJaegher. Out of the record. Senate Bill 2076, Representative Lang. Out of the record. Senate Bill 2079, Representative McPike. Out of the record. Senate Bill 2128 has been moved to Third (Reading). Senate Bill 2131

152nd Legislative Day

June 9, 1992

has been moved to Third (Reading). Senate Bill 2134, Representative McAfee. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 2134, a Bill for an Act to amend the

 Code of Civil Procedure. Second Reading of the Bill. No

 Committee or Floor Amendments."
- Speaker Young: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 2138, Representative White. Out of the record. Senate Bill 2139. Out of the record. Senate Bill Representative Giorgi. 2155, Representative Ryder. Out of the record. Senate Bill 2159, Representative Preston. Has been read a second time and was held on Second Reading. Senate (Bill) 2167, Representative Ronan. Out of the record. Senate (Bill) Cronin. Out the Representative οf Senate...Bill 2170, Representative Cronin. Out οf record. Senate Bill 2155. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 2155, a Bill for an Act concerning narcotics, profit forfeitures. Second Reading of the Bill.

 No Committee or Floor Amendments."

Speaker Young: "Are there any Floor Amendments filed?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Floor Amendments."

- Speaker Young: "Third Reading. On page 14 of the Calendar, under the Speaker's Table, appears House Resolution 322, Representative Kubik. Representative Kubik. Out of the record. House Resolution 644, Representative Pedersen on House Resolution 644. Read the Resolution, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 644 urges the President and Congress to enact...to enact pro-child tax credit legislation. Revenue Committee recommends 'be adopted as amended'."

Speaker Young: "Representative Pedersen."

Pedersen: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. All this Resolution does is urge the Congress of

152nd Legislative Day

June 9, 1992

the United States and the...Senate to...give tax relief to families with children and kind of go along with some of the things that we talked about last year when...when the Speaker proposed...Family First legislation."

Speaker Young: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of House Resolution 644. On that Motion, is there any discussion? Representative Schoenberg."

Schoenberg: "A question of the Sponsor."

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

Schoenberg: "I just have...one quick question and that is..."

Speaker Young: "Excuse me. Could we take this Motion out of the record for a minute, please?"

Pedersen: "Beg your pardon?"

Speaker Young: "I said, 'Could we take this Resolution out of the record for a second?'"

Pedersen: "Why? Why are we taking this out of the record, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Young: "Because the...our staff would like to review it for a second. Out of the record. Representative Ronan."

Ronan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. ... The Transportation Committee

- this is just a public announcement - Transportation

Committee that was called for Thursday morning has been

cancelled. We have no reason to have the committee."

Speaker Young: "...Transportation. Second Reading. Appears
House Bill 2167. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 2167, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Vehicle Code. Second Reading of the Bill.

Amendment #1 was adopted in committee."

Speaker Young: "Are there any motions filed?"

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

Speaker Young: "Third Reading. I'd like to clarify that we just moved Senate Bill 2167 to Third Reading. Senate Bill.

152nd Legislative Day

June 9, 1992

Representative Black."

- Black: "Yes. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. An inquiry of the Chair. I... Some of us would like to, perhaps...get something to eat or...have a break. How long do we have to sit on this runway? And if we're just going to sit on the runway, can we at least leave the airplane? I think he's in touch with the pilot now."
- Speaker Young: "Representative Black, I've been informed that the Speaker is working with Minority Leader Daniels to coordinate Party Caucuses; and we should remain at ease on the floor."
- Black: "So, in other words, we have to keep our seatbelts fastened until further word. Right? Well, thank you very much."
- Speaker Young: "Representative Matijevich."
- Matijevich: "Speaker, I'd like to introduce a former Member who's

 in the back here on the Democratic side. A good friend of

 mine. A labor leader. Tom Hanahan over here."
- Speaker Young: "Representative Deuchler."
- Deuchler: "Speaker, I'd like to introduce a former Member here on the Republican side, Susan Catania."
- Speaker Young: "Representative Shirley Jones."
- Jones, S.: "Mr. Speaker, we have in the House the Chinese-American Service League and I would like to...

 They're from my district and they're down here lobbying for the home care program. And I would like for everybody to give them a hand."
- Speaker McPike: "The House will come to order. Republicans will have a Caucus immediately in Room 118. Democrats will have a Caucus immediately in 114. Approximately one hour for the Caucus. Be back at 4:30 p.m. and then we will start on Second Readings for the... To consider the airport

152nd Legislative Day

June 9, 1992

- legislation. The House will stand at ease for one hour."
- Speaker McPike: "The House will come to order. Special Order of
 Business. The Regional Airport Authority. House Bill
 3275. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3275, a Bill for an Act to amend the Airport Authorities Act. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Giorgi asks leave to return the Bill to Second (Reading). Representative Madigan."
- Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, I request that the Bill be placed on the Order of Second Reading for the purpose of Amendment."
- Speaker McPike: "Someone asked leave to return the Bill to Second Reading. The Bill's now on Second Reading. Mr. Clerk, are there any Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Giorgi."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Giorgi."
- Giorgi: "Withdraw Amendment #1, please."
- Speaker McPike: "The Gentleman withdraws Amendment #1. Further Amendments."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Giorgi."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Giorgi."
- Giorgi: "Withdraw Amendment #2, please."
- Speaker McPike: "Withdraws Amendment #2. Further Amendments."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative...Speaker Madigan."
- Speaker McPike: "Speaker Madigan."
- Madigan: "Withdraw the Amendment."
- Speaker McPike: "The Gentleman withdraws the Amendment. Further Amendments."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #4, offered by Speaker Madigan."

