162nd Legislative Day

June 26. 1992

- Speaker Giorgi: "The House will come to order. The Members will be in their seats. The Chaplain for today is Reverend Roger Kilser of Greenup and Liberty Hill United Methodist Church in Greenup, Illinois, and Reverend Kilser is a guest of Representative Noland. Our guests in the gallery may wish to rise for the invocation. Reverend Kilser."
- Reverend Kilser: "Thank you. Let us pray. Gracious Heavenly Father, we thank You for this day that You have given us. We pray, Father, that Your spirit will be here and lead those whom we have entrusted into the care and the policy-making of our state. We thank You, Father, for their leadership and their diligence and the things that lie before them. Father, without Your guidance, we know that every small task can become a large one. Every large task can be overburdened. But, Father, with Your presence and Your help as You have given us this day, those whom You have selected will be able to do their best for Your honor and Your glory. In Your name, we give praise. Amen."
- Speaker Giorgi: "Thank you, Reverend. We'll be led in the Pledge of Allegiance. Hartke yields to Representative Deering."
- Deering 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 Giorgi: "Roll Call for Attendance. Were you gonna...were you given the...were you gonna pledge of allegiance this morning, Ann? Indicate Mautino being present, Mr. Clerk.

  Representative Kubik, any announcements of members?"
- Kubik: "Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Let the record reflect that Representative...Frederick is excused today due to illness."

162nd Legislative Day

June 26, 1992

- Speaker Giorgi: "Matijevich, for the same reason. Representative Matijevich."
- Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, no excused absences on this side of the aisle. After the record is taken, Mr. Speaker, I would ask that you call on Representative Dan Burke. He has some information that I think would be interesting to the Members. Call on Dan Burke after you're through with the...No, no..."
- Speaker Giorgi: "Okay...take the...take the roll, Mr. Clerk. On this...ll6 being present, there's a quorum present.

  Representative Burke, on the quorum."
- Burke: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the Assembly. I am very proud to stand here this morning and advise the Members that we, indeed, have a hero in our midst. Last evening, at the Capitol Plaza Hotel at a celebration, a young child slipped into the swimming pool and, for all practical purposes, I would suggest, was drowning. Whereupon Representative John McDonough jumped into the pool and saved the child's life I would suggest to you...with his cloths on."
- Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Matijevich, for what reason do
   you rise?"
- Matijevich: "I was gonna add, (because I asked John, Did you have your swimming suit on?) to show you how he did it so quickly. He had...He was fully-clothed and still saw the young child and could see that the child was drowning and jumped in, fully-clothed, and saved the child."
- Speaker Giorgi: "Very good. Representative Stepan, for what reason do you rise?"
- Stepan: "I, too, was there standing right beside John when it happened, and I commend him. His quick reflexes...There wasn't a split-second that passed. John saw this little

162nd Legislative Day

- June 26, 1992
- girl going down, and jumped right in and pulled her out. And I...I was proud for my colleague to take that quick action and save this little girl's life. Good going, John."
- Speaker Giorgi: "We will start on the Calendar, Concurrences,
  Government Administration. Representative Wolf, on House
  Bill 2645. Would you like to concur to that Bill? House
  Bill 2645. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2645, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Pension Code together with Senate Amendment #1."
- Wolf: "Mr. Speaker, I move to nonconcur in Senate Amendment #1, to House Bill 2645."
- Speaker Giorgi: "All in favor will signify by saying 'aye' on the Gentleman's Motion to nonconcur; and those opposed, 'nay'.

  The 'ayes' have it, and the House does not concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2645. It has to go back for the Senate to do something to it. Representative Wolf, on 2730. Do you wanna run the Bill? Mr. Clerk, House Bill 2730 on the Concurrence Calendar. Representative Wolf. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill..."
- Wolf: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to nonconcur in Senate

  Amendment #1 to House Bill 2730."
- Speaker Giorgi: "Mr. Clerk, go ahead and read the Bill. That Gentleman's Motion is to not concur to House Bill 2730.

  All those in favor will signify by saying 'aye' and those opposed, 'nay', and the 'ayes' have it, and the House does not concur to Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2730.

  Representative McPike, on 3580...He's at a meeting. Kulas.

  Kulas. He's not in the chamber. Representative Steczo, in

162nd Legislative Day

June 26, 1992

Concurrence, on State and Local Government. Representative Steczo. He's not in the chamber. Representative Mautino is not in the chamber. On Concurrences, Representative Brunsvold. Representative Brunsvold, do you want to concur to House Bill 2433 and 2434? Out of the record? Out of the record. Representative McAuliffe. Is Roger McAuliffe in the chambers? Representative Barnes. Is she in the chamber? Do you want to concur to House Bill 3037? No? Out of the record. Representative Capparelli, do you want ot concur to House Bill 3055? All right. Mr. Clerk, read House Bill 3055."

Clerk O'Brien: "(House Bill) 2055?"

Capparelli: "Mr. Speaker, I would like to not concur on House Bill 3055."

Speaker Giorgi: "You hear the Gentleman's Motion? Any debate?

The question is, 'Shall the House nonconcur to

Senate...House Bill 3055?' All in favor signify by voting
'aye', and those opposed by voting 'no', and the 'ayes'

have it, and we do not concur to House Bill 3055.

Representative Novak on...Would you like to concur to House
Bill 3098? Mr. Clerk, read House Bill 3098."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3098, a Bill for an Act to amend the Public Employees' Disability Act together with Senate Amendment #1."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Novak, on House Bill 3098."

Novak: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. I move that we concur on Senate
Amendment #1 to House Bill 3098. The Amendment...was a
concern of the Department of Central Management Services.

This whole Bill deals with 100% compensation for part-time
employees that are injured...at various state agencies such

162nd Legislative Day

June 26, 1992

as Corrections and Mental Health. Part-time employees are utilized for various purposes and, right now, as the law stands full-time employees enjoy this privilege, and we think it's only fair that the part-time employee should also enjoy this privilege. I ask for its adoption."

Speaker Giorgi: "There being no request for debate, the question is, 'Shall the House concur on Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3098?' All favor will signify by voting 'aye', and those opposed by voting 'no'. This is final action - final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? On this question, there are 116 'ayes', no 'nays', none voting 'present', and the House concurs in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3098, and this Bill, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Capparelli, would you like to call House Bill 3100? Mr. Clerk, read House Bill 3100."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3100..."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Capparelli."

Capparelli: "Mr. Speaker, I move to concur with House Amendments 2 and 3. House Amendment 2...in Senate, amends the Agency Act to require a district board of standardization to meet at least once every three months instead of every two months, and Amendment #3 amends the agency to act, allows requests for purchases to be executed, and approved and signed electronically as well as manually. I ask for adoption."

Speaker Giorgi: "There being no request for debate, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment...Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 3100. All in favor will signify by voting 'aye', and those opposed by voting 'no'. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question, there

162nd Legislative Day

June 26, 1992

are 114 'ayes', no 'nays', none voting 'present', and the House concurs in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3100, and this Bill, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative McGuire, would you like...concur to House Bill 3105? Mr. Clerk, read the Bill. House Bill 3105."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3105, a Bill for an Act to amend the Intergovernmental Cooperation Act, together with Senate Amendment #2."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative McGuire, on Senate Amendment #2."

McGuire: "Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of
the House. I'd like to concur with Senate Amendment #2."

Speaker Giorgi: "Would you explain the Amendment, Representative

Mcguire? Explain the Amendment? Representative Wennlund,

for what reason do you rise?"

McGuire: "Could you hold on a second, Mr. Speaker? We're trying to get the Amendment. Okay, the Bill is the Intergovernmental Cooperation and it's for townships with a population under 700,000 to establish a municipal joint action water agency by intergovernmental agreement, and the Amendment...states that the water is to be used for Municipal Joint Action Water Agency could only come from Lake Michigan."

Speaker Giorgi: "There being no request for debate..."

McGuire: "Senate Amendment 2...Senate Amendment 2 allows the water also to come from the Mississippi River."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Hultgren, on the Amendment.

Hultgren."

