69th Legislative Day

June 20, 1991

- Speaker Keane: "The House will come to order. The Members will be in their seats. The Chaplain for today is Pastor J. R. Crowe, of the Fellowship Baptist Church in Shelbyville.

 Pastor Crowe is the guest of Representative Noland. Our guests in the gallery may wish to rise for the invocation."
- Pastor J. R. Crowe: "Would you bow with me in prayer, please.

 Father, we can't help but come before Thee grateful (sic gratefully) for the resources that You have given us in this State, both natural resources and people. We recognize also where much is given, much is required. We do ask at this time that You might grant wisdom to these men and women as they come together to make decisions that affect the lives of thousands of people, and Father, we do recognize that the complexities of this modern age are such that many times it's hard to determine right and wrong, so we ask that in Your grace that you might grant wisdom, and we pray it in Jesus' name. Amen.
- Speaker Keane: "We'll be led in the Pledge by Representative Hartke."
- Hartke et al: "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."
- Speaker Keane: "Roll Call for Attendance. Representative Matijevich for excused absences."
- Matijevich: "Speaker, we're all here today."
- Speaker Keane: "Representative Myron Olson for excused absences."
- Olson, M.: "Yeah. Thank you. Good morning, Mr. Speaker. Jane
 Barnes and Richard Klemm are excused, plus Tom Ewing.

 Those three. Barnes, Klemm and Ewing."
- Speaker Keane: "115 Members being present, there is a quorum.

 Take the Roll. Messages from the Senate."

69th Legislative Day

June 20, 1991

Clerk O'Brien: "A message from the Senate by Ms. Hawker, Secretary. 'Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the . House of Representatives that the Senate has concurred with the House of Representatives in passage of Bills with the following titles, to wit; House Bills #2, 104, 137, 318, 489, 554, 624, 703, 714, 735, 738, 739, 743, 772, 818, 844, 852, 889, 894, 954, 1024, 2177, 2306, 2307, 2309, 2385, 2416, 2421, 2423, 2446, 2488, 2536, and 2562, together with the attached Amendments adoption of which I instructed to ask concurrence of the House, passed the Senate as amended, June 19, 1991. Linda Secretary."

Speaker Keane: "Committee Reports."

Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Hannig, Chairman of the Committee on General Services Appropriations, to which the following Bills were referred, action taken June 19, 1991 and back with reported the same the following recommendations: 'do pass' Senate Bills 335 and 350; 'do pass as amended' Senate Bills 337, 341, 342, 347, 348, 349, 352, 353, 356, 357, 358, 359, 360, 361, 409, and 953. Representative Hicks, Chairman from the Committee on Public Safety and Infrastructure Appropriations, to which the following Bills were referred, action taken June 19, same reported the back with the following recommendations: 'do pass' Senate Bill 363; 'do pass as amended' Senate Bills 133, 258, 336, 338, 339, 340, 344, 346, 351, 354, 355, 364, 365, 367, 440; and 954. Representative McGann, Chairman from the Committee on Education Appropriations, to which the following Bills were referred, action taken June 20, 1991, reported the back with the following recommendations: 'Do pass' Senate Bills 308, 306, 305, 304, 303, 302, 301, 310, and 311. pass as amended' Senate Bills 958 and 345. Representative

69th Legislative Day

June 20, 1991

LeFlore, Chairman from the Committee on Human Services Appropriations, to which the following Bills were referred, action taken June 20, 1991, reported the same back with the following recommendations: 'do pass' Senate Bills 956, 369, and 370; 'do pass as amended' Senate Bills 371, 343, 366, 368, 372, 374, 373, 959, and 1341."

Speaker Keane: "We will begin at the top of the Calendar and go through Second Readings in the various categories, and when we complete that we will go to Third Reading. That's using today's Special Order Calendar. In the Order of Human Second Reading, is Senate Bill 435. Services, Representative Phelps. Out of the record. Senate Bill 500, Representative Homer. Out of the record. Senate Bill 628, Representative Manny Hoffman. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1037, Representative McGann. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1037, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Act on the Aging. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Keane: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representatives

McGann and Hultgren."

Speaker Keane: "Representative McGann."

McGann: "Yes. Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1037 is an agreement that was made in committee...Representative Hultgren...and what it does is actually... gives the lineage that's exactly...was in the House Bill that we sent over to the Senate, and I'd ask for its adoption."

Speaker Keane: "Representative Hultgren."

Hultgren: "Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of Floor Amendment #1.

Representative McGann explained it accurately."

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

69th Legislative Day

June 20, 1991

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

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Keane: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1125, Representative Morrow. Do you wish your Bill... Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1125, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Act on the Aging. Second Reading of the Bill.

Amendment #1 was adopted in committee."

Speaker Keane: "Any Motions filed?"

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

Speaker Keane: "Third Reading. On Senate Bills Agriculture and Environment, Second Reading, Senate Bill 31. Representative Giglio. Do you wish Senate Bill 31 called?

Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 31, a Bill for an Act to amend the Animal Control Act, Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee or Floor Amendments."

"Third Reading. Senate Bill 923, Representative Speaker Keane: Kulas. Out οf the record. Senate Bill 1048. Representative Hannig. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1310, Representative Tenhouse. Oh, that Bill is That Bill has been moved to Third Reading, improperly... the Clerk tells me. It's improperly on our Calendar. sorry. 1303. Pardon me. Representative Tenhouse, do you wish Senate Bill 1303 to be called? Out of the record. Senate Bill 1364, Representative Hartke. Out οf record. Senate Bill 1365. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1427, Representative Peterson. Out of the record. On Senate Bills, Consumer Protection, Second Reading. Bill 1192, Representative Rice. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill." Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1192, a Bill for an Act to create

69th Legislative Day

June 20, 1991

the Illinois Consumer Credit Reporting Agencies Act, Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee or Floor Amendments."

Speaker Keane: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1273, Representative Hensel. Out of the record. On the Order of Educational Finance, Second Reading. Senate Bill 158, Representative LeFlore. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 158, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code, Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee."

Speaker Keane: "Any Motions filed?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Keane: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative LeFlore and Flowers."

Speaker Keane: "Representative LeFlore."

Speaker. Amendment #2 makes LeFlore: "Thank Mr. you, following change to the State Chapter 1 provision of the Chicago School Reform Act. Of course you know, we're looking for funding to come back...the budget and add dollars to the budget. Ιn phase one and targeting, it delays the State Chapter 1 Phase-in schedule of funds Phase-in will cost about one year...by one year. \$50,000,000. The board can do...if the board do it now, that will generate some funds in order to cut back the Now, there's an unspent portion of the supplemental Chapter 1 that we can use for the generation purpose of FY '92. This will help in balancing the need these dollars, and the amount of dollars that will be generated out of this particular package will come to about \$78,000,000 that will go to Chicago Board of Education, School District 299, and I'll just like to have a favorable vote on this Amendment, Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 158."

Speaker Keane: "Representative Cowlishaw."

69th Legislative Day

June 20, 1991

Cowlishaw: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Representative LeFlore, I was fortunate that someone came over earlier today and explained all of this at considerable length, and I think you've done an excellent job with this Amendment, and I stand in support of Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 158."

LeFlore: "Thank you, Representative. I'm sorry I didn't consult with you. It was on my mind, but I just haven't had time.

Thank you very much."

Speaker Keane: "Representative Ropp."

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

Speaker Keane: "He indicates he will."

Ropp: "Representative, I want to commend you for this Amendment.

My question though is, did dollars that were allocated last
year not become fully implemented, or how are we able to
create some additional dollars?"

LeFlore: "Representative, in response to your question, some of those dollars that were allocated last year wasn't used, so you know, we had a five—year deal on the Chicago Reform Mandate. So this budget has dollars that hadn't been used, so what we are doing, we are asking you to just let us use these monies for one year, and then the program will go back to its original format."

Ropp: "I hope that they'll be able to use them efficiently and effectively this year, and certainly would support your Amendment."

LeFlore: "Thank you."

Speaker Keane: "Representative LeFlore moves the adoption of Amendment #1. All those in favor say 'aye'...I'm sorry, Amendment #2. All those in favor say 'aye', all opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Amendment #2 is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Keane: "Third Reading. On the Order of Government

69th Legislative Day

June 20, 1991

Operations, Second Reading, Senate Bill 837, Representative Out οf the record. 838, Representative Bugielski. Out of the record. 908, Representative Senate Bill 908. Out of the record. On the Capparelli. Order of Insurance, Second Reading, is Senate Bill 1059. Representative Curran. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1059, a Bill for an Act to amend the State Employees Group Insurance Act. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee or Floor Amendments."
- Speaker Keane: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1338, Representative Williams. Out of the record. On the Order of Municipal, County and Conservation Law, Second Reading, appears Senate Bill 216. Representative Steczo. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 216, a Bill for an Act to amend the Counties Code. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker Keane: "Any Motions filed?"

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

- "Third Reading. Senate Bill 221, Representative Speaker Keane: Steczo. Out οf the record. Senate Bill 511, Representative Brunsvold. Out of the record. Senate Bill 593, Representative McAfee.Out of the record. Senate Bill 659, Representative Williams. Out of the record. Senate Bill 846, Representative Morrow. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill. Senate Bill Out of the record. 992. Representative Williams. Out οf the record. Senate Bill 1006. Representative Giorgi. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1032, Representative McGann. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1032, a Bill for an Act that creates the Home Rule Note Act, Second Reading of the Bill. There are no Committee or Floor Amendments."
- Speaker Keane: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1073, Representative

69th Legislative Day

June 20, 1991

Saltsman. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1073, a Bill for an Act to amend the Personnel Code. Second Reading of the Bill. There are no Committee Amendments."

Speaker Keane: "Any Floor Amendments?"

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

Speaker Keane: "Representative Saltsman."

Saltsman: "Yes. Thank you, Mr.Speaker. Amendment #1...what it does is, it just changes part of the Pension Code so the term also includes a retired employee of any public community college organized pursuant to Public Community College Act, was receiving retirement, annuity, or disability benefits under Article XV of the Pension Code would also be included. This was House Bill 123, it passed out of here with over 100 votes, and it got stalled in the Senate and that's why we're offering this Amendment to the Bill."

Speaker Keane: "Representative Black."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I just rise to support the Gentleman's Motion. Many of us in this chamber have been working on this for some three or four years. This is a good Amendment, it's long overdue, it's a good Amendment, and I hope it goes on the Bill and I hope the Bill passes by an overwhelming majority."

Speaker Keane: "Representative Parke."

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

Speaker Keane: "He indicates he will."

Parke: "Representative Saltsman, I just didn't catch.. Again, just in your own words, what does this do?"

Saltsman: "Representative Parke, I'm doing this for the American Federation of Teachers. It does not change the Pension Code. It allows people who are in the Code with community

69th Legislative Day

June 20, 1991

college assistance to be able to receive disability benefits."

Parke: "Do we have any kind of idea what this is going to cost the community college systems, and have they signed off on this?"

Saltsman: "It's very minimal. I didn't have House Bill 123 when it left here to go to the Senate, and I don't think there's any cost factor to amount to anything within it."

Parke: "Have you heard of any opposition to this?"

Saltsman: "No opposition whatsoever."

Parke: "Thank you, Representative. I appreciate the information."

Speaker Keane: "Question is, 'Shall the House adopt Amendment #1

to Senate Bill 1073. All in favor say 'aye', all opposed

'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the Amendment is adopted.

Any further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Keane: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1161, Representative Wait. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1409, Representative Brunsvold. Representative Brunsvold, 1409. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1426, out of the record. We will go back to Government Operations, Second Reading. Senate Bill 10, Representative Lang. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 10, a Bill for an Act in relationship to school reform. Second Reading of the Bill. There are no Committee Amendments."

Speaker Keane: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #1 is being offered by Representative Anthony Young and Levin."

Speaker Keane: "Representative Lang."

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is simply a technical Amendment, I ask its adoption.

Speaker Keane: "Any discussion? There being none, the question

69th Legislative Day

June 20, 1991

- is, 'Shall the House adopt Amendment #1?' All those in favor say 'aye'...Representative Black."
- Black: "Yeah. Thank you very much. Did...Representative Lang handling this for Representative Young?"
- Speaker Keane: "Correct."
- Black: "Alright. Representative, is this still going to be basically a Shell Bill for negotiations? Is that the purpose? Alright."
- Speaker Keane: "Representative Lang moves adoption of Amendment #1. All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Keane: "Third Reading, Second Reading, Public Utilities, Senate Bill 654, Representative Hicks. Out of the record. Second Reading, Senate Bill 487, Estate Law, Real On Representative Shaw. Out of the record. Senate Bills...Transportation Second Reading is Senate Bill 1016, Representative Obrzut. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1061, Representative Matijevich. Out of the record. On the Order of Second... Veteran's, Second Reading, is Senate Bill 37, Representative Granberg. Out of the record. On the Order of Children and Family Law, Second Reading, Senate Bill 757. Representative Davis, Children and Family Law, Senate Bill 757. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 757, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Alcoholism and Other Drug Dependency Act. Second Reading of the Bill. There are no Committee or Floor Amendments."
- Speaker Keane: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 873, Representative Deuchler. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 873, a Bill for an Act to amend the Juvenile Court Act. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment

69th Legislative Day

June 20, 1991

#1 was adopted in committee."

Speaker Keane: "Any Motions filed?"

Clerk Leone: "No Motions filed and no further Amendments."

Speaker Keane: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 930, Representative οf the record. Bill Homer. Out Senate 1215. Representative White. Out of the record. On the Order οf Law, Second Reading. Senate Bill 64. Representative Weaver. Representative Weaver. Read Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 64, a Bill for an Act to amend the Home Repair Fraud Act. Second Reading of the Bill. There are no Committee Amendments."

Speaker Keane: "Any Floor Amendments?"

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

Speaker Keane: "Representative Homer on Floor Amendment #1."

Homer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Amendment is being offered as a result of an agreement made in committee. It adjusts downward the penalties for the...part of the Home Repair...Aggravated Home Repair Fraud statute that the Bill would attempt to enhance the penalties for. This Amendment would adjust them in order to coordinate them and make them consistent with the home repair fraud violations as they now exist, so I would answer any questions and move the adoption."

Speaker Keane: "Representative Weaver."

Weaver: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. This is an agreed Amendment. It was part of the agreement for us to get the Bill out of committee. Can we take this out of the record, please?"

Speaker Keane: "Out of the record. Senate Bill 116,

Representative McGuire. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 116, a Bill for an Act to amend the

69th Legislative Day

- June 20, 1991
- Criminal Code. Second Reading of the Bill. There are no Committee or Floor Amendments."
- Speaker Keane: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 151, Representative DeJaegher. Representative DeJaegher. Do you wish to call 151? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 151, a Bill for an Act to amend the
 Illinois Controlled Substances Act. Second Reading of the
 Bill. There are no Committee Amendments."
- Speaker Keane: "Any Floor Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative
 Homer."
- Speaker Keane: "Representative Homer on Floor Amendment #1."
- Homer: "Yeah. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Amendment would make consistent the provisions of Senate Bill 151 with House Bill 1101 which passed both of these Bills, tried to reconcile three different statutes that were in conflict concerning the classification of controlled substances and their amounts. This Amendment is being offered to make some technical changes in Senate Bill 151 and to make it consistent with the House Bill that we previously passed. I would urge its adoption."
- Speaker Keane: "Any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt Amendment #1? All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Keane: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 242, Representative McGuire. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 242, a Bill for an Act to amend the Unified Code of Corrections. Second Reading of the Bill.

 There are no Committee or Floor Amendments."
- Speaker Keane: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 263, Representative Petka. Mr. Clerk, read-the Bill."

69th Legislative Day

June 20, 1991

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 263, a Bill for an Act to amend the Criminal Code. Second Reading of the Bill. There are no Committee Amendments."

Speaker Keane: "Any Floor Amendments?"

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

Speaker Keane: "Representative Petka."

Petka: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Floor Amendment #1 provides that the Department of Public Health shall be liable for costs, expenses and damages incurred by a patient due to the department's failure to notify a person that the health care provider has been diagnosed as being infected with the HIV virus or any other other causative agent of AIDS. I would move for its adoption."

Speaker Keane: "Representative Homer."

Homer: "Thank you. Will the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Keane: "He indicates he will."

Homer: "Representative Petka, I didn't hear the explanation. I remember the Bill. What's the Amendment do?"

Petka: "Representative Homer, the Amendment that was added to this Bill would provide that the Department of Public Health would be held liable in those instances where they fail to notify a person who had been treated by a health care provider that had been diagnosed with HIV...with the HIV virus, when the Department knew that the...that such care was given."

Homer: "Is this in response to the recent news article concerning the doctor who treated a number of patients?"

Petka: "I would say that's fair to say. Yes, Sir."

Homer: "So, this Amendment would make the department liable?

This Amendment would make the Illinois Department of Public

Health liable for failure to notify the person that the

69th Legislative Day

June 20, 1991

provider had HIV?"

Petka: "That is the intent of the Amendment."

Homer: "What is the justification for it? Why would you...What's the rationale for doing this?"

Petka: "Well, it just seems as a matter of public policy,
Representative, that when they have information which
basically creates a risk of a serious, serious bodily
injury, that can result from a causative agent such as HIV,
that under those circumstances, if they have information
and fail to disclose that to people, that this
significantly enhances the chance of the spread of this
virus."

Homer: "What is the current duty of the department to notify a person that his provider has been diagnosed? Is there a statutory duty now requiring the department...?"

Petka: "Representative, it's my understanding that there's no statutory duty."

Homer: "There is none?"

Petka: "That is my understanding."

Homer: "Well then, how could you make them liable then for failing to notify if they have no duty to notify now?"

Petka: "Well, this creates that duty, and it makes them liable for failing to do it, Sir."

Homer: "Well, wouldn't you first, though, have to impose upon them a duty...I mean, in other words, it seems to me that if they are under no legal duty, they may be, in fact, infringing upon the rights of the provider to take it upon themselves to make notifications to patients where they have no legal authority or responsibility to do that, and this statute then would purport to make them liable for failing to do something that the statutes do not require them to do."

Petka: "Representative, the statute is intended to create

69th Legislative Day

June 20, 1991

liability in instances where the department has knowledge that an individual who is a health care provider has been diagnosed with having HIV virus and simply refuses to tell the people that have been provided services that in fact they were treated by a provider who has been infected."

Homer: "And how is this reconciled with the AIDS Confidentiality
Act?"

Petka: "Quite frankly, I don't know, Representative."

Homer: "Under the AIDS Confidentiality Act, and you correct me if
I'm wrong, does it not require that this information be
confidential? That if the Department of Public Health
learns that an individual has..."

Petka: "Except where otherwise authorized by law, and this would be one of those instances, Representative."

Homer: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I wish to, and I should have done this at the outset, but I would question whether, first of all, this Amendment is germane to the Bill. I would like a ruling. I noticed the Bill amends the Criminal Code. This Amendment would amend the Civil Administrative Code of Illinois, which is a far different provision in the statutes, and I would ask a ruling first as to whether this is a germane Amendment."

Speaker Keane: "The Parliamentarian has ruled that the Amendment is germane. Any further discussion? Representative Homer."

Homer: "Yes. Thank you. I...Mr. Speaker, to the Bill, I...or to the Amendment. I think this is something we should not simply adopt here at this juncture. I think we should be concerned about imposing a liability on the Department of Public Health where there appears to be conflicting provision in another statute that we passed requires the department that to maintain the confidentiality of those who have been diagnosed to have

69th Legislative Day

June 20, 1991

How can you on the one hand order the HIV virus. information to be confidential, and on the other hand statute that would create liability for the for maintaining that legal duty The Amendment, I don't believe, is well confidentiality? drafted or thought out. It would make the department and the State of Illinois, the taxpayers of this state, liable for costs, expenses, and damages incurred Now that's pretty broad wording. What are the costs, expenses and damages of the absence of notification? What you would ensure is opening the floodgates litigation at the expense of the Illinois taxpayer at a time when we're in a perilous budget crisis. I don't that that would be something that we would want to do, at least without further consideration and thought being given to this Amendment. I think it's a fairly far-reaching It's being amended onto a Bill that amends the provision. Criminal Code. It would open up liability to the State Illinois, and would seem to me to place in conflict two separate or prior statutes and public policy adopted by this state quaranteeing and requiring the confidentiality of those who have been diagnosed having the HIV virus. And as a practical matter, how would you implement this? How would the Illinois Department of Public Health notify or even determine all of the patients or patient contacts of a particular physician? It would be a cumbersome task, and I don't think it's something that we should enter into for the first time without public hearings on the entertainment of an Amendment to an unrelated Bill. So in spite of my high regard for the Sponsor, and I...his obvious good intentions, I would have to recommend a 'no' vote on the Amendment."

Speaker Keane: "Representative Pullen."

69th Legislative Day

June 20, 1991

Pullen: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to ask the Sponsor to answer a couple of questions?"

Speaker Keane: "He indicates he'll yield."

Pullen: "Would there be...First of all, the purpose of this
Amendment is to ensure that the Illinois Department of
Health would undertake a policy of notifying the patients
who have had invasive procedures performed on them by
health care workers found to be infected with the HIV or
AIDS virus. Is that correct?"

Petka: "That's correct."

Pullen: "Is that for the purpose of providing that patient information about their own possible health problems?

Petka: "Yes. It is."

Pullen: "Is that for the purpose of that patient, on learning of possible exposure, to provide for testing of him or herself so that they could receive proper health care and also prevent from passing it on to loved ones?"

Petka: "That is certainly the case, and I would...that type of result is something that society would expect."

Pullen: "Do you have reason to believe that the Department of Public Health has not undertaken any policy of notifying patients in such cases?"

Petka: "I believe there has been an incident that has been well publicized in central Illinois, yes."

Pullen: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I urge the House to adopt this Amendment. The Department of Public Health can no longer claim that there is no risk to health care patients who are given invasive treatment by health care workers who are infected with the AIDS virus, for there have now been at least 5 documented cases of transmission of this virus from a dentist in the State of Florida. It is no longer a question of whether there is the possibility of transmission from infected health care

69th Legislative Day

June 20, 1991

workers who perform invasive procedures. That risk is now documented. Yet the Illinois Department of Public Health has refused to recognize that risk, has refused the notification they are, in undertake my authorized under law to do, if the AIDS Confidentiality Act is read in conjunction with other Illinois law. Because of provisions in the AIDS Confidentiality Act in situations such as this, it cannot and should not be read alone, but should be read in connection and conjunction with other Illinois law on a subject of HIV testing and diagnosis. The health care patients of Illinois deserve to know that this House has some concern for their health, and some concern for their legitimate interest in being advised that they may have been exposed to this deadly virus. Someone who has not engaged in what is traditionally considered high risk behavior, would have otherwise no reason to seek knowledge of whether or not they are infected in order to treatment for gain health care themselves tragically have become infected with this long-time symptomless deadly virus, and in order to themselves from unknowingly transmitting this virus to a loved one. The Gentleman's proposal here may be a rather creative way of conveying to the department that it a the duty, but certainly it is a duty that none of us should neglect, and it is an Amendment which should receive the full support of this House to protect citizens of Illinois from unknowingly transmitting or from being infected by the AIDS virus. I fully support the Gentleman in this effort, and thank him for taking this stand to help the people of Illinois. Thank you."

Speaker Keane: "Any further discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt Amendment #1?' All in favor say 'aye', all opposed 'no'. The 'nos' have it and

69th Legislative Day

- June 20, 1991
- the Amendment fails. Third Reading. On that...Senate Bill 264, Representative Hoffman. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 264, a Bill..."
- Speaker Keane: "Excuse me, Mr. Clerk. Representative Petka, for what purpose do you arise?"
- Petka: "Mr. Speaker, I was not given an opportunity to close on my own Amendment, and I would like to have that opportunity. Now it just seems to me as a matter of fairness. It was my Amendment, I was not given an opportunity to close, and I was going to ask for a Roll Call vote."
- Speaker Keane: "The Chair is in error, and I apologize. I thought that you had closed your dialogue with Representative Pullen."
- Petka: "I did not."
- Speaker Keane: "But your appeal is untimely because we've left that...moved the Bill to Third and we are now on another Bill. Representative Hoffman. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 264, a Bill for an Act to amend the Criminal Code. Second Reading of the Bill. There are no Committee Amendments."
- Speaker Keane: "Any Floor Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Jay
 Hoffman."
- Speaker Keane: "Representative Jay Hoffman."
- Hoffman, J.: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House.

 Floor Amendment #1 essentially makes a technical change in
 the Bill in order to bring it into compliance with the
 Illinois Supreme Court decision. It says there may be an
 inference in certain cases in this Bill as opposed to
 Shell."
- Speaker Keane: "Any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt the Amendment...Representative

69th Legislative Day

June 20, 1991

- Hultgren."
- Hultgren: "Has this Amendment been printed and distributed, Mr. Speaker?"
- Amendment has not been printed and Speaker Keane: "The distributed, you're correct."
- Hultgren: "If you could just see that I could get a copy of it, I withdraw any objection to proceeding, so that I could take a look at it here."
- Speaker Keane: "We'll get you a copy. The question is, 'Shall the House' ... Representative Homer."
- Homer: "Mr. Speaker, we also don't have a copy of the Amendment. We don't know what it does, I have high faith in the Sponsor, but as a matter of protocol, I think we should have the Amendment and have it analyzed, so I would raise the objection."
- Speaker Keane: "Take the Bill out of the record. Senate Bill 1111, Representative Shaw. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1147, Representative Hartke. Representative Hartke. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1274, Representative Out of the record. Senate Bill Representative Davis. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1302, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act in relationship to the forfeiture of property. Second Reading of the Bill. There are no Committee or Floor Amendments."
- Speaker Keane: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1428, Representative Cronin. Out of the record. The Order of Elementary and Secondary Education, Second Reading. Senate Bill 645, Representative Deering. Do you wish to call 645? Out of Senate Bill 724, Representative Cowlishaw. record. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 724, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. Second Reading of the Bill. There are no

69th Legislative Day

June 20, 1991

Committee Amendments."

Speaker Keane: "Any Floor Amendments?"

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

Speaker Keane: "Representative Lang. Representative Lang, do you wish to proceed with your Amendment?"

Lang: "Mr. Speaker, let's table Amendment #1."

Speaker Keane: "Gentleman asks to withdraw Amendment #1.