152nd Legislative Day

June 9, 1992

Speaker McPike: "Speaker Madigan, on Amendment #4."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #4 would become the Bill. Amendment #4 would provide for the creation of a regional airport authority in This authority would northeastern Illinois. jurisdiction over O'Hare Airport, Midway Airport and a proposed, new Lake Calumet Airport. The authority created by the Amendment would be a unit of local government. Ιt would not be a State agency. The Amendment provides that on or before January 1, 1993, the newly created board would be required to establish a date upon which the authority would become the owner and operator of Midway and O'Hare airport(s). Concerning the rights of current City of Chicago employees, the Amendment would provide that if these employees are covered by a collective bargaining agreement, then they would continue to be covered by the collective bargaining agreement. However, if they are not by an agreement, then their continuation in covered employment would be subject to the discretion of the newly Concerning the transfer of Authority. created obligations under the current revenue bonds issued by City of Chicago for both O'Hare and Midway Airport(s), the Act provides that the obligation on such bonds remains with the City of Chicago. However, the Act does authorize the City of Chicago and the authority to agree to transfer the bonds to the authority as permitted by federal tax The Amendment further provides that the City of Chicago would be able to retain the revenue stream from existing O'Hare and Midway bonds in order to retire those bonds, while also permitting the Authority to issue revenue bonds with the claims on O'Hare and Midway proceeds for the construction of the Lake Calumet Airport.

152nd Legislative Day

June 9, 1992

different places the Amendment provides that Midway Airport operate as a commercial airport. will continue to Concerning the composition of the Authority, at the very beginning, there would be nine people on the authority. Six of the nine would be appointed by the Mayor of Chicago. Three would be appointed by the Governor of Illinois. division would continue until certain transportation and environmental approvals were obtained from the Federal Aviation Administration and from the Federal Environmental Protection Agency. Once the transportation and environmental approvals have been obtained, then the composition of the airport authority would be equally divided between the Mayor and the Governor. The Mayor would appoint three and the Governor would appoint three. The Governor would appoint the chair of the authority. The Mayor would select the chief executive officer of the authority who would serve under a four-year contract. There are certain actions of the board which would require the approval of both the mayor's appointees and the Governor's appointees. These actions would occur prior to previously referred the receipt of the approvals which I and these would be matters such as the transfer of O'Hare or Midway to some other entity, and, then, there are several other such powers. The directors and the chair of the authority will not be compensated but they will be reimbursed for their actual expenses. There is a section which deals with conflict of interest, and I plan to offer a later Amendment which will change that section on conflict of interest. So concerning Amendment #4, Amendment #4 would provide, and it would prohibit, any director or officer from holding more than 7 1/2% interest in any entity contracting with or performing any work for

152nd Legislative Day

June 9, 1992

the authority. With respect to any other economic interest, the director or the officer must disclose the nature and extent of such interest prior to final action by the authority with respect to such work. The Amendment further provides that any contract in violation of this conflict of interest provision is voidable, not void. it further provides that the Act would prohibit the removal of any officer or director engaging in a prohibited conflict of interest. The subsequent Amendment will remove that language which would prohibit the removal of any officer or director engaging in a prohibited conflict of There will be a committee of the board which will control litigation engaged in by the board relative to...any challenge of the Lake Calumet site committee would be controlled by the Mayor. The Amendment further provides that if the board determines not to continue with the development or the operation of the Lake Calumet Airport or if the required approvals are not obtained and all appeals have been exhausted, then control of the Authority would go to the Mayor. The Mayor would appoint three people to the Authority and there would only three people serving on the Authority and then, of course, the authority would be in a position to operate Midway Airport(s). Concerning an and interstate compact with Indiana, the Act provides that one additional director shall be appointed by the State of Indiana upon the effective date of Interstate compact with Upon the effective date of the compact, a Indiana. majority of seven of the ten directors must approve Authority action prior to receipt of the approvals that I referred to earlier and six votes are needed after receipt of the approvals. There are certain powers given to the

152nd Legislative Day

June 9, 1992

authority relative to the construction of the Lake Calumet Airport: Some of those would be the power to acquire land; the power to provide for the soundproofing of buildings; the power to acquire state land; the power to engage in relocation for the purposes of housing; the power to adopt zoning ordinances; and the power to deal with the question of waterways and flood plains. There is current language in the Amendment that deals with eminent domain that there will be a subsequent Amendment that will change Amendment #4. So, after the adoption of the later Amendments, the authority will be given eminent domain and quick take power only at the site of the Lake Calumet Airport. The language of Amendment #4 would give eminent domain power statewide for the purpose of obtaining relocation housing statewide for the purpose of finding sites to relocate pollutants that may be on the site of the Lake Calumet After the later Amendment, after the later Airport. Amendments, the Bill shall provide eminent domain power and quick take power only at the site of the Lake Calumet Airport. The authority is granted the power to establish foreign trade zones within the Lake Calumet Airport area. It's given the normal police powers. It's given the normal general powers. There is a requirement that any contract in excess of \$25,000 must, be awarded to the lowest responsive and responsible bidder, upon public bidding. Board is authorized to impose and levy a passenger facility charge pursuant to Federal Aviation Administration regulations to provide for the financing of the airport. The board is also authorized to set fees and charges for the use of any airport facilities or airport property including any leases for airport property. Contrary to earlier drafts, interest on bonds issued for the purpose of