Hultgren: "I have a question of the Sponsor."

Speaker Giorgi: "Continue."

Hultgren: "Do I understand that this deals with the Freedom of Information Act? I didn't hear you explain it..."

162nd Legislative Day

June 26, 1992

McGuire: "No, no. No, it's not, Sir."

Hultgren: "Has that been deleted from the Bill?"

McGuire: "I'm not aware of that being in the Bill. This was a...an intergovernmental agreement to get water for some townships in Will County."

McGurie: "That's all right. Thank you."

Speaker Giorgi: "There being no further requests for debate, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 3105?' All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', and those opposed by voting 'no'. Voting This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. this question there are...on this question there are 113 'ayes', no 'nays', none voting 'present', and the House concurs on Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 3105, and this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Black, we pulled the Resolution out of the record that you wanted, House Resolution 1751. Mr. Clerk, would you read House Resolution 1751? Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 1751..."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Black, on House Resolution 1751."

Black: "Yes. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Resolution 1751, in all due respect to the Director the Department of of the Department of State Police and...and in all due respect to the budget crisis that he is facing, simply says that if he is going to announce major reorganization and restructuring and closure of...of state police posts throughout the State of

162nd Legislative Day

June 26, 1992

Illinois, that the General Assembly requests that he take us into his confidence and that we have public hearings on...on the process of doing such a reorganization and that the General Assembly simply be allowed to participate in these discussions because we're the ones who have to make the votes on the cuts in the budget and what have you. I don't mean to chastise the director for his earlier actions, but I know it caught many of us by surprise and many of our constituents were very upset by his announced plan to restructure the Illinois State Police. So all this Resolution asks him to do is to involve the General Assembly in the process and to hold any closures or reorganization plans in abeyance until July 1, 1993. understand the budget may not let him do that, but I think it should be the sense of this Assembly that we, least, ask him to involve us in any plans that do a major reorganization of the Illinois State Police, and I would ask your favorable consideration of House Resolution 1751." Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Johnson, on House Resolution 1751."

Johnson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. This is a...may be a first for the Session: Representative Black and I don't agree on something. I don't think this is an appropriate Resolution from a number of standpoints. certainly not unique that a department of State Government, state police or any other, would have the opportunity, as certain reorganizational they have here, to make decisions...within their department. I don't think any of us have to use imagination to be able to enumerate those areas and to...be in a situation of legislatively micro-managing the department, I'm not sure is appropriate, and I certainly don't believe that it's appropriate to call

162nd Legislative Day

June 26, 1992

on a moratorium for...for...to...ask a moratorium of 12 months when some major structural reorganization needs to take place, not only from a cost standpoint but from a standpoint of service to various areas. Some of us believe that some of the recommendations made by the Department of State Police were and are, appropriate, not only in terms saving money but in providing the best service to the people of this state, and so, with all due respect to Sponsor of the Amendment, I'm not sure it's something that the Legislature ought to do by way of Resolution or otherwise. In some cases, there's the necessity of in the case of the closure of legislative approval, as Public Aid offices. They have to seek and they should have to seek, because of existing legislation, substantive changes in the law but where those law...those changes aren't mandated by current statute, I'm not sure we wanna be in a position of telling the State Police how to run their business. I happen to believe that, with some modifications, the program set forth by the department is an appropriate program and one that's good for the people of Illinois. So, with all due respect, and maybe, uniquely this Session, Representative Black and I don't agree, and I don't believe...that this Resolution oughta pass in its current form."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Matijevich, on House Resolution 1751."

Matijevich: "...Yes, I wasn't going to rise until I saw that there's opposition to this...Resolution. I didn't think there would be any. I would commend Representative Black on the introduction of this Resolution. The announcement by the...Superintendent of the State Police...raised many concerns of the rank and file, and I think the rank and

162nd Legislative Day

June 26, 1992

file amongst the State Police are aware their mission. This would have had a profound effect on the administration and the enforcement of law enforcement around the State of Illinois. I sensed, as I read some of the press releases, that it...it had some...some effect on what we were going to do with the state budget, and I though in that regard it was premature. So I would urge the Members to go along with Representative Black in the...adoption of this...Resolution."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Homer, on House Resolution 1751." Homer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I also join to support the Gentleman in his Motion. This is a very important Resolution. Few...matters have caused as much concern among residents, units of government and other concerned entities, than the Director of State Police's proposed so-called revitalization plan. In my area we're part of District 14, which has a headquarters in Macomb. this plan, we would be put into some new district, called District 20, with its headquarters at the far southern end of that district in the town of Pittsfield. That would remove our people some two and a half hours from the nearest State Police headquarters at a time when we have a correctional center...in our area, and when the State Police offer the first line of defense. We reject the idea that we ought to compromise the security and safety of our citizenry. This was not a well-thought-out plan. Although it was offered in the name of streamlining government and saving costs, a thorough analysis of the proposal showed that it saved very little if anything; yet caused great consternation, compromised the safety and security of our citizenry. The Gentleman wants to postpone this plan, put it on the back burner, subject it to more thorough

162nd Legislative Day

June 26, 1992

consideration. That's what we oughta do. I would urge support for House Resolution 1751."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Novak, on House Resolution 1751." "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Novak: I, too, rise in support of this important Resolution. I want to commend Representative Black and all the other Sponsors and, hopefully, the other Members of the Legislature that will approve this Resolution. Just to give you an example of what this proposed consolidation plan would have done to the Ashkum Police District: Ωf course. it would have closed it down, so that means there would not have been a police-district...State District station - all the way on Interstate 57 from the Southside of Chicago all the way down to Pesotom, Illinois, which is in Champaign County, over 150 miles without any state police station. Now, we all know Interstate 57 is notorious for drug trafficking, for drugs being transported from the southern part of the county up through Interstate 57 into the drug market in the City of Chicago and points elsewhere. So, as Representative Homer indicated, and as Representative Black indicated, I think we should postpone this, give it further consideration and study it in-depth, and I certainly urge my colleagues to support this Resolution."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Black, to close on the Resolution."

Black: "Yes. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I think most of you have been contacted by your constituents when this plan first was announced. It came as a complete surprise to them. It came as a complete surprise to most of the Members of this Assembly. All we're asking in this Resolution is, 'Slow

162nd Legislative Day

June 26, 1992

down a little bit and work with us and let us work with you.' I think it's a Resolution deserving your support. I would ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Giorgi: "The question is, 'Shall House Resolution 1751 pass?' All those in favor will signify by saying 'aye', and those opposed, 'nay'. You want a roll call, Representative Black? 'Ayes' have it. The Resolution's adopted. We're going to go back and pick up two Bills that we passed over. Representative Brunsvold, on House Bill 2433, would you like to concur to that? Clerk, read House Bill 2433."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2433..."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Brunsvold."

- Brunsvold: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The next two Bills, House Bill 2433 and 2434, are LRB revisory Bills. On House Bill 3433 (sic-2433), I would like to concur in Senate Amendment #1."
- Speaker Giorgi: "(House Bill) 2433. Do you want to concur to Senate Amendment #1 to this Bill?"
- Brunsvold: "Yes. I would like to concur. I move to concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2433."
- Brunsvold: "Yes. I have also filed a Motion for the...for the members to not print the Amendment since it is 1,100 pages long."
- Speaker Giorgi: "You've heard the Gentleman's Motion to suspend the filing, printing and distribution requirments of House Rules 79(a) and (b). All in favor will signify by saying 'aye', and those opposed, 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it, and the Motion is carried. Use the Attendance Roll Call to

162nd Legislative Day

June 26, 1992

indicate. Now do you want to concur or not concur to this?"