Amendment #1 is withdrawn. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Keane: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 725, Representative Giorgi. Out of the record. Senate Bill Representative Hannig. Out of the record. On Health Care, Second Reading, appears Senate Bill 601, Representative McAfee. Representative McAfee. Out of the record. On the Order of Higher Education, Second Reading, is Senate Bill 453, Representative Curran. Out of the record. Bill 1353, Representative Turner. Out of the record. the Order of Legalized Gambling, Second Reading, 378, Representative Brunsvold. On the Order Legalized Gambling. Out of the record. On the Order οf Professional Regulation, Second Reading. Senate Bill 131, Representative Curran. Out of the record. Senate Bill 312, Representative Steczo. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 312, a Bill for an Act to amend the Regulatory Agency Sunset Act. Second Reading of the Bill.

Amendments 1 and 2 were adopted in committee."

Speaker Keane: "Any Motions filed?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Keane: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative Steczo, Hartke and Ropp."

Speaker Keane: "Representative Steczo."

69th Legislative Day

June 20, 1991

- Steczo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Amendment #3 is an Amendment that was worked out with the Illinois Department of Public Health, and amends, I believe, the Structural Pest Control Act, and there's no opposition, and I would ask for adoption of the Amendment."
- Speaker Keane: "Any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt Amendment #3?' All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, Amendment #3 is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Keane: "Third Reading. Representative Steczo."

- Steczo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 312 had originally been on the Consent Calendar. Representative Black filed an objection to that. My understanding is with the adoption of this Amendment, Representative Black would withdraw his objection to the Bill being on the Consent Calendar, so..."
- Speaker Keane: "Is there leave? By use of the Attendance Roll Call, we'll return the Bill to Consent Calendar? Leave, and the Bill will be so recorded. We'll go back to the Order of Criminal Law, Second Reading, to pick up a couple of Bills. Senate Bill 1272, Representative Cronin. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1272, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Vehicle Code. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee or Floor Amendments."
- Speaker Keane: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 1428, Representative Cronin. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1428, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Vehicle Code. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee or Floor Amendments."
- Speaker Keane: "Third Reading. We will...we will now return to Professional Regulation, Second Reading. Senate Bill 325,

- 69th Legislative Day June 20, 1991

 Representative Levin. Representative Levin, 325. Mr.

 Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 325, a Bill for an Act to amend the Plats Act, Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee or Floor Amendments."
- Speaker Keane: "We'll hold the Bill on Second. Senate Bill 407,

 Representative Novak. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 407, a Bill for an Act to amend the Barbers, Cosmetology and Esthetics Act. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee."
- Speaker Keane: "Any Motions filed?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed, and no Floor Amendments."
- Speaker Keane: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 689, Representative Mautino. Out of the record. Senate Bill 835, Representative Hicks. Out of the record. Senate Bill 961, Representative Novak. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 961, a Bill for an Act to amend the Liquor Control Act. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee or Floor Amendments."
- Speaker Keane: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 962, Representative McPike. Out of the record. Senate Bill 964, Representative Balanoff. Representative Balanoff. Out of the record. We will go back to pick up a Bill on Elementary and Secondary Education, Second Reading. Senate Bill 725. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 725, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee or Floor Amendments."
- Speaker Keane: "Third Reading. We will now go to Civil Law,
 Second Reading. Senate Bill 154, Representative Walsh.
 Out of the record. Senate Bill 182, Representative
 Granberg. Out of the record. Senate Bill 502,
 Representative Hasara. Out of the record. Senate Bill

69th Legislative Day

June 20, 1991

587, Representative Manny Hoffman. Mr. Clerk...Out of the record. Senate Bill 714, Representative Lang. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1465, Representative Hicks. 1465. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1465, a Bill for an Act to amend the

Illinois Securities Law. Second Reading of the Bill.

Amendment #1 was adopted in committee."

Speaker Keane: "Any Motions filed?"

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

Speaker Keane: "Third Reading. On the Order of State and Local Government, Second Reading appears Senate Bill 42, Representative Curran. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 42, a Bill for an Act to amend the Personnel Code. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Keane: "Any Floor Amendments?"

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

Curran."

Speaker Keane: "Representative Curran ."

Curran: "Amendment #1 is agreed to Amendment that incorporates the provisions of Senate Bill 91 and Senate Bill 259. This would be a Curran, McGuire, Deuchler, Capparelli and Richmond Bill. I don't know of any opposition."

Keane: "Is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall...' Representative Wennlund."

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

Speaker Keane: "He indicates he will."

Wennlund: "What exactly is a sick leave bank program?"

Curran: "Just a second. It is a plan to allow participating employees in each agency to bank a designated amount or portion of their accrued sick leave in a sick leave bank to be used by any participating employee in the agency who has exhausted his or her sick leave benefits."

69th Legislative Day

June 20, 1991

Wennlund: "So that you have one employee who has 10 days of paid sick leave per year, if he doesn't use it, some other employee can use it?"

Curran: "That would be correct."

Wennlund: "I'm sorry. I didn't hear you."

Curran: "That would be correct. The answer is yes."

Wennlund: "And has there been any estimate what this might cost the State of Illinois?"

Curran: "Not to my knowledge. As I said, this is an agreed Bill coming out of committee, Representative."

Wennlund: "Was this a portion of the Bill when it came out of committee?"

Curran: "Yes."

Wennlund: "Okay. Thank you very much."

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

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Keane: "Third Reading. We will go back to pick up one Bill on the Order of Civil Law, Second Reading, is Senate Bill 587, Representative Manny Hoffman. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 587, a Bill for an Act regarding physician orders limiting resuscitation. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Keane: "Any Floor Amendments?"

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

Manny Hoffman."

Speaker Keane: "Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen. I would like to withdraw Amendment #2."

Speaker Keane: "Withdraw Amendment #2."

69th Legislative Day June 20, 1991

Hoffman: "Excuse me, Amendment #1."

Speaker Keane: "Withdraw Amendment #1."

Hoffman: "And I have filed Amendment #3."

Speaker Keane: "Withdraw Amendment #1. Any further Amendments?"

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

Hasara."

Speaker Keane: "Representative Hasara."

House Amendment #2 is a new Hasara: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. approach to the problem of infant mortality. people know, that's a very serious problem in the State of Illinois, and although there's been some recent argument over what the figures are, and...this area, Springfield does have a very high infant mortality rate. This Amendment would create a new type of community based grant which would be an incentive grant, so that if, in fact, the statistics went down, the money would qo up, vice-versa. I think we need in this Body to look for innovative solutions to problems that have been around for quite a while, and I feel that this Amendment does that. I move for the adoption of Floor Amendment #2."

Speaker Keane: "Any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall...' Representative Homer."

Homer: "Thank you. Will the Lady yield?"

Speaker Keane: "She indicates she will."

Homer: "Representative Hasara, would you explain your Amendment one more time?"

Hasara: "Yes. This Amendment creates a competitive type grant under the Department of Public Health in order to try and do something about the high rate of infant mortality. The grant would be competitive bidding process, a multiyear contract, and it would establish goals to reduce infant mortality. If the rate went down the money would go up. If the rate went up, the amount of money would go down.

69th Legislative Day

June 20, 1991

It's a new approach to the idea."

Homer: "Representative Hasara, was this the subject of a House Bill that you had introduced?"

Hasara: "Yes, it was."

Homer: "What was the fate of the Bill?"

Hasara: "I'm sorry...?"

Homer: "What happened to the House Bill?"

Hasara: "It was never called in the House on Third Reading, so it has not had a hearing in this Body. It did pass out of the Human Services Committee."

Homer: "What was the vote in committee?"

Hasara: "I believe it was a unanimous vote in favor."

Speaker Keane: "Representative Curran."

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Rather than questions, Curran: "Yes. Speaker, a comment. With all due respect for my good friend and district mate Representative Hasara, what this Bill does is works a disadvantage to the City Springfield, the Mayor of the City of Springfield, being a friend of many of the people in this Chamber, and takes away a program from the city which has been very effective and acknowledged to be effective in working in reducing the problem of infant mortality and low birth weight, and makes it possible that that be transferred away from the city just when that city's program is working so well. I know that the Lady is...has good intentions, but I know that the final result of this would be a serious disadvantage for the City of Springfield, and I know that a friend of many of ours, the Mayor of Springfield, will feel strongly opposed to this, and so I rise in reluctant opposition to my good friend and her good intentions."

Hasara: "I want to close."

Speaker Keane: "Representative Davis."

Davis: "Thank you; Mr. Speaker. I, too, rise in opposition to

69th Legislative Day

June 20, 1991

this Amendment because I had talked with people from the City of Springfield and other urban areas who felt that their mortality programs...their programs in order to prohibit the high infant mortality rates...they were attempting to get them to work, and they were very concerned that the Springfield legislators would try determine for them what programs they should have, and that, especially in Springfield, they were trying to this one program to be successful, and at this time it had not had an opportunity to even work, and I think that there are a number of organizations who are opposed to this Amendment. Therefore, I rise in support of the State of Illinois reducing its infant mortality rate, and not allow certain people to choose who gets those dollars to prevent infant mortality."

Speaker Keane: "Representative White."

White: "Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Bill came before my committee...the concept came before my committee, and it was agreed upon in the beginning, but later on we found out that this was a hostile approach, one that was not agreed upon by the City of Springfield, and for those reasons and more, I stand in opposition to this Amendment, even though the concept is good. They're presently doing a great job here in Springfield in reducing their infant mortality rate, and I think that this Amendment would be counterproductive, so I stand in opposition to it."

Speaker Keane: "Representative LeFlore."

LeFlore: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Keane: "She indicates he will."

LeFlore: "Representative, what effect will this transfer have on the infant mortality program in Springfield, and where will the money go? I mean, will this money be transferred, and

69th Legislative Day

June 20, 1991

what effect will it have on the program, the current program?"

"Representative, obviously the goal, and everyone's goal, is to reduce infant mortality in Springfield. This is certainly no reflection upon the current grantee, and what keep saying is if, in fact, the city is doing such a wonderful job, there is no doubt in my mind that they will continue to be the grantee under this Bill. I simply feel that when you look at the statistics, and Springfield per capita has, I believe, the highest rate, even higher than the City of Chicago, that we need to take another look at what we're doing, and I want to open up the grant process. For example, it seems logical to me that the Springfield Urban League would be a logical group to take a look at receiving this grant. The only opposition that this Bill has are from those people that now have the grant, and I That would only be logical, but I understand that. just...we have a big problem here."

LeFlore: "Is the Department of Public Health in support of this?"

Hasara: "I really don't know, you'll have to ask them."

LeFlore: "I think they're opposed to the transaction that you're trying to bring forward. So, with that, I feel that the program should remain in Springfield. It's done quite well now. I understand what you're trying to do, but we need to continue the program, and then perhaps add to what you're trying to do. So therefore, I'm opposed to your request as amended."

Speaker Keane: "Representative Hasara to close."

Hasara: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We have had a grant given to the public...Springfield Public Health Department for a number of years. They say all of a sudden, since this Bill came out, that they've improved, they've been making a lot of improvements. I have no reason to deny that, but I

69th Legislative Day

June 20, 1991

think we're very short sighted when we keep doing the same thing over and over again to solve a problem that is very serious. If we don't start looking at new answers to old problems, we're never going to solve those problems. Again, this is not meant in any way to hurt the City of Springfield, and if, in fact, they're doing such a wonderful job, there is no doubt in my mind that their grant will be renewed, but I think it's time to give a new, fresh approach, and give someone else a chance to see what they can do about this serious problem. I'd ask for a Roll Call vote, please."

Speaker Keane: "The Lady has asked for a Roll Call vote. All those in favor of the Amendment vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Amendment, there are 38 voting 'aye', 70 voting 'no', and the Amendment fails. Any further Amendments?"

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

Manny Hoffman."

Speaker Keane: "Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman, M.: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. The Amendment deletes the first section of the Bill as agreed to by both the Illinois State Medical Society and the Illinois Hospital Association. Provision removed by Amendment 1 is necessary to the Bill. The Joint Commission on the Accreditation of Health Care Organizations has already required hospitals that have a do not resuscitate policy. There's no need to establish a mandate statute when the requirement currently exists, and all hospitals comply. I ask for a favorable vote on this Amendment and moving the Bill to Third Reading."

Speaker Keane: "Any discussion? There being none, the question

69th Legislative Day

June 20, 1991

is, 'Shall the House adopt Amendment #3? All in favor say 'aye', all opposed, 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and Amendment #3 is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Keane: "Third Reading."

Clerk O'Brien: "Does he want to withdraw this request for a fiscal note?"

Speaker Keane: 'I'm sorry, there's been a request for a fiscal note that's been filed. The Bill will remain on Second Reading...Members would give their attention. We are pleased today to have with us Clemens Coreth, who's the Austrian Counsel General. He's going to share a few words with us and please give him your kind attention."

Clemens Coreth: "Mr. Deputy Speaker, Members of the House of Representatives of the State of Illinois, distinguished Ladies and Gentlemen. I consider it, indeed, as a great honor for myself and my wife to have been invited by you, distinguished Representatives, to be here in these hallowed halls and chambers here in Springfield and would like to point out to you that the crystal chandeliers hanging here the House were a gift of Emperor France Joseph and the government of the Austro-Hungarian empire in 1877 in tribute to one of the great sons of Illinois, Abraham Lincoln. Fortunately, not the only connection we have. Emperor France Joseph, as is well known, was a great admirer of Abraham Lincoln and his quest for the abolition of slavery. Illinois, also for Austrians, is the heartland of America which would be, if it would be considered an individual country, the eleventh largest country in the world GNP wise, a fact that many Illinoisians are not aware And here we have the connection to Austria, which has great many links to Illinois. Austria's geographical position, a small country in the heart of Europe, is

69th Legislative Day

June 20, 1991

comparable to the geographical position of Illinois and the heart of America. In the last few years the political upheavals in Eastern Europe have again put Austria into the focus and minds of politicians and economic leaders of the United States of America. Mr. Deputy Speaker, Austria, for reasons of geography, history and ties of ideally suited to be of assistance in this vital process of elevating this whole region of Eastern Europe to some semblance of economic well being, which will be a necessary feature for the new Europe. The situation of the Soviet Union, need I mention the tenuous position of President Gorbachev, the turmoil in the Baltics, the Ukraine elsewhere. The almost unsolvable economic problems of the nation's changing gears from a failing central command economic system to a free market system, the increasing signs of break up in Yugoslavia, one of Austria's most important neighbors, clearly show us that we may be seeing an emerging new Europe, hopefully, whole and free, but without major problems. Our economic ties with the region are not restricted to trade alone. Austrian investment these countries is increasing rapidly. With regard to joint ventures, Austria ranks as number in one Czechoslovakia, number two in Hungary, 1400 joint ventures in Hungary alone, right behind the Federal Republic of There are also many joint ventures in Poland, Germany. Yugoslavia and the Soviet Union. 15% of all east-west have Austrian partners. joint ventures Austria has provided substantially to the region far too numerous to be presented here in detail. Mr. Deputy Speaker, one aspect this close Austrian cooperation with the countries of Eastern Europe deserves to be mentioned here. There's a lot of expertise, and practical know how about economic activities in this region. Austria can also provide the

69th Legislative Day

June 20, 1991

necessary infrastructure which could be tapped by U.S. businesses and businesses from Illinois. Vienna could serve as a bridgehead for expanding economic activities by the U.S. in these countries. Recent developments have shown, beyond any doubt, that Austria's status of permanent neutrality has in no way hindered us in wholeheartedly supporting the United Nations and the Gulf coalition leadership of the United States of America. unlike Switzerland, given over flight rights to the U.S. Air Force and also permitted the transit of U.S. salvage through Austria by rail. Of the facts mentioned, I urge you, distinguished Representatives, and also the business community of Illinois, to make use of Austria's expertise in politics and trade in dealing with the newly emerging democracies in the former Eastern Bloc. was long a focal point of emigrations for Illinois Austrians to the United States, and the 1910 United States census reported that 163,020 inhabitants of Illinois were Austrian origin, a thing which is often forgotten here You're all familiar with bookstore, Kroch's and Brentano's in Chicago, which was founded by two Austrians and then expanded from Chicago to New York, Washington and Paris, France, and it still exists all over the United States but not any more in France. Mr. Deputy Speaker, one of the great sons hailing from Austria, a Nobel Prize winner for economics, Freidrich August Von Hayek was a longtime member of the Committee of ... Thought at the University of Chicago. And the Vienna School of Economics lives on in the monetary theories of the economic school at the world famous University of Chicago. With Fortune 500 companies in the manufacturing field based in Illinois, I can assure you that all of them do a lot trade with Austria, and our economic ties are strengthening

69th Legislative Day

June 20, 1991

every year. Motorola is building the digital car telephone Caterpillar and John Deere are major system in Austria. exporters of heavy equipment to Austria, just to mention a few. I do really hope that the political and cultural ties between this great State of Illinois and Austria will be strengthened further in the future. As this great heartland οf America, with one of the the metropolises of the world, Chicago, and its capital, Springfield, the haven of democracy, where Abraham Lincoln was once a Member of your chambers, really matter to Allow me to end my remarks to you, distinguished Representatives of the House of Illinois, in tribute to one of Illinois' greatest sons, Abraham Lincoln, as well as in tribute to the political, democratic system of the United States with a quotation of John Milton, famous English poet, from the Tenure of Kings and Magistrates written in 'None can love freedom heartedly but good men. rest love not freedom but license.' Thank you so much for according me your precious time. Thank you, dear Mr. Deputy Speaker."

Black: "Thank you very much, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House and Mr. Speaker. The Counsel General will be visiting my hometown tomorrow, but I have the great pleasure οf introducing his wife to you. His wife, Sennie, is with him On the drive down, she thought perhaps today. interstates were like an autobahn. She's been introduced to the Illinois State Police. I won't tell you exactly how She said 110 kilometers which, fast she was going. evidently, is against the law in Illinois. So, she has a So, Sennie and Counsel General, welcome to Illinois, glad to have you with us."

Clemens Coreth: "Thank you."

Speaker Keane: "Representative Satterthwaite in the Chair."

69th Legislative Day

June 20, 1991

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Mr. Clerk, can you indicate to us the status of House Bill (sic — Senate Bill) 587? I believe it was held on Second Reading."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 587, the Bill was read a second time, amended and held on Second Reading for a fiscal note."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Who requested the fiscal note?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Representative Homer."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Homer, do you wish to withdraw your request for a fiscal note? Yes, he indicates he does. The fiscal note request is withdrawn and Senate Bill 587 goes to Third Reading...Senate Bill 587 goes to Third Reading. We will go back on a few Bills that we had covered earlier. At the top of your Special Calendar on Higher Education, Second Reading, Senate Bill 453, Representative Curran. Representative Curran, did you wish to call Senate Bill 453 on Second Reading? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 453, a Bill for an Act to amend the Public Community College Act. Second Reading of the Bill.

No Committee Amendments."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Any Floor Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #1..."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Is that Representative..."

Clerk O'Brien: "...offered by Representative Curran."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Curran."

Curran: "This is a technical Amendment to a...purely a shell
Bill. This is Senator Hall's wish to get it back in the
Senate so he can work on it."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "The Gentleman moves for adoption of Amendment #1. Seeing no one seeking recognition, the...All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it and Amendment #1 is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

69th Legislative Day

June 20, 1991

- Speaker Satterthwaite: "Third Reading. On the Order of Professional Regulation, Second Reading, Representative Curran on Senate Bill 131. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 131, a Bill for an Act to regulate the conduct of balloon dart games. Second Reading of the Bill. No committee Amendments."
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "Any Floor Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative
 Curran."
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Curran."
- Curran: "Amendment #1 is a...is a technical Amendment agreed to by the Senate Sponsor, Senator Woodyard."
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "The Gentleman moves the adoption of Amendment #1. All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it and Amendment #1 is adopted. Any further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "Third Reading. On the same order, we have Senate Bill 714, Representative Lang. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 714, a Bill for an Act to amend the Code of Civil Procedure. Second Reading of the Bill.

 Amendment #1 was adopted in committee."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Any Motions filed?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Any Floor Amendments?"

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

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Lang."

Lang: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Amendment #2 is a technical
Amendment dealing with the form of wage deduction
affidavits. It's agreed to by all parties and technical
and I move its adoption."

69th Legislative Day

June 20, 1991

Speaker Satterthwaite: "You've heard the Gentleman's Motion. All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it and Amendment #2 is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Third Reading. On the Special Order of Consumer Protection, Senate Bill 1273, Representative Hensel. Representative Hensel, do you wish to have the Bill called? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1273, a Bill for an Act to amend the Motor Vehicle Retail Installment Sales Act. Second Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Any Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Amendment #1 was adopted in committee."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Any Motions filed?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Any Floor Amendments?"

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

Hensel and Ronan."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Hensel...Representative Homer."

Hensel: "Thank you, Madam..."

Homer: "Has that Amendment been printed and distributed?"

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Hensel, would you present the Amendment, please."

Hensel: "Thank you. Thank you, Madam Speaker and Members of the House. Amendment #2 amends the Illinois Motor Vehicle Franchise Act to provide certain guidelines for existing franchise Illinois dealers, when manufacturers initiate programs to establish facilities to sell factory repurchase program vehicles of the dealers' same line, made in the dealers relevant market areas. I would just ask for adoption of the Amendment #2."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Homer, for what purpose do

69th Legislative Day

June 20, 1991

you rise?"

Homer: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. We have not seen the Amendment but we understand it's okay, and we would join in moving for its passage."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Hartke."

Hartke: "Yeah, will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Satterthwaite: "He indicates he'll yield."

Hartke: "Representative Hensel, I haven't seen it either, but I believe some correspondence crossed my desk that indicated that there was an agreement...that this is an issue that's not new to the Assembly. Is this the Amendment that both parties have agreed upon between the..."

Hensel: "Yes, this Amendment was at the request..."

Hartke: "...car dealers and the credit unions and so forth."

Hensel: "No, this has nothing to do with the credit unions. This is the Amendment that is the request of the New Car/Truck Dealers and the Secretary of State is in agreement, but this does not deal with the credit unions selling cars or anything, this has nothing to do with that."

Hartke: "Okay, I'm in error then, sorry."

Hensel: "Thank you."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Hensel to close."

Hensel: "Thank you. I just ask for favorable adoption."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "The Gentleman moves for adoption of Amendment #2. All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. Amendment #2 is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Third Reading. State and Local Government, Senate Bill 89, Representative Currie. Out of the record. Senate Bill 750, Representative Steczo. Representative Steczo. Out of the record. Senate Bill 779, Representative Capparelli. Out of the record. Senate

69th Legislative Day

June 20, 1991

Bill 894, Representative Peterson. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1189, Representative Matijevich. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1264, Representative Granberg. Do you wish to call the Bill on Second Reading? 1264. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1264, a.Bill for an Act to amend an Act in relation to reorganization of asbestos abatement activities. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Any Motions filed?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Any Floor Amendments?"

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

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Granberg."

Granberg: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. At the appropriate time, I
 would move to table Amendment #1."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "This is the appropriate time for tabling Motions. The Gentleman moves to table Amendment #1. All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it and Amendment #1 is tabled. Amendment #2, Representative Granberg."

Granberg: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #2 corrects the language that was inadvertently put in Amendment #1. It is the language that's been agreed to by the Attorney General's Office and the Capital Development Board. I don't believe there's any objection to the Amendment, and I would move to adopt Amendment #2."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "You've heard the Gentleman's Motion. All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it and Amendment #2 is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

69th Legislative Day

June 20, 1991

"Third Reading. Proceeding to the Special Speaker Satterthwaite: Order, Revenue, Second Reading, Senate Bill 455. Representative Phelps. Representative Phelps, do you wish to call Senate Bill 455 on Second Reading? Mr. Clerk, read...Out of the record. Representative Bugielski, Senate Bill 497. Out of the record. Representative Hartke, Senate Bill 499. Out of the record. Representative McGann. Senate Bill 707. Is the Gentleman in the chamber? Out of the record. Senate Bill 792, Representative Currie. Senate Bill 792. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1218, Representative Keane. Representative Keane. Out of the record. On the Special Order of Business, Second Reading, Representative Wolf on Senate Bill 136. Mr Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 136, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Pension Code. Second Reading of the Bill.

Amendment #1 was adopted in committee."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Any Motions filed?"

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

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Third Reading. Representative Wolf on Senate Bill 774. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "...774, a Bill for an Act to amend the Chicago
Park District Act. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment
#1..."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Any Motions filed?"

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

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Third Reading. Representative Wolf on Senate Bill 1470. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate, Bill 1470, a Bill for an Act to amend the Pension Code. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Any Motions filed?"

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

69th Legislative Day

June 20, 1991

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Third Reading. On the Special Order of Business, Second Reading, Representative Lou Jones, Senate Bill 756. Is the Lady in the Chamber? Out of the record. Representative Turner on Senate Bill 1322. Do you want the Bill called on Second Reading, Representative? Out of the record. On the Special Order of Business, Senate Bill 922, Representative... Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 922, a Bill for an Act in relation to back door referenda. Second Reading of the Bill.

Amendment #1 was adopted in committee."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Any Motions filed?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Any Floor Amendments?"

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

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Stern."

Stern: "We would, Madam Speaker, like to withdraw Amendment #2 and move to Amendment #3."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Amendment #2 is withdrawn."

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative Stern and Myron Olson."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Stern."

Stern: "Madam Speaker and Members of the House. This is material you have heard about before. It passed over to the Senate in House Bill 351 and 352, but it has not been dealt with We are simply adding it on to this Bill in the there. hopes of getting a concurrence in the Senate. It deals agreed upon things that...how to...let me here...has to do with which precincts shall have three two Republicans and vice versa Democrats and three Republicans and two Democrats at elections. It has to do how county boards can be made single member, with what...how many on a petition. It deals with all agreed

69th Legislative Day

June 20, 1991

upon things, like what is a legal voter. Well, there's five or six different portions of it, and as I say, it was all negotiated and acceptable to both Republicans and Democrats. I ask your approval."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Black."

Black: "An inquiry of the Chair, Madam Speaker. I think the Lady mentioned five separate House Bills that are incorporated in this Amendment. The Amendment was put on my desk about 30 seconds ago. I would ask the Chair if it's been printed and distributed. I would also ask the Sponsor if she would pull it out the record, so we can at least take five minutes to look at something that's incorporating five Bills."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Olson."

Olson: "Thank you very much, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is an agreed Amendment. It covers some of the things that we missed earlier in the Session. I urge the adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Steczo."

Steczo: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Just to indicate that the provisions in Amendment #3 have already been discussed and have passed this House, and in addition, the Amendment was on my desk a lot earlier than five minutes ago. So, there should have been ample time for the other side to review it...Representative Olson, the Minority Spokesman of Elections and Representative Stern have both agreed, so there shouldn't really be a problem with this Amendment."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Stern to close."