152nd Legislative Day

June 9, 1992

the Lake Calumet Airport will be subject to the The bonds are not a debt of the State of income tax. Illinois nor are they the debt of the City of Chicago. Neither the State nor the city can be required to levy any tax to support the bonds. State appropriations cannot be pledged to be used to pay back the bonds. There are extensive provisions on affirmative action and they're modeled on the McC-Peir legislation. There will be later Amendments that deal with affirmative action so that when later Amendments are taken with Amendment #4, the Act will utilize the 25% minority business and 5% female business affirmative action goals contained in the McC-Peir The goals will apply to the annual dollar legislation. value of all purchases and contracts. In addition, after a later Amendment, these requirements will apply to the job holders working for the contractors that (sic-who) get the contracts for the construction of the Calumet Airport. There's а provision for Lake intergovernmental cooperation and in the area of home the Act permits the authority to enter into an agreement with either the City of Chicago or with Calumet City for the exclusive exercise of powers granted under the Act by the authority and for the concurrence and exercise of other powers held by the home rule municipalities. prohibits development of the Lake Calumet Airport until the authority enters into an agreement with Chicago, but no such agreement is required with Calumet City. The Act does not contain an express limitation on home rule powers. unusual provisions relative to the some Environmental Protection Act and the main item here Illinois Environmental provision which allows the Protection Agency to delegate all or portions of its

152nd Legislative Day

June 9, 1992

permitting, (sic-inspection) and enforcement monitoring, and other relevant functions, to the newly created airport authority, where consistent with current State and federal laws. This delegation Section includes a limitation on Authority liability which will be removed by a later Amendment. Mr. Speaker, those are the highlights of the Amendment. I'm sure that there are many people who have questions and others who will engage in debate and discussion. Thank you."

- Speaker McPike: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of the Amendment #4 and on that, Representative Black."
- Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker McPike: "Yes."

- Black: "Mr. Speaker, one thing that I don't find explained in the Amendment: You obviously made reference to three different points in said Amendment that Midway Airport will be required to permanently remain open and I can understand why you would...why you would want that, but my question to you is, 'How can any legislation that we pass see to it, without additional statutory authority, that, that, in fact, indeed, happens?"
- Madigan: "The law of the State of Illinois contained in this

 Amendment will provide that Midway Airport shall continue
 as a commercial airport."
- Black: "But if, in fact, the air carriers and/or the general aviation community decide that the proposed new site better fits their needs or the proposed...or the existing site at O'Hare now opens up to better suit their needs and they decide to leave, then what does the State of Illinois do in that case?"

Madigan: "I don't know that the State of Illinois would do

152nd Legislative Day

June 9, 1992

anything. I think the point you're getting to is that Midway Airport would not be utilized to the extent that it. is utilized today."

Black: "Correct."

Madigan: "Of course, there was a period ten to fifteen years ago
where there was a low utilization of Midway Airport and so,
if airplane operators, whoever they may be, decide not to
land their planes at Midway, for whatever reasons, yes,
there would be a low utilization of the airport."

Black: "All right. But...but, your intent is clear on the...continuation of Midway Airport as a viable facility?"

Madigan: "Yes."

Black: "All right. My second question deals with eminent domain.
...I believe the question centers on page 23, line 8. It
is not clear to me, and perhaps you can make clear to all
of us. Is there anything in this that adds to or gives
additional eminent domain authority to O'Hare Airport?"

Madigan: "My understanding would be no. My understanding." Black: "So, if..."

Madigan: "I'm advised that under this Amendment that the newly created airport authority would inherit whatever power O'Hare Airport has today in this area, but nothing more."

Black: "All right. The other question, then, that I have is...deals with the...whether or not the language in this Amendment #4 is, in fact, the one that is totally agreed to by the Governor of Illinois and the Mayor of the City of Chicago."

Madigan: "I do not know."

Black: "All right. So, it is not... You are not purporting then this to be an agreed Amendment - the one that has been talked about in the press - that all parties may, in fact, agree to."

152nd Legislative Day

June 9, 1992

Black: "In part. Okay."

Madigan: "In part. However, I am advised that there are continuing discussions and negotiations between the mayor and the Governor which may lead to some changes in their positions."

Black: "All right. Thank you very much for your patience, Mr. Mr. Speaker, to the Amendment. There are a Speaker. number of things in this Amendment, obviously. I think the Sponsor has done an excellent job of outlining some very cogent points that many of you need to examine as to how you will vote for this issue. Obviously, it is an issue that has ramifications beyond the City of Chicago; indeed, has ramifications for 'most everyone in the State of Given that fact, Mr. Speaker, I would ask Illinois. that...you follow the Rules of the House, under 55(c), (and I am joined by four or more of my colleagues) and we would ask that you have a recorded (sic) vote on this Amendment at the appropriate time, in the (sic) accordance with the House Rules 55(c)."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Wennlund."