- Brunsvold: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to concur with Senate Amendment #1 on House Bill 2433."
- Speaker Giorgi: "So the question is to concur to Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2433. All in favor signify by saying 'aye' or voting 'aye', and those opposed by voting 'no'. This is final action. Final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? On this question, there are 114 'ayes', no 'nays', none voting 'present', and the House concurs on Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2433, and this Bill, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, read House Bill 2434."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2434, a Bill for an Act to create the 1991 Revisory Act together with Senate Amendment #1."
- Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Brunsvold, on House Bill 2434."
- Brunsvold: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This second Revisory Bill is for the fall, and it was amended in the Senate for the purposes of putting it into Conference Committee so it may be used in the fall Veto Session for that Revisory Bill. So I would move to refuse to concur with Senate Amendment #1."
- Speaker Giorgi: "The Gentleman moves to nonconcur to Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2434. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', those opposed, 'nays'. The 'ayes' have it and the House does not concur to 2434. Passed over a Bill that we're going to go back to for a moment. On House Bill 2824, Mr. Clerk, read the Bill. Representative McAuliffe, after the Clerk reads the Bill, what is your pleasure on 2824?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 2824, a Bill for an Act to amend the

162nd Legislative Day

June 26, 1992

Professional Boxing and Wrestling Act together with Senate
Amendments #1 and 3."

Speaker Giorgi: "Out of the record, Representative, for a moment.

Representative Sieben in the chambers? Sieben, would you like to go with House Bill 3126? Mr. Clerk, read House Bill 3126."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3126..."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Sieben, on House Bill 3126."

Clerk O'Brien: "...a Bill for an Act to amend the Uniform

Disposition of Unclaimed Property Act together with Senate

Amendment #1 and 2."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Sieben."

Sieben: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would move to concur in Senate Amendments #1 and #2."

Speaker Giorgi: "Would you explain the Amendments or..."

Sieben: "Amendment #1 clarifies the change being proposed in the Uniform Disposition of Unclaimed Property Act by another Bill, 1949. That's the Bill we know of as seven to five Bill, and this was put on at the request of Representative Currie, who had some concerns about how that was beingdone. Senate Amendment #2 amends the Uniform Commercial Code in relation to commercial paper and bank deposits and collections. This was put on at the request of Representative McCracken and is identical to House Bill 4094. Be pleased to answer any questions."

Speaker Giorgi: "There being no request for debate, the question is, 'Shall the House concur to Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 3126?' All in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. Final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? On this question...take the roll, Mr. Clerk. On this question,

162nd Legislative Day

June 26, 1992

there are 114 'ayes', none voting 'no', none voting 'present', and the House does concur to Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 3126, and this Bill, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Hicks. Is Representative Hicks in the chamber? Representative Steczo, on House Bill 3204. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3204..."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Steczo, on House Bill, 3204."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Steczo."

Steczo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would move to nonconcur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3204. This Bill addresses the whole question of flow limits and negotiations are taking place so the thought is to put this Bill in Conference Committee and, hopefully, have some agreement by the fall."

Speaker Giorgi: "Being no request for debate, the question is,
'Shall House nonconcur to House Bill 3204 and Senate
Amendment #1?' All in favor signify by saying 'aye',
those opposed 'nay', and the House does not concur to House
Bill 3204 and Senate Amendment #1. Representative W.
Peterson, is he in the chamber? Bill Peterson, would you
want to call 3281, House Bill 3281? Mr. Peterson. Read
the Bill, Mr. Clerk. House Bill 3281."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3281, a Bill for an Act in relation to insurance and benefits together with Senate Amendment #1."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Peterson, on House Bill 3281."

Peterson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to concur with Senate

Amendment 1. That adds to the Bill...it's a Department of

162nd Legislative Day

June 26, 1992

Insurance initiative. It creates a Producer Control Insure Act. It's an agreed Amendment, and I ask for concurrence." Speaker Giorgi: "There being no request for debate, the question is, 'Shall the House concur to Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3281?' All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', and those opposed by voting 'nay', and this is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question, there are 114 'ayes', no 'nays', none voting 'present', and the House does concur to Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3281, and this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Hoffman in chambers? Jay Hoffman? You want call 3374? Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk. House Bill 3374."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3374, a Bill for an Act to amend the Counties Code, together with Senate Amendments #2 and 3."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Hoffman, on House Bill 3374."

Hoffman: "Yes, I move to concur on Senate Amendments #2 and 3.

Basically, what this does, is the two Senate Amendments indicate and have to do with municipalities leap-frogging over unincorporated areas and annexation and pre-annexation agreements. It's my understanding that it's been worked out. So it's...Municipal League has no opposition. This is a Bill that Cook County, all Collar Counties and Madison and St. Clair County is who it applies to, and the Metro-Counties Association...supports this."

Speaker Giorgi: "Are you moving to concur, Mr. Hoffman?"
Hoffman: "Move to concur. Yes."

Speaker Giorgi: "To concur? The question is, 'Shall the House concur to House Bill 3374 and Senate Amendments 2 and 3?'

All in favor will signify by voting 'aye', and those opposed by voting 'nay'. This is final action. He moves

162nd Legislative Day

June 26, 1992

to concur. Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question, there are 111 'ayes', no 'nays', none voting 'present', and the House does concur to Senate Amendments #2 and 3 to House Bill 3374, and this Bill, received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Ronan. Is Representative Ronan in the chambers? Representative Wennlund, for what reason...that's right, you're going to handle this Bill. Representative Wennlund, on House Bill 1410. (House Bill) 3410. House Bill 3410. I'm corrected. Representative...Mr. Clerk, read House Bill 3410."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3410, a Bill for an Act to amend the

Consumer Fraud and Deceptive Business Practice Act together

Senate Amendments #1 and 2."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Wennlund, on House Bill 3410."

Wennlund: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to concur on Senate Amendments 1 and 2. The New Car and Truck Dealers' Association has indicated that these changes clarify the statute. Amendment #1 merely deletes a reference to a used motor vehicle in the section concerning the dealers' share of repair costs for power train repair, and this is really a non-substantive change. And Senate Amendment #2 amends the Consumer Fraud and Deceptive Practices Act to an Act that is commonly referred to as an offer of judgment. It will help the negotiations between purchasers and dealers, and I know of no opposition to the Amendment. They were minor Amendments in the Senate and I move for concurrence."

Speaker Giorgi: "There being no request for debate, the question is, 'Shall the House concur to Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 3410?' All those in favor will signify by saying 'aye', and those opposed by voting 'nay'. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who

162nd Legislative Day

June 26, 1992

wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question, there are lll 'ayes', none voting 'no', 1 voting 'present', and House Bill 3410 with Senate Amendments 1 and 2, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Is Representative Hicks in the chambers? You wanna run with House Bill 3479, Government Efficiency Agency Report? Representative Hicks, do you want this Bill called? Take it out of the record. Take it out of the record. Mr. Hoffman, do you want to go to House Bill 3485? Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk, House Bill 3485."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3485, a Bill for an Act to amend the Counties Code, together with Senate Amendments #1 and 2."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Hoffman, on House Bill 3485."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move to concur with Senate Amendments #1 and 2.

Basically, this sets out more fully the language, and the Sheriffs' Association's okay with it. The counties are okay with it. I move for concurrence."

Speaker Giorgi: "There being no request for debate, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 3485?' All in favor will signify by voting 'aye', and those opposed by voting 'no'. Voting is open. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question, there are 115 'ayes', none voting 'no', voting 'present', and House Bill 3485 and Senate Amendments and 2, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Flinn. Representative Flinn in the chamber? You want 3495 called, Representative Flinn? Cullen. Mr. Cullen, would you ask Mr. Flinn if he wants 3495 called? Read the Bill. Mr.

162nd Legislative Day

June 26, 1992

Clerk."

- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3495, a Bill for an Act to amend the Clerks of Court Act together with Senate Amendments #1 and 2."
- Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Flinn, on House Bill 3495."
- Flinn: "I was gonna concur on those, but I'm not quite prepared to explain them right now."
- Speaker Giorgi: "Let's take it out of the record then.

  Representative Shirley Jones, do you want to run 3504,

  Medical Center? Medical Center Distribution? Style

  Changes. House Bill 3504. Want to take it out of the record for a couple of minutes? Mr. Clerk, read House Bill 3504."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3504, a Bill for an Act to amend the Medical Center District Act, together with Senate Amendment 1."
- Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Shirley Jones, on House Bill 3504."

Jones: "I want to nonconcur on Senate Amendment #1, please."

Speaker Giorgi: "You want to concur or not concur?"