Stern: "Frankly, I don't think a closing speech is necessary.

Everybody seems to be in agreement upon it. If

Representative Black is satisfied that his people are
satisfied, I'd ask your supportive vote."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "The Lady moves for the adoption of

69th Legislative Day

June 20, 1991

Amendment #3. All those in favor say 'aye', opposed, 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it, the Amendment's adopted. Further Amendments?"

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

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Homer."

"Thank you, Madam Speaker. Floor Amendment #4 is an Amendment which would establish, for the year September primary. It would be used only in that year, as a pilot program, to determine whether it should be fully implemented on a full time basis. It's an important initiative. It was the substance of Senate Bill 1, which President Rock was the Sponsor, which passed out of the Senate overwhelmingly and is now pending before us in the form of this Amendment. It's designed to cut down on the time of an election, the amount of cost that expended. It's hoped that it would reduce the amount of negative campaigning, that it would be designed to voter interest at a higher level by focusing the issues of an election within a reasonable period of time, which actually longer than we now allow for the municipal primary and general election. But it would be a very important initiative and the most important thing, single thing, that we can do to implement and advance election reform this Again, it is only applicable for the year 1994. We would be able to examine its workability and determine, following that year, whether it should be implemented on a continuing basis. Clearly, our voters are for this Bill and I would urge the adoption of this Amendment."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Myron Olson."

Olson: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. First of all, I don't think the Amendment has been printed and distributed. Secondly, I would call to the

69th Legislative Day

June 20, 1991

attention, Members of the House, we voted on this just last Thursday at a Discharge Motion. It failed 26 to 81. There are no new elements to this issue and I would urge its defeat if, indeed, the Amendment has been distributed, which I doubt sincerely."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Stern."

Stern: "Madam Speaker and Members of the House, I concur in all the remarks of Representative Olson. This is not an issue this House is supportive of. We have gone around and we have taken a total Roll Call and we do not, in this House, support a September primary. There are lots of other date changes we might discuss that would do the things, but with the most cordial response in the world, I ask that you defeat this Amendment."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Rice."

Rice: "As the prior speaker said, we did discuss it. I'm humbly sorry, as Chairman of the Election Committee, that Representative Homer was not there to present it on the day that he was supposed to come back for the vote. That I'm apologetic for, but I do feel that he's making a statement that all the voters of the State of Illinois...A number of the voters have decided or discussed it. In my district, I asked him as I've asked him before, there was no survey taken and I feel that this is erroneous, and at this particular time, we'd like to defeat this Amendment."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Steczo."

Steczo: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'd like to, at this point, take Senate Bill 922 out of the record."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Out of the record. On the Special Order of Services, Third Reading. Sponsors are Black, Levin, Bugielski, DeJaegher and Munizzi. If those Sponsors can be ready, we will call their Bills. Senate Bill 130, Representative Black. Out of the record. Senate Bill 477,

69th Legislative Day

June 20, 1991

Representative Levin. Out of the record. Senate Bill 651, Representative Bugielski. Out of the record. Senate Bill 705. Representative DeJaegher. 705 on Third Reading. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1009 on Third Reading, Representative DeJaegher. Representative DeJaegher, We'll come back to those in just a moment. Senate Bill Representative Munizzi. Out of the record. Special Order of Constitutional Officers, Third Reading. Representative Senate Bill 271. Out of the record. Martinez on Representative DeJaegher, are you ready to go back to your Bills? On Senate Bill 1009, Representative DeJaegher. Clerk, read the Bill.

- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1009, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Act on Aging. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative DeJaegher."
- DeJaegher: "Madam Speaker and Members of this General Assembly.

 I would like to take this Bill back to Second for the purpose of an Amendment and these Amendments that I make reference to have been agreed to by the other side.

 Basically what I'd like to do is delete Amendment #1 and move with Amendment #2 which basically would be the Bill."
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "At the Gentleman's request, we will return the Bill to the Order of Second Reading. And then it is your request to table Amendment #1, is that correct, Mr. DeJaegher?"
- DeJaegher: "Yes, I would like to table #1 and move on Amendment #2 which is an agreed to Amendment by the other side."
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "The Gentleman moves to table Amendment #1 on Senate Bill 1009. All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it and Amendment #1 is tabled.

 Mr.Clerk, further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #2 offered by Representative DeJaegher."

69th Legislative Day June 20, 1991

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative DeJaegher."

DeJaegher: "Do you want me to explain the Amendment?"

Speaker Satterthwaite: "I would suggest you do that."

DeJaegher: "Alright, what this does is build in protection to those persons soon to be terminated from the community care program due to changes of eligibility. It provides 60 days rather than 15 days notice, and 60 days rather than 10 days to appeal. The Department of Aging supports this Amendment and says there is no cost involved." And as I stated earlier, the other side is in complete agreement with this. Department of Aging shall establish eligibility standards for services provided by the Department, taking into consideration unique economic and social needs of the target population of what they're provided. Eligibility standards shall be based on the recipient's ability to pay services. The target population are persons age 60 and older who've identified service needs. And, of course, this Amendment would then become the Bill."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Amendment #2. All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it, and Amendment #2 is adopted. Any further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Third Reading."

DeJaegher: "Could I move that, Madam Speaker? Could I go ahead with it?"

Speaker Satterthwaite: "The Gentleman asks leave to hear the Bill now on Third Reading. Is there leave for that purpose?

Seeing no objection, House Bill 10...Senate Bill 1009,

Representative DeJaegher."

DeJaegher: "Thank you, Madam Speaker..."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Mr. Clerk. Excuse me. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

69th Legislative Day

June 20, 1991

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1009, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Act on the Aging. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative DeJaegher."

DeJaegher: "Thank you, Madam Speaker and Members of the General Assembly. This Bill has been put together with the cooperation of the other side. I think I explained the Bill in its entirety by the utilization of these particular Amendments. These are agreed to not only by the Republican part but also the Department of Aging and for that I ask for an Affirmative Roll Call. Thank you."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Hultgren."

- Hultgren: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in support of the Bill and want to commend the Sponsor for working with this side of the aisle and for working with the department to resolve all the problems that this Bill had early on. Thank you."
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "Question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1009 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 110 voting 'yes', none voting 'no', none voting 'present'. The Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. We will go back to pick up a couple of other Bills on Second Reading. The first one is on the Special Order of Health Care, Senate Bill 601, Representative McAfee. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 601, a Bill for an Act to amend the AIDS Confidentiality Act. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee or Floor Amendments."
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative McAfee... on Third Reading. We're also going to go back to Representative Turner on Senate Bill 322. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

69th Legislative Day

June 20, 1991

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 322..."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Turner."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 322, a Bill for an Act to amend the...Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Excuse me, Mr. Clerk, we have called the wrong Bill number. The Bill is 1322."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1322, a Bill for an Act to amend the Abandoned Housing Rehabilitation Act. Second Reading of the Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Any Motions filed?"

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

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Third Reading...Human Services, Third Reading. Representative DeJaegher wishes to call Senate Bill 705. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 705, a Bill for an Act to amend the Act on Aging. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative DeJaegher."

DeJaegher: "Thank you, Madam Speaker and Members of General Assembly. Basically what this does is deals with the federal minimum wage. It requires the Department of Aging to verify that homemakers, chore and housekeepers are receiving increase in pay when the federal minimum wage is increased. Basically, that's the substance of the Bill, and of course when the federal guidelines...federal minimum wage is increased, then of course these people receive that incentive also, and that's basically the extent of the Bill and that's all that it does."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Wennlund."

Wennlund: "Thank you, will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Satterthwaite: "He indicates he will."

DeJaegher: "I'll try."

Wennlund: "Okay, where do the dollars come from every time the federal government changes the minimum wage? Where do

69th Legislative Day

June 20, 1991

the...Is there a built in funding mechanism for them or where do they come from?"

DeJaegher: "Well, basically, according to this...the providers, at these particular chore services et cetera, would install these dollars so that these people could receive this compensation."

Wennlund: "Thank you."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative DeJaegher to close."

DeJaegher: "Basically, I say, it's more or less a Bill that basically will ensure, that these people will keep receiving the minimum amount of wage that the federal government designates for them, and I ask for passage of this legislation."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 705 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who is open. wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 110 voting 'yes', none voting 'no', 2 voting 'present'. The Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On Constitutional Officers, Third Reading, Representative Martinez. Is the Gentleman in the chamber? He is not. On the Special Order, Agriculture and Environment, Third Reading, the Sponsors on the early part of the call are Representatives Steczo, Novak, Hicks, Representative Steczo on Senate Bill 16. Kulas. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 16, a Bill for an Act to amend the

Environmental Protection Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Steczo."

Steczo: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Members of the House. Senate
Bill 16 is a Bill that was sponsored in the Senate by
Senator Kelly, and this Bill amends the Environmental
Protection Act, dealing with applications for local site

69th Legislative Day

June 20, 1991

review for new regional pollution control facilities. The present law indicates that we, as Members of the General Assembly, must be informed as to these applications. The law also says the agency must be informed of these applications. This Bill just simply says that, in addition to that, the governing authority of every municipality contiguous to the proposed site or contiguous to the municipality of the proposed site, should receive the notices too. It came out of the Senate unanimously, out of House Committee unanimously. I'd ask for a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Is there any discussion? Seeing no one seeking recognition, the Gentleman moves for passage of Senate Bill 16. All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Peterson wishes to be voted 'aye'. Mr. Clerk, take the record. 111 voting 'yes', none voting 'no', 2 voting The Bill has received the Constitutional 'present'. Majority and is hereby declared passed. Representative Novak on Senate Bill 201. Is the Gentleman in the chamber? Out of the record. Representative Hicks on Senate Bill Out of the record. Representative Kulas on Senate 326. Bill 924. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 924, a Bill for an Act to amend the

Environmental Protection Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Kulas."

Kulas: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 924 amends the Environmental Protection Act. It defines the offense of criminal operation of a hazardous waste or PCB incinerator. The initial violation is a Class IV felony with fines of up to \$100,000 per day. Subsequent violations are a Class III felony with fines up to \$250,000 per day. Senate Bill 924 as amended

69th Legislative Day

June 20, 1991

establishes criminal sanctions for knowingly operating a dangerous hazardous waste or PCB incinerator, and, I would move for the passage of Senate Bill 924."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Any discussion? Seeing no one seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 924 pass?'

All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Weller wishes to be voted 'aye'. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are lll voting 'yes', none voting 'no', 2 voting 'present'. The Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 947, Representative Currie. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 947, a Bill for an Act to amend the

Environmental Protection Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Members of the House. Bill was introduced in response to a study required by this General Assembly by the Department of Energy and Natural Resources to find ways that we could reduce the use of chlorofluorocarbon in the State of Illinois. The Bill also tracks the Federal Clean Air Act Amendments and the Montreal Accords, to which the United States was a party. As the Bill has been amended, it would track those dates, the dates of the Montreal Accords exactly. And the Bill, in its current form, has the support of the Manufacturers Association, as well as the Retail Merchants, as well of environmental groups. I'd be happy to answer questions and would appreciate your support for Senate Bill 947, as we've amended it."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Is there any discussion? Seeing no one seeking recognition...Representative McCracken."

69th Legislative Day

June 20, 1991

McCracken: "Is this one of those wacky environmental Bills? Is the sky really falling? That's what I want to know?"

Currie: "The sky is falling. This is not a wacky..."

McCracken: "Is the world going to heat up and boil us in oil and we're all going to suffocate in the greenhouse?"

Currie: "Only...only if...That will happen, of course,

Representative, if we fail to adopt Senate Bill 947."

McCracken: "I...I'm sure you're right. I'm sure the world is going to end if we don't pass this legislation. Let me ask you this, what does this do, other...other than give wacky environmentalists a cause? What does this do?"

Currie: "I don't understand your second...your clause there about wacky environmentalists."

McCracken: "No, no, cause."

Currie: "What the Bill does is apply separate enforcement in the State of Illinois for those who use halons and chlorofluorocarbons, as will be organized under the Federal Clean Air Act Amendments and the Montreal Accords. This Bill would take Illinois no further, no faster than we will be required to move under existing federal statutes. What this does is enable us to use our own environmental regulatory scheme to make sure that there is adequate enforcement of the federal provisions."

McCracken: "Well, I think the world is..."

Currie: "I don't know of any opposition..."

McCracken: "...going to end tomorrow, if we don't move more quickly than the federal government. Why are we..."

Currie: "I would prefer..."

McCracken: "...taking such a long time to comply?"

Currie: "Good question, good question. I did mention in my opening remarks that this Bill not only has the support of the strong environmental groups, but also the Manufacturers Association and the Retail Merchants."

69th Legislative Day

June 20, 1991

McCracken: "The sky is falling. I hope we pass this Bill and live another day."

Currie: "Thank you, Representative."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Currie to close."

Currie: "I'll rest on Representative McCracken's strong support for Senate Bill 947."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "The question, 'Shall Senate Bill 947...Representative Mautino."

Mautino: "Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. Will the Lady..."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "The Lady has just closed."

Mautino: "But my button was on before she had closed, that's why

I was yelling back here. Would she mind answering a
guestion?"

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Proceed."

Mautino: "Please respond to this scenario: I am a repair shop for an automobile and I fix the air conditioning in a car.

What must I do with the refrigerant that's in that air conditioning of that vehicle? And how do I keep track of that? And where do I get rid of it? That is, the used refrigerant?"

Currie: "Okay, first of all, the legislation requires the Pollution Control Board to adopt regulations that would cover that situation. The board may also adopt thresholds that would, in effect, say that the small repairer would not have to worry about buying, recycling or re—use machinery. That's what the Bill provides."

Mautino: "That's not my question. My question is what do I do with that?"

Currie: "Well, I think the point of the Bill is to try to make sure we are recapturing and recycling refrigerants. Under the Bill, the board would be able to exempt certain kinds of businesses, small users, for example, or those for whom there would be an economic hardship if they were required

69th Legislative Day

June 20, 1991

to buy recapturing or recycling equipment."

Mautino: "To the legislation, if I may."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Proceed."

Mautino: "Ladies and Gentlemen, I hope that you're listening to what she just said. If you have a car, and this has happened to some of us here, that has an air conditioning problem and it must be repaired, you're putting that repair person in a very precarious position. He really can't take out the refrigerant because there is no where he can And if, in fact, this legislation goes dispose of it. through, most of those repair people have to buy a piece of equipment that costs \$1700 in order to address the coolant that's in the air conditioning of a car. Now, that was just brought to my attention a day or two ago by a radiator/refrigeration repair...a repair unit. And if we do this, the Gentleman asked a question that no one can answer is: what does he do with the refrigerant that he takes out of the air conditioner of a car? And there's nowhere to put it if we enact this. That's what I've been informed, and somebody had better tell me different because I'm not going to have that problem be created by this legislation."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Currie."

Currie: "To respond and to close, Madam Speaker. What he does is, he reuses it."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Currie, it's unfortunate, we have opened Pandora's box. If you wish to respond to Representative Mautino, this is the time."

Currie: "What he does with it is that he reuses it, and as I said, this is already federal law, and the question is how we implement that law at the state level."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Black."

Black: "Yeah, thank you very much, Madam Speaker. I...My family

69th Legislative Day

June 20, 1991

has been in the heating and air conditioning business for more than 65 years, and let me just say, the Sponsor done her very best to craft a Bill that would perhaps put us in compliance with the Federal Clean Air Act, and I appreciate that. I would hope that perhaps some of the components of the Federal Clean Air Act, as it relates to air conditioning, might be altered somewhat, and that's why her Bill. I would echo Representative support Mautino. It not only applies to automobiles, but it applies to the air conditioning systems in your home. There is no substitute for that refrigerant at this time. Efforts are under way to find a suitable substitute so that chlorofluorocarbons won't be involved, but until that substitute is find...is found, which may be four years, may be five, six, seven, eight years, I don't know. If we rush into this, then I think the very least that all of you can do, who want to support this Bill, is to take the air conditioning system out of your car, take the air conditioning out of your home and out of your office, Representative Mautino is absolutely correct. There is no place to use this under existing law. recycling and storage equipment can only hold 'x' number of pounds and it cannot be continually reused, because it becomes contaminated and will ruin the system. So, I...I appreciate what the Sponsor's trying to do. She has told us the truth. It is under Federal Law, trying to bring us under compliance. But in all due respect to the Sponsor, until we use a little common sense, I cannot and will not support this measure."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Currie to close."

Currie: "Thank you, Madam Speaker and Members of the House. Let me remind you that this is not only a measure that will be in absolute compliance with the Federal Clean Air Act

69th Legislative Day

June 20, 1991

Amendments of last year, but it also is the direct response to recommendations from our own Department of Energy and Natural Resources. The concerns of businesses that we have heard this afternoon, I think were addressed in the Amendment that was adopted on this Bill yesterday. With the Amendment, the Bill does have the support from the Illinois business community. The people who here speak for the local businesses back home, as well as the strong support of the environmental community. I think this is a reasonable approach. I think the statutory framework this Bill would establish would put Illinois in good shape, to know that we are enforcing the Federal Clean Air Act requirements and I would appreciate your 'yes' votes on this reasoned and well balanced measure."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 947

pass?' All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. The

voting is open. Representative Balanoff."

"Yeah, to explain my vote...Yes, Madam Speaker, Balanoff: explain my vote. You know, I guess maybe I'm one that Chicken Little syndrome suffers from the Representative McCracken spoke about, but I really do believe that global warming and the hole in the upper ozone layer are very significant problems that we have to start getting a handle on and have to start dealing with. Not yesterday...I mean, not tomorrow and not today. it's something that we should have done a long time ago, and certainly, this is a Bill that makes a whole lot of sense, and I really would urge everybody that's voting against this Bill or voting 'present', to really think about it and to really decide to vote 'yes'."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Myron Olson."

Olson: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I join with Representative Mautino in raising the

69th Legislative Day

June 20, 1991

issues relative to, first of all, we are trying to put together some plans on a five year basis for counties for waste disposal and to put together our whole program in such a fashion that we can deal with this in a reasonable manner. This approach is not reasonable. It would put many counties in jeopardy, put some businesses in jeopardy, and that's not the business of the General Assembly. Let's do it in a timely fashion and vote 'no' on this Bill."

- Speaker Satterthwaite: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Peterson."
- Peterson: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. To explain my vote, I'd like the Body to know that when Representative Currie this Bill there were some problems. oresented addressed those problems through the Amendments. The TMA and IRMA have signed off on this Bill and I urge an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 57 voting 'yes', 35 voting 'no', 22 voting 'present'. The Lady asks for a Poll of the Absentees."
- Clerk O'Brien: "A poll of those not voting. J. Hoffman. No further."
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Hoffman votes 'aye'.

 Representative McCracken, are you seeking recognition?"
- McCracken: "Madam Speaker, just for a verification, if it appears to receive 60 votes."
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Currie, do you wish to have the Bill placed on Postponed Consideration? That shall be done. Representative Preston, for what reason do you rise?"
- Preston: "Madam Speaker, we have a lost child on this side of the aisle, Michael McCracken. If there is anyone who is

69th Legislative Day

June 20, 1991

related to him, would they please raise their hand."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Well, it's good to know that the Chairman of the Committee on Children is looking out for lost children today."

Preston: "Yes."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Steczo on Senate Bill 973.

Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 970..."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "972, I believe it is."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 972, a Bill for an Act to create the

Government Buildings Energy Cost Reduction Act. Third

Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Steczo."

Steczo: "Madam Speaker, I'd ask leave to bring Senate Bill 972 back to the Order of Second Reading for the purpose of an Amendment please?"

Speaker Satterthwaite: "The Gentleman asks leave to bring the Bill back to Second Reading. Is there any objection? Seeing none, the Bill will be brought back to Second Reading. Mr. Clerk, are there Amendments?"

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

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Steczo."

"Thank you, Madam Speaker, Members of Steczo: the House. Amendment #1 addresses some of the concerns and some of the questions that were raised in the House Committee. including delaying for one year the process by which energy cost reduction assessments must be completed. It clarifies the powers of the Inter-Agency Energy Conservation Committee and provides that they are discretionary. it clear that not every state owned building must be audited for costs, only those energy that designed...designated by the committee. And it clarifies

69th Legislative Day

- June 20, 1991
- that the committee will not have the authority to affect state or local building codes. I would move for its adoption."
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Amendment #1. All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it and Amendment #1 is adopted. Any further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative
 Klemm and Deuchler."
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Deuchler."
- Deuchler: "Madam Speaker, I move to table Amendments 2 through 5."
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "The Lady withdraws Amendments #2 through 5. Any further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "Third Reading. The Gentleman asks leave to proceed with the Bill on Third Reading at this time. Is there leave? Seeing no objection, leave is granted. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 972, a Bill for an Act to promote energy efficiency and reduce operating costs in government facilities. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Steczo."
- Steczo: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Members of the House. Senate Bill 972 creates the Inter-Agency Energy Conservation Committee to review and plan energy conservation projects in state owned and leased buildings and facilities. The Department of Energy and Natural Resources would be the lead agency and the Bill requires the cooperation of the state, local and public health agencies, to identify energy conservation projects and to arrange for the financing of those projects. State agencies must also include energy cost reduction projects and annual capital plans submitted

69th Legislative Day

June 20, 1991

to the Bureau of the Budget. Similar programs, Madam Speaker, Members of the House, are currently in force in Iowa, California, Texas and Michigan. The result is savings of millions and millions of dollars in energy conservation costs. I'd be happy to answer any questions for the Members and would now ask for your 'yes' votes."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Is there any discussion? Seeing no one seeking recognition, the Gentleman asks for passage of Senate Bill 972. All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Lang wishes to be voted 'aye'. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 109 voting 'aye', none voting 'no', none voting 'present'. The Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 979, Representative Hannig. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 979, a Bill for an Act to amend the Insurance Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Hannig."

thank you, Madam Speaker and Members of the House. Hannig: "Yes, This Bill basically does three things. First, it clarifies the definition of mine subsidence. Secondly, for the first time, beginning January 1st, 1992, it requires that that provide homeowners insurance companies. to individuals, make it available for people who have condominiums and cooperatives to buy land subsidence . insurance. And thirdly, it requires the Mine Subsidence prepare two consumer information Insurance Fund to publications to aid the public in their knowledge about The Bill's a product of the Mine mine subsidence. Subsidence Insurance Task Force and it...has no problem with them, obviously, and I know of no opposition to the

69th Legislative Day

June 20, 1991

Bill. And I'd ask for your 'yes' vote."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Seeing no one seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 979 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 110 voting 'yes', none voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. The Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Novak requests that we go back to Senate Bill 201. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 201, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Low Level Radioactive Management Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Novak."

Novak: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of Senate Bill 201 amends the Low Level Radioactive House. Waste Management Act and prohibits the disposal of any level radioactive wastes at any site other than a regional facility, unless otherwise authorized by the Midwest Interstate Low Level Radioactive Waste Commission. This Bill is supported by the Illinois Department of Nuclear Safety, and what it basically concerns itself with is that, unfortunately, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has classified or is attempting to classify low level nuclear waste as BRC, commonly known as Below Regulatory We all know that regardless of whether...low level waste or high level waste, it certainly contains radioactive material and it certainly imposes an imminent threat to the health and safety and welfare of And, simply, this Bill makes sure that we do not citizens. place any low level radioactive wastes or BRCs, what's being referred to by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, into our landfills. I'd be happy to entertain any

69th Legislative Day questions."

June 20, 1991

- Speaker Satterthwaite: "Seeing no one seeking recognition, Gentleman asks for the passage of Senate Bill 201. All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 114 voting 'yes', none voting 'no', none voting 'present'. The having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Members might wish to listen to an announcement, in regard to House scheduling. The House will be in Session tomorrow and when we adjourn after a day of work tomorrow, we will come back at 4:00 p.m. on Monday and work until we conclude our business. Monday at 4:00 p.m. You may wish to arrange your schedules to be sure to be back here at that time. And we will work every day from until we have concluded the business of the them Legislature. 4:00 p.m. on Monday, but also a day of work tomorrow. Senate... Representative Pullen."
- Pullen: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, just an inquiry relative to what you just announced. Should the House work past June 30th and past that and past that and past that... When you say that we would be working every day, does the Speaker, to your knowledge, contemplate our being in Session on the Fourth of July, if we go past that date?"
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "We'll ask the Speaker whether he has any plans in that regard. We do not know at this time, other than the fact that past practice has sometimes had us here on the fourth of July."
- Pullen: "Well, I do recall that the current Speaker of the House... Not you, Ma'am, but the Speaker has in the past had us in Session on the Fourth of July. And I would like to point out that that is a national holiday. Thank you."

 Speaker Satterthwaite: "We will certainly ask the Speaker whether

69th Legislative Day

June 20, 1991

he has plans at this time about what we will do on the Fourth of July, if our business is not complete. But until we get further word on that, Members should plan to come back on Monday, with sufficient sets of clothing and other necessities, to be here as long as is necessary for us to complete our business. Completing our business as rapidly as possibly, we go back to Senate Bill 1071. Representative Hannig, do you wish to call the Bill? Representative Hannig. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1071, a Bill for an Act to amend the Natural Resources Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Hannig."

Hannig: "Yes, thank you, Madam Speaker, Members of the House.

Representative... or Senator Rea asked me to handle this
Bill for him here in the House. It amends the Natural
Resources Act and adds one additional member, to the Board
of Natural Resources and Conservation, representing the
scientific field of ecology. That's all the Bill does and
I'd ask for a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Is there any discussion? Representative Wennlund."

Wennlund: "I'm not on. Oh, thank you. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Satterthwaite: "He indicates he will."

Wennlund: "Thank you. Representative, why is the Department of Energy and Natural Resources opposed to this legislation?"

Hannig: "Representative, I'm not aware that they are, but...that they are opposed to it and I certainly don't doubt your word, but Representative Rea (sic — Senator) sent it over and we haven't seen any opposition in committee or anywhere yet and I think, quite frankly, he would like to use the Bill to address the problem in his area, but I don't know that he's got any problems with them."

69th Legislative Day

June 20, 1991

Wennlund: "What is it that the Bill actually does?"

Hannig: "Well, it just adds one additional member to the board."

Wennlund: "What was the...What was the purpose of adding one additional member to the board?"

Hannig: "I think the Senator, perhaps, has someone who made that request of him and I think that also the Senator may have some additional requests since then, from what he has informed me. And would like to have us move the Bill back."

Wennlund: "How...How many members are on the board now?"

Hannig: "I don't really know, I'd have to look."