Wennlund: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Amendment. There's one thing that everybody in this House really ought to know and take a look at and that is the impact, other than from a strict airport standpoint, that will affect the entire State of Illinois and everyone of you who lives or represents a district outside the City of Chicago, and that is that when you...when you displace 50,000 people, you take 9,000 homes off of the tax rolls, you take 150 businesses off of the tax rolls, and when you do all that you remove a half-a-billion dollars in equalized assessed

152nd Legislative Day

June 9, 1992

valuation. Now, when you remove from the tax rolls a half-a-billion dollars in equalized assessed valuation, what you're going to end up doing is, is you're going redirect under the school aid distribution formula \$8.5 million into the City of Chicago public schools. Board of Education has done a run of the numbers, and it shows \$8,447,000 in new money to the City of Chicago schools but a loss to every other school district in this Now, that...the answer to that question entire state. there is no answer at this point in time. I've not had anyone that can tell me how that problem will be taken care But if you vote for this Amendment and if you vote for this airport, you're voting to take money out of every school district in the entire state with one exception and that's the City of Chicago which is a gainer of 8.5 million That problem has not been solved, but it bucks a year. will virtually affect every downstate school district other than in the City of Chicago and they will all lose. And if you would like to see how many school districts and how much they are losing in your district, I would be happy to share this with you. The problem is, and I don't think it can be solved unless you're going to change the school aid formula - and you know how long we've argued about that in House....It's а serious matter; it's a very complicated Amendment, a very complicated authority, and to have a vote on this Amendment, at this time, I probably ill-conceived until all of the answers...the State's power of condemnation extending beyond the Lake Calumet Airport region could be virtually disastrous; the environmental impact, disastrous; 1,478 acres of wetlands, 400 acres of park lands gone, in addition to the 9000 homes. It is a extremely important Bill; it's too early to

152nd Legislative Day

June 9, 1992

be considering all the details of it; and a 'no' vote is the proper vote; and as Mr. Black has done, I would reiterate the call for a recorded (sic) Roll Call vote. Thank you."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Giglio. Will the staff clear the aisle, please?"

Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Giglio: "Thank you, Mr. House. This Amendment essentially becomes the Bill, and I said a few weeks ago that I think there should be a Bill out there but it ought to be a shell Bill without anything on it simply because in the process that has been going on since the third airport has been...decided on to be Lake Calumet, the process now, as I understand it, is that the Governors of this state and the committee that chose site has to get approval from a minimum of four federal agencies to see whether or not this site is the appropriate site and whether or not that would be the place to put third airport. I will reiterate that I, as one in this General Assembly, believe we do need a third airport the future of the State of Illinois. What this Amendment would do would be to put the cart before the horse. We don't know if this site is going to be approved. We're going to put an authority with condem...with condemnation; you're going to eliminate not only one town outside the City of Chicago, but two towns. There's a possibility that in what they call the master plan (that's going to take anywhere from three to five years) that this airport, if Lake Calumet was chosen, could be moved. The people, I understand. that are...responsible for putting this together, are still talking with the State of Indiana. Indiana is talking about how much that will cost them, what benefits they will reap, where their boundaries are.

152nd Legislative Day

June 9, 1992

There's a possibility that this airport, if...if...it will still be Lake Calumet Airport...could all be in the City of Chicago and the State of Indiana and with that, then there's no need to extend the boundary lines to I-80 on the south or I-94 on the west as stated in this Amendment. it's all premature, in my judgment, that this Amendment be There's (sic-there're) a number of other things adopted. that this Amendment would do, but the bottom line is that if we were to adopt this thing now, the way it is, it would be tragic and all the other Amendments, thereafter. I would urge my colleagues to defeat this Amendment and all the other Amendments follow, wait until the people on the federal level agree or disagree that this airport should be in Lake Calumet, and then take it up from there. Right now it's just a waste of time and a wasted effort to put this thing in its proper perspective because we don't know which perspective it's going to be. Thank you."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Balanoff."

Balanoff: "Yes, yes, Mr. Speakers, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House I have a few questions there. There are a number of references to attempts to keep...Midway open; as a matter of fact, I see three of them here. But, in the Lake Calumet Airport feasibility study update, in the planning stage up until this point in time - and the Mayor of the City of Chicago on many, many occasions has said, 'We're not talking about a third airport. We're talking about a second airport.' I would like to...have the Speaker enlighten us. It's not just a matter of saying, well, we can put it in language in legislation. But, based on fact, and we have...that we've heard many people testify Midway would have to be closed. When we talk (and everybody should know) when we talk about a 1,000 or more

152nd Legislative Day

June 9. 1992

commercial air traffic oper...air carrier operations a year. Currently, there are 200,000 over 200,000, at Midway. That would mean 500 planes could come in and take off a year - that's what he defines 'commercial operations'- but I'd like to know, in fact, what basis...or federal aviation authority or what, has even suggested the possibility, because of air-space limitations, that Midway could be kept open?"

Speaker McPike: "Speaker Madigan."

Madigan: "My authority comes from Congressman William Lipinski, who represents the congressional district where Midway Airport is located, and he has consulted with a Mr. Ken Quinn, who is counsel to the FAA in Washington, D.C. and pursuant to the advise of Mr. Ken Quinn, Mr. Lipinski has advised me that Mr. Quinn has told him that Midway Airport could continue as a commercial airport even after the construction of the Lake Calumet Airport..."

Balanoff: "Initially, the board would be made up of 6 appointees from the City and 3 by the Governor. Is that..."

Madigan: "Yes."

Balanoff: "Under Section 20-15, 'the board is empowered to adopt the relocation plan as governed by applicable federal law for persons and entities displaced by the Lake Calumet Airport. Replacement housing need not be located in the City of Chicago.' Can you tell us, currently, what federal law is as it relates to replacement housing?"

Madigan: "I would not be in a position to answer that question."

Balanoff: "Well, I, maybe then I could tell you from what I, at least, understand because I think it's kind of important.

The City always talks about how well they're going to take care of everybody in this plan that they displace, and we're talking about 50,000 people. Federal law says that

152nd Legislative Day

June 9, 1992

they can give you - don't have to - but there is some formula up to \$22,000 for relocation expenses. But, one of the big problems that we have in the Lake Calumet area is that property has not appreciated since the airport came on-line. Certainly...when...when the City has talked about how well we'd be taken care of, I think that many people on the Southeast side would disagree. You said that there's going to be an Amendment regarding eminent domain and taking out eminent domain powers for the relocation of environmental improvement facilities."