Jones: "Nonconcur."

Speaker Giorgi: "Oh, you want to move nonconcur.

Representative...there being no request for debate...Representative Wennlund, do you want to speak on this issue on House Bill 3504?"

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

Speaker Giorgi: "She indicates she will."

Jones: "Yes, I will."

Wennlund: "Representative, can you tell me what your intentions are in putting this into a Conference Committee?"

Jones: "This is, like I said before to Mr. Black when he asked me the last time, this is only on Amendment that is really for

162nd Legislative Day

June 26, 1992

my district to put a shopping center in my district."

Wennlund: "I'm sorry. The noise level's pretty high. I'm sorry.

I couldn't hear you."

Jones: "It only make it a shell. I just want to put it in the Conference Committee."

Wennlund: "For what purpose?"

Jones: "I just want to leave it there so we can try to get some negotiation."

Wennlund: "Negotiations for what?"

Jones: "Shopping center in my district."

Wennlund: "How would this affect a shopping center in your district, Representative?"

Jones: "Pardon me?"

Wennlund: "How will this affect a shopping center in your district?"

Jones: "Well, the medical center and the city are trying to put a shopping center in there, and the land...I don't know exactly who the land belongs to, I think some land belongs to the medical center and some belongs to the city, so they're trying to negotiate on it, but it's really just a shell Bill right now."

Wennlund: "Is...is this intended to convey state land for the purposes of a private shopping center?"

Jones: "Pardon me?"

Wennlund: "Is this to convey state land for the purposes of building a shopping center that would be privately owned?"

Jones: "Mr. Speaker, I can't hardly hear him. I didn't hear you, Wennlund, when you..."

Wennlund: "Is the purpose of this Bill to convey some state-owned land for the purpose of putting up a private shopping center?"

Jones: "For the state...What did you say? I can't hear you."

162nd Legislative Day

June 26, 1992

- Wennlund: "Is the purpose of this to convey state land for use to build a privately owned shopping center?"
- Jones: "No. No. No. This is not for the state. No."
- Wennlund: "How does the State of Illinois get involved in the shopping center through this Bill?"
- Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Wennlund..."
- Jones: "I really can't answer that question right now because I don't know, but actually, like I said before, this is just a shell Bill, and I will get back to you and let you know how the state is involved in this. Okay?"
- Speaker Giorgi: "The Lady wishes to nonconcur to House Bill 3504 and Senate Amendment #1. All in favor will signify by saying 'aye', those opposed, 'nays'. The 'ayes' have it, and the House does not concur to House Bill 3504 and Senate Amendment #1. Representative DeJaegher, would you like to go with...Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk. House Bill 3519."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3519, a Bill for an Act to amend the Civil Administrative Code of Illinois together with Senate Amendments #1 and 2."
- Speaker Giorgi: "Representative DeJaegher, on House Bill 3519."
- DeJaegher: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move that the House concur with Senate Amendment #1 and Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 3519. The intent of the Bill is to create an regulating the occupation of environment practitioners. Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill removes language concerning the National Environmental Health Association examination and replace it with the professional examination service. The second Amendment to 3519 provides it shall be the responsibility of individuals required to register under this Act to pay for their own registration. This shall not be the responsibility of his or her employer, and I move for

162nd Legislative Day

June 26, 1992

passage of 3519."

Speaker Giorgi: "There being no request for debate, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 3519 pass with Senate Amendments #1 and 2?' All in favor signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'no'. Voting's open. Voting's open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question, there are 72 'ayes', 39 'nays', none voting 'present', and House Bill 3519 with Senate Amendments #1 and 2, having a received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Stern in the chambers? Would you like to go with 3563, Representative Stern? Election deputy registrars. Mr. Clerk, read House Bill 3563."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3563, a Bill for an Act to amend the

Election Code together with Senate Amendments #1 and 2."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Stern, on House Bill 3563."

Stern: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I would like to concur the Amendments that come from the Senate on this This Motor Voter Bill. is the Bill which has removed...Wait a minute. Let me find all this. Hold everything. It has removed the offices other than the Secretary of State's Office from this Bill which ought to take away considerable of the concern that people had. Senate Amendment #1 deletes the majority of the Bill. Provides for only for voter registration in the Secretary of State's Office. Senate Amendment #2 becomes the Bill, amends the Election Code, the Vehicle Code, provides for voter registration at the Secretary of State's Offices. The Secretary of State must inquire of applicants for licenses want to register to vote. It is very much as it was here except less cumbersome for the various major

162nd Legislative Day

June 26, 1992

service offices."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Hartke, on House Bill 3563."

Hartke: "I have a question."

Speaker Giorgi: "Continue."

Hartke: "Representative, what is the effective date on the implementation of this law?"

Stern: "Just a moment, Representative. There is no effective date included on the Bill, so January 1 would be the effective date."

Hartke: "January 1, 1993. Okay, you said it took off several other state offices that registration would have been allowed under our legislation. It only puts in the Secretary of State."

Stern: "That's correct."

Hartke: "Which offices were taken out?"

Stern: "Public Aid, Department of Employment Security, Public Health, I believe."

Hartke: "Okay, thank you very much."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Kubik, on House Bill 3563."

Kubik: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would rise in opposition to the Lady's Motion for a variety of reasons, one of which is the cost. It is estimated that...there is a potential of almost 700,000 voters who would be potentially eligible to register and to make this...Right now, this is a permissive program. In other words, the Secretary of State can do it as he sees fit. By mandating this program and mandating that the employees have to be...voter registrars and go through this process, we're talking about a rather significant fiscal impact in the neighborhood of \$1.7 million. That's not a small chunk of change. Now the proponent will tell you that that can be a program that's easily enacted, but it's

162nd Legislative Day

June 26, 1992

really not that easy because the forms will have to be changed, people will have to be trained, and there will be a cost impact and in a year when we're looking at tightening up budgets and all the like, this seems like the wrong time to look at this particular proposal. realize that the proponents indicate that they're...they do this in other states, et cetera. The difference is that in many other states the Secretary of State is the chief election officer in the state. In our State, the Secretary of State is not the chief election officer. He is...His primary responsibility is the registration οf result. the...doesn't vehicles and...so as а necessarily...It's not a compatible kind of situation. suggestion would be that we defeat these Amendments and leave this as a permissive program to allow the Secretary State to do this as he sees fit and not mandate this program which is going to cost a great deal of money. is not the year to look at increasing costs on budgets such as this one. So I would rise in opposition and I would ask for...that we look at this very carefully and that we indicate...give it a 'no' vote because it's just not fiscally sound in this particular year. Thank you."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Black, on House Bill 3563."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is a very admirable program, and I would like to rise to support it, but I can't, and I don't think a lot of you can either if you just listen carefully to some of the facts. Clerk Orr up in Cook County, has estimated that 700,000 people could register under this mandated program each and every year. Now that's great. I think we'd all like to see that happen, but to do that, the voter transaction is going to take about 12 minutes longer

# 162nd Legislative Day

June 26, 1992

to process in addition to the processing time for a drivers license or a vehicle transaction. Now keep in mind, there are only 20 facilities in the Chicago area to do that only 20 to handle 700,000 people that might take advantage So you're going to have longer lines and of this service. slower service, and you're going to get the complaints I'm sure you already do), about slower service when they're there to get their drivers license or to complete a motor vehicle transaction. The Secretary surveyed people visiting drivers license facilities, and the overwhelming response was say...was to say, 'Hey, I'm here to get a motor vehicle transaction completed in the quickest, most expeditious manner possible. I may be here on my lunch hour or a break. I don't have time to waste.' registering to vote in this motor vehicle facility is not a very high priority with people that (sic - who) visiting these states. So, the difference is with this Bill, if you vote to concur, you are mandating a program that's going make longer lines and unhappier to constituents. We think that the permissive system now in force can certainly go a long way towards helping. When we get some of these little problems worked out, I would love to stand and support a Bill like this, but I don't think this is the year to do it, and, Mr. Speaker, we, obviously, request a Roll Call Vote on this Motion and will seek a verification should it get the requisite number."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Schoenberg, on House Bill 3563."