Wennlund: "I believe there are five members of the board, adding another member could bring the board to deadlock. By putting six members on, it would be a three-three tie and it would deadlock the board."

Hannig: "Well, we could...We could put this Bill in conference and maybe make two additional members, if that would satisfy your problem with it."

Wennlund: "Well, the basis of their objection is that if you have
a six member board, you could end up very easily and often
with a three to three vote and you end up with a deadlock
on some very important issues that would come before the
Board of Natural Resources and Conservation. And I don't
think that's a healthy situation."

Hannig: "Representative, I give you my word that when I talk to the Senator about this Bill, I will ask him if we can work this in conference to make it an odd numbered board and a number that you feel comfortable with. Okay?"

Wennlund: "Is it...What...Who is the individual that, that we're trying to protect here, trying to put on the board?"

Hannig: "I'm not, I'm not aware, Representative."

Wennlund: "Is there any intention to...in conference to do something with coal with this Bill?"

69th Legislative Day

June 20, 1991

Hannig: "It certainly could be possible, if it would be germane.

I don't know that it would have to be. It wouldn't do with scrubbers or things of that nature, 'cause it deals with boards, Representative."

Wennlund: "It would be dealing, I'm sorry, with what?"

Hannig: "The underlying Bill deals with boards. We understand that the germaneness issue could still deal with the coal board but it would not deal with digging. You know, with mine subsidence or some of the other issues that deal with coal."

Wennlund: "Well, when you're amending the Natural Resources Act, you can use anything. Coal or oil or anything else. basically, it's just a vehicle Bill. To the Bill, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the Bill creates an additional member to the Board of Natural Resources, which currently a five member board. By adding an additional member you're going to make it a six member board, which very often and very likely would end up in a deadlock situation, which is one of the reasons the Department of Energy and Natural Resources is opposed to this Bill. And the Bill is identical to Senate Bill 1903 which did pass out of the Senate Rules Committee in the 86th General Assembly. It's a vehicle Bill. It may end up with coal and the scrubber situation again. And, I think that all the Members ought to be aware that that's what this Bill is all about. Thank you."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Hannig to close."

Hannig: "Yes, thank you, Madam Speaker and Members of the House.

Representative, I have another Bill that actually will be a vehicle for that and I'll certainly be happy to make you know that when it comes up. This Bill, basically, deals with a board. I certainly have no problem with adding two members, four members, six members, whatever the

69th Legislative Day

June 20, 1991

Representative feels is appropriate. Indeed, it certainly could be a vehicle but, on the other hand, anything that we might do in Conference Committee would have to come back to this Body and be ratified by 60 votes, as well as pass the Senate before it even had a chance to go to the Governor. But I don't know that we're really doing anything all that controversial, at this point, besides adding one member to a board. And, it certainly will put it in conference if that's necessary to add two members to the board. So, it's not a big Bill but I'd certainly ask you if you could give me a 'yes' vote. It would be greatly appreciated."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1071 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 72 voting 'aye', 38 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. The Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Kulas on Senate Bill 1231. Out of the record. Representative Kulas on Senate Bill 1241. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1241, a Bill for an Act to amend the
Environmental Protection Act. Third Reading of the Bill."
Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Kulas."

Kulas: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 1241 amends the Environmental Protection Act. It would require the Pollution Control Board to adopt regulations implementing a gasoline vapor recovery program at gas stations in the State of Illinois. Under the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990. gas stations to install such gasoline requires recovery systems. This would require the recovery gasoline vapor in systems which dispense more than 10,000 gallons of gasoline per month in areas which are classified

69th Legislative Day

June 20, 1991

as moderate, nonattainment or worse for ozone under the Clean Air Act. And I would move for its passage."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Is there any discussion? Representative Wennlund."

Wennlund: "Thank you, will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Satterthwaite: "He indicates he will."

Wennlund: "For the benefit of the Members of the House, it's my understanding, Representative Kulas, that the Petroleum Council and the Petroleum Marketers are all on board with respect to this Bill. Is that correct?"

Kulas: "That is correct."

Wennlund: "Thank you."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Kulas to close."

Kulas: "Just ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1241 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 113 voting 'yes', none voting 'no', none voting 'present'. The Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Hultgren on Senate Bill 1295. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1295, a Bill for an Act to amend the Solid Waste Planning and Recycling Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Hultgren."

Hultgren: "Thank you. Senate Bill 1295, as amended here on the floor, requires the Department of Energy and Natural Resources to study the potential for charging disposal fees that encourage waste generators to participate in source reduction and recycling programs. The earlier Bill did far more than that but the portions that had been objected to by the City of Chicago and the Municipal League were

69th Legislative Day

June 20, 1991

removed by Floor Amendment #2. Would ask for a favorable Roll Call and would be willing to answer any questions that may be..."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Kulas."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "He indicates he will."

Kulas: "Representative Hultgren, I didn't quite...I didn't hear your explanation completely because of the noise in the chamber. The Bill has been amended to address the problems that the City of Chicago and the Municipal League had with the Bill?"

Hultgren: "Representative, it was amended here on the floor to address those concerns. And I spoke with your staff person earlier this week when the Amendment went on the Bill, he indicated that he had seen the Amendment, had approved of it, and that he was no longer concerned about the objectionable provisions, after it was amended."

Kulas: "Okay, thank you, then I'm in full support of the Bill."
Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Hultgren to close."

Hultgren: "I would simply ask for a favorable Roll Call, Madam Speaker."

- Speaker Satterthwaite: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1295 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 114 voting 'yes', none voting 'no', none voting 'present'. The Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1296, Representative Parke. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1296, a Bill for an Act to amend certain Acts in relationship to solid waste. Third Reading of the Bill."

69th Legislative Day

- June 20, 1991
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Parke."
- Parke: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. May I move the Bill back to Second Reading for purposes of an Amendment?"
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "The Gentleman asks leave to bring the Bill back to Second Reading. Hearing no objections, leave is granted. Mr. Clerk, are there any Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #3 is offered by Representative Burzynski."
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Burzynski."
- Burzynski: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Floor Amendment #3 just basically brings Illinois laws regarding contaminate substances in...response to those that have been recently adopted by the U.S.E.P.A. I move for its adoption."
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Amendment #3. Is there any discussion? Seeing no one seeking recognition...The question is...Representative Lang."
- Lang: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'm not certain this Amendment has been printed and distributed."
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "Has the Amendment been printed and distributed? It has not. Representative Parke, what is your wish?"
- Parke: "I would like it taken from the record, please. Could it be put back on Third Reading though and then taken from the record?"
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "The Gentleman asks leave to have the Bill placed back on the Calendar of Third Reading. Is there any objection? Seeing none, the Bill is back on Third Reading.

 Representative Persico on Senate Bill 1309."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1309, a Bill for an Act to amend the Environmental Protection Act. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Persico."
- Persico: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Members of the House. Senate

69th Legislative Day

June 20, 1991

Bill 1309 is an agency Bill which amends the Environmental Protection Act. It authorizes the Pollution Control Board to waive the requirement for the public hearing for the parties involved that have reached a settlement agreement. It still requires the Board to publish notice of any proposed settlement in the same manner as it would currently be required to publish notice of the hearing. This Bill would eliminate the costly burden of the Board holding hearings for every case for which a settlement has already been worked out. I know of no opposition to this Bill and I urge for its adoption."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Balanoff."

Balanoff: "Yes, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in opposition to this Bill. Because...Just because the parties involved in a complaint before the Pollution Control Board are in agreement does not necessarily mean that the community is in agreement. Specifically, in my community things of this nature have happened. Further, the idea that they would have to publish that they were going to remove it from the docket doesn't mean that people a community would become aware of this, because they might miss it in the newspaper or something. So, I would really urge people to think. This is... This is a question of the rights of a community to be involved, often times, in the procedures before the Pollution Control Board. I would urge everybody to vote 'no' because there really is some opposition."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Kulas."

Kulas: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in support of Senate Bill 1309. It just alleviates more bureaucratic work. We're at a time when all the departments are hurting for cash. The pollution control board doesn't even have enough money to pay for

69th Legislative Day

June 20, 1991

hearing officers and all we're saying is, if there's an agreement between... a contest between two parties, we'll just eliminate one less hearing. So, we're saving the State of Illinois money in this case. The community still has its venues to go to court. There's nothing to prevent the community from going to court. All we're saying is, to save the state some money, let's eliminate one of these hearings if there's an agreement, and I would urge all Members to support this Bill."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Persico to close."

Persico: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Again, I would just like to reiterate that it still requires the board to publish notice of any proposed settlement, so in 95% of these cases no member of the public even attends these meetings. The board estimates that it will save in excess of \$1,000. per meeting plus stop the delays of up to one month in order to get these things expedited. So, I do urge its adoption."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 1309 All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question who wish? there are 97 voting 'yes', 5 voting 'no', The Bill, having received a Constitutional 'present'. Majority is hereby declared passed. On the Order of Banking, Third Reading. The Sponsors, on the early part of the call, are Representatives Currie, Wolf, Black and Parke. Representatives. Excuse me. We are going to back up for a Bill that we omitted a little earlier on Human Services, Third Reading. Senate Bill 651, Representative Bugielski. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 651, a Bill for an Act to amend the Department on Aging. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Bugielski."

69th Legislative Day

June 20, 1991

Bugielski: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 651 establishes a pilot program. I'd like to emphasize 'pilot program', to provide temporary housing and emergency shelter programs for abused and neglected elderly individuals. This Bill would be repealed on July 1,1993. The estimated cost to establish one emergency shelter would be, roughly, \$200,000. the Department of Aging has had a significant lapse in the Elder Abuse Program, and they may be able to assume In the fiscal year '91 lapse there was a lapse of \$641,200. The department is mainly opposed to it based on cost. There's a growing need for emergency shelter for abused elderly persons. Shelters accept elderly persons but do not provide any basic medical care which the elderly may need. The department would establish a pilot program which extends temporary housing emergency shelter to abused or neglected elderly individuals. The program would be established conjunction with private agencies that provide services to eligible adults, and the one point in there is that department would have to make a report back to the General Assembly 180 days after the inception of this Bill."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Hultgren."

Hultgren: "Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise reluctantly to oppose Senate Bill 651 because, indeed, the Sponsor has offered a good program and one that addresses needs of a portion of our population in the State of Illinois. However, as we discussed in committee, this is a program, albeit a pilot program, that costs money. By the Sponsor's own estimate, I believe, \$250,000. By the department's estimate, \$500,000. I'm not here to quibble about who's correct on the dollars, but whichever it is, they're dollars this year that we do not have. We are

69th Legislative Day

June 20, 1991

cutting Public Aid this year, we are cutting the Department of Aging this year. We may be cutting the State Board of Higher Education this year. We may be cutting Elementary and Secondary Education this year. We simply do not have funds to start a new pilot program, whether it costs \$250,000 or whether it cost \$500,000. Now having said that, this is a need that needs to be addressed in our society, but it is not a need that is totally ignored with current state programs. Indeed, elder abuse currently can find shelter in Domestic Violence shelters or, in the Early Intervention Program. Funds already appropriate for these programs can serve those in the elderly community. The Elder Abuse agencies and the Domestic Violence shelters are addressing the issue as best they can, without additional funds. While the program is meritorious, and while the Sponsor deserves commendation for his thoughtful approach, we simply don't have the money this year. I rise, reluctantly, to oppose the Bill, will be voting 'no' and would ask my colleagues to join me in that respect. Thank you very much."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Wennlund."

Wennlund: "Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Satterthwaite: "He indicates he will."

Wennlund: "Representative Bugielski, isn't it a fact that it really isn't going to cost that much to fly this pilot program because there are other funds available?"

Bugielski: "There are other funds that can be available, and just as the previous speaker mentioned, that the department said it would be \$500,000, that cost was based on two shelters. Since this is a pilot program, as I mentioned in committee, one shelter is sufficient. So, that cuts the cost down in half already. And yes, there would be other ways that we

69th Legislative Day

June 20, 1991

would be able to obtain some money and that would be going through private agencies, picking up some funds from private agencies, which they do right now at the present time. And also federally, if some of the clients are medically eligible, some federal funds can be obtained through reimbursements."

Wennlund: "Wasn't there a lapse last year of federal funds, that could've been available?"

Bugielski: "There was a lapse in the Elder Abuse Program of \$641,000 in the Department of Aging."

Wennlund: "Are you going to be charging \$10 a head or, a ..."

Bugielski: "That's another possibility which I was going to use in my closing. I used this in committee, that since most of the elderly are abused or neglected, and not necessarily indigent, they can pay for a fee. Most of them are on Social Security or other means of income. They will be able to pay \$10. a night to these shelters. That would reduce their costs tremendously. Roughly by 60%."

Wennlund: "How do senior citizens stand on this issue?"

Bugielski: "The senior citizens are all in favor of it. The one point I want to mention is like, for instance, the coalition on domestic violence. Right now they have some shelters available but these are for everyone. You have children there, you have teenagers in there and no one wants to see a senior citizen that's 75 years old in the same shelter with teenagers running around because, certainly, that could really cause a coronary for them."

Wennlund: "Thank you very much. You've done an excellent job of researching the issue and I appreciate the explanation."

Bugielski: "Thank you."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative DeJaegher."

DeJaegher: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Members of the General Assembly. I rise with great pride to support this

69th Legislative Day

June 20, 1991

legislation which is Senate Bill 651. Contrary to what you may believe or what you may think, there is senior abuse, there is senior neglect, and I think the three components of this particular Bill that you have to bear in mind is this. This will not be ongoing legislation. It. sunset provision of 180 days. When this Bill was introduced originally there were two shelters. reduced that shelter to one. Also, remember, as I...we stated before, this is a pilot program. If it doesn't work, if it doesn't have any merit, of course we can terminate the program, and for those particular, three specific reasons, I think this Bill deserves and needs your support. Thank you."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Pedersen."

Pedersen: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. In committee the Department of Aging opposed this Bill. They pointed out that while there may have been a lapse of funds for last year, that it was almost certain to be none this year because of the funding crisis. The other thing is that they're very concerned that this would cut into other senior programs. They're already addressing it, to some extent anyway, so this is really not what you could call a real serious problem. We're already doing it so I think that we can let it ride for this year and go along with the department on their recommendation. I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Bugielski, to close."

Bugielski: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I feel that this is a very important, as much of the debate has come out, it is a very commendable program. It is something that we have to look at. There's a lot of neglected and abused elders. We can't let this ride off for another year. Naturally, yes, we are in tight straits right now, but with the funding

69th Legislative Day

June 20, 1991

that I have come up with, let the agencies, the private agencies, help out. If we should charge, as I mentioned before, \$10 a night, it helps tremendously. This is something that's a a pilot program. It is repealed in 1993. They have to make a report back to the General Assembly within 180 days. I feel that it is an excellent pilot program. We've conceded by bringing it down from two shelters to one shelter and I ask for your favorable Roll Call."

- Speaker Satterthwaite: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 651 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 75 voting 'yes', 11 voting 'no', 25 voting 'present', the Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. On the order of Criminal Law, Second Reading, there is Senate Bill 64; Representative Weaver. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 64, a Bill for an Act to amend the Home Repair Fraud Act. Second Reading of the Bill. There are no Committee Amendments."
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "Any Floor Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #1 is being offered by Representative Homer."
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Homer? Senate Bill 64,
 Amendment #1."
- Homer: "Madam Speaker, I would ask to withdraw Amendment #1."
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "The Amendment is withdrawn. Any further Amendments?
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representatives

 Homer and Weaver."
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Homer."
- Homer: "Thank you. House Amendment #2 is an Amendment which was

69th Legislative Day

June 20, 1991

agreed to in committee that would reduce from the proposed level of the Bill the penalty for aggravated home repair fraud, when committed under this specific subsection. The original Bill enhanced the penalty two levels. It was agreed in committee that the Bill would be supported if the Sponsor would agree to only enhance the penalty to one level from the ordinary home repair fraud violations. The Sponsor made that agreement. This amendment, then, would effectuate that agreement. I would move its adoption."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Weaver."

- Weaver: "Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. This Amendment is an Agreed Amendment. It enabled us to get the Bill out of the House. The Bill had some basic problems and I appreciate Representative Homer's willingness to work to get this crafted to a position that it finally makes this Bill a good Bill. I would urge its passage."
- Satterthwaite: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Amendment #2. All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'nay', the 'ayes' have it and Amendment #2 is Adopted. Any further Amendments?" Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."
- Satterthwaite: "Third Reading. On the Special Order of Banking,
 Third Reading. Senate Bill 33; Representative Currie. Mr.
 Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 33, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act concerning Home Equity Conversion Mortgages. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Currie."
- Currie: "Thank you Madam Speaker, Members of the House. Senate
 Bill 33 would provide the opportunity for Illinois lending
 institutions to offer nonrecourse reverse mortgages to
 seniors aged 62 and older. In all but one respect, it's
 identical to House Bill 67 which passed this chamber a few
 weeks ago. That respect is that under House Bill 67, as we

69th Legislative Day

June 20, 1991

passed it, we limited the amount of equity that could be the subject of this mortgage to 80%. I am told by people who are familiar with the Federal Fannie Mae loan guarantee program, that that provision would make lenders ineligible, in the State of Illinois, to participate in the federal HUD program, so we've removed that provision from this Bill at this time. I'd be happy to answer your questions and would certainly appreciate your support for the opportunity for senior citizens in this state to take advantage of the equity in their homes in order to generate income to meet their daily needs and responsibilities."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Is there any discussion? Seeing no seeking recognition the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 33 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there 'no', three voting are 109 voting 'yes', none voting 'present'. The Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Wolf on Senate Bill 829, out of the record. Representative Turner? For what reason do you arise?"

Turner: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I know there was an inquiry earlier as to whether or not we'll be working on the Fourth of July, and Representative Shaw came by my desk to remind me that the last time we worked on the Fourth of July, there was a barbque held out on the capitol lawn and we want to let all of the Members know that if we are in Session on the fourth of July, that event will be repeated and we will be taking orders later in the week."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Speaker Madigan in the Chair."

Madigan: "Ladies and Gentlemen, if we could have your attention.

The Chair will recognize Representative Daniels for a special announcement and Representative Daniels is

69th Legislative Day

June 20, 1991

instructed that it's only for a limited announcement that he assumes the Chair."

- Daniels: "Will you call a Republican redistricting plan, please? Thank you, Speaker Madigan. We are indeed privileged and it is indeed a pleasure of mine, to introduce to you a woman who is setting an example for all women throughout Illinois and the country today, a person whom I have known now for many years and getting to know a lot better as has performed, and is performing, her role as the First Lady of the State of Illinois. Would you join me in welcoming to our chamber, in the gallery, Brenda Edgar, the First Lady of Illinois. We understand that Mrs. Edgar is here to observe the Assembly in Session. You missed us by day, but if you hang around for a little while we might be able to get in some other items as well, and certainly the ensuing week we'll have a few other matters to discuss that you may be interested in as well. So, thank you, and Speaker Madigan, back in the Chair."
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Satterthwaite, back in the Chair. On Banking, Third Reading, Senate Bill 895, Representative Black. Do you wish to have the Bill presented? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 895, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act to create the Financial Institution Activity Reporting Act.

 Third Reading of the Bill." Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Black."
- Black: "Thank you very much, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 895, as amended, creates the Financial Institution Activity Reporting Act, and amends the Bank Holding Company Act to require certain nonresident financial institutions to file a report of their financial activities within the State of Illinois. This Bill has had substantial number of hearings, thorough examination in

69th Legislative Day

June 20, 1991

committee, some Amendments were filed yesterday that were requested. I would ask your favorable consideration of Senate Bill 895."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Is there any discussion? Seeing no one seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 895 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this issue, there are 115 voting 'yes', none voting 'no', none voting 'present'. The Bill having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Representative Parke on Senate Bill 988. Out of the record. Representative Williams on Senate Bill 1079. Is the Gentleman in the Chambers? Representative Williams? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1079, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Banking Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Williams."

Williams: "Thank you. Senate Bill 1079 amends the Illinois Banking Act. It permits banks to operate and administer a fund for the investment for local units of government or school districts that would allow them to, more or less, rollover certain investments that they have without going through the process of reissuing bonds. It's going to make somewhat easier for them to be able to administer the funds and the money on short-term notes. In addition, provides that financial institutions. in situations, dealing with... who might have. insolvency or bankruptcy, have managed to take, say, travel and have not been able to serve them otherwise, agencies, that they would let those individual banks that now hold them continue to operate them in their present form and it just grandfathers in those that already hold it.

69th Legislative Day

June 20, 1991

addition, it provides that certain funds, and bank notes, that would be allowed within vendors would be able to be transferred and be used as debts for other vendors within state agencies. I ask for a favorable roll call."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Is there any discussion? Seeing no one seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1079 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Clerk, take the record. On this issue there are 114 voting 'yes', none voting 'no', one voting 'present'. The Bill having received a Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Representative Keane on Senate Bill 1169, out of the record. On the Order of Consumer Protection, Third Reading, Representative Homer on Senate Bill 800. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 800, a Bill for an Act to amend the Ticket Scalping Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Homer."

Madam Speaker, this is the Ticket Scalping Homer: "Thank you. Act that we dealt with in an identical House Bill that provides that there would be an exception to the Ticket Scalping Act for ticket brokers and the Bill specifically defines what it is that you have to be to be a ticket broker which includes operating all year around from a fixed place of business and that you are in full compliance with all tax requirements and reporting requirements. Bill was very thoroughly discussed in House committees, both the House Executive Committee, in one version, and the House Committee on Consumer Protection in another version of the Bill. It received overwhelming support passage out of the Senate as it did in the House. answer questions and urge your favorable consideration of the Bill."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Is there any discussion? Seeing no one

69th Legislative Day

June 20, 1991

seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 800 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye', oh, Representative Black, I'm sorry, I did not see your light."

- Black: "Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. I know the Gentleman would like to pass his Bill, but... and I don't want to engage in 5 or 10 minutes of floor debates, if you would give him some assurance you'd come right back to this, could he take it out of the record, we could chat for a minute or two?"
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "Take the Bill out of the record. On the Special Order of Economic Development, Third Reading, the lead Sponsors are Representatives Curran, Rotello, Pike, et cetera. Representative Curran on Senate Bill 233. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 233, a Bill for an Act to amend the Bi-State Development Powers Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Curran."

- Curran: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This amends the Bi-State Development Powers Act. It authorizes that agency to employ security forces. It sets violations, provides penalties, and this only becomes effective, when Congress and Missouri and the State of Illinois all pass the same law, and it becomes effective when the latter of those three passes the law. This Bill has been amended in the House by Representative Young's technical Amendment. It will have to go back to the Senate for concurrence."
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "Is there any discussion? Seeing no one seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 233 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye, opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question,

69th Legislative Day

June 20, 1991

there are 111 voting 'yes', none voting 'no', one voting 'present'. The Bill having received a Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Representative Rotello on Senate Bill 484. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 484, a Bill for an Act to amend an Act in relationship to trade With the European community.

Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Rotello."

Rotello: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The intention of this Bill is to have DCCA prepare for the unification of the common market in Europe so that we can be ready to deal with international trade. Actually, the department has worked in those areas but we think we need to coordinate our efforts and be ready for the common economic market in Europe that will take place in 1992. So, I urge the passage of the Bill."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Ropp."

Ropp: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Satterthwaite: "He indicates he will."

Ropp: "Representative, Why is there a need for a Bill like this?

Do you not assume that the Department of Commerce and

Community Affairs are not, let's say, doing what we think

they're doing? What kind of support does this give, for

them?"

Rotello: "I think that the need is to just set policy, to be on record that the legislature is concerned about our being in place to deal with that. There are other states that are already making measures to move in that direction and I don't think we're as far along as we need to be."

Ropp: "So we need to establish a law that tells them to become more involved in international trade? Isn't the mere fact that we establish a trade office and that we have directors of agencies who, I would hope, are attempting to implement

69th Legislative Day

June 20, 1991

our intent when we established that trade office, anyway?"
Rotello: "Well, I think that is probably a matter of philosophy.,
It's my opinion that we need to have the legislature
involved in making stronger policy statements in terms of
dealing with that."

Ropp: "Couldn't it also be done with a House-Senate Joint Resolution versus a law? I don't know, we have a lot of laws that sometimes seem unnecessary and I think we have an attempt to tell them what to do and we do that by the mere fact we've established a trade office. We've done it by the mere fact that we have funded and to now come with a law saying what you will or what you won't do seems a little bit counterproductive, I guess, or I guess, maybe more duplicative, rather than counterproductive, and I'm a big supporter of international trade, helped establish several offices, too. I guess I just wonder whether or not we need to say, in law, that fills all our statutes, okay, this is what you have to do to implement what we wanted you to do in the first place."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Mautino."

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

Speaker Satterthwaite: "He indicates he will."

Mautino: "Representative Rotello, what you're proposing to do here is to eliminate the Illinois Export Authority and the Illinois Export Council with this legislation. Can you tell me how much bonds are currently outstanding that are owed on July 1 of 1991, that's in two weeks, included in this legislation?"

Rotello: "Representative Hartke says 14.1 billion dollars. I don't know."

Mautino: "I'm sorry, it's 16.5 million dollars. I would like to inform you that we've been working with Lieutenant Governor Kustra, the export authority people, the export council.

69th Legislative Day

June 20, 1991

We don't have all the information from bond council, whether what your legislation or Senate Bill 1314 will legally do in the state, and what kind of position it puts us in with the bank of Tokyo who issued these bonds. Since I was the original author of both of those programs, I would hope that you might take this legislation out of the record and hang onto it until next Tuesday or Wednesday when we can get the answers necessary so that we all know what we're doing and we don't get the State of Illinois into a deeper problem. Would you please do that?"

Rotello: "Ill be happy to do that."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Rotello indicates that he'll take the Bill from the record. Representative McPike on Senate Bill 796, out of the record. Senate Bill 799, out of the record. Representative Brunsvold, on Senate Bill 1091. Is the Gentleman in the Chamber? Out of the record. Representative Homer on Senate Bill 800."

"Thank you, Madam Speaker. We just had this Bill out of the record at Representative Black's request. Bill amends the Ticket Scalping Act, to specifically authorize ticket brokers to be an exception to the scalping act which generally prohibits the resale of tickets to sporting events, and other promotions, at a price above the face value of the ticket. It defines ticket brokers in such a way that it would include those who maintain a year around business at a fixed place of business away from the that is being promoted, and would require a ticket event broker to be in full compliance with all Department of Revenue requirements and to have paid all taxes that may be a result of engaging in the business. attempts to differentiate between scalpers and ticket There clearly is a very functional need to have brokers. ticket brokering. It provides a secondary outlet and

69th Legislative Day

June 20, 1991

market for unused season tickets. It provides a means of distribution of tickets to events to those who otherwise may not have the ability to purchase tickets from the event or from one of the recognized distribution facilities. The Bill passed overwhelmingly in the Senate. It passed here earlier in the form of a House Bill that Representative Capparelli sponsored, also by a lopsided vote. The Bill is identical to that Bill. I would answer any questions and urge the passage of the Bill."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Is there any discussion? Representative Black."