- Madigan: "After the adoption of the later Amendment. Amendment #4 and, therefore, the Bill, will provide that eminent domain power and quick-take power are given to the airport authority, but only at the site of the Lake Calumet Airport, nowhere else."
- Balanoff: "But, later on, it takes powers...it says that the...they can take...the Illinois Environmental Protection Agency can grant and delegate all or part of the permitting process to the authority for permitting and inspection. So, I'm saying that they...You're saying that the Illinois Environmental Protection Agency can give up their...or they can delegate to this authority made up of some amount of people, depending upon what point in the design phase or whatever that we're in and they could be responsible for permitting, or inspection, or disposal, or whatever."
- Madigan: "I spoke to that in my initial remarks, and, of course, that's only with the approval of the Federal EPA."
- Balanoff: "Okay. Certainly, I'm one that's very concerned about cost, also, of the proposed project. I'm sure you're aware of the AMS Consultants (which were the consultants for the Bi-State commission) that they spent seven and a half million dollars worth of taxpayers' money looking at and

152nd Legislative Day

June 9, 1992

comparing a number of sites for a third regional airport for the Chicago area, and the AMS Consultants found this certainly to be far and away the most costly of all of the proposals. Do you happen to know what like...If this was the Lake Calumet Airport is ever built (and I'm one that really doesn't believe that it ever will be built), but I'm concerned about how we're going to pay for this thing, and I was wondering if you could tell us how you feel this airport, you know, its possibility of being paid for, and why you do not...and what you feel as far as liability for the rest of the state, for taxpayers across the State of Illinois?"

- Madigan: "Well, Mr. Balanoff, the proponents of the Lake Calumet Airport and the drafters of the legislation have provided that the financing will come from the imposition of a passenger facility charge at O'Hare and Midway Airport(s). This is a newly authorized charge, it was authorized by the Congress of the United States."
- Balanoff: "Okay. That passenger facility charge...my understanding is that that would raise somewhere in the neighborhood of \$1 billion over the life of that passenger facility charge, according to the City of Chicago. So, then, we're..now still \$10 billion short."
- Madigan: "Mr. Balanoff, the only figures I would have relative to receipts under the passenger facility charge would come from sources other than myself, and so all I could do is to tell you what they say. Now, if you disagree with the receipts, why then we're in disagreement."
- Balanoff: "Well, I would suggest to everybody across the State of Illinois that to pay for this airport certainly everybody in the State of Illinois is going to pay. There's a financial feasibility study, technical paper #17, which has

152nd Legislative Day

June 9, 1992

never been released, and among other things, it probably about things like passenger enplanement costs. talks Currently, at Detroit's Wayne Major Airport, the is \$1.50 at O'Hare, the enplanement cost enplanement cost is \$10, and at the new airport in Denver, United has just contracted and for 44 gates and they have demanded in the long-term lease agreement that the passenger charge can never, never, over the life of the agreement, exceed \$20 in 1990 dollars. It has been suggested by Bob Donahue, who is the former Director of Aeronautics for the State of Illinois and former Associate Administrator of the Federal Aviation Authority, that based on the cost, again, assuming that the City's numbers are correct (and I certainly don't) that the enplanement cost at Lake Calumet Airport would be \$75 before the plane moved per person certainly, pricing it way, way, way out of the market for anybody to use it as a hub, and I don't know of any airlines that are jumping up and down saying, 'build me an airport,' but as the only Legislator whose home is directly threatened by the proposed Lake Calumet Airport, I'm very strongly opposed to this project. High on my list for...of reasons for opposition are these photographs that many of you probably have seen that I've been around all day. (These are) home to over 50,000 people, who would be displaced, where you can leave your unlocked at night, where your children play in the same playgrounds that you played in and that your grandfather go to the same churches same schools, where played in, everybody knows you by your first name. Neighborhoods like these are established over generations and are the anchor the City of Chicago and the State of Illinois. But there's a much wider range of reasons to oppose the Lake

152nd Legislative Day

June 9, 1992

Calumet Airport and the regional authority. People from across the State of Illinois spoke out last Wednesday at a hearing because the Lake Calumet proposal contains so many generalities. Ιt is so vaque that even characterization of buying the proverbial 'pig in the poke' is not adequate. Financing, I again, as Representative Wennlund very adequately pointed out, if Lake Calumet is ever built, schools across the State of Illinois, many currently teetering on the verge of bankruptcy, would lose and, certainly, one of our responsibilities as Legislators is to protect public funds. Originally, the cost of a Lake Calumet Airport site was estimated at \$17 or \$18 billion by the AMS Consultants. Then the City went in there (remember the AMS Consultants were consultants that looked at all these sites, independent consultants, spent seven and a half million dollars of our money, and the AMS Consultants said it would cost \$17 billion or \$18 billion to build Lake Cal, the City went in and negotiated and they brought the price down eventually to \$10.8 billion. Is the funding there? Absolutely not. Although everybody who gets on a plane now in Illinois - or certainly at O'Hare and Midway - is now paying a tax that the City of Chicago bullied through Congress. But even by their numbers this will only generate about a billion dollars leaving...which would leave them over \$10 billion short. The cost of the Lake Calumet Airport will be many, many, many times the cost of any of the other sites that were considered. As a fact, currently, the most costly airport ever matter of built in the United States is being built Denver...Denver, Colorado. Cost overruns of...and that is at a cost of about \$3 billion. Financing for that airport is so difficult that they are issuing the bond ratings for