Schoenberg: "Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would rise in strong support of these Amendments. I'm very sensitive to the issue of mandates. After all, I was...I helped sponsor Representative Churchill's legislation on a constitutional

162nd Legislative Day

June 26, 1992

Amendment limiting mandates, but the reality is, for those of us who are so sensitive to the economics of the there's a corresponding savings for the Cook County clerks, and in the end, if I can quote Ernest Hemingway in The Sun Also Rises, 'It's the taxpayer who pays and pays and pays.' The saving's going to be translated on the property tax bill to the counties, and, I think, in the largest county, Cook County, I don't think David Orr, in light of his fiscal responsibility, would be supporting this measure if, be...imprudent. in fact. it was going to corresponding savings will enable us to provide more people with an opportunity to vote, and I believe that Secretary of State's facilities are already capable of just taking that extra, additional time in order to provide more people with the...ability to...participate in democracy. So we don't operate in a vacuum. The savings will be the property tax end for our respective county clerks, and I would urge you all to support this."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Matijevich, on House Bill 3563."

Matijevich: "Speaker, I also stand in strong support of this measure. You know, in past years and recent years, we've said that with driving a car, you need to be a responsible citizen. In fact, we've used the drivers license..taking away those privileges from young people who we feel haven't been responsible in their actions. What better policy in the State of Illinois than to say that if you're going to drive an automobile, you also ought to take that...matter of voting...seriously, and the fact is that many people want to vote, and then they put off registration for some reason or other - It hasn't been convenient for them - and the next thing you know they've been locked out. They waited too long. This way we take the opportunity when

162nd Legislative Day

June 26, 1992

somebody does get their drivers license that they registered. I think it's good public policy. We ought to put it in effect. I...You know, I have a sense about this that, you know, why is this being political? There's been that argument that more...the more people that register that it may favor one party or the other party. Is...is it the feeling of the Republican Party that you're going to lose politically? That because more people that register may be Democrats. I don't think either political party ought to base their vote on who may gain politically from Who gains from it is the person who does become registered, and I also have the feeling that, as I have so often before, that agencies give us a figure that is much higher with regards to the implementation of the certain things that we put on them. It doesn't take very long for a person to register a voter. So I would urge Membership, both Republicans and Democrats, to vote in support of this, and if the Republicans fail to vote on it, I think they will be suspect amongst all of the voters of the State of Illinois."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Edley, last speaker."

Edley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the General Assembly. I think this should be a bipartisan Bill. In fact, on a national level, it has been a bipartisan Bill. I have a letter from the Secretary of State from the State of Washington, a Republican Secretary of State, and he writes, 'I'm writing to you in support of the concept of motor voter. As a Republican Secretary of State, I serve as Washington's Chief Elections Officer.'

And he goes on to say that they've registered a 100,000 new voters with the same staff and the same equipment that they had previous to this legislation, and I would think that

162nd Legislative Day

June 26, 1992

given the fact that we're trying to involve people in our process, to try to empower people in government, to try to demonstrate that we are open, that we are responsive - that this motor voter makes sense. It makes tremendous sense, and I would urge a bipartisan support, and, hopefully, this flies out of here. Thank you."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Stern, to close."

Stern: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I am astonished that this has become a political issue. I cannot imagine that anyone in this House is going to be willing to stand in front of his or her voters between now and November say, 'I voted against making registration to vote easier and more convenient for you, the voters of my area.' heaven's sake, Ladies and Gentlemen, this is an idea whose time had come 10 years ago. We have been very slow in implementing this kind of thing. Other states have put this plan into effect with no additional costs. Ιn the additional costs are negligible. No additional staff was added in Arizona. No additional persons were needed in Colorado. I can understand that the Secretary of State would like, perhaps not, to add to the duties of his clerks, but I think he ought to rethink that. By spreading this kind of activity over the whole 365-day spectrum. we avoiding that enormous rush in the 30 days prior to every election when voting registration is cut off. The 30 days prior to that, people think of coming in to register. is a matter of conscience for you, I urge. not cost the kind of amounts that the Secretary of State has indicated. It will not be the kind of difficult, complicated service to offer. These are the years that we should be offering service to our people. In this day and age, we can create forms that make it possible to apply for

162nd Legislative Day

June 26, 1992

a drivers license and registration to vote on the same form. We have between now and January 1 to create such a form. (There are firms that do that with one hand tied behind them.) I think opposition to this Bill is a serious error if your name is going to be on the ballot in November. It is going to be a very difficult vote to defend if you vote against it. I urge you to re-examine this issue and vote 'aye' on House Bill 3563."

Speaker Giorgi: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur to the Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 3563?' All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed by voting 'nay'. This is final action. The voting's open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question, there are 65 'ayes', 40 voting 'nay', 10 voting 'present', and do you persist, Mr. Black, in your...question?"

Black: "Mr. Speaker, as much as I'd like to speed things up, it's still early in the day, and I think I'll give it a shot."

Speaker Giorgi: "The Gentleman requests a verification. Would
 you call the...poll those not voting?"

Clerk McLennand: "Those not voting. Representative Bugielski."

Speaker Giorgi: "Okay. Poll the affirmative."

"Those voting in the affirmative: Balanoff. Clerk McLennand: Brunsvold. Burke. Capparelli. Curran. Currie. Davis. DeJaegher. DeLeo. Dunn. Edley. Farley. Flinn. Flowers. Giglio. Giorgi. Granberg. Hartke. Hicks. J. Hoffman. Homer. Hultgren. Lou Jones. Shirley Jones. Kulas. Keane. Kirkland. Lang. Laurino. LeFlore. Levin. Marinaro. Matijevich. Mautino. McDonough. McGuire. McPike. Morrow. Mulcahey. McGann. Novak. Rice. Obrzut. Phelps. Preston. Richmond. Ronan.

162nd Legislative Day

June 26, 1992

Rotello. Saltsman. Santiago. Satterthwaite. Schakowsky. Schoenberg. Shaw. Steczo. Stepan. Stern. Trotter. Turner. White. Williams. Wolf. Woolard. Anthony Young, and Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Mautino wishes to be recorded voting 'aye'. Do you want to be verified? He's at a meeting. Would you verify Representative Mautino, Mr. Black?"

Black: "Yes, fine."

Speaker Giorgi: "Okay. Do you have any questions of the affirmative?"

Black: "Yes. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Representative Trotter?"

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Trotter. Is Representative Trotter in the chambers? Remove him from the roll call."

Black: "Representative Lou Jones?"

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Lou Jones. Is Representative Lou Jones in the chamber? Lou Jones? Remove her from the record."

Black: "Representative Shaw?"

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Shaw is in his seat."

Black: "I'm sorry. Representative Flowers?"

Speaker Giorgi: "Flowers in her seat. Excuse me, Mr. Black.

Representative Bugielski wants to be recorded as voting
'aye'. Flowers in her seat, Representative Black."

Black: "Thank you. It's hard to see with so many people wandering around. Representative White in the chambers?"

Speaker Giorgi: "Jesse White. Representative White.

Representative White in the chambers? Representative
White. Remove him from the record."

Black: "Representative Ronan?"

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Ronan. Representative Ronan...is

162nd Legislative Day

June 26, 1992

Representative Ronan in the chambers? Remove him from the record. All right. Excuse me, Mr. Black. Representative Edley would like to be verified. Go ahead, Mr. Black."

Black: "Representative Kulas?"

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Kulas. Representative Kulas.

Representative Kulas in the chamber? Remove him from the record. Deering would like to be verified."

Black: "Thank you. That's fine. Representative Farley?"

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Farley. Representative Farley.

Is Farley in the chamber? Remove him from the record."

Black: "Representative Keane? Jim Keane?"

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Keane is standing beside me."

Black: "Sorry about that. Representative Hicks?"

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Hicks. Is Representative Hicks in the chambers? Representative Hicks. Remove him from the record."

Black: "Representative Burke?"

Speaker Giorgi: "Danny Burke is..."

Black: "Representative Turner?"