Black: "Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. Let me just commend the Sponsor for his cooperation in explaining some details to the Bill that I was not clear on. He's done an excellent job and I rise to support the Gentleman's Bill."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Is there further discussion? Seeing no one seeking recognition... Representative Steczo? Representative Steczo."

Steczo: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
Speaker Satterthwaite: "He indicates he will."

Steczo: "Representative Homer, just a question. We are, in this Bill, differentiating between ticket scalpers and ticket brokers, correct?"

Homer: "Yes."

Steczo: "Are we, in this Bill, specifying any rate or any cap on, over/above the purchase price that a broker pays for a ticket?"

Homer: "No."

Steczo: "So, a broker could purchase a ticket for face value, \$15, and sell it for 10, 20, 30, 40 or 100 times over the cost of that ticket."

Homer: "This Bill does not address that."

Steczo: "So, the only difference between scalping and brokering

69th Legislative Day

June 20, 1991

is having a full year business in a central office and complying with the Department of Revenue laws and regulations?"

- Homer: "And the ticket broker must not engage in the practice of selling during the time that the event is being held or standing near the facility at which the event is being held."
- Steczo: "Is there a limitation in the Bill on the... Does it prohibit a ticket broker from operating within a certain distance of a sporting arena?"
- Homer: "It prohibits the ticket broker from sitting or standing near the facility, is the way the Bill is drafted. It doesn't say a specific distance."
- Steczo: "Okay, thank you, Mr. Homer. Madam Speaker, Members of the House, I just really have cautions and would suggest to the House that we should take some precautions when dealing with this particular issue. The fact is that we're just simply specifying that if you don't operate near stadium... we don't know what 'near' means, when addressing this issue. We are not capping at all the amount of money that a ticket broker can use. So in that respect, there's not much difference in a ticket broker and a ticket This legislature, in the past, has scalper. always specified that ticket scalping is illegal. I'm not so sure at this point, without some protections and without we, some exemptions, want to be in a position of allowing this kind of a practice, so, I would urge a 'no' or 'present' vote."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Frederick."

Frederick: "Yes, thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise in support of this Bill. Brokers in cities where there are all kinds of athletic events and cultural events provide a legitimate service, especially to tourists coming into the area and

69th Legislative Day

June 20, 1991

would have no chance of getting tickets without a broker.

Sure, they do charge a fee, but I have not found them to be exorbitant and I would move approval of Senate Bill 800."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Homer to Close."

Homer: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I would only echo the comments of the previous Lady. I think she's right on brokering differs Ticket substantially from ticket scalping, that's why this Bill is offered, to differentiate between the two, to recognize that the ticket brokers provide a valuable service to their clients. They make sure that tickets are redistributed that otherwise The Concierges Association of the have vacant seats. hotels in Chicago traveled to Springfield to testify in support of the legislation in committee. They did so because they recognized that their quests are requesting from them the service to provide tickets to these events. Without the ticket brokers there would be no opportunity these tourists to see these events. The price is dictated by the market. The fees charged are There are competing ticket brokers to ensure a competitive marketplace and to ensure that prices are a reasonable There's no one who is disavantaged or price charged. victimized by this practice that is already in existence now, through this Bill, would be formalized by but legislation and regulated thereby. I would urge adoption of the Bill."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 800 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Representative Dunn, to explain his vote. The Gentleman does not wish to explain his vote. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this issue there are 105 voting 'yes', 3 voting 'no', 7 voting 'present'. The Bill having received

69th Legislative Day

June 20, 1991

- a Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. On the Order of Human Services, Second Reading, appears Senate Bill 628, Representative Manny Hoffman. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 628, a Bill for an Act to amend the Emergency Medical Services System Act. Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments."
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "Any Floor Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative

 Manny Hoffman."
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Hoffman."
- Hoffman: "Thank you, Madam Chairman. This section does not apply if... The Amendment #1 states that this section does not apply if an ambulance is dispatched under a trauma system established by a local health department to which authority has been delegated under Section 29.1. What this does is, it excludes the City of Chicago from this Bill."
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "Is there any discussion on the Gentleman's Amendment? Seeing no one seeking recognition, the question is, 'shall Amendment #1 be adopted? All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it and Amendment #1 is Adopted. Any further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "Third Reading. Representative...,
 Representative, this Bill has been read a second time
 previously. Would you like to proceed with the Bill on
 Third Reading?"
- Hoffman: '"I'd like leave to have the Bill heard at the present time?"
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "The Gentleman asks leave. It doesn't take leave. We can just do it since it was already read a second time on a previous day. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 628, a Bill for an Act to amend the

69th Legislative Day

June 20, 1991

Emergency Medical System Services Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Madam Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen. This Bill amends the Emergency Medical Services System Act and is a very important Bill. It provides that if an ambulance is required by telephone and the estimated response time is more than 5 minutes, the dispatcher will advise the caller of the estimated time of arrival. This Act would only apply to basic life support ambulances. I believe that this is a good Bill. We've had, in the past, a number of occasions where ambulances have been late and I think this is an important Bill and I ask for this Body's consideration."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Is there any discussion? Seeing no one seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 628 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote Have all voted who wish? Have all The voting is open. voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 114 voting 'yes', none voting 'no', none voting 'present'. The Bill having received Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Back on Economic Development, Third Reading, Senate Bill 1323, Representative Balanoff. Do you wish to have that Bill called on Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1323, a Bill for an Act to amend the Civil Administrative Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Balanoff."

Balanoff: "Senate Bill 1323 would amend the Civil Administrative
Code of Illinois and provide the Department of Commerce and
Community Affairs' Business Assistance Office can provide
technical and managerial assistance to certain local groups
such as community groups or local chambers of commerce."

69th Legislative Day

June 20, 1991

- Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Black...is there further discussion on the Bill? Seeing no one seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1323 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye', opposed 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 109 voting 'yes', none voting 'no', none voting 'present'. The Bill having received a Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. On Special Order of Education Finance, Third Reading, Representative Steczo on Senate Bill 185. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 185, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Steczo."
- Steczo: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I ask leave to bring Senate
 Bill 185 back to the Order of Second Reading for purposes
 of an Amendment, please."
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "Is there leave? Hearing no objection, leave is granted. The Bill is on Second Reading."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Steczo."
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Steczo."
- Madam Speaker, Members of the House. Steczo: "Thank you, Amendment #1 is offered by myself, Representative Weaver, Representative McNamara and Representative Cowlishaw and deals with the question of health care reimbursement. State Board of Education and the Illinois Department of Public Aid are now reaching closure on an interagency agreement which will allow Medicaid to flow as matching funds to local school districts. Medicaid eliqible children with disabilities are receiving select, related services eligible for Medicaid funding. Those youngsters would be receiving these services if in their IEP, with or

69th Legislative Day

June 20, 1991

without Medicaid entering into the picture. So, they receive the services regardless of whether Medicaid is allowed presently. This will allow us to take those services that are being provided, match them with Medicaid dollars, qualify for Medicaid reimbursement, and we expect to see approximately 5 million new federal dollars coming into the state as a result of this change. So, Madam Speaker, I would answer any questions, or would ask for the adoption of this Amendment."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Is there discussion? Seeing no one seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall Amendment #1 be adopted? All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed say 'no'.

The 'ayes' have it and the Amendment is Adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Third Reading. The Gentleman asks to proceed with the Bill on Third Reading at this time. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill. Leave is granted by the Attendance Roll Call. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 185, a Bill for an Act in relation to Special Education. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Steczo."

Steczo: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Members of the House.

Amendment #1 became the Bill on Senate Bill 185. Let me
just reiterate, that through this interagency agreement
between the Department of Public Aid and the State Board of
Education we can see an additional 5 million new Medicaid
dollars flow into the State of Illinois and be directed at
our local school districts. I would ask for passage...
move for passage for Senate Bill 185."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Is there any discussion? Seeing no one seeking recognition, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 185 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'no'.

69th Legislative Day

June 20, 1991

Voting is open. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 113 voting 'yes', none voting 'no', none voting 'present'. The Bill having received a Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Earlier, we were dealing with Senate Bill 922 on Second Reading and at the request of the Sponsor, the Bill was taken out of the record. Representative Steczo, would you like to proceed at this time with Senate Bill 922 on the Special Order of Elections? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 922, a Bill for an Act in relation to backdoor referenda. This Bill's been read a second time previously. Amendment #1 was adopted in committee."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Any Motions filed?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No Motions filed. We were proceeding on Floor Amendment #4, offered by Representative Homer."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Homer."

Homer: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. This is the September primary Bill. It would provide that in the year 1994 only, that on the second Tuesday following the second Monday, the primary would be held in the month of September. The purpose the Bill is to take a giant step forward to improve the election process by creating an additional degree interest by eliminating the prolonged and protracted and costly elections that we have where those of us who are the House of Representatives are sworn into office in January and of the same calendar year are required to circulate and file petitions for reelection. The public has clearly said through their apathy, indifference, staying away from the polls that they want a change. Bill, more than any other thing that we could do, would bring about reform, would help hold down the costs of elections, would maintain voter interest, would allow elected officials to concentrate on the duties of

69th Legislative Day

June 20, 1991

would reduce the amount of negative campaigning that has become so prevalent, would increase voter turnout, would make Illinois consistent with the numerous other states that now have a September primary. It's only for one election. It's a non-Presidential year in 1994. It's an attempt to let us see whether it works, whether the adversaries and opponents have merit to their arguments. do not believe that they do. The Bill is drafted in such a way as to reduce the time within which the county clerk has to certify, and the State Board of Elections has, to certify the nominees, so as to allow a greater time It is... even with this Bill, Ladies election contests. and Gentlemen, with the second Tuesday in September, it still provides a wider distance, in terms of time, between the primary and the general election, than do our current municipal elections. So, for those who say it cannot be administered, I would simply say to you that if you look at the consolidated election law, the municipal elections, the school board elections, the park district elections, they now operate in a less time frame than this Bill. I would urge Members to take the one vote that they may have an opportunity to take to effect election reform in a number of years in this Chamber. That would be an 'aye' vote on Amendment #4 to Senate Bill 922."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Wennlund."

Wennlund: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I don't know how many times we've had the opportunity to vote this proposal down, but apparently we're going to have at least this one more time to defeat this proposal which has been defeated at least four times, or three times, that I can recall. The time has not yet come, in Illinois, to be moving the primary election dates around. The Bill has been defeated. Let's go ahead and

69th Legislative Day

June 20, 1991

defeat this one more time and get rid of it."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Stern."

Stern: "Madam Speaker and Members of the House, I have to admire the Gentleman's tenacity. Never say die on the September primary. Despite what he says, and in spite of the fact that I agree that the election season is too long, this House simply does not support a September primary because it recognizes that there is insufficient time to get absentee ballots out. We have dealt with this issue over and over again. I really feel that to add this Amendment to the Bill would sink the Bill which is otherwise filled with noncontroversial but important legislation on election law, and I urge you to defeat this Amendment."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Hartke."

Hartke: "Thank you very much, Madam Speaker, Members of the House. Realizing that we've defeated this motion several times, I will not bore you with the reasons I'm opposed to it other than to say that, I don't think this is the answer, to bring more people into the election. As a matter of fact, I think it would confuse the electorate more than help. Moving the primary date around, even on a pilot basis, will not help. That's not what people are disturbed about by not voting to the polls. It's the candidates that are running, and so I move the defeat of this Amendment."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Myron Olson."

Olson: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. We discussed this issue a couple of hours ago, while the Amendment was still being printed and distributed. I want to reiterate on a Discharge Motion last week, this thing went down 26 to 81. It was defeated after significant testimony in the Elections Committee. Democratic task force in the House, together with the

69th Legislative Day

June 20, 1991

Republican Minority here, who have... most of its members do not support this position, have rejected this proposal. It deserves to be roundly defeated and I suggest a 'no' vote."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Homer, to Close."

Homer: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I want to correct some of previous speakers about whether we've had a prior vote on this Bill. The fact is, this Bill has never been allowed to have a prior vote. The committee did not take a vote on it, although there was testimony in the committee, the committee did not vote on the Bill. The vote to which Gentleman refers was a motion to discharge the committee. That has never been considered a vote on the merits. has never been a vote on the merits on this Bill in the This will be the first and possibly only Roll Call House. which will record each of our positions with respect to election reform measure. Clearly, it's needed. Clearly, the people of the State of Illinois want election They have spoken out time and again urging us to do so, and yet, their efforts and their voice has been frustrated. This is our opportunity to respond. This is our opportunity to show that we are for streamlining, improving and reducing the cost of the election process in Illinois. That we're in favor of having elected officials attend to their duties on a full and conscientious basis as opposed to forever campaigning. This is the one chance that you'll have to vote to do something positive to help get voters back into the election process. I urge your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #4 be adopted?' All in favor say 'aye', opposed say 'no'. The 'nos' have it and the Amendment fails. Further Amendments."

69th Legislative Day

June 20, 1991

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #5, offered by Representative Pullen."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Homer."

Homer: "I want to be heard on this. Now this, I think, is... I asked for a Roll Call vote before the Chair announced the vote. Now, I know that the Chair can rule that this thing had been voted on and do it on a voice vote, but I think that that would send a more clear message than anything that this chamber is trying to frustrate the opportunity of the people to be heard on this question. This is clearly a violation of my rights and the right of the people to have a hearing. This Bill was bottled in committee. This Bill was bottled in terms of allowing a motion to discharge, and now the right of the people would be circumvented. Clearly, this would be a frustration of my right and the right of the people to have a Roll call vote. I asked for it in a timely manner and insist upon my rights."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative, I'm sorry if I did not hear you ask for a Roll Call vote. We will have a Roll Call vote on Amendment #4. We will go back to Amendment #4. All those in favor vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 38 voting 'yes', 75 voting 'no', one voting 'present' and the Amendment fails. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #5, offered by Representative Pullen, McCracken and Parke."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Pullen."

Pullen: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, before I begin the presentation of the amendment, I would like to mention to you, Madam Speaker, that I would like a Roll Call vote on this Amendment."

69th Legislative Day

June 20, 1991

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Thank you."

I think it's important that we Pullen: "Thank you very much. take a Roll Call on this Amendment because this Amendment does have a bearing on the question of property taxes and since there may not be very many opportunities for us to deal with the question of property taxes, I think that it's important that the people of Illinois do have some idea of where their Legislators stand on the question of property The Gentleman has a commendable Bill in its basic taxes. The Gentleman's Bill is to standardize the number thrust. signatures required for the calling of a backdoor referendum. The Gentleman and I have worked in years on attempting to be sure that backdoor referendum rights and backdoor referendum language, generally in law, is written in a way that is standard with respect to many other aspects of the backdoor referendum right. With the number of signatures, that respect to has not previously been standardized, and this Bill bluow standardize it. The problem that I have with the Bill as it was sent to us by the Senate is that it standardizes the number of signatures at 10% Ten percent of the registered the registered voters voters. Ten percent of jurisdiction is something that is currently in the law for a number of backdoor referenda but it is not the standard level. If it were the lowest level, that would be fine, but it is not. Currently in the law, there are a number of backdoor referenda which can be invoked by 5% of the voters So, when we standardize it at 10%, that signing petitions. the effect of raising the number of signatures needed to call a backdoor referendum in a number of instances in which backdoor referenda now appear in the law. I know that that's the way the Senate sent this over. I'm not certain whether the Gentleman himself would have written it

69th Legislative Day

June 20, 1991

in that manner, but I believe that it would be unjust for us to pass the Bill as is, in a format which makes harder for people to call backdoor referenda in some of the circumstances under which that is now available in law. my Amendment would propose, as the thrust of the Bill is, to standardize the number of signatures needed to call a backdoor referendum, but to put that standard level at 5% of the voters, rather than at ten. That way, it would not be an increase in any unit of government for any purpose. It would make it easier in some cases for voters to call backdoor referenda and would not make it harder in any case, as the underlying Bill would otherwise do. the same provision which did pass the House last year on a unanimous vote. So, I would urge that in this particular year we confirm what we did last year for the taxpayers and send it back to the Senate as a standard 5% signatures required for a backdoor referendum Bill. Thank you very much."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Parke."

"Thank you, Madam Speaker. Members of the House, I rise Parke: in support of this Amendment. You know, having accessibility to government is basic to American political initiative. Being able to have a 5% threshold, which makes it somewhat easy, but not too easy, to allow citizens to participate in the democratic process, is very important to all of us. Standardizing 5% of the voters being able to sign a petition that reflects backdoor referendum is I would ask that my colleagues support this healthy. Amendment. It makes a good idea even better, and I would ask for passage of this fine Amendment."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Stern."

Stern: "Madam Speaker and Members of the House, I rise in opposition to the Amendment for two reasons. First of all,

69th Legislative Day

June 20, 1991

this is an Agreed Bill that was negotiated between both sides of the aisle, between the House and the Senate. I would like to see it stand as it is, and also because the main body of the Bill deals with exactly this question and is the subject that Senator Rigney has devoted a number of years to. He cares very much about keeping that part of the Bill intact and I know he would join me if he were here in asking your defeat of this amendment. I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Steczo."

"Thank you, Madam Speaker, Members of the House. I, too, rise in opposition to Amendment #5. Representative Stern had alluded to the number of hours and the number of years that Senator Rigney has devoted to coming up with the provisions of Senate Bill 922, and he and I had a long conversation yesterday, and his comment was that he felt, too, that the 10% level was the most appropriate one to be placed in this Bill. We now, in our Illinois statutes, have a wide ranging number of backdoor referendum provisions and a wide ranging number of provisions to be able to get those backdoor referendum questions on the ballot. What is worse for our voters and for our taxpayers is being confused by the large, large number of these confusing, confusing requirements that are out there. Senator Rigney has taken months and yes, and maybe even years to do, is to search out all these little, little backdoor referendum provisions and say, we need to standardize them, we need people to know that every time backdoor referendum is called for there is one standard level that is used in the statute. Granted, when that, some are going to be raised, some are going to be lowered. But how'd you like to be in the position of saying, gee, do I need 20% of all registered voters? This

69th Legislative Day

June 20, 1991

makes it 10. Twenty percent of the voters voting in the last election, this makes it 10% of registered voters. 1s it registered voters? Is it people voting the elections? Do I have 5 days? Do I have 15 days? Do I The electorate is so have 30 days? Do I have 45 days? confused, quite often they just throw up their hands and say, forget it! Even though this may mean a tax increase us, forget it, we're not gonna bother, confusing. Senator Rigney has taken all the confusion and has made sense. Voters will know now, every time there's a backdoor referendum, 10% of the voters would be needed. feels that 10% is a logical number to use. Five percent as Representative Pullen asks for this Amendment desirable. Ten percent is the logical choice. has agreed on 10%. I think we should leave it there and I would ask for the defeat of this Amendment."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Myron Olson."

Olson: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I join Representative Stern and Steczo in their description of what we're doing here. Senator Rigney, my Senator in the 35th Legislative District, has been with a number of people, trying to put together these numbers for a long time where the threshold where we can do it. It's time to defeat this Amendment and support the Bill as it was originally written."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative McCracken."

McCracken: "Thank you. I want to say to Representative Steczo, that I hold him in the highest respect on this subject matter and he has helped me pass legislation regarding petition requirements that I could not have passed otherwise and it was only due to his good will that I was able to do that in the past. Now, I was successful in reducing a petition requirement down to seven and one-half

69th Legislative Day

June 20, 1991

percent of the registered voters level of 15 from a That was done a year or two ago, I forget which. That would be raised to 10% by this Bill. But I must say, do not find it compelling that a few people have decided to adopt a 10% standard. I don't believe that's an issue to which we should defer on to self-proclaimed experts. think that each of us is able to determine whether 10% is a good standard or 5% is a better standard. I agree with the desire to standardize in the first place, but I do not find that argument compelling, either. It is not a problem to what the law is. The law does vary, so the find out citizen is required to read, but fortunately, we have a very literate state and people are able to discern the petition requirements as they are currently drawn. unwilling to agree to standardization for its own sake when violence to the petition requirements. The do overwhelming good here is not merely to standardize but to adopt a rational level of requirements. That has to be in favor of the electorate. We have to favor their ability the value of standardization. Over the value of ... How should we say?... our institutional arrogance. Isn't that what it is, really? Don't we really say to the voter that we are in a better position to know, than you? Shouldn't we be, at the lowest practical level, consistent with our desire to not have frivolous referenda? Isn't that our only legitimate reason to set a petition requirement in the first place? That, I believe, I believe 5% is a far more desirable standard. correct. The balance it strikes, if it errs at all, errs in favor of I mean, that's the whole point here, isn't our citizens. it? So let us for once shed our institutional arrogance and go for a number which will facilitate these referenda, but only responsible referenda, and that's what the 5%

69th Legislative Day

June 20, 1991

number does."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Pedersen."

Pedersen: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I have been deeply involved in election process for probably 30 years. I have always felt that it's important to have liberal use of referenda so the people can have their say. I don't think 5% is an inconsequential number and I think I'll agree with the previous speaker who said, if we're going to lean one direction or another on this percentage, we should lean in favor of the people who want to express their views on a referendum matter. So, I would urge support of this. I think it's an improvement and what we're being presented with and I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Pullen, to close."

Pullen: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of House. This Amendment has been characterized by some as going against something that has been agreed to everybody, and I don't know who that 'everybody' is but I would like each of you to ask yourself, did anybody ask you whether you preferred to have this at 10% or anybody ask the taxpayers in your district whether they would prefer to have this at 10% or 5%? If you ask people in your district whether they would prefer to have a difficult calling of a backdoor referendum or one that protected their rights to undo a project that they might not agree with or the spending of their local tax dollars that they might not agree with, what do you think they would say? They're the people who have not been asked, and this Bill makes it harder for them to be asked, for them to answer that question, when the time comes for people to take matters into their own hands about the their property tax dollars. That's what this issue is

69th Legislative Day

June 20, 1991

about. Yes, standardization is a good idea but if it raises the level to cheat the taxpayers out of their opportunity, then maybe standardization is not such a good idea. I would urge you to adopt this Amendment so that we can standardize, which is a good idea, at the proper level and not pass a standardizing Bill that hurts taxpayers. This Amendment gives us the opportunity to vote for a good proposal to standardize the backdoor referendum signature requirements. I ask again for a recorded Roll Call and I appreciate your consideration and your attention to this debate."

- Speaker Satterthwaite: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #5 be adopted?' All those in favor vote 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Schoenberg wishes to vote 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 40 voting 'yes', 69 voting 'no', 4 voting 'present' and the Amendment fails. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #6, offered by Representative Doederlein, Pullen and McCracken."
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Doederlein."
- Doederlein: "Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House.

 If we are serious about trying to keep property taxes down,
 then we have to have Amendment #6 to Senate Bill 922 which
 requires park districts making capital expenditures of
 \$1,000,000. or more, for construction improvements to real
 estate, to publish the proposal, hold a public hearing and
 allow an opportunity for a backdoor referendum."
- Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative, excuse me...

 Representative Steczo, for what reason do you arise."
- Steczo: "Madam Speaker, has Amendment #6 been printed and distributed?"

69th Legislative Day

June 20, 1991

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Has Amendment #6 been printed and distributed? He indicates it has been. Proceed, Representative Doederlein."

Doederlein: "Again, are you serious about helping the taxpayers? If you are, then this amendment has to QΟ on. Amendment 6 to House Bill 922. It requires park districts making capital expenditures of \$1,000,000. or more construction improvements to real estate to publish the proposal, hold a public hearing and allow an opportunity backdoor referendums on the proposed expenditures. Now, this requirement is only on construction improvements to real estate. It does not apply to the purchase of land for open space. I believe that this is a good Amendment. In fact, this was Senate Bill 488 that passed out of the Senate 56 to 3. I believe we need this Amendment so the taxpayers know what their taxes are going for. you very much. I would ask for a Roll Call."

Speaker Satterthwaite: Representative Stern."

Stern: "Madam Speaker and Members of the House. Ι rise in opposition to this Amendment for some of the same reasons I in opposition to the previous one. Once again, I would like to say that the election law committee regularly and never did this appear before us. I did not hear it discussed. It's my understanding that this issue was defeated in the Executive Committee of the House this year. Once again, it would unravel the main Bill which is negotiated and agreed to Bill noncontroversial election subjects. I ask your rejection of this Amendment and a 'no' vote."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Myron Olson."

Olson: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I think the Amendment is not drafted too well. It certainly does not define what new capital projects are,

69th Legislative Day

June 20, 1991

nor does it indicate any of those that might be underway. Are they lumped together to hit the million dollar figure, or which way are they gonna go? Therefore, I would suggest we reject the Amendment."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Steczo."

Steczo: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Members of the House. I also rise in opposition to Amendment #6. I think we in the House have found out this year that when the Senate has passed Bills 58 to nothing, and 56 to 3, and we've had a chance to review those proposals over here, we have found how poorly drafted and what poor proposals those Senate Bills actually were. A number of them have been held in our committees. A number of them have been defeated, as this one was, in our own House Committee. In actuality, what this Bill would do, would completely and utterly destroy the ability of park districts to make even the simplest decisions about capital expenditures and capital plans. I think it's not an idea for our time and I think that it would, in fact, destroy what we're trying to do with Senate Bill 922, so I would urge its defeat, as well."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Wennlund."

Wennlund: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Amendment just singles out one local government entity and that's park districts, and that's wrong. If you want to treat the problem, treat all of the problem. This is a horrible way to do it and it places a horrible burden on park districts in Illinois, unfairly, as opposed to everyone else. I urge the defeat of this Amendment."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative McCracken."

McCracken: "Thank you. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Satterthwaite: "He indicates he will."

McCracken: "This does not require a referendum on the subject,

69th Legislative Day

June 20, 1991

does it?"

Doederlein: "No."

McCracken: "It merely allows for a referendum if the petition requirements are met by the citizens."

Doederlein: "Right."

McCracken: "And, it is possible for park districts, under current law, to make expenditures in excess of \$1,000,000. for capital improvements without the opportunity for any referenda under any circumstances, currently. Is that not right?"

Doederlein: "Right."

McCracken: "And, has this come to your attention, this issue, as a result of your personal experience as a Legislator?"