152nd Legislative Day

June 9, 1992

the bonds that they are issuing are BBB-which are barely a Even then, they're having a step above junk bonds. difficult time selling these bonds. And the Denver airport is more than four times the size of the proposed Lake Calumet site, and it's located outside of a city so that expansion, if necessary, certainly could take place. DeGaulle Airport in Paris is 15 to 18 miles northeast of Paris, when they built it ten years ago on a green grass site. Okaido, Japan, 40 miles outside of Tokyo, was built within the last ten years. Dallas-Fort Worth was built between the cities in a green site. Certainly, an urban airport, in 1992, does not make sense. In these tough economic times, I'm sure that we...none of us would want our taxpayers to have to pay for such a boondoggle, and we know there will be cost overruns. Downstaters, people in Highland Park, people in across Marion, Illinois, across this state, not only would their school children pay, their taxpayers would pay. It's interesting that the Mayor's latest airport footprint, many of the worst toxic conditions are skirted on the southeast side of Chicago. This is a quarantee that they would never be cleaned up, and when the Sponsor of the Amendment says that we're going to have the, we're going to now not have this eminent domain for the question of cleanup, what the city's gonna is what they have suggested, is use the toxic waste oftentimes for berms, for berms for noise control. And even for the sites that are within the footprint. They're not necessarily talking about cleanup; oftentimes they're talking about simply contouring and paving over. So the toxins can leak into the groundwater and eventually get into Lake Michigan, poisoning the drinking water for over eight million people, and I will tell everybody that

152nd Legislative Day

June 9, 1992

very significant to me that the City has consistently opposed the Bill providing for the Lake Calumet groundwater study which could make the southeast side eligible for just countless millions of dollars in federal Super clean-up money. The question of wetlands. The question of There are over 150 businesses and thousands and thousands of jobs that would be lost as a result not only of the closing of Midway Airport, the vital economic engine the southwest side of Chicago, but through the closing of the largest employer on the southeast side of Chicago-Ford Motor. And the important rail capacity of our area would be destroyed. This matters not only to the south side of Chicago but to the city and the entire state. To make this grime picture even worse, again using the TAM's Consultant Numbers the cost per job created by the Lake Calumet Airport would be \$270,000."

Speaker McPike: "Please bring your remarks to a close."

Balanoff: "Safety. Safety issues and air space limitations are A number of years ago, in 1988, they cut also important. back (the Federal Aviation Authority) on the number of flights allowed to go into and come out of O'Hare...or coming into O'Hare from 93 to 80 an hour. They did this because of air sp...very serious air space limitations. Lake Calumet would add to this nightmare. At any rate, this is an idea that doesn't make any sense. The reasons of include the fact that if Lake Calumet, with all problems, stays on the table, it guarantees more runways at O'Hare, more planes, more traffic, and much more noise. And we would be creating a situation similar to the people around those communities that have been fighting for many years for noise reduction in the areas like Pillhill, in Chatham, in Chesterfield, in the south suburban areas. I

152nd Legislative Day

June 9, 1992

guess I could go on and on about the reasons to say no to the Lake Calumet Airport and a Regional Airport Authority; but I think it is important that we just take this crazy idea off the table, vote 'no' on the Regional Authority, and I would ask that if this Bill receives enough votes to pass, that I would ask for a verification."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Balthis."

Balthis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker McPike: "Yes."

Balthis: "Mr. Speaker, on page 44 under Section 30-15 under heading of Municipalities, and I read from the section, It says, 'The Authority and any home rule municipality in which any part of any metropolitan airport is located may enter into one or more agreements for the exclusive exercise by the Authority of any power granted to the Authority under this Act.' It goes on to say, 'The Authority and the municipality may also agree that any such power may be either concurrently exercised by the Authority and the municipality or may be exclusively exercised by the municipality.' Is it your intent that the City of Chicago or the Authority could not do anything in another home-rule community without the concurrence of that home-rule community?"

Madigan: "The Bill does not provide that."

Balthis: "What...Could you explain to me the intent of the wording or the verbiage in Section 30-15 under 'municipalities'?"

Madigan: "The intent of this Section is to permit, as an example, the City of Chicago and the newly created Airport Authority to enter into an agreement where the Authority would be given certain powers from the City of Chicago. So, in a

152nd Legislative Day

June 9, 1992

sense, you see, it would enable the Authority to proceed with its purpose."

- Balthis: "Okay. But this language says, 'the Authority and any home-rule municipality in which any part of any metropolitan...'So, it says any...any municipality, home rule, in which any part...they must go to that community and they must get their authority to exercise the powers under this Amendment."
- Madigan: "My understanding is that this is permissive, that they may do that, but they're not required to."
- Balthis: "Well, it goes on further (obviously to help the City of Chicago) in the following Section and indicates that City of Chicago (obviously because it is where the major portion of the airport is going to be located) shall retain all of its home rule revenue powers, which means the City of Chicago is not going to give up any of its revenue powers, but the suburban home rule communities will. So there's...there's obviously a distinction between the power there and the power in the first part. So, the first part appears that any home rule community has a right to control its destiny, and in the second part you're giving the City of Chicago specific authority. So it appears to me that there is a difference in treatment. However, are...still have specific language that says any community, any home rule municipality, shall be allowed to exercise its authority. Just...just want to understand exactly what the intent of that Section is."
- Madigan: "Well, the intent is, as I previously stated to permit, as an example, the City of Chicago and the newly created Airport Authority, to enter into an agreement where the Authority would be given certain powers and authority to proceed with its mission. That's the intent."