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Turner. Art Turner. Is Art
Turner in the district? Restore Lovana Jones to the roll
call, Mr. Clerk. Is Turner in the chambers? Remove him
from the roll call."

Black: "Representative Currie?"

Speaker Giorgi: "Currie's in her seat."

Black: "I can't see around Mark over there."

Speaker Giorgi: "I'll help you, Bill."

Black: "Okay. Thank you. You're very kind. Representative Kirkland?"

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Kirkland is on our side of the
 aisle."

Black: "Well, tell him to get back to his seat. Will you,

162nd Legislative Day

June 26, 1992

please?"

Speaker Giorgi: "I think he's happier there."

Black: "Oh. Thank you. Representative Williams?"

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative, restore White to the roll call.

Jesse White, and what was the other question? Continue,

Mr. Black."

Black: "Thank you. Representative Phelps?"

Speaker Giorgi: "Phelps. Dave Phelps is in the doorway."

Black: "Representative Williams? Paul Williams?"

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Paul Williams. Representative Williams. Is Williams in the chambers? Remove him from the record."

Black: "Representative Woolard?"

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Woolard. Representative Woolard.

Representative Woolard's in his seat."

Black: "I have nothing further."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Stern."

Stern: "Mr. Speaker..."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Hicks. Just a moment. Just a moment. Keep calm."

Stern: "I am informed that..."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Dunn, now for what reason do you rise? We're in the middle of a verification."

Dunn: "Mr. Speaker, I was in and out. How am I recorded?"

Speaker Giorgi: "You are recorded as voting 'aye'."

Dunn: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I hope you'll leave me on 'aye'. That's where I want to be."

Speaker Giorgi: "Mr. Black, Representative Hicks is here in the well. Will you put him back on the roll call, Mr. Clerk?

On this question, 60 'ayes', 40 'nays', 10 voting 'present', and this Senate...House Bill 3563, with Senate Amendments #1 and 2, is hereby...receiving the

162nd Legislative Day

June 26, 1992

Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Curran, do you want to go with House Bill 3587? Out of the record. Stepan. Representative Stepan, would you like to go with House Bill 3638? House Bill 3638. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk McLennand: "House Bill 3638, a Bill for an Act to amend the

Lead Poisoning Prevention Act together with Senate

Amendments 1 and 2."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Stepan on 3638, House Bill."

Stepan: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I move that the House concur with Senate Amendments 1 and 2."

Speaker Giorgi: "There being no request for a debate, the question is, 'Shall the House concur to House Bill 3638 with Senate Amendment #1 and 2?' All those in...One and 2, Mrs. Stepan? One and 2?"

Stepan: "Yes."

Speaker Giorgi: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 3638?' All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', and those opposed...Excuse me. Representative Black seeks recognition. Representative Black, on this issue."

Black: "Yeah. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Once again..."

Speaker Giorgi: "We started a roll call, Black."

Black: "Well, I understand. But, I..."

Speaker Giorgi: "Nobody signified they wanted to be..."

Black: "Like Representative Preston said yesterday, when somebody says we just concur and nobody explains anything that's in the Amendment, I'm not sure you ought to vote for that. This was a controversial Bill at one time. I have no idea what's in these Amendments."

Speaker Giorgi: "Mrs. Stepan, will you please explain Amendment #1 and 2?"

162nd Legislative Day

June 26, 1992

Stepan: "Yes. Representative, I'd be happy to explain...the Amendments. This is, by the way, Representative, an Agreed Bill with the realtors and all parties that were involved in this Bill worked very hard, as you well know, and it was controversial, and I am very pleased in that the provisions in this Bill will go a long way in helping us to eliminate lead poisoning from our homes. This would require that the Illinois Department of Public Health would repair...would prepare a report following the inspection of a building where a person does screen positive for lead poisoning. A copy of that report would then be provided to the property owner and occupants of the dwelling unit. It would require the department to serve a mitigation notice when a lead hazard is found and would require property owners to complete mitigation in accordance with specific standards and timetables set up by the department. It would also set out the standards and procedures for the mitigation including the use of licensed lead abatement contractors and licensed lead abatement workers for activities that involve the destruction or the disturbance of any lead surface. The department may permit certain activities to be performed by unlicensed contractors and may waive that requirement if there is no danger to the health of the workers and the safety of humans. And when they do find that mitigation has been satisfied, there would be a certificate of compliance issued. It would require the property owners who have received mitigation notice, would give every prospective leasee a written notice of the hazard. It would also require owners of residential buildings or dwellings...or dwellings built before 1978 to give prospective tenants information on the potential health hazards posed by lead by giving them..."

162nd Legislative Day

June 26, 1992

Speaker Giorgi: "Thank you, Representative Stepan."

Stepan: "And this brochure would be provided by the Department of Public Health."

Speaker Giorgi: "The guestion is... Take the roll, Mr. Clerk. this question, there are 102 'ayes', 4 'nays', 3 voting 'present', and the House does concur to Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 3638. And this Bill, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Thank you for your explanation. Speaker Madigan and Representative Giorgi, 'aye'. Jane Barnes, Marinaro, 'aye'. Can you put them on, Mr. Clerk, or is it closed? It's gone. They indicate they wanted to vote 'aye'. Monique Davis. Representative Ackerman, 'no'. The record should indicate Representative Ackerman wanted Representative Hoffman. Is he in the to vote 'no'. Representative Morrow, for what reason do you chambers? rise?"

Morrow: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. I also rise for the point of personal privilege."

Speaker Giorgi: "Continue."

Morrow: "We have in the gallery the fine members of the 20th Ward

Democratic Organization under the leadership of Senator

Ethel Skyles Alexander. Will the 20th Ward please stand

up? Stand up and please recognize them for being here."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Curran, do you want to go with House Bill 3650? Representative Curran. Representative Curran, 3650. House Bill 3650. Out of the record. Representative Lang, do you want to go with House Bill 3651? Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3651, a Bill for an Act concerning comprehensive, statewide poison control system together with Senate Amendment #1."

162nd Legislative Day

June 26, 1992

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Lang, on 3651."

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would move to concur with Senate Amendment #1 which is a fairly technical Amendment relative to funding for the poison control centers."

Speaker Giorqi: "There being no request for debate, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 3651 pass with Senate Amendments #1?' All in favor will signify by voting 'aye' and those opposed by voting 'no'. Voting is open. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? On this question... Take the roll, Mr. Clerk. On this question, there are 111 'ayes', none 'nay', none voting 'present', and House Bill 3651 with Senate Amendment #1. having received the required Constitutional Majority, is declared passed. Representative Turner in the chambers? Representative Turner? Representative Keane. Representative Keane in the chambers? Representative Capparelli, do you want to call 3676, Metro Reclamation District? Mr. Clerk, read 3676."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3676, a Bill for an Act to amend the Metropolitan Water Reclamation District Act together with Senate Amendment #1."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Capparelli, on House Bill 3676."

Capparelli: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to concur with Senate Amendment #1. It amends the Metropolitan Water Reclamation District Act to create a position of Director of Information Technology. The district appointed a blue ribbon advisory committee and the report recommended the agency appoint a Director of Information Technology. The net effect of this Amendment will be to save money because computer planning will be centralized, reducing the needed experts in each department. I'd ask for a favorable roll call."

162nd Legislative Day

June 26, 1992

Speaker Giorgi: "There being no request for debate, the question is 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments #1 to House Bill 3676?' All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye' and those opposed, 'no'. The voting is open. This is final passage. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? On this question, there are...Mr. Clerk, take the roll. On this question, there are 109 'ayes', no 'nays', none voting 'present', and House Bill 3676 with Senate Amendment #1 is hereby...The House does concur. And this Bill, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Black, would you like to run with 1754, House Bill 1754? State Police Finances? All right. Mr. Clerk, read...Senate Bill 3754."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3754, a Bill for an Act in relation to the Department of State Police together with Senate Amendment #1."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Black, on House Bill 3754."