Doederlein: "Yes. In my own district... recreation, a complex was built at no cost to the voters. This is the way it was sold, no cost to the voters, no referendum. The park district built it by overbudgeting for several years. They did build this and then it came to the attention that we had to staff it, we had to put new furniture in, we had to do the staffing of this, and then we got a tax on top of this. It, also in my area there is a swimming pool that's probably going to be built, and the people have voted on an advisory referendum that it wasn't supposed to be built, so, I think that this Bill is necessary for the taxpayers protection."

McCracken: "Contrary to the statements made, I don't think this portends dire consequences for park districts. I don't think it's so irrational or insulting. My son just took a dive. Are you okay? I don't find it so insulting that we give the citizens the right to address substantial capital improvement expenditure issues by reference to a backdoor referendum... and now the seat is up and he says he's fine... Thank you for that light moment, Michael. It

69th Legislative Day

June 20, 1991

should not detract from the gravity of the issue. We are not insulting park districts, we are lauding the taxpayer, it's as simple as that. We're not requiring a referendum. If there is not a citizen outcry, then there will be no inconvenience. That's all."

Speaker Satterthwaite: "Representative Tony Young in the chair."

Speaker Young: "Representative Preston."

Preston: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. That young man was lost earlier on this side of the aisle and I asked if his parents were in the chamber. I would not have sent him back to his father had I known the boy was going to be abused on that side of the aisle."

Speaker Young: "Representative Hartke."

Hartke: "Thank...thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I applaud what the Sponsor is trying to do, but I think that it just points to the fact that in many cases, the local government officials, whether it be park districts or what, sometimes get out of hand, and I think that's why it's important that when local elections are elected that we elect the right officials, and she's trying to correct it with a matter down here that could be handled locally, and I urge the defeat of this Amendment."

Speaker Young: "Representative Doederlein, to close."

Doederlein: "Thank you very much for this opportunity to talk to you about this Amendment. This did have a fair hearing. I believe everyone that was sitting in on the hearing really wanted to vote for this Bill because they really are for the taxpayers. However, somewhere along the line there was a little mark on somebody's paper, and there was a very lively discussion for this Amendment or this Bill, this was Senate Bill 488. Are we for the taxpayers? If we are, you will vote for this Amendment. This is for the taxpayers, and I would ask for a Roll Call vote. Certainly, this is

69th Legislative Day

- June 20, 1991
- for your own people in your own community. Thank you very much."
- Speaker Young: "The question is, 'Shall the House adopt Floor Amendment #6 to House Bill...Senate Bill 922?' Those in favor, vote 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 27 voting 'yes', 83 voting 'no', and the Amendment fails. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #7, offered by Representatives

 Doederlein, Pullen and McCracken."
- Speaker Young: "Representative Doederlein."
- Doederlein: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is Amendment #7 to Senate Bill 922. I believe this is an Amendment that you cannot disagree with. If a park district has submitted an advisory public question to the voters of the district..."
- Speaker Young: "Excuse me...excuse me, Representative Doederlein.

 Representative Steczo, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"
- Steczo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. An inquiry of the Chair. Has the...Amendment been printed and distributed?"
- Speaker Young: "Yes, the Amendment has been printed and distributed. Representative Doederlein."
- Doederlein: "Again, if the park district has submitted an advisory public question to the voters of the district requesting that a project or series of projects be built for the park district, and a majority of the voters of the district voting on that advisory public question rejected that project or series of projects to be built, the district may not build any part of the proposed project or series of projects unless a back door referendum is held to approve the building of the project or series of projects.

69th Legislative Day

June 20, 1991

When an advisory public question is on the ballot and fails, it seems to me that the public is disenfranchised when the wishes are not considered. I ask you for a Roll Call vote and your favorable vote on this Bill...this Amendment."

Speaker Young: "The Lady from Lake, Representative Stern."

Stern: "Madam Speaker and Members of the House. Once again, I must rise in opposition. This is a Bill that has not been heard before this last minute addition as an Amendment. I think that it should be taken up, perhaps, at greater lengths next year, and I would certainly support the Lady's effort to have it heard, but I think this is not the time to add it to a package that has already been negotiated and agreed to between the two aisles and the two Houses of the chamber. I ask your 'no' vote on this Amendment."

Speaker Young: "The Gentleman from Lee, Representative Myron Olson."

Olson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I join Representative Stern in suggesting rejection of this Amendment. Just keep this one simple thing in mind: This suggestion here would make a non-binding referendum a binding referendum, and that isn't what we have in mind. Please vote 'no'."

Speaker Young: "Representative Steczo."

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

Speaker Young: "Indicates she will yield for a question."

Steczo: "Representative Doederlein, you are saying in this

Amendment that if an...if a park district proposes a

project or projects, an advisory referendum is held?"

Doederlein: "Right."

Steczo: "If the advisory referendum fails, then the park district cannot embark upon that project or any in the series of those projects?"

69th Legislative Day

June 20, 1991

Doederlein: "The project that was voted on on an advisory referendum, yes."

Steczo: "Okay, let's...let's take both of now those circumstances. Let's say there's a project, and let's say they want to build an auditorium or a gymnasium for the kids and they want to include stands and everything else, and during the debate... during the debate of the issue, in community, people...people indicate to the district, for instance, 'Well, your plan might be grandiose, it might be too large. Scale it back, it'll be okay', but the people don't have a chance to vote on that particular project. The referendum fails, but because of the discussion and dialogue that went on during the referendum, they decide to take on a scaled-back project.

That would be impermissible under this Bill, correct?"

Doederlein: "That's right, because they could have another referendum."

Steczo: "They can have another referendum?"

Doederlein: "'Cause how do they know the wishes of the public?

If the public says that they did not want this, then they should come back and have another referendum on the smaller scaled—down project."

Steczo: "But the referendum does not have all the options that...that one would normally have. So, if you want to build a swimming pool in...in May or April, and you have the referendum in March, and you learn from the constituency that perhaps the plans might be too grandiose, your next opportunity for a referendum is in November. It's going to do you a hell of a lot of good to build a swimming pool in November."

Doederlein: "Well, I hope we don't ignore the wishes of our citizenry."

Steczo: "Now, let me ask another question. There's a series of

69th Legislative Day

June 20, 1991

projects and an advisory referendum is held and people may object to one of those projects. This would disallow...this would disallow any of those...any of those projects from being built?"

Doederlein: "I would hope that the park district would know what they are putting on the ballot, and if they put everything together, then they would...might be spending that much..."

Steczo: "But, that's what this Amendment says? Correct?"

Doederlein: "That's right."

Steczo: "That's correct."

Doederlein: "And they can go for another referendum. They can scale it down."

Steczo: "So, in my...in my district where I have multi-racial areas, and if there are problems in the community, I might find, because of a referendum like this, that some of the neediest neighborhoods in my district or any one of the cities, could not be served because the...the defeat of this referendum could cause...could cause the...you know...could cause outdoor facilities or anything else not to be approved and not to be built in poor areas. Because those who can afford it, don't want it, so the people that don't have it are denied. So, that would be the effect of this, correct?"

Doederlein: "It seems to me that all the taxpayers would have to pay for all of the...the improvements, so even the taxpayers who are in the poor districts have taxes. Remember, that the...our park district is the second highest taxing body in our area. Our constituents are wondering, 'Where do these taxes come from'? They come from the local communities. We want the local citizens to be informed. I think if there is an informed citizenry, we would have a better government. Let's take the taxpayers advice."

69th Legislative Day

June 20, 1991

Steczo: "To the Amendment, Mr. Speaker. Just to say that...that we in the...in a Republic form of government entrust certain decisions to our elected officials. We expect that even during a referendum process, they will...they will understand the wishes and the will of their community to the extent possible and to...and to know that, if their community may not like a project, that the community lets them know during the referendum process perhaps that they should scale it back. That in fact, the officials may do Otherwise, we just might as well abolish park that. districts and cities and villages and townships counties and then do everything by referendum. We need to entrust the ability to judge in those local officials are elected to do that job, and I would encourage a 'no' vote for this Amendment."

Speaker Young: "Representative Doederlein to close."

Doederlein: "The trouble is that all of our elected officials are not elected at one time on the park district board, and therefore, we have issues, rather than those that are competent to hold the office and...and think about the taxpayers. We need to take the taxpayers into our fold and...ask...tell them what we're doing. Inform them what we want, and, therefore, I would ask for a 'yes' vote on this Amendment and a Roll Call, please."

Speaker Young: "The question is, 'Shall the House adopt Floor Amendment #7 to Senate Bill 922?' Those in favor, vote 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 17 voting 'yes', 88 voting 'no', and Floor Amendment #7 fails. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Young: "Third Reading. We will now go to the Order of

69th Legislative Day

June 20, 1991

Government Operations, Third Reading. First Bill on that Order, Senate Bill 11. Out of the record. Senate Bill 257, Representative Giglio. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 257, a Bill for an Act to amend the Metropolitan Water Reclamation District Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Young: "Representative Giglio."

Giglio: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Bill 257 is the Bill that amends the Metropolitan Water Reclamation District and requires that by 1994 the trustees of the district be elected from each of the nine suburb districts, rather than at large. As you know, right now, they are elected in Cook County at large. This would...would break it down where they would have single member districts. Senate Amendment #2 broke it down that the Bill...that the elected officials would be staggered. There was another Amendment on here, that was put on other day, which would give the superintendent or the elected officials the...the authority to hire various officers at the district. I think in this day and age, and what we're doing now with all the...with the districts and with redistricting, as far as our congressional map, judicial map and also our own maps, that it's only fair those people that from that are elected the metropolitan...the Water Reclamation District be elected in I know in the area where I come from that we districts. have no representation. We have more than three-thirds projects and three-thirds of the work that goes on in the...in the Water Reclamation District are out in the yet, we don't have not area and, have suburban representation. I think the time has come that...that this Bill should be passed and the people given an opportunity to have an elected official from all parts of Cook County."

69th Legislative Day

June 20, 1991

Speaker Young: "Representative Giglio."

Giglio: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I informed the Body with some misinformation, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, there was...the Amendment that was put on actually gutted the Bill. It became a shell Bill, and the only Amendment that went on the Bill was the Lang Amendment, which allowed the elected officials to appoint the officers of the sanitary districts. The subdistricts and that are not in the Bill. We were hoping that this would become a...a...Bill that could go back to the Senate, hopefully, we can work out if we're going to go to single member districts in the Conference Committee. So therefore, I would ask for your support."

Speaker Young: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Ronan."

Ronan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Gentleman yield for a few questions?"

Speaker Young: "He indicates he will yield."

Ronan: "Yeah, Representative Giglio, why'd you put this Amendment on, and why are you trying to move the Bill?"

Giglio: "Pardon?"

Ronan: "What's the purpose behind this Amendment and the Bill?"

Giglio: "The purpose behind the Amendment is to get it back to the Senate, and, hopefully, that a Conference Committee will...will be set up so we can get the...both sides of the Legislature and both sides of the aisle on...and the two Houses together and, hopefully, come up with districts where we can have single member districts of the Water Reclamation District."

Ronan: "But that has nothing to do with the intent of the legislation that you're bringing forth. My question is not the procedural responsibility of how we move a Bill between the House and the Senate. The concept that deals here with the structure of the Sanitary District. What's the purpose

69th Legislative Day

June 20, 1991

behind that? You're saying what you want to do is strip some of the powers away from the general superintendent and give them to the board. My question...well, let me ask two questions. Does the general superintendent want you to do this?"

Giglio: "Does the general superintendent want me to do what?"

Ronan: "Sponsor this legislation."

Giglio: "Well, I'm the original Sponsor without the Amendment that was put on about...about...stripping the general superintendent of his authority. My intent, at the time when I got it, when it came from the Senate, was that to make it a Bill that we could bring it back to the...to the Senate and, hopefully, talk about single member districts. Now, what happened after that, it wasn't my Amendment. I have to live with it and hopefully it'll go back and we can talk about it, and if they want to take it off and go to single member districts, fine. But at this point in time, I have no control over it...over the Amendment that's on it."

Ronan: "Well then, Representative, at this point it appears that the intent of what you want to achieve is not in this legislation. If I were you, I'd move to table the Bill at this point, because what you want to achieve should be done through a different piece of legislation. My question is, you're trying to change the structural authority of the Metropolitan Sanitary...or the Water Reclamation District. I want to know, is this something that the General Superintendent is in support of?"

Giglio: "I...I have no idea of what the general superintendent supports or what he doesn't support."

Ronan: "Well then, let me inform you. I don't want you to be uninformed because you are one of the brighter Members of the General Assembly. The general superintendent is not in

69th Legislative Day

June 20, 1991

support of this. Alright, if the general superintendent is not in support of it, and you want to give the power away from him to the board, let me ask you a second question. Does this board support this concept?"

Giglio: "I can't answer that because I don't know. I just talk to the people out in the area of Cook County that want representation. That's all I know."

Ronan: "Let me answer the second question for you because, again, you are one of the brighter Members of the General The board is also opposed to the legislation. Assembly. So now you've got a situation where you want to accomplish something, but this has nothing to do with the Bill that we're dealing with right now. My advice is, why don't we take the Bill back to Second, strip off this Amendment, put on whatever you want, send it to the Senate and then deal with the issue that you want to deal with? This is a bad concept, what you're trying to establish here. In 1967, as you remember, when you were a very young man, there was a major scandal at the Sanitary District. That scandal involved over political involvement at the board. Consequently, there was a reform package put together to clarify this, to give the general superintendent certain powers, to give the board certain powers. This flies the face of what was achieved back then. This is a bad concept. It makes no sense for it to move out of General Assembly. I have no problems with what you're trying to achieve through another concept. Why don't take this bad Amendment off, and let's move ahead with what you want to accomplish? That's all I'm asking you to do. The bottom line is, the Water Reclamation District, board that you want to empower, doesn't want the power. The general superintendent that you want to strip doesn't want that to happen. It's not good public policy. It

69th Legislative Day

Lanq:

June 20, 1991

makes no sense. I would move that this Bill should be killed. If you want to accomplish something on another piece of legislation, let's go out and do that. Thank you very much."

Speaker Young: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Lang."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Amendments on this Bill are my Amendments. Yes, there was a scandal in this board many years ago, and as a result of that scandal, the General Assembly, in what I feel is sort of a knee jerk reaction, stripped the board of its powers and gave the powers to a general superintendent. But that was a mistake, Ladies and Gentlemen, and it's a mistake for obvious reasons. No elected board should be able to delegate its authority to hire important department heads to another person. You wouldn't want the Governor to have his Chief of Staff appointing the head of IDOT or the head of the Department of Public Aid. You wouldn't want nonelected official, who is involved with the General Assembly, to make decisions on whether we should raise income taxes. We do that. We make those decisions. the general superintendent of the Water Reclamation District hires people, and some of them are making over \$100,000 a year, that superintendent is not accountable to The members of that board are accountable to the voters. the voters. They should be held accountable to us; should be held accountable in the statute to make the decisions that they have to make to hire the appropriate people to run the district. It's a red herring! doesn't matter that the general superintendent doesn't want stripped of his power. Of course the superintendent doesn't want to be stripped of his powers. That goes without saying. The lobbyist for him that have been working the floor for the last several days are paid

69th Legislative Day

June 20, 1991

by him. They're chosen by him to come and lobby you. Of course he doesn't want to be stripped of that power. As it relates to the board, let me tell you that I have spoken to board members who privately tell me they want this power. They tell you...the public posture is they don't want power because they don't want to buck the superintendent. The fact is, they want the power, and let me tell you, elected officials, that elected officials should want responsibility. You should want the power responsibility to make choices that affect the people you So the issue is not who wants this power, issue is who should have the power. And who should have the power is the elected officials that the people in Cook County elect to represent them, that's the issue here. issue here is whether the representatives of the people will make the decisions that affect that board. People are hired that...that...whose salaries total thousands upon thousands of dollars and they're not accountable to the voters. We should have...we should have only the elected officials there making those decisions. Please vote 'aye'."

"The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Kubik." Speaker Young: you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Kubik: "Thank House. First of all, I'd like to tell the Members...if you look up at the board the Bill says, 'Giglio-Kubik'. I have filed a slip to remove my name from the Bill. Ι the underlying concept, which is...which was removed from this Bill, which is to create a redistricting process Sanitary District. This Bill does not do that at all anymore, so it's a bad Bill. It's turned out to Representative Giglio, a good concept turned to a bad concept. We have other vehicles which we can to...to push forward the issue of the redistricting process

69th Legislative Day

June 20, 1991

Sanitary District or the Water Reclamation the District. Now, I know a Gentleman on the other side of the aisle who put these Amendments on, argues that the board privately is...is for this Amendment. Well, the only thing we can do is take their word publicly. And publicly they're lobbying against this Bill, and the reality is, Ladies and Gentlemen, that the Sanitary District, up until the recent few years, has been a source of great and has been a source of many political problems and many...unfortunate scandals. Lately, it has been run well. Lately, it has been run as an award-winning agency. relationship between the general superintendent and the board is an excellent one. Ι might point out that board selects the general superintendent, and they select him with the idea that he or she will make these kinds of decisions in a proper manner. So they are not uninterested They are participating in this process, and they are doing it right. You know, there's an old saw 'If isn't broke, don't fix it', and this is very appropriate in There is no reason, other than an internal this case. power struggle between a couple of people, that we should change this particular law. It was not a knee jerk reaction in the late '60s to change this concept Sanitary District. It was the result of a major scandal, and it shouldn't be changed. So, while I supported the Bill originally and...and I think Representative Giglio had a good idea, and I think it's an idea we ought to continue discussions on, and that is to create a...a redistricting process for the Sanitary District, this Bill doesn't do it. would urge my colleagues on the Republican side of the aisle to oppose this Bill. It is a bad Bill. It makes agency unduly political, and we ought to defeat this Bill."

Speaker Young: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative McAuliffe."

69th Legislative Day

June 20, 1991

McAuliffe: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I've talked to a number of members of the board. I talked to one that lives in my ward. She asked me to oppose this concept, and I'm here today to say that I'm opposed to it because of talking to the board members. Sanitary District is doing a good job. I recall years ago when there was a lot of scandals there, but currently they're doing a good job. They're cleaning up the rivers. They're doing a good job in the forest preserves, and the Des Plaines River. There's actually fish swimming there now where there used to be just garbage. So they're doing a good job, and I see no reason to change it at this time."

Speaker Young: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative Steczo."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I, too, Steczo: rise in opposition to Senate Bill 257. Representative Kubik and Representative Ronan cited the scandals of the mid '60s that caused this General Assembly to change the rules as they relate to the Sanitary District. So what we did...what we did, I think, is something that professionalism within the Sanitary District or the Water Reclamation District, as it's called now. So we have a board that's an elected board, and that board has the responsibility to do what board members should. To establish policy, to award contracts and to appoint overseers for the district: the general superintendent, the treasurer, who both serve at the pleasure of the board. the general superintendent, not the board members, responsible for the day to day operation of management of the Water Reclamation District and they also appoint keep in mind, and this is the heads. But important thing, that those board members still have advice and consent powers. The general superintendent appoints, the board members do approve those appointments.

69th Legislative Day

June 20, 1991

reform legislation, which was significant, that we passed in 1967 has provided an effective working relationship district's political between the leaders and professional staff. So, they have provided a professional staff that has created actually an award-winning organization. So, I quess...I quess in opposing...in opposing this Bill, I would say, 'Lead them not into temptation', and let us not go back to the days in 1967 when the district was so scandal ridden. It works well now. It should stay that way, and I urge a 'no' vote."

- Speaker Young: "Representative Giglio. Representative Giglio.

 Would you like to close or maybe return to Second Reading?"
- Giglio: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It doesn't look like I got much to close with after all those great speeches. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to move to take the Bill back to Second and ask that the appropriate rule so I can take the Amendment off, and it'll go back to the original concept of what I had."
- Speaker Young: "The Gentleman asks leave of the Body to return this Bill to Second Reading for purposes of a Motion. Does he have leave? He has leave. Second. Read the Bill on Second, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "This Bill's been read a second time previously.

 Amendments #1, 2 and 3 have been adopted."
- Speaker Young: "Representative Giglio."
- Giglio: "Mr. Speaker, there seems to be a lot of confusion. Can we take it out of the record?"
- Speaker Young: "Out of the record. Senate Bill 441. Currie. Representative Representative Currie. Representative Currie. Out of the record. Senate Bill 535, Representative Richmond. Out of the record. Senate Bill 843, Representative Capparelli. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1076, Representative Bugielski. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

69th Legislative Day

June 20, 1991

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1076, a Bill for an Act to amend the Forest Preserve District Tax Levy Validation Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Young: "Representative Bugielski."

Bugielski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Senate Bill 1076 is a Bill that has been introduced and passed every year for over two...two decades. All it does is validate, by state law, the Fiscal Year 90 appropriation ordinance and tax levy of both the Cook County Board and all forest preserve districts in Illinois. In validating these ordinances, all the Bill says is that the procedural and technical requirements have been met. It does not, and I emphasize not, validate tax levies that are in excess of maximum rates. The purpose of this Bill is to preempt any lawsuit which would seek to invalidate an appropriation or tax levy ordinance on technical grounds, and I ask for your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Young: "The Gentleman has moved for passage of Senate Bill 1076. On that question, the Lady from Cook, Representative Pullen."

Pullen: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wonder whether the Gentleman would answer a couple of questions?"

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

Pullen: "What are the technical grounds that would be taken away from people...from taxpayers in filing protests against their property taxes under this?"

Bugielski: "What are the technical grounds?"

Pullen: "Yes."

Bugielski: "This is just...so in case there's a lawsuit. Every year this Bill comes up and they just add the next year."

Pullen: "Yes, I know. What are the technical grounds that this would validate. What are the illegalities in the appropriation and tax levy ordinance that this Bill seeks

69th Legislative Day

June 20, 1991

to validate after the fact?"

Bugielski: "Could you repeat the question?"

Pullen: "What are the illegalities in the appropriation and tax levy ordinances that this Bill seeks to validate after the fact?"

Bugielski: "We don't know of any specific illegalities."

Pullen: "Why is it necessary to validate the appropriations and tax levy ordinances after the fact, if they have been adopted validly as you suggest by saying that you don't know of any illegalities?"

Bugielski: "This is to preempt any lawsuit."

Pullen: "Who would be bringing the lawsuit?"

Bugielski: "I don't know. It could be forest preserve district, it could be anyone."

Pullen: "The forest preserve district would be the plaintiff in a lawsuit against its own appropriations and tax levy ordinance? Who would be the plaintiff?"

Bugielski: "We don't know."

. Pullen: "What type of plaintiffs would there be? Didn't you say that it would prevent lawsuits by taxpayers, in the event of an illegality or some invalidity in the appropriation and tax levy ordinance?"

Bugielski: "These are all technical."

Pullen: "No, I'm asking who the plaintiffs would be. Didn't you indicate earlier that it would be the taxpayers, individual taxpayers?"

Bugielski: "It's for the wealthy people that can afford the tax lawyers."

Pullen: "It would be taxpayers, wouldn't it? Because they would be the only ones who would be aggrieved if there were illegalities in the adoption of a tax levy or appropriation ordinance?"

Bugielski: "Taxpayers that are wealthy enough to make it worth

69th Legislative Day

June 20, 1991

their while."

Pullen: "Well Sir, I do serve on the Legal Services Corporation Board, and I know that there are...that there are lawyers provided for indigent people in this country and in this state as well, so I'm not sure that your answer that Mr. Steczo has given you is really responsive to my question. Speaker, I would like to address the Bill, please. The Gentleman is correct that this is something that done annually. Every year there's another year added to this statute that was adopted by some General Assembly foggy distance of memory, when no one was looking, obviously, because what this statute actually does is as the Gentleman indicated, prevent taxpayers from being able to file lawsuits in protest of their property taxes. Now, that doesn't include all lawsuits. I wouldn't go so far as to say that, but it does include property taxpayers protesting their taxes on the basis that the appropriation and tax levy ordinance was adopted in some illegal manner. years past when I have asked questions about this Bill, Sponsors have received information and provided it that one example of illegality could be the failure of the county or the forest preserve board to line item their appropriations ordinances. I found that, at the time, to be interesting answer because it indicates to me that the law of this state requires the county and the forest preserve district to adopt ordinances for their budget, appropriation and tax levy ordinance, that have line just as we have to do for our state budget. The state law requires that, but the county and the Forest Preserve Board never follow that state law. They lump sum their appropriations. They do not want to provide line items because that would reduce their flexibility spending. Well, we provide line items. We are required to

69th Legislative Day

June 20, 1991

so that people will understand what the money is being spent for and so that the bureaucracy will be limited in their flexibility on spending. But what this legislation does is, after the county board and the forest preserve board have adopted an illegally broad, vague appropriation and tax levy ordinance, with vast lump sums without the itemization that this General Assembly requires by then we come back, or some of you come back, and say, 'That's okay, they didn't have to follow the law to begin I would suggest, Ladies and Gentlemen, that a more proper piece of legislation would be to change the law that requires line iteming of appropriations and tax ordinance in counties and forest preserves. That law that exists now is to protect the taxpayers, but they are not protected, because every year the General Assembly comes along and says, 'We didn't really mean that'. I'm sure the Gentleman is well intended. After all, he's just sponsoring a Bill that this House does every year or sometimes every two years because I make this such a painful process. But the Gentleman's Bill, unfortunately, unknowingly to him, cheats the public of their opportunity to protest their taxes...their property taxes, on the basis illegally adopted appropriations and of tax levy ordinances, and I would urge a 'no' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Young: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Steczo."

Steczo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I rise in support of Senate Bill 1076, and what the previous speaker mentioned is not all wrong. However, we find ourselves in this unusual situation of not knowing exactly which method to take. In fact, the suggestion that was made that this General Assembly should come back and say, 'We ought to just abolish the ability of the...of the downstate forest preserve districts and the County of Cook and the Cook

69th Legislative Day

June 20, 1991

County Forest Preserve District'. To just not line item, I think, would be ...would be a...something that would be unfair to the taxpayers because by validating, by allowing them to do their appropriation first. we have an opportunity to review exactly what they have done to make sure that nothing outrageous, in fact, has gone on. The validation process was begun under Governor Ogilvie's administration back in 1966 and '67, and what it does, this Bill is intended to take care of situations where there's been technical objections. For instance, in DuPage County a couple of years ago, this Bill also affects the County Forest Preserve District, there was a situation where the president of the forest preserve district, signing the levy ordinance, forgot to put his middle name on the...on the...when signing the ordinance, on the paper. There was a tax objection filed because that was an apparent violation of the state law. That's the kind of a thing that this Bill is... is attempting to try to correct. information has been given...has been given to We, also, hear that in Cook County, people... in order to publish, in order to instance. publish according to law, the information by line item it would cause an amount to be printed that would equal seven Chicago telephone books. Now, just think of the expense of doing that and think of what that would mean in terms property tax increases that people would pay just to pay for the publishing. So we have to attempt here to trv to bridge that gap. There's case law on the issue. The case law is extremely confusing, so the only alternative that we have is to come to the General Assembly, after the fact, say, 'We have reviewed what you have done. While not strictly in conformance with the state law, in spirit have complied. Because you have complied in spirit, we

69th Legislative Day

June 20, 1991

will then validate those ordinances'. That's all this thing does. For people that have legitimate tax objections, they are not affected by this Bill in the very least, and we should all vote 'yes'."