152nd Legislative Day

June 9, 1992

Balthis: "Okay. Thank you. Ladies and Gentlemen, to the Bill.

I think it's very obvious that this Amendment, purely and simply, attempts to take over a lot of area, a lot of communities, a lot of homes. There are distinctions between home rule communities in the suburban area, and this does not, by the way, for those of you that happen to be in the O'Hare area, it does not say suburban south; it says metropolitan airport. So I would caution all of you to read Section 30-15, on page 44, because there are...There is the ability for them to take over certain things around the O'Hare field, as this reads. Thank you."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Trotter."

Trotter: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Members of this House. I share with my colleagues who've stated they have opposition and unreadiness to this piece of legislation at this time. I'm not going to be redundant and share with you and give you the figures and the formulas that they have given you already, but what we have seen is that these numbers do not add up for a profit for our state or for our city. What we see is just the opposite: that our school boards and our school districts will be the losers, that our children and our communities will be the losers. Bill is tantamount (to) no more, and definitely no less, than the Holocaust that we have all said that we're appalled to (sic). This Bill in Section 20-40 says that it has quick-take powers, which says that this Authority has the right to take the homes, the businesses and also the community that these people have put and lived in all their That is Gestapo tactics. This Bill here says in lives. Section 25-45 that we should trash the affirmative action

laws and rights and regulations that we have all labored to put in place to ensure that we all have an an equitable

152nd Legislative Day

June 9, 1992

piece of the pie. This Bill is not for the people of This Bill is for those fat cats who have traditionally sat at the trough and will feed more and more and give only just a little bit back to the community. says in 25-45 that this Bill does not, does...only permits, - does not require - that there'll selection of minority-or-female-owned businesses professional services. This Bill says that this authority, this eminent Authority, has the right to determine, if it is impractical or excessively costly to attain minority-or female-owned businesses to perform work, that they will waive that commitment in the contract, as they may deem appropriate. This is not a Bill for us. There's not us now to be making passage for this type of legislation; no, just the opposite. This destroys, and it is a slap in the face not only to us but to our followers forefathers, who said in the Bill of Rights that this is supposed to be a government of the people and for the This is a Bill just for those lawyers and those people. contractors who will make a profit off those people who that, they feel, do not have a voice here in this Well, I am their voice. We, and as heard Legislature. before, there're a lot of voices here, and I think that we all today should stand up and let them know that we're not going to take this; we're not gonna allow them, because they come for me today and no one says anything. Don't surprised when they come for you tomorrow and nobody is there for you. Let's vote 'no' on this bad precedent. Let's vote 'no' on these Gestapo tactics that are now being rammed down our throat here on this day. Let's leave here letting the people know that we're on their side and vote 'no' on this legislation."

152nd Legislative Day

June 9, 1992

Speaker McPike: "Speaker Madigan, to close."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen. This Amendment is being offered in furtherance of an agreement between Mayor Daley and Governor Edgar. That agreement was announced on February 20, 1992, February 20th of 1992. are now in the month of June. And I heard some references from one of the prior speakers on the other side of the aisle alluding to the possibility that there might be further changes in the agreement and that because of the uncertainty of the status of the negotiations, this individual probably will not support this particular Amendment today. I find all of that very unfortunate because, as I said, the announcement of this agreement occurred on February the 20th of this year. It's now several months later; we are moving toward the end of a very difficult Legislative Session where we are being called upon to reduce state spending across the board, which is a very arduous and difficult process; and so it seems to me that, as we consider this House Bill in the House in June, that we ought to be prepared to move ahead This Amendment was drafted, working cooperatively today. with people from the Governor's Office and from the Mayor's office of Chicago. There are subsequent Amendments filed that will cure certain defects which have been found, which have been alleged by previous speakers; and one previous speaker complained about Sections of the Affirmative Action Provision of the Bill and there's a later Amendment to provide that those provisions on Affirmative Action will be requirements and not goals. So, Ladies and Gentlemen, I would simply say to you this is a matter on Second Reading. My desire is to adopt this Amendment to the Bill, adopt the later Amendments which would provide refinements

152nd Legislative Day

June 9, 1992

Amendment #4, and then place the Bill on Third Reading so that, hopefully, it could be called on Third Reading on Thursday when we have scheduled a Special Order of call to consider the Bill on Third Reading. So again, Mr. Speaker, and in conclusion, I would recommend an 'aye' vote. This is my Amendment to put this Bill in the shape that I desire. Thank you."

Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #4 be adopted?' All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'.

Representative Daniels, to explain his vote."

Daniels: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. stand in opposition to the Gentleman's Amendment #4 and, basically, just to tell you that there is no agreement as we stand here now between the Mayor of the City of Chicago and the Governor of Illinois; and, consequently, I think we're premature on that until the two chief executives of their respective areas enter into an agreement. It is at that point that I think they will come back to us to express their support for the agreement that they enter Now, nobody knows, at that point, whether or not into. this Assembly will accept their agreement that they put forth to us, but I think we are premature. As we all know, this Bill, House Bill 3275, was extended...to...sine die date, January 1993, so we do have time in which to work on it, and I, for that reason, I vote 'no'."

Speaker McPike: "Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this Amendment, there are 28 'ayes' and 71 'noes', and the Amendment is defeated. Mr. Speaker. Turn the Gentleman's mike off. Speaker Madigan. Give the Gentleman your attention."