Black: "Yeah. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I think this Bill passed out of the House unanimously. Senate Amendment #1 was added at the request of the state police to simply clarify that not only can they...use private dollars or funds that might be donated to them, but also the Department of Central Management Services could do that as well. I know of no opposition to this...Bill. It also carries language in it that we passed out of the House with overwhelming support creating the Interstate Rail Passenger Network Compact. I'd be glad to answer any questions that you have. Would urge your support of this Bill."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Stern, on House Bill 3754."
Stern: "Will the Gentleman yield?"

162nd Legislative Day

June 26, 1992

Speaker Giorgi: "He indicates he will."

Stern: "Is...When you say that they can accept money or use money that is donated to them, is this the kind of situation that happens in our home almost every night when the phone rings at 8:00 and someone announces that they are from the police?"

Black: "Absolutely not. That language was clarified and made very clear at the request of the Jewish Federation and the United Way that we are not going out soliciting. That if a company comes to the state police and wants to give them a grant to carry on I-Search or an identification program, right now there is no mechanism that would let them accept this grant and put it for that use. The Jewish Federation and the United Way put specific language in the Bill so that they could not be out soliciting. Obviously, they don't want another group out soliciting, and we and you and I agree we don't need anymore people calling us at home."

Stern: "A lot of those people are police people, you know."

Black: "Well, local police people, yes, raising money for lodges, but this certainly does not provide for that."

Stern: "Thank you very much, Representative."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Hicks on House Bill 3754."

Hicks: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Gentleman yield for a question, please?"

Speaker Giorgi: "He indicates he will."

Hicks: "Representative Black, when the state police, let's say, for example, were to receive money from one of these organizations, how do they spend that money? Do they have to come back to us for authority to do so or can they just spend it any way they see fit?"

Black: "The language in the Bill that we were asked to put in provides that any funds received by the department must be

162nd Legislative Day

June 26, 1992

appropriated to the department by the General Assembly for the purpose specified by the grantor or contractor."

Hicks: "Okay. So that goes for not only state police but CMS and anybody else."

Black: "Yes. Yes."

Hicks: "Okay. Thank you very much."

Speaker Giorgi: "There being no further request for debate, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments #1 to House Bill 3754?' All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', and those opposed by voting 'no'. The voting is open. This is final passage. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? On this question, there are 114 'ayes'...Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question, there are 114 'ayes', none voting 'no', none voting 'present', and the House concurs on Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3754, and this Bill, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Tim Johnson, for what reason do you rise? Representative Johnson."

- Johnson: "My privilege to introduce my guest for the day who is he thinks the winner. (I'm not sure he really won.) It
  might have been a loser in a contest...a bid for charity in
  Ford County in our area the State's Attorney of Ford
  County from Paxton, my friend Tony Lee, who's here with us
  today."
- Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Turner. Mr. Speaker.

  Representative McPike in the Chair."
- Speaker McPike: "House Bill 3275. This Bill has been read a second time previously. Mr. Clerk, are there any Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #25, offered by Representative Farley."

162nd Legislative Day

June 26, 1992

Speaker McPike: "...Speaker Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that Amendments 25 through 28 are out of order."

Speaker McPike: "Floor Amendments 25, 26, 27 and 28 are out of order. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #29, offered by Speaker Madigan."

Speaker McPike: "Speaker Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen, once again this matter concerns the proposal to create a Regional Airport Authority in northeastern Illinois, which authority would build a new airport at the site of Lake Calumet. The matter has been thoroughly discussed on three previous occasions. I don't plan to offer any further remarks other than to say that this Amendment is substantially the same as the last Amendment, and I move for the adoption of the Amendment."

Speaker McPike: "And on the Speaker's Motion, Representative Balanoff."

Balanoff: "Yes. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Often times in the Legislature, we hear about the Cubs and the Cardinals. For sure I thought it was baseball season because I was always taught that three strikes and you're out, but I must be wrong because this Bill keeps coming back, and back, and back. The Lake Calumet proposal is not like a bottle of fine wine that improves with age. It does not get any better. It may get heavier, but it doesn't get any better. All it can do is cost the want taxpayers more and more money. Today Ι specifically address the changes in Amendment 29. It calls noise commission that could for phony make recommendations to the Federal Aviation Authority regarding noise, according to those who have fought so valiantly over

162nd Legislative Day

June 26, 1992

many, many years to protect their homes around O'Hare from noise, the Suburban O'Hare Commission, and I have been in contact..."

Speaker McPike: "Yes. Mr. Balanoff, bring your remarks to a close."

Balanoff: "And I have been in contact with them this morning.

This will not work. There is no trade...according to them for Lake Calumet, because Lake Calumet will only guarantee more runways at O'Hare. I've talked before about the \$11 billion price tag and the taxes that it's going to mean. My hope is this morning (or this afternoon, as it may be), that the Mayor and the Governor have put Dr. Deets on alert and much other medical staff to take care of all the broken arms if this Bill is to pass. Lake Calumet is a bad idea. I could see the fliers now in your districts and I guarantee you that some in this chamber will not be back if they vote in favor of this Amendment today."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Curran."

Curran: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Very simply, very short, at a time when we may have the worst budget crisis in recent memory, perhaps the worst in this century, it is no time to be trying to build the most expensive airport in the history of the planet. I ask you to vote 'no'."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Giglio."

Giglio: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I don't think there's too much more to say after the third time around, but I'd just like to remind my colleagues, once again, to picture themselves in one of their towns with approximately a seven-mile square area and it's bulldozed down and you have a piece of flatland ready to put an airport and the homes and the houses and everything else are right across the street. That's

162nd Legislative Day

June 26, 1992

exactly what it will be like if this airport site at Then try and picture a site in the Calumet is approved. green grass. Picture taking a ride out in the country and picture seven miles of flatland. Yes, you'll probably see maybe a church, a school house or maybe a farm but try and visualize seven square miles of vacant land and then another three miles, like they are doing in Denver, where they won't allow anybody to build anything. What a place for a beautiful airport, and I truthfully believe and will reiterate that, yes, we do need another airport for the future, but the Lake Calumet is not the right site. And I would ask you once again to consider voting 'no' and, hopefully, let the Federal Government decide that they will also turn this site down and, hopefully, we'll have a third airport in Illinois at a green grass site."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Black."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. When I came down here, I went to an orientation session in 1986. The Dean of the House spoke to all new Members at that Session and he said (particularly to those of us from Downstate), he said, 'You people from Downstate can come here and you can make a career out of bashing Chicago if that's what you want to (And I must admit to you that that's popular in my district.) Yet, at the same time, Chicago whether we like or not, is an integral part of the economy and well-being of the State of Illinois. I've come to this General Assembly many times in the five years that I've been here and I've asked you to help me and my district that was decimated by the recession in '79 and '80, and I've asked you to help me on economic development projects and, for the most part, you have done that, and we have

162nd Legislative Day

June 26, 1992

been able to save some jobs in my district because of cooperation and votes from both sides of the aisle. be back to you in the Veto Session to once again ask your help in trying to save the largest single employer in my and I may need your help. I agree with everything that's been said. It's a controversial vote. It's a difficult issue. I am now convinced, because of the compromise that the Sponsor of this Bill has worked out, that my downstate taxpayers will not have to bear any great burden if this airport becomes a reality. It will be financed by airline user fees, a \$3 per head tax on passengers at O'Hare and other Chicago or Authority airports and the Federal Airport Improvement Trust Fund. Furthermore, in talking with people back home, we do not now have access, air access, to O'Hare Airport because of its overcrowdedness. Now that may not be critical to me, I seldom fly to Chicago, but it is critical to businessmen and women in my district, who work for Fortune 500 companies, who have to not only get to Chicago but often to corporate headquarters in New York or Denver or Fort Worth or Dallas or Phoenix. Without that air service, I'm afraid the economy in my district will be even further I'm hoping that if plans progress for a third airport in Illinois, that downstate communities who now cannot get access to O'Hare - and we lost train service more than 25 years ago - will be able to benefit additional slots at an international airport. good infrastructure nothing as important as transportation if all areas of this state are to survive and to progress as we want it to do. So, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, if I come to you and plead for economic development in Central Illinois, which