Speaker Young: "Representative Bugielski, to close."

Bugielski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. You've heard in the debate all this is is just a technical Bill that updates and makes the corrections in there and it's gotta be done periodically, every year or every two years, and all we're doing is adding the 1990 Fiscal Year to this, and I ask for your favorable vote."

Speaker Young: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1076 pass?'

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

Voting is open. This is final passage. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 86 voting 'yes', 25 voting 'no', and 3 voting 'present'. Senate Bill 1076, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of Insurance, Third Reading, appears Senate Bill 267, Representative William Peterson. Representative Peterson."

Peterson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 267 represents a package of insurance regulatory proposals recommended by the Department of Insurance. The Bill, as amended, contains: (1) a model law and credit for a reinsurance (2) a model law on financial examinations (3) a model law on reinsurance intermediaries and (4) financial regulatory replacement that goes to regulation over reinsurance intermediaries. who serve as agents or brokers It requires the department to reinsurance companies. perform a financial examination once, at least once every five years for all companies. The Bill is supported by the major insurance companies, Allstate and State Farm;

69th Legislative Day

June 20, 1991

other companies, American Family, Farmers-Kemper, the Associations, Life Insurance Council are all neutral on the Bill. I ask for a favorable Roll Call, Senate Bill 267."

Speaker Young: "Read the Bill a third time, Mr. Clerk."

- Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 267, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Insurance Code. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Young: "The Gentleman has moved for passage of Senate
 Bill 267. On that question, the Gentleman from Bureau,
 Representative Mautino."
- "Thank you very...thank you very much, Mr. Speaker Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 267 is the .attempt by this General Assembly and through the Amendments that were provided both in the committee and on the House floor to address a question of solvency as it pertains to domestic and foreign the the companies operate...foreign insurance companies that operate within the State of Illinois. The establishment of an established fee, \$16,000 and \$25,000 as it pertains to the foreign domestic corporations, is one that is a step in the right direction whereby the elimination occurs of the...the expense falling on only that company that is examined during that five to seven year period. This way we will have the dedicated fund established for ongoing solvency questions and (2) and we also address the...the amount of outside investment by percentage basis and lower that to maintain that solvency question that is most important in a country today. I stand in support of Senate Bill 267, as presented and amended, and I ask all of you to join with us."
- Speaker Young: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Parcells."
- Parcells: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I, too, as the Minority spokesman on the Insurance

69th Legislative Day

June 20, 1991

Committee, rise in favor of this. This will help the State of Illinois to maintain its status as a certified state for the purposes of insurance regulation. At a time when solvency is very important to all of us and in the forefront of our thoughts, it's important that the health of our financial institutions is kept high, and this package will enhance that solvency regulation, and it's very timely. We have Allstate and State Farm in favor of it, and we know of no one that's opposed to it. Most of the other companies are neutral saying that this is a good idea and won't cost them any more money, so I would ask for your 'aye' vote for Senate Bill 267 as amended."

Speaker Young: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Rice."

Rice: "May I ask the...question of the former speaker?"

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

Rice: "In creating a dedicated fund, are we diverting funds from the General Revenue?"

Keane: "No. It reduces General Revenue, but it does not create a dedicated fund."

Rice: "It does not create a dedicated fund? I heard the Gentleman...prior Gentleman say it did create a dedicated fund."

Keane: "The fund is already created. It's going into an already created fund."

Rice: "Are you increasing that fund?"

Keane: "Yes."

Rice: "How much money are we increasing?"

Keane: "It would generate \$1.6 million in new revenues."

Rice: "One point six million dollars and this state is in trouble now? Can we afford such a luxury?"

Keane: "It's from the insurance companies, not from the General Revenue Fund."

69th Legislative Day

June 20, 1991

Rice: "Most money that comes to the General Revenue Fund comes from other sources, Sir."

Keane: "This source is the companies themselves, Representative."

"You identified...you said certain companies were Rice: Golden State for one company is not...I agreement, mean...Golden Rule for one company is not in agreement. also think that at this particular time, we can't afford the luxury to divert funds from the General...divert monies for a dedicated fund from the General Revenue, and I don't think it's...I think it's erroneous to stand and tell this Body that all the companies are satisfied. You identified certain companies like Allstate and Kemper. Those giants, which this is only a drop in the bucket to them, but as I indicated in the committee, there was smaller companies that couldn't afford it. I suggest that this Body reads the fact sheet and deal with it and vote their conscience, on the other hand, but I suggest you vote 'no'."

Keane: "The monies that are generated will be generated by the companies to the fund. It will mean that there will be less GRF funds used. So we're not taking money out of GRF.

The companies themselves will be paying their way for the examinations and the other parts of the Bill, as enacted."

Speaker Young: "The Gentleman from Effingham, Representative Hartke."

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

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

Hartke: "Is it my understanding by this piece of legislation that you intend to bypass the appropriations process to take a greater amount of this dedicated fund directly to the Department of Insurance?"

Rice: "No, Sir. Every dollar has to be appropriated by this General Assembly."

69th Legislative Day June 20, 1991

Hartke: "Is there a matching appropriation level in the...the insurance budget?"

Rice: "Would you restate the question?"

Hartke: "Well, if you're requesting more funds... this is not an appropriation Bill, is it?"

Rice: "No."

Hartke: "This is a substantive piece of legislation. I asked is there a line item in the...in the budget request for the Department of Insurance for this amount of funds to be given to them this year?"

Rice: "It's designed to take place in Fiscal Year 1993, not in the fiscal year coming up."

Hartke: "This sets up the process then where it will automatically go into that fund. Is that not correct?"

Rice: "Correct."

Hartke: "What it is then is an increase in that fund that the insurance companies will be paying in the coming year."

Rice: "Yes, the insurance companies will be paying it."

Hartke: "That will be a tax increase, then for them?"

Rice: "No, it's not a tax increase. It's coming from the insurance companies. The assessment's coming from the insurance companies."

Hartke: "Okay. To the Bill: I still want to oppose this piece of legislation. I don't think we have the problems in the insurance industry, as indicated by a couple of previous speakers, and I think that it will cost the insurance companies in the State of Illinois \$1.6 million in 1993, as indicated, and I'm opposed to this piece of legislation."

Speaker Young: "For an announcement, Representative Hicks and Ryder request leave of the Body for the Public Safety and Infrastructure Appropriations Committee to meet while the House is in Session for the purposes of passing one Bill. So, do they have leave? By use of the Attendance Roll

69th Legislative Day

June 20, 1991

Call, leave is granted, and the Public Safety and Infrastructure Committee will meet immediately in the Speaker's conference room for the purpose of passing one Bill. On Senate Bill 267, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Parke."

Parke: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Would the Sponsor of this Bill yield for a question?"

Speaker Young: "He indicates he will."

Parke: "Representative Peterson, I would like to address the underlying Bill. I understand the concern about a dedicated fund concept..."

Peterson: "Representative, I can't hear you."

Parke: "I'm sorry. I understand the concern of some companies that...such as Golden Rule and some other insurance groups that have a concern about the philosophy of a dedicated fund. However, it is my understanding that this is a department Bill that underlines a concern with the NAIC, the National Association Insurance Commissioners, which have established certain guidelines that the states must comply with over a certain period of time to get validation of having insurance issued in the state...the various states. Perhaps we might talk about the underlying Bill and the importance that it is to the insurance holders of this state. Can you just take and...about a minute to tell how this Bill applies to the NAIC model?"

Peterson: "I understand that the state just received certification by NAIC, but we also were asked to put this legislation in to bring us up to the standards that are going to be applicable to all states."

Parke: "So in essence, that...we need to have this legislation to, in fact, be certified and maintain that certification, so that we're in line with all the other states..."

69th Legislative Day

June 20, 1991

Peterson: "Definitely."

Parke: "Thank you for the information."

Speaker Young: "The Gentleman from Macoupin, Representative Hannig."

Hannig: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Sponsor yield for a few questions?"

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

Hannig: "Representative, isn't it true that we have a number of dedicated funds in the State of Illinois now for specific purposes?"

Peterson: "Yes."

Hannig: "For example, I know that the utilities pay a fee and then that goes to fund the Commerce Commission. The financial institutions pay a fee and that goes in turn to..."

Peterson: "That's correct. This is not a new concept."

Hannig: "And so really, basically, we're not looking a brand new concept, but we're going to apply this concept now to insurance and, in effect, I think the net effect, isn't it...is it not, that we will save some GRF money?"

Peterson: "We are saving GRF funds because the dedicated funds will be generated by the insurance companies, not by the taxpayers."

Parke: "So my point, quite simply, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House is: we do this in a lot of fields already. It's proven to be a way that we can raise money from the industry to regulate the industry. We have oversight within the Appropriation Committees. I think it's a very good concept, and I rise in support."

Speaker Young: "Representative Peterson to close."

Peterson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think the Bill's been well debated. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Young: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 267 pass?'

69th Legislative Day

June 20, 1991

All those in favor, vote 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. This is final passage. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 95 voting 'yes'...96 voting 'yes', 11 voting 'no', 3 voting 'present'. Senate Bill 267, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 527, Representative Currie. Out of the record. Senate Bill 703, Representative Rice. Representative Rice. Senate Bill 703, Representative Rice. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 703, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Insurance Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Young: "Representative Rice."

Rice: "Can we take this back and put a technical Amendment on it, please?"

Speaker Young: "Representative Rice asks leave of the Body to return Senate Bill 703 to Second Reading for purposes of Amendment. Does he have leave? Leave is granted. Read the Bill on Second, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 703, this Bill's been read a second time previously. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Rice."

Speaker Young: "Representative Rice."

Rice: "Amendment to Senate Bill on page one, line thirty, changing such to...changing 'the' to 'such' so we can get it back to the Senate."

Speaker Young: "The Gentleman asks...the Gentleman moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 703. On that Motion, is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt Floor Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 703?' 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

69th Legislative Day

June 20, 1991

Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Young: "Third Reading. Representative Rice now requests leave of the Body for immediate hearing of Senate Bill 703 on Third Reading. Is leave granted? By use of the Attendance Roll Call, leave is granted. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 703, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Insurance Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Young: "Representative Rice."

Rice: "I would ask...it's a shell Bill, and we'd like to get it back to the Senate. Thank you."

Speaker Young: "The Gentleman moves for the passage of Senate
Bill 703. On that question, the Gentleman from Cook,
Representative Parke."

Parke: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor of the Bill please yield for a question?"

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

Parke: "Representative Rice, just...I'm curious, what kind of a purpose do you foresee this Bill being used in the Senate?"

Rice: "Representative Parke, not to tell you a lie: The Bill belongs to Senator Jones, and they have some things they'd like to do with the Insurance Code, and they will deal with it. I can't give you any other information."

Parke: "The Senate wants...some Members of the Senate want to do some Insurance Codes to this...some changes to the Insurance Code. Is that what you're saying?"

Rice: "That's as far as I know, Sir."

Parke: "Who is the Senate Sponsor of this?"

Rice: "Senator Jones."

Parke: "Thank you, Representative."

Speaker Young: "Further discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 703 pass?' All those in favor, vote

69th Legislative Day

June 20, 1991

'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. This is final passage. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On this question, there are 72 voting 'yes', 39 voting 'no' and 2 voting 'present'. Senate Bill 703, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 830, Representative Currie. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1018, Representative Steczo. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1018, a Bill for an Act to amend the State Employees Group Insurance Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Young: "Representative Steczo."

Steczo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Senate Bill 1018 is a Bill that provides that Illinois domestic violence shelters, funded by the Illinois Coalition Against Domestic Violence may be granted insurance coverage for employees and dependents at the expense of the shelters. Requires the Director of Central Management Services to adopt necessary rules. This is something that would really assist the operation of domestic violence shelters. There is no known opposition to the Bill, and I would answer any questions you might have, but if not, would ask for a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Young: "The Gentleman moves the passage of Senate Bill 1018. On that question, is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1018 pass?' All those in favor, vote 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. This is final passage. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 112 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present', Senate Bill 1018, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is

69th Legislative Day

June 20, 1991

hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1310, Representative Balthis. Representative Balthis. Out of the record. On the Order of Municipal County and Conservation Law, Third Reading, appears Senate Bill 153, Representative Steczo. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 153, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Municipal Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Young: "Representative Steczo."

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

Amendment...or Senate Bill 153 is a simple Bill that says that a vacancy in the Office of Trustee of a village or incorporated town shall be filled by the appointment of the president with advice and consent of the trustees. Right now, everybody jointly picks the trustees, but this puts it in line with what the law is for all other units of local government. So I would just ask for a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Young: "The Gentleman moves for passage of Senate Bill 153. On that question, is there any discussion? none, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 153 pass?' All those in favor, vote 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open, and this is final passage. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the On this question, there are 108 voting 'yes', 0 record. voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. Senate Bill 153, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 229, Representative Senate Bill 385, Representative Keane. Out of the record. Olson. Out of the record. Senate Bill Representative Hasara. Out of the record. Senate Bill 461, Representative 443. Out of the record. Out of the record. Senate Bill 637. Steczo. Representative Hasara. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 637, a Bill for an Act to amend the

69th Legislative Day

June 20, 1991

Wildlife Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Young: "Representative Hasara."

- Hasara: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 637 is the same as the House Bill that passed. This was at the request of the falconers, and it adds snipes and woodcocks to the list of migratory game birds. Evidently, the Department of Conservation needs this in the statute to clarify their authority to establish season for their harvest. I move for its adoption."
- Speaker Young: "The Lady moves for passage of Senate Bill 637.

 On that Motion, is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 637 pass?' All those in favor, vote 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open, and this is final passage. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 112 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. Senate Bill 637, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 398, Representative Hasara."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 398, a Bill for an Act to amend the Wildlife Code. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Young: "Representative Hasara."
- Hasara: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to please move this Bill back to Second Reading and ask to table Amendment #1."
- Speaker Young: "The Lady requests leave of the Body to return

 Senate Bill 398 to Second Reading for purposes of a Motion.

 Does she have leave? Leave is granted. Read the Bill, Mr.

 Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "On the Order of Second Reading, Motion to table. I move to table Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 398, filed by Representative Hasara."
- Speaker Young: "The Lady moves to table Senate Amendment #1. On

69th Legislative Day

June 20, 1991

that Motion, is there any discussion? The Motion is to table Senate Amendment #1. Hearing no discussion, the question is, 'Shall the Amendment 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. Further Motions?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Motions or Amendments."

Speaker Young: "Third Reading. Representative Hasara now requests leave of the Body for immediate hearing of Senate Bill 398. Does she have leave? By use of the Attendance Roll Call, leave is granted. Read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 398, a Bill for an Act to amend the Wildlife Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Young: "Representative Hasara."

Hasara: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 398 provides that a person with a permanent physical impairment which renders them unable to use a conventional bow and arrow may be issued a permit to use a crossbow to take deer. As the rule is now written, only a very severely disabled person can receive a permit, so the department has requested this in the case of people who are not in wheelchairs but cannot use a conventional crossbow."

Speaker Young: "The Lady moves for passage of Senate Bill 398.

Is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is,

'Shall Senate Bill 398 pass?' All those in favor, vote
'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. This is
final passage. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted
who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question,
there are 108 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting
'present'. Senate Bill 398, having received the required
Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate
Bill 661, Representative Hartke. Out of the record.
Senate Bill 673, Representative Williams. Read the Bill,

69th Legislative Day

June 20, 1991

Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 673, a Bill for an Act to amend the Counties Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Young: "Representative Williams."

Williams: "Yes, Senate Bill 673 is a Bill that's being proposed behalf of the Public Defender's Office in Cook County and on behalf of the...it's something that's been worked out with the entire board. What it does is it transfers the public defender's office from under the circuit...the Justice of the Circuit Court and puts it into an office in which the public defender would be appointed by the president of the board for a six-year term and then it would be ratified by the entire board. If, in fact, were to be removed it would be for cause given a due hearing. The whole purpose is to try to realize that order for the public defender to operate independently, he should be able and be allowed to and have an independent office from, apart separate from, the Justice Department...or not the Justice Department but from the Judicial Department, and I'd just ask for an 'aye' vote and willing to answer any questions."

Speaker Young: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Parke."

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

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

Parke: "Thank you. Representative Williams, it says here on a notice that I have that it requires a public hearing for issuance of bonds. Is that correct?

Williams: "For issuance of bonds?"

Parke: "Right. In Senate Bill 673. It also... provisions of this Amendment are unnecessary and restrictive and would require, among other things, a full-page ad in the newspaper."

Parke: "This would have been in terms of...what page are you

69th Legislative Day

June 20, 1991

- referencing, please?"
- Williams: "It's a notice from a school district...association that is concerned about this Bill."
- Parke: "What page are you referring? I'm not really...'cause I'm not quite certain we're in the same..."
- Williams: "Does it pertain at all to the issuance of bonds?"
- Parke: "Not that I know of. That's what I'm saying. Senate Bill 673 dealing with the public defender's office. You have the page number? Maybe I can read it here. I've got the Bill."
- Williams: "I do not. I just have a capsule analysis. Well, as far as you know, it's not there, then just...I stand corrected. I'm sorry to have bothered you. Thank you."
- Speaker Young: "Further discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 673 pass?' All those in favor, vote 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open, and this is final passage. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 112 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 679, Representative Steczo. Out of the record. Senate Bill 715, Representative Giglio. Out of the record. Senate Bill 887. Out of the record. Senate Bill 909, Representative Deering. Representative Deering. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 909, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Municipal Code. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Young: "Representative Deering."
- Deering: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. What Senate Bill 909 does simply is that it provides that in municipalities of all sizes the sale of surplus real estate may only take place if the real estate

69th Legislative Day

June 20, 1991

has been appraised by a M.I.A. or a state certified appraiser and upon approval by three fourths of the elected board of that municipality. Be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Young: "The Gentleman moves for passage of Senate Bill On that Motion, is there any discussion? none, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 909 pass?' those in favor, vote 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. This is final passage. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the On this question, there are 110 voting 'yes', record. voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. Senate Bill 909, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. We will now go to a Special Call. Order of Revenue, Special Call. On Page 8 of the Calendar appears Senate Bill 629, Representative Phelps. Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 629, a Bill for an Act to amend the Revenue Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Young: "Representative Phelps. Phelps."

Phelps: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I request that Senate Bill 629 be returned to Second Reading to be read a second time for the purposes of Amendment that would be in addressed tomorrow's business."

Speaker Young: "Return Senate Bill 629 to Second Reading, Mr. Clerk. We are returning Senate Bill 629 to Second Reading. Representative Phelps, is it your wish to leave Senate Bill 629 on Second Reading at this time? Out of the record. will return now to the Order of Municipal County and Conservation Law, Third Reading. On that order 1030. Representative Munizzi. Senate Bill Out of the Senate record. Bill 1033, Representative Representative Burke, Senate Bill 1033. Out of the record.

69th Legislative Day

- June 20, 1991
- Senate Bill 1042, Representative DeLeo. Out of the record.

 Senate Bill 1208, Representative Brunsvold. Read the Bill,

 Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1208, a Bill for an Act to amend the Fish Code. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Young: "Representative Brunsvold."
- Brunsvold: "Mr. Speaker, will you take this out of the record for a minute?"
- Speaker Young: "Out of the record. Senate Bill 1283,
 Representative Wennlund. Out of the record. Senate Bill
 1374, Representative Daniels. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk.
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1374, a Bill for an Act to amend the Counties Code. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Young: "Representative Leitch."
- Leitch: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 1374 simply clarifies the county's authority to adopt and enforce flood plain regulations and puts our state into compliance with Federal Emergency Management Agency regulations. FINA regulations, as they're commonly known, for preventing flood damage. I know of no opposition, and I'd ask for a favorable Roll Call, please."
- Speaker Young: "The Gentleman moves the passage of Senate Bill 1374. On that Motion, is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1374 pass?' All those in favor, vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open, and this is final passage. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 113 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. Senate Bill 1374, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1283, Representative Wennlund. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

69th Legislative Day

June 20, 1991

- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1283, a Bill for an Act to amend the Downstate Forest Preserve District Act. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Young: "Representative Wennlund."
- Wennlund: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I ask leave of the House to return this Bill to the Order of Second Reading for the purpose of an Amendment."
- Speaker Young: "The Gentleman asks leave of the House to return

 Senate Bill 1283 to Second Reading. Leave is granted.

 Read the Bill on Second Reading, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "On the Order of Second Reading, Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1283 is being offered by Representatives Wennlund and Petka."
- Speaker Young: "Representative Wennlund."
- Wennlund: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Floor Amendment #1

 restores the provisions of a Bill that went out of here two
 years ago and it makes a technical change to apply to
 counties of less than 500,000 for downstate forest preserve
 districts. I ask for the adoption of the Amendment."
- Speaker Young: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Floor

 Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1283. On that Motion, the

 Gentleman from Warren, Representative Hultgren."
- Hultgren: "Has this Amendment been distributed? Can I... Can we take a minute for a copy of it?"
- Speaker Young: "This Amendment has not been distributed."
- Wennlund: "Take the Bill out of the record."
- Speaker Young: "Out of the record. Committee reports."
- Clerk Leone: "Representative Hicks, Chairman from the Committee on Appropriations for Public Safety and Infrastructure to which the following Bill was referred, action taken June 20, 1991, reported the same back with the following recommendations: Do pass as amended, Senate Bill 334."
- Speaker Young: "Representative Ryder, for what purpose do you

69th Legislative Day

June 20, 1991

rise?"

Ryder: "Mr. Speaker, if I could, I rise for two purposes. First, to ask the House Republican Members, immediately upon adjournment to gather for a conference, please. House Republican Members, immediately upon adjournment gather for a conference in the usual room. Now, may I proceed with the Motion?

Speaker Young: "Proceed."

Ryder: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, in order to move along the appropriations process, I would wish to suspend Rule 35(a) so the following Bills can be placed on Second Reading, Second Legislative Day. I'll read these Bills very quickly. There are about forty. Senate Bills 133, 258, 301, 302, 303, 304, 305, 306, 308, 310, 311, 334, 335, 336, 337, 338, 339, 340, 341, 342, 343, 344, 345, 346, 347, 348... I wish there were an easier way to do this... 349, 350, 351, 352, 353, 354, 355... You got all those Tony?... 356, 357, 358, 359, 360, 361, 363, 364, 365, 366, 367, 368, 369, 370, 371, 372, 373, 374, 409, 440, 953, 954, 956, 957, 959 and 1341."

Speaker Young: "Representative Ryder, did you mean 957 or 958?" Ryder: "956, 958."

Speaker Young: "Thank you."

Ryder: "Did you want me to repeat those?"

Speaker Young: "The Gentleman asks leave to suspend the appropriate rule and advance those Bills to Second Reading, Second Legislative Day. Does he have leave? By use of the Attendance Roll Call, leave is granted."

Ryder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and again I would ask House
Republicans to gather for a conference immediately upon
adjournment in the usual room. Thank you for your
consideration."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1283, a Bill for an Act to amend the

- June 20, 1991
- Downstate Forest Preserve District Act. Third Reading of the Bill.
- Speaker Young: "Mr. Clerk, this Bill is already on Second Reading."
- Wennlund: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As I said before, this is a technical Amendment making it applicable to the forest preserve district that are of population of 500,000 or less. It is correct. The previous error in a Bill that passed out two years ago unanimously and passed out of the Senate unanimously and there's a question about its enforcability without this change. I ask for its adoption."
- Speaker Young: "Gentleman moves for the adoption of Amendment #1.

 That is Amendment #1?"
- Clerk Leone: "Correct."
- Speaker Young: "Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1283. On the next question, is there any discussion? Hearing none, all those in favor of the adoption of Amendment #1 say 'aye' those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it and the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #2 is being offered by Representative Steczo and Manny Hoffman."
- Speaker Young: "Representative Steczo. Representative Hoffman.
 On Floor Amendment #2."
- Steczo: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Speaker. The...this
 Amendment #2 adds language to Senate Bill 911 that did not
 pass out of the House Counties and Townships. It amends
 the Park District Code and provides that if territories are
 to be organized as a park district includes any part of a
 municipality, then all the municipalities must be included
 in a new district. Let me tell you an example. Is if a
 park district decides they would like to take a shopping
 center out for themselves that they cannot take the

69th Legislative Day

June 20, 1991

shopping center out alone, that they must take the district area around the shopping center along with the shopping center. I think this is important because it will eliminate park districts from just taking pieces of real estate that can benefit them and I ask for your passage."

Speaker Young: "Gentleman moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 1283. On that Motion is there any discussion? Hearing none the question is, 'Shall the House adopt Floor Amendment #2?' All those in favor say 'aye' those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it and Floor Amendment #2 is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "Amendment #3 offered by Representative Steczo."

Speaker Young: "Representative Wennlund on Floor Amendment #3."
Wennlund: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Floor Amendment #3 is
sponsored by Representative Steczo and is also another
technical Amendment to the Forest Preserve District Act and
I move for its' adoption."

Speaker Young: "Gentleman moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #3. On that Motion, is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall Floor Amendment #3 be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye' those opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it and Floor Amendment #3 is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Young: "Third Reading. Representative Wennlund now asks leave of the body for immediate consideration of Senate Bill 1283. Does he have leave by use of the Attendance Roll Call? Leave is granted. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "House Bill 1283, a Bill for an Act to amend the Downstate Forest Preserve District Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Young: "Representative Wennlund."

69th Legislative Day

June 20, 1991

Wennlund: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentleman of the House. House Bill 1283 basically contains some technical Amendments. Representative Steczo and I have worked on for the Forest Preserve and Park District Act and I'd be happy to answer any questions and I ask for a favorable 'aye' vote."