152nd Legislative Day

- June 9, 1992
- Madigan: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. Would you take the Bill out of the record?"
- Speaker McPike: "Yes. Take the Bill out of the record. The Bill will remain on Second Reading. Representative Capparelli."
- Capparelli: "I presume we'll be adjourning. If we are, I would like to tell everybody the ball game is going to be going on at 6:30. There's going to be free beer and bratwurst for everyone. See you out there."
- Speaker McPike: "Agreed Resolutions. Representative McGann, for an announcement. Mr. McGann."
- McGann: "Mr. Speaker, just an announcement. The Legislative Audit Commission meeting was scheduled for 6:00 p.m. Will be cancelled for this evening and will be re-scheduled. That's the 6:00 p.m. Audit Commission meeting. Legislative Audit Commission meeting. Thank you."
- Speaker McPike: "Agreed Resolutions."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 2096, offered by Representative Speaker Madigan; 2097, Daniels; 2098, McGann; 2102, Bugielski; 2103, Flowers; 2104, Hultgren; 2105, McGann; 2106, McAfee; 2107, Deering; 2108, Hartke; 2109, DeJaegher; 2110, DeJaegher; 2111, DeJaegher; 2112, DeJaegher; 2113, DeJaegher; 2114, Hasara; 2115, Wyvetter Younge; 2116, Wyvetter Younge; 2117, Wyvetter Younge; 2118, Schakowsky; 2119, Schakowsky; 2120, J. Hoffman; 2121, Leitch; 2122, Steczo; 2123, Ropp; 2124, Ropp; 2125, Hultgren; House Joint Resolution 144, Dunn and 145, Klemm."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Matijevich."
- Matijevich: "Speaker, these are all agreed-to. I move the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions."
- Speaker McPike: "The Gentleman moves the adoption of Agreed Resolutions. All in favor say 'aye', opposed, 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the Agreed Resolutions are adopted.

152nd Legislative Day

June 9, 1992

Representative Jesse White."

- White: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Following the ball game today, or tonight, there's a party that's being hosted in my honor at Gary LaPaille's house, so all of you are welcome. This is at 801 Williams after the ball game the home of Gary LaPaille. Thank you."
- Speaker McPike: "Death Resolutions."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 2099, offered by Representative Shaw, with respect to the memory of Mike Campbell. House Resolution 2100, offered by Representative Morrow, with respect to the memory of Allen Anderson, Sr. House Resolution 2101, offered by Representative Morrow, with respect to the memory of Mrs. Taylor Hawes.
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Matijevich moves the adoption of the Death Resolutions. All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the Death Resolutions are adopted. General Resolutions."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Joint Resolution 143, offered by Representative Churchill and Senate Joint Resolution 142, offered by Representative Saltsman."
- Speaker McPike: "Committee on Assignment. Representative Matijevich now moves that the House stands adjourned until tomorrow at the hour of 12:00 noon. All in favor say 'aye', opposed, 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the House stands adjourned."

REPORT: TIFLDAY PAGE: 001

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

92/09/28 15:41:37

JUNE 09 1992

HB-3275	RECALLED	PAGE	27
HB-3275	OUT OF RECORD	PAGE	52
SB-0911	THIRD READING	PAGE	19
\$8-0934	THIRD READING	PAGE	13
SB-1499	SECOND READING	PAGE	7
SB-1499	SECOND READING	PAGE	20
SB-1510	SECOND READING	PAGE	7
SB-1519	SECOND READING	PAGE	8
SB-1531	MOTION	PAGE	3
SB-1531	MOTION	PAGE	5
SB-1567	SECOND READING	PAGE	20
SB-1638	SECOND READING	PAGE	8
SB-1763	SECOND READING	PAGE	8
SB-1766	SECOND READING	PAGE	8
SB-1783	SECOND READING	PAGE	21
SB-1789	SECOND READING	PAGE	9
SB-1815	SECOND READING	PAGE	9
SB-1821	SECOND READING	PAGE	9
SB-1823	SECOND READING	PAGE	9
SB-1831	SECOND READING	PAGE	21
SB-1846	SECOND READING	PAGE	22
	SECOND READING	PAGE	22
SB-1897	SECOND READING	PAGE	10
SB-1907	SECOND READING	PAGE	22
SB-1964	SECOND READING	PAGE	10
SB-1965	SECOND READING	PAGE	10
\$8-1979	SECOND READING	PAGE	10
SB-2056	SECOND READING	PAGE	10
	SECOND READING	PAGE	23
SB-2056	OUT OF RECORD	PAGE	11
SB-2128	SECOND READING	PAGE	11
SB-2131		PAGE	11
	SECOND READING	PAGE	24
	SECOND READING	PAGE	24
SB-2159	SECOND READING	PAGE	11
	HELD ON SECOND	PAGE	12
	SECOND READING	PAGE	25
	RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	24
HR-0644	OUT OF RECORD	PAGE	24

SUBJECT MATTER

HOUSE TO ORDER - SPEAKER MCPIKE PRAYER - REVEREND STEVEN HORN PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE ROLL CALL FOR ATTENDANCE CONSENT CALENDAR - SECOND READING COMMITTEE REPORT REPRESENTATIVE YOUNG IN THE CHAIR REPRESENTATIVE MCPIKE IN THE CHAIR AGREED RESOLUTIONS DEATH RESOLUTIONS	PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE PAGE	1 1 1 3 4 27 52 53
DEATH RESOLUTIONS	PAGE	53
GENERAL RESOLUTIONS	PAGE	54
ADJOURNED	PAGE	54