Speaker Young: "Gentleman moves for the passage of Senate 1283. On that Motion, is there any discussion? Hearing none the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1283 pass?' A11 those in favor vote 'aye' those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open and this is final passage. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk take the record. On this question, there are 112 voting 'yes' none voting 'no' and none voting 'present'. Senate Bill 1283 having received the required Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. On the same order appears Senate Bill 1208. Representative Brunsvold. Read the Bill."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1208, a Bill for an Act to amend the Fish Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Young: "Representative Brunsvold."

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

Senate Bill 1208 is a continuing effort that we have pursued over the last couple of years to try to make a better relationship between the farmer and the hunter and the fisherman. A couple of years ago, we passed language that would release the farmer from liability for allowing hunters and fishermen on their ground and this is the next step. In fact, does exactly what the conservation officers do now with putting it in the statutes. It simply says that that person is hunting and fishing on property without permission. The conservation officer then can be called by the farmer and come out and arrest that person for

69th Legislative Day

June 20, 1991

trespassing on that property. I would ask for the passage of Senate Bill 1208."

- Speaker Young: "Gentleman moves the passage of Senate Bill 1208. On that Motion, is there any discussion? Hearing none the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1208 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye' those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open and this is final passage. Have all voted who wish? all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 108 voting 'yes', 2 voting 'no' Senate Bill 1208 having received none voting 'present'. required Constitution Majority is hereby declared the passed. On this order appears Senate Bill 661. Representative Hartke. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 661, a Bill for an act to amend the Counties Code. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Young: "Representative Hartke."
- Hartke: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Senate Bill 661 provides the sheriff of each county in which the state...states that...he shall be the warden of any new jail facility. I'd be happy to answer any questions."
- Speaker Young: "Gentleman moves the passage of Senate Bill 661.

 On that Motion, is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 661 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye' those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open and this is final passage. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Black, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"
- Black: "Well, I guess I'll have to explain my vote, since I can't ask a question now, but this Bill appears to be a vehicle.

 I would have liked to have gotten the Sponsor's intent on the record, but be that as it may... I'll vote 'present'."

 Speaker Young: "Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the

69th Legislative Day

June 20, 1991

record. On this question, there are 96 voting 'yes' and none voting 'no', 15 voting 'present'. Senate Bill 661 having received the required the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. On the order of Public Utilities, Third Reading. Senate Bill 1051, Representative Schakowsky. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1051, a Bill for an Act to amend the Rental Property Utilities Service Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Young: "Representative Schakowsky."

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

Senate Bill 1051 offers some protection for tenants from landlords who fail to pay their utility bills. This is a Bill that was worked out and agreed to by the realtors, utility companies, and the consumer groups representing tenants. It provides that... It prohibits landlords from causing termination of utility service by not paying bills or tampering with equipment and provides remedies if they do. I urge your support for Senate Bill 1051, and I'd be happy to answer questions."

Speaker Young: "The Lady has moved for passage of Senate Bill 1051. On that Motion, the Gentleman from Will, Representative Regan."

Regan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Will she yield for a question, please?"

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

Regan: "Is the Real Estate Association still opposed to this Bill or have we worked out an agreement?"

Schakowsky: "No, they are not and all... They have signed off on this Bill."

Regan: "Thanks a lot."

Speaker Young: "Further discussion? Hearing none the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1051 pass?' All those in favor vote

69th Legislative Day

June 20, 1991

'aye' those oppose 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 108 voting 'yes', 1 voting 'no', and none voting 'present'. Senate Bill 1051 having received the required Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. On the Order of Real Estate Law, Third Reading, appears Senate Bill 778, Representative Schoenberg. Out of the record. Senate Bill 1053, Representative Schakowsky. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1053, a Bill for an Act to amend the Rental Property Utilities Services Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Young: "Representative Schakowsky."

Schakowsky: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentleman of the House. This is another fine Bill brought to us by Senator Cullerton from the Senate and agreed to by all parties. The realtors, utility companies, and the consumer groups. What this bill does is provides that no landlord shall change from a landlord mastered meter building to a tenant paid utility building or from...they won't change the form of payment during the course of the lease. I urge your support of Senate Bill 1053 and I'll answer any questions."

Speaker Young: "The Lady has moved for passage for Senate Bill 1053. On that Motion, the Gentleman from Vermillion, Representative Black."

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

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

Black: "Representative, first of all, let me thank you for being very cooperative in talking to our side of the aisle about this Bill. We appreciate that, but if... for the record, what in this Bill took the utility and realtors...from

- June 20, 1991
- their opponent position to a neutral position?"
- Schakowsky: "The Bill was literally rewritten in conference with the utility companies and the realtors. I'm sorry...let me see if I can be more specific."
- Black: "Well, I know... I know one concern was a definition of a master metered utility and I think you took care of that in Committee Amendment #1 and I just have no reason to doubt what you say. I just want your willingness to go on the record that you know of no opposition to this Bill. At one time, I know the realtors were opposed to this Bill and, quite frankly, I don't know at this point whether they still are or not."
- Schakowsky: "They testified in committee in favor of this Bill,

 Representative."
- Black: "You're right. I remember that, thank you very much."
- Speaker Young: "Further discussion? Hearing none the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1053 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. This is final passage. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 112 voting 'yes', none voting 'no' and none voting present. Senate Bill 1053 having received the required Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. On the order of transportation, Third Reading, appears Senate Bill 585, Representative Giorgi. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 585, a Bill for an Act to amend the Regional Transportation Authority Act. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Young: "Representative Giorgi."
- Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, Senate Bill 585 provides that the Metropolitan Transit Authority Act that ... Provides that the Board of Authority shall appoint 11 rather than 10

- June 20, 1991
- persons to a citizens advisory board and requires one of the members be at least 65 years of age. I know of no objection to the Bill."
- Speaker Young: "Gentleman moves for passage of Senate Bill 585.

 On that Motion, the Gentleman from Vermilion,

 Representative Black."
- Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. An inquiry of the Chair. On this Bill, have any Floor Amendments been adopted to this Bill?"
- Speaker Young: "Have any Floor Amendments been adopted, Mr.

 Clerk? The Calendar reflects that no Floor Amendments have been adopted."
- Black: "So, you do not show an Amendment #3 having been adopted to this Bill?"
- Speaker Young: "Amendments 1 and 2 lost. No other Amendments were offered."
- Black: "Okay. Alright. Thank you very much."
- Speaker Young: "Further discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 585 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. This is final passage. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 110 voting 'yes', none voting 'no', and 1 voting 'present'. Senate Bill 585 having received the required Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 844, Representative Ronan. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 844, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Highway Code. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Young: "Representative Ronan."
- Ronan: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. I would like to bring the Bill back to

 Second Reading for some Amendments that have been filed."
- Speaker Young: "Representative Ronan asks leave of the Body to return Senate Bill 844 to Second Reading for purposes of an

- June 20, 1991
- Amendment. Does he have leave? Leave is granted. Second Reading. Read the Bill."
- Ronan: "Could the Clerk notify me which Amendments he's got in his possession?"
- Clerk Leone: "There are Amendments #2, 3, 4 and 5 which have been filed."
- Ronan: "Great. Now, let's start with #2 then."
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #2 is being offered by Representatives Ronan and Hensel."
- Ronan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Floor Amendment #2 is some Bills that we had agreed to by Members on both sides of the aisle in Committee. They were not added to the Bill, but these are agreed to Amendments from the committee to be a part of the Omnibus Transportation Bill, so I move for the adoption of Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 844."
- Speaker Young: "Gentleman moves for the adoption of Floor
 Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 844. On that Motion, is there
 any discussion? Hearing none the question is, 'Shall Floor
 Amendment #2 be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye'
 those opposed say 'no'. The opinion of the Chair, the
 'ayes' have it and Floor Amendment #2 is adopted. Further
 Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representatives

 Ronan and Hensel."
- Speaker Young: "Representative Ronan."
- Ronan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 844.

 The Senate, in their absolute arrogance, killed one of our omnibus Bills because they didn't like the style we sent it over in. My attitude is, we're going to send it back to them, so this is...the content of Senate Bill...House Bill 719. The Senate was wrong, so now we're going to send it back to them."
- Speaker Young: "Gentleman moves for the adoption of Floor

69th Legislative Day

June 20, 1991

Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 844. On that Motion, is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall the Amendment be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye' all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it and Floor Amendment #3 is adopted. Further Amendments?"

- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #4, offered by Representatives

 Ronan and Hensel."
- Ronan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is a...House Bill 1189. It was another omnibus Bill we sent over and the Senate in their absolute arrogance killed it, so we are going to send it back to them again, so this is Amendment #4."
- Speaker Young: "Gentleman moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #4 to Senate Bill 844. On that Motion, is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall Floor Amendment #4 be adopted? All those in favor say 'aye' those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. Floor Amendment #4 is adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Leone: "Floor Amendment #5, offered by Representative Black."
- Speaker Young: "Representative Black."
- Black: "Yes, thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate Chairman Ronan allowing me to offer Amendment #5 to this Bill. As far as I know, there is no opposition to this Bill. There is a confusion in the law about school buses being able to use the strobe light that many districts put on their buses, and the State Police has agreed to this Amendment. It simply says that if a school bus has a strobe light they can use it at any time when transporting children regardless of the weather conditions. That's all the Amendment does. It doesn't mandate strobe lights, it just simply clears up when they can use it. I would urge

69th Legislative Day

June 20, 1991

your favorable consideration of Amendment #5."

Speaker Young: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Floor
Amendment #5 to Senate Bill 844. On that Motion, is there
any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall
Amendment #5 be adopted?' All those in favor say 'aye',
those opposed say 'no'. The opinion of the Chair, the
'ayes' have it and the Amendment's adopted. Further
Amendments?"

Clerk Leone: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Young: "Third Reading. On the Order of Veterans Affairs,
Third Reading. Third Reading. Representative Ronan."

Ronan: "Mr. Speaker, why don't we move for the consideration of Senate Bill 844?"

Speaker Young: "On the Order of Veterans, Third Reading, appears

Senate Bill 234, Representative Hasara. Read the Bill, Mr.

Clerk."

Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 234, a Bill for an Act to amend the Personal Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Young: "Representative Hasara."

Hasara: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill gives to Merit Comp
Employees the same benefit that bargaining unit employees
have to have...two days a year to visit Veterans' Hospitals
for Medical Care. I move for its adoption. That's state
employees."

Speaker Young: "The Lady has moved for passage of Senate Bill 234. On that Motion, is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 234 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. This is final passage. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 110 voting 'yes', none voting 'no', and 1 voting 'present'. Senate Bill 234 having received the required Constitutional Majority is hereby.

- June 20, 1991
- declared passed. Agriculture and Environment, Third Reading, appears Senate Bill 1296, Representative Parke. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "Senate Bill 1296, a Bill for an Act to amend certain Acts in relationship to solid waste. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Young: "Representative Parke."
- Parke: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. May I have this Bill brought back for the purposes of Amendment to Second Reading?"
- Speaker Young: "Representative Parke asks leave of the House to return Senate Bill 1296 to Second Reading. Does he have leave? Leave is granted. Read the Bill on Second, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Leone: "On the Order of Second Reading, Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative Burzynski."
- Speaker Young: "Representative Burzynski."
- Burzynski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Amendment basically makes Illinois laws regarding contaminant substance in public water supplies consistent with that that is now designated by the federal statutes, so I move for its adoption."
- Speaker Young: "Gentleman moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 1296. On that Motion, is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall Floor Amendment...' On that Motion, the Gentleman from Fulton, Representative Homer."
- Homer: "Thank you. Will the Gentleman yield?"
- Speaker Young: "Indicates he'll yield for a question."
- Homer: "Representative Burzynski, does this Amendment make Illinois' Environmental Protection Act consistent with the new changes in the federal law regarding the allowable levels of radium and uranium in water supplies?"
- Burzynski: "Yes, this just makes our state statutes consistent

69th Legislative Day

with federal, the new federal guidelines. This is being

offered on behalf of the IEPA."

Homer: "I see. Okay. I think it makes some sense. You know it has always amazed me... The EPA will crackdown on a community because it exceeds the allowable limits for radium and other contaminates, and after the community has been subjected to major expense, then they come along and say, 'Oops, we just decided that those levels are no longer operable and you can drink water safely with higher levels of he same chemicals, and this Bill...this Amendment is a good Amendment because it recognizes the change in the USEPA provisions. But I just hope that those agencies will be more sensitive to what they're doing to some of our small communities in imposing upon them very expensive solutions to apparently nonexistant problems, so I support your Amendment."

Burzynski: "Thank you."

Speaker Young: "Question is, 'Shall the House adopt Floor
Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 1296?' 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. Representative Parke now asks
leave of the House for immediate consideration of Senate
Bill 1296. Does he have leave? By the use of the
Attendance Roll Call, leave is granted. Read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1296, a Bill for an Act to amend certain Acts in relation to solid waste. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Young: "Representative Parke."

Parke: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Beginning January 1, 1991, changes certain plastic

69th Legislative Day

June 20, 1991

coding requirements to make Illinois coding requirements identical to those of the surrounding states. Also adds definitions for the term 'waste transfer station' and 'recycling center' not currently contained anywhere in the statutes. Makes numerous other technical and nonsubstantive changes to standardize definitions relating to solid waste and recycling. As amended, I would ask the Body to vote positively for Senate Bill 1296."

- Speaker Young: "Gentleman moves for the passage of Senate Bill 1296. On that Motion, is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1296 pass? All those in favor vote 'aye' those oppose vote 'no'. Voting is open. This is final passage. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 110 voting yes, none voting no, and none voting present. Senate Bill 1296 having received the required Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Agreed Resolutions."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Joint Resolution 66 offered by Representative Hasara. House Resolution 730, Hasara; 732, Weller; 733, Black; 737, Weller; 738, Novak; 739, Mautino; 742, Ryder; 743, Petka; 744, Ronan; 745, Tenhouse; 746, Weller; 747, Weller; 748, Trotter; 749, McGuire; 750, McGuire; 751, Leitch; 752, Schoenberg; and 753, B. Pedersen."

Speaker Young: "Representative Matijevich."

- Matijevich: "Speaker, we've examined the Resolutions. They're all congratulatory and I move the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions."
- Speaker Young: "Representative Matijevich moves the adoption of Agreed Resolutions. All those in favor say 'aye', those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes'

- 69th Legislative Day

 Agreed Resolutions are adopted. General
 Resolutions."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolutions 731 offered by Representative
 Parke. House Resolutions 736 offered by Representative
 Parcells. House Resolutions 754 offered by Representative
 Ropp."
- Speaker Young: "Committee on Assignment. Representative Black, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"
- Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I just simply rise on behalf of Representative Ryder who wanted me to remind all the Republican Members that we have a Conference immediately on Adjournment and thank you very much."
- Speaker Young: "Death Resolutions."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 734 offered by Representative Morrow with respect to the memory of Jasmine Ross. House Resolution 735 offered by Representative Morrow with respect to the memory of Evelyn Gloria Bundy. House Resolution 740, offered by Representative Johnson with respect to the memory of Mildred L. Anderson. House Resolution 741 offered by Representative Shaw with respect to the memory of Lois Justin."
- Speaker Young: "Representative Matijevich moves the adoption of the Death Resolutions. All those in favor say 'aye', those oppose say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it and the Death Resolutions are adopted. perfunctory Representative...allowing for time. Representative Matijevich now moves that the House stands the morning. adjourned until the hour of 9:30 in Representative Matijevich. The First Special Session will The Attendance Roll Call for the come to order. Regular Session will stand for the Roll Call for the First Special Session. Senate Bill 1. Out of the Record. Representative Black now moves that the First Special

69th Legislative Day

June 20, 1991

Session now stands adjourned until the hour of 9:30 in the morning. All those in favor say 'aye', those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it and the House now stands adjourned."

Clerk O'Brien: "Returning to Perfunctory Session and the Regular Session. Messages from the Senate. A Message from the Senate from Ms. Hawker, Secretary. 'Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives the Senate concurred with the House of Representatives in passage of Bills with the following titles, to wit: House Bills 1109, 1123, 1139, 1149, 1183, 1204, 1218, 1254, 1353, 1364, 1430, 1433, 1440, 1453, 1464, 1466, 1468, 1528, 1545, 1604, 1699, 1749, 1752, 1815, 1831, 1856, 1864 and 1911 together with the attached Amendments and the adoption of which I am instructed to ask concurrence of the House, passed the as amended, June 20, 1991. Linda Hawker, Senate Secretary.' There being no further business, the House now stands adjourned."

DOCUMENT NAME		STORE GROUP	PRINT COMMAND	DATE	СОРУ	D WIDTH	DEPTH	ERROR
Т062091	137	0	рj	08/14/92	1	66	78	

.

.

REPORT: TIFLDAY PAGE: 001

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

92/09/14 14:38:23

JUNE 20, 1991

SB-0010 SECOND READING	PAGE	9
SB-0031 SECOND READING	PAGE	4
SB-0033 THIRD READING	PAGE	77
SB-0042 SECOND READING	PAGE	24
SB-0064 SECOND READING	PAGE	11
SB-0064 SECOND READING	PAGE	76
SB-0064 OUT OF RECORD	PAGE	11
SB-0116 SECOND READING SB-0131 SECOND READING	PAGE	11
SB-0131 SECOND READING SB-0133 MOTION	PAGE	36
SB-0136 SECOND READING	PAGE PAGE	146 40
SB-0151 SECOND READING	PAGE	12
SB-0153 THIRD READING	PAGE	138
SB-0158 SECOND READING	PAGE	5
SB-0185 RECALLED	PAGE	91
SB-0185 THIRD READING	PAGE	91
SB-0185 THIRD READING	PAGE	92
SB-0201 THIRD READING	PAGE	61
SB-0216 SECOND READING	PAGE	7
SB-0233 THIRD READING	PAGE	82
SB-0234 THIRD READING	PAGE	157
SB-0242 SECOND READING	PAGE	12
SB-0257 RECALLED	PAGE	122
SB-0257 THIRD READING	PAGE	114
SB-0257 OUT OF RECORD SB-0258 MOTION	PAGE	122
SB-0258 AUTION SB-0263 SECOND READING	PAGE PAGE	146
SB-0264 SECOND READING	PAGE	13 19
SB-0264 OUT OF RECORD	PAGE	20
SB-0267 THIRD READING	PAGE	128
SB-0301 MOT ION	PAGE	146
SB-0302 MOTION	PAGE	146
SB-0303 MOTION	PAGE	146
SB-0304 MOTION	PAGE	146
SB-0305 MOTION	PAGE	146
SB-0306 MOTION	PAGE	146
SB-0308 MOTION	PAGE	146
SB-0310 MOTION SB-0311 MOTION	PAGE	146
SB-0312 SECOND READING	PAGE Page	146 21
SB-0325 SECOND READING	PAGE	23
SB-0325 HELD ON SECOND	PAGE	23
SB-0334 MOTION	PAGE	146
SB-0335 MOTION	PAGE	146
SB-0336 MOTION	PAGE	146
SB-0337 MOTION	PAGE	146
SB-0338 MOTION	PAGE	146
SB-0339 NOTION	PAGE	146
SB-0340 MOTION	PAGE	146
SB-0341 MOTION	PAGE	146
SB-0342 MOTION SB-0343 MOTION	PAGE	146
SB-0344 MOTION	PAGE PAGE	146 146
SB-0345 MOTION	PAGE	146
SB-0346 MOTION	PAGE	146
SB-0347 MOTION	PAGE	146
SB-0348 MOTION	PAGE	146
SB-0349 MOTION	PAGE	146
SB-0350 MOTION	PAGE	146
SB-0351 MOTION	PAGE	146
SB-0352 MOTION	PAGE	146
SB-0353 MOTION	PAGE	146
SB-0354 MOTION	PAGE	146
SB-0355 MUTION	PAGE	146

REPORT: TIFLDAY PAGE: 002

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

92/09/14 14:38:23

JUNE 20, 1991

SB-0356 MOTION	PAGE	146
SB-0357 MOTION	PAGE	146
SB-0358 MOTION	PAGE	146
SB-0359 MOTION	PAGE	146
SB-0360 MOTION	PAGE	146
SB-0361 MOTION	PAGE	146
SB-0363 MOTION	PAGE	146
SB-0364 MOTION	PAGE	146
SB-0365 MOTION	PAGE	146
SB-0366 MOTION	PAGE	146
SB-0367 MOTION	PAGE	146
SB-0368 MOTION	PAGE	146
SB-0369 MOTION	PAGE	146
SB-0370 MOTION	PAGE	146
SB-0371 MOTION	PAGE	146
SB-0372 MOTION	PAGE	146
SB-0373 MOTION	PAGE	146
SB-0374 MOTION	PAGE	146
SB-0398 RECALLED	PAGE	139
SB-0398 THIRD READING	PAGE	139
SB-0398 THIRD READING	PAGE	140
SB-0407 SECOND READING	PAGE	23
SB-0409 MOTION	PAGE	146
SB-0440 MOTION	PAGE	146
SB-0453 SECOND READING	PAGE	35
SB-0484 THIRD READING	PAGE	83
SB-0484 OUT OF RECORD	PAGE	85
SB-0585 THIRD READING	PAGE	153
SB-0587 SECOND READING	PAGE	25
SB-0587 RECALLED	PAGE	31
SB-0601 SECOND READING	PAGE	47
SB-0628 SECOND READING	PAGE	89
SB-0629 RECALLED	PAGE	143
SB-0629 THIRD READING	PAGE	143
SB-0629 OUT OF RECORD	PAGE	143
SB-0637 THIRD READING	PAGE	138
SB-0651 THIRD READING	PAGE	71
SB-0661 THIRD READING	PAGE	150
SB-0673 THIRD READING	PAGE	141
SB-0703 RECALLED	PAGE	135
SB-0703 THIRD READING	PAGE	135
SB-0703 THIRD READING	PAGE	136
SB-0705 THIRD READING	PAGE	48
SB-0714 SECOND READING	PAGE	36
SB-0724 SECOND READING	PAGE	20
SB-0725 SECOND READING	PAGE	23
SB-0757 SECOND READING	PAGE	10
SB-0774 SECOND READING	PAGE	40
SB-0800 THIRD READING	, PAGE	81
SB-0800 THIRD READING	PAGE	85
SB-0800 OUT OF RECORD	PAGE	82
SB-0844 RECALLED	PAGE	154
SB-0844 THIRD READING	PAGE	154
SB-0873 SECOND READING	PAGE	10
SB-0895 THIRD READING	PAGE	79
SB-0909 THIRD READING	PAGE	142
SB-0922 SECOND READING	PAGE	41
SB-0922 SECOND READING	PAGE	93
SB-0922 OUT OF RECORD	PAGE	44
SB-0924 THIRD READING	PAGE	50
SB-0947 THIRD READING	PAGE	51
SB-0947 POSTPONED CONSIDERATION	PAGE	57
SB-0953 MOTION	PAGE	146
SB-0954 MOTION	PAGE	146

REPORT: TIFLDAY PAGE: 003

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

92/09/14 14:38:23

JUNE 20, 1991

	00112 207 2772		
SB-0956	MOTION	PAGE	146
SB-0958	MOTION	PAGE	146
SB-0959	MOTION	PAGE	146
SB-0961	SECOND READING	PAGE	23
SB-0972	RECALLED	PAGE	58
SB-0972	THIRD READING	PAGE	58
\$8-0972	THIRD READING	PAGE	59
SB-0979	THIRD READING	PAGE	60
SB-1009	SECOND READING	PAGE	45
\$8-1009	THIRD READING	PAGE	47
SB-1018	THIRD READING	PAGE	137
\$3-1032	SECOND READING	PAGE	7
\$8-1037	SECOND READING	PAGE	3
SB-1051	THIRD READING	PAGE	151
\$8-1053	THIRD READING	PAGE	152
\$8-1059	SECOND READING	PAGE	7
S8-1071	THIRD READING	PAGE	63
SB-1073	SECOND READING	PAGE	8
S8-1076	THIRD READING	PAGE	123
SB-1079	THIRD READING	PAGE	80
\$8-1125	SECOND READING	PAGE	4
SB-1192	SECOND READING	PAGE	5
\$8-1208	THIRD READING	PAGE	144
SB-1208	THIRD READING	PAGE	149
SB-1208	OUT OF RECORD	PAGE	144
SB-1241	THIRD READING	PAGE	66
SB-1264	SECOND READING	PAGE	39
SB-12 7 2	SECOND READING	PAGE	22
SB-1273	SECOND READING	PAGE	37
SB-1283	SECOND READING	PAGE	146
	RECALLED	PAGE	145
	THIRD READING	PAGE	145
	THIRD READING	PAGE	148
	OUT OF RECORD	PAGE	145
	THIRD READING	PAGE	67
	RECALLED	PAGE	69
	RECALLED	PAGE	158
	THIRD READING	PAGE	68
	THIRD READING	PAGE	159
	SECOND READING	PAGE	20
	THIRD READING	PAGE	69
	SECOND READING	PAGE	48
	THIRD READING	PAGE	90
SB-1341		PAGE	146
	THIRD READING	PAGE	144
	SECOND READING	PAGE	22
	SECOND READING	PAGE	24
	SECOND READING	PAGE	40
SB-1470	SECOND READING	PAGE	40
	SUBJECT MATTER		

HOUSE TO ORDER - SPEAKER KEANE	PAGE	1
PRAYER - PASTOR J. R. CROWE	PAGE	1
PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE	PAGE	1
ROLL CALL FOR ATTENDANCE	PAGE	1
MESSAGES FROM THE SENATE	PAGE	2
COMMITTEE REPORTS	PAGE	2
AUSTRIAN COUNSEL GENERAL - CLEMENS CORETH	PAGE	31
REPRESENTATIVE SATTERTHWAITE IN THE CHAIR	PAGE	35
SPEAKER MADIGAN IN THE CHAIR	PAGE	78
REPRESENTATIVE SATTERTHWAITE IN THE CHAIR	PAGE	79
REPRESENTATIVE YOUNG IN THE CHAIR	PAGE	108
COMMITTEE REPORTS	PAGE	145

REPORT: TIFLDAY PAGE: 004

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

92/09/14 14:38:23

JUNE 20, 1991

SUBJECT MATTER

AGREED RESOLUTIONS	PAGE	160
GENERAL RESOLUTIONS	PAGE	161
DEATH RESOLUTIONS	PAGE	161
ADJOURNMENT	PAGE	161
FIRST SPECIAL SESSION	PAGE	161
FIRST SPECIAL SESSION - ADJOURNMENT	PAGE	162
PERFUNCTORY SESSION	PAGE	162
MESSAGES FROM THE SENATE	PAGE	162
PERFUNCTORY SESSION - ADJOURNMENT	PAGE	162