# 162nd Legislative Day

June 26, 1992

we so desperately need in highways and infrastructure and water and sewer and school construction loans, it is the City of hypocritical of me to stand up every time Chicago wants something to always vote 'no'. That is hypocritical. There are times you have to make a tough No. This will not play well in my district. All I can say is to the people who sent me here, you sent me here to try to do what's right, and I think, finally, at this point this is what's right for the State of Illinois. Without a major international airport, Illinois will its position in the international and national business community, and whether we like it or not, Members of 105th District in Central Illinois, whether we like it or not, while I'm as careful as you want me to be with what Chicago gets and how they get it, if Chicago dies on the vine, how do you think that will help us? It'll have the opposite effect. There'll be more demands on our tax dollars to meet the needs of the City of Chicago. believe, after studying this Amendment, that it is in our best interest to keep Chicago as vibrant and healthy as possible, so that we in turn Downstate can have our tax dollars and our needed infrastructure improvements for what we so desperately need. I can't stand here anymore and be hypocritical and vote 'no' every time there's an issue before the City of Chicago. I think it's right. The is now. A third airport is necessary if we're to keep this state at the pre-eminent spot in the international and national business field, and all I can hope is that keeping that transportation network up to date and state of the art, that some of those jobs and some of that money will come down into my district. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this one project will create 100,000 jobs. Now

162nd Legislative Day

June 26, 1992

I don't anticipate that many of those jobs will go to people in my district, but I'm going to stand with you today and help you create those 100,000 jobs, and when I come back next fall, or if I come back next fall, I may need your help to try and keep 1,000 jobs in East Central Illinois, and I've asked you to help before and you have, and I hope you'll help in the future. I think, Ladies and Gentlemen, we've postured enough. The time is right. This is about the economic future, not just for the City of Chicago, but for the State of Illinois, and I intend to vote 'aye'."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Balthis."

Balthis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. It's rather ironic that most of us that agree that third airport is important, agree wholeheartedly with about 99% of what the previous speaker just said. believe that a third airport in the Chicago area would be good for Illinois, but we do not believe that displacing 50,000 people (which is more than half of one of our legislative districts), is good for Illinois. It's time that this House thought about one thing and that's people. We can discuss, the rest of the day, the rest of the week and in the next month, the issue of the third airport. What we're talking about is people's lives. We talking about economic development. We're talking about people's lives. I would ask each and every one οf that are going to cast a green vote today, to think about how you would feel if this was happening in your district."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Trotter."

Trotter: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Members of this

House. Let me begin by thanking all of you who have

remained steadfast in voting 'no' in this assault on my

# 162nd Legislative Day

June 26, 1992

community. This week we've heard the arguments, we've heard the statistics, and, rightfully so, Representative Santiago, you're absolutely correct when you said, 'There's affirmative action issue here.' You're absolutely If you're going to have this project, if you can't cut us in, then cut the whole project out. right on that, and thank you, Representative Dunn, reminding us about the federal folly and the things that they've done as far as trying to promote a super-collider But when they found out they didn't have the project. money, even in their wisdom, they said forget the project. The State of Illinois does not have the money for this project, and just as the last speaker said, there 50,000 other reasons as well for not having this project, and that are...those are the people who live in community; the people who reside and go to the schools and attend the churches; the people who've lived and made history of that community be a living history; those folks who moved in that community 100 years ago and helped build this state by working in the steel mills and by building their own homes because they bought into a dream. And that dream, the American dream, of having a home, community where they can worship, where they can play and where they can raise their children. You know, there are 50,000 other reasons to oppose this Bill. Representative Ropp, I doubt very seriously if they talked about down Bloomington - which only has 48,000 people - that you would stand before this committee and vote for I doubt very seriously you would do that. Representative Tenhouse. Tenhouse, the same thing. if they wanted to tear down Beardstown which has 6,338 people or Rushville with 3,348 people. No. You would jump

162nd Legislative Day

June 26, 1992

up and down and ask this chamber to please be with you on protecting the history, the integrity of your community. Representative Hasara, you too. If they started talking about tearing down your beloved Chatham. If they started talking about doing things in New Berlin with 834 people, you'd be the loudest voice on this floor saying, 'Stop! There's history. There's community. There's a purpose.' Well, there's a purpose for voting 'no' on this Bill, and it's 50,000 of them and I ask you to vote with us in saying 'no' again for this legislation. Thank you."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Hasara."

Hasara: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is probably the toughest vote that most of us will make this Session. We all we've all been pressured by both sides. Yes, I've talked to the Governor, and I do intend to vote 'yes' on this legislation. Let me tell you what I discovered when I started analyzing why a Downstater would vote for this project. First of all, let me tell you, I'll tell you of all, I went to the Department of why. First Agriculture. Much of my district is agriculturally oriented. The Department of Agriculture, according to its Director, Becky Doyle, prefers this site greatly over any the other sites that have been mentioned. At the current time, we lose on the average in Illinois, 30,000 This site minimizes the loss of acres to development. acreage to our agricultural areas, not only for the site alone but also if you put this site in Kankakee, Peotone or one of the other green sites, the infrastructure to that site takes away a number of acres of agricultural area. that is certainly one reason why it is attractive to a Downstater. Another reason is the safety of all of the residents of Illinois who use air planes and fly in this

162nd Legislative Day

June 26, 1992

state. Almost every citizen of this state uses O'Hare. We know it is one of the most dangerous airports at the present time of any airport in this country, and I think it is in the best interest of both Downstate and every other οf the state to look for the safety of area constituents. Then I went to the EPA and Ι Gatey how she felt about this site. I was told that this is an environmentally ravaged area and that it will beneficial to this site to get it cleaned up. That would probably not happen if we did not build a third airport. Let's talk about dollars. First of all, I think it's well to remember that the passage of this Bill does not cost one penny. What it gives us the authority to do is to proceed trying to obtain the required numerous permits and to look for federal funds. There is \$50,000 that will appropriated out of state money for a study and that is it. federal dollars are our tax dollars too, but I would much prefer using those federal dollars to create jobs in my state than doing what Congress keeps doing and that is voting to extend unemployment compensation benefits for the hundreds of thousands of unemployed people in this country. If we're going to spend federal dollars, let's spend them on jobs, not on unemployment benefits. We also are talking about - and no one is objecting to - assisting Scott Air Force Base in keeping its economic development. No one's objecting to that, so why are we so dead set on objecting to this site when we're actually putting more state dollars into Scott than we are into this site? Polls in Illinois show that unemployment is the number one concern of our citizens. This is a chance for us to deal with their The passage of this Bill does not mean one more concerns. state layoff. It does not take away one job. In fact, it

162nd Legislative Day

June 26, 1992

creates thousands of jobs. Another concern that has been raised is the loss of assessed valuation in the area. Let's take a look at that issue. On the short term, there will be a slight decrease in assessed valuation, but let's look at what's happened in the O'Hare Airport area and how assessed valuation has continued to climb and to grow in that area. We know very good and well that with the creation of another airport assessed valuation will continue to increase in the Lake Calumet area, and there is a hold-harmless clause for any school district in that area. Lastly, let's look at another facet of economic We're always competing with other states for development. various opportunities, car plants and the like. all know that if we do not pass this. Indiana will be waiting in line to get this airport. Let's not give Indiana or any other states any more jobs than we have to give them. Let's businesses and lose economic not send more development to surrounding states. Let's leave them right here in Illinois. I intend to vote on this measure. Thank you."

Speaker McPike: "Speaker Madigan, to close."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, before I begin my closing remarks, I'm very pleased in terms of a public service announcement, Mr. Speaker, a public service announcement. I'm very pleased to tell everyone that there was an announcement on the radio this morning that although the national and State of Illinois unemployment figures went up, Springfield went down. So, I'm very happy and I'm sure you're very happy that the people of Springfield are all finding jobs while everybody else in the nation is filing for unemployment insurance, and with that, Mr. Speaker, again I would ask for an 'aye' vote."

162nd Legislative Day

June 26, 1992

Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #29 be adopted?' All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'.

Representative Morrow."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of Morrow: House. During the debate on House Bill 3275 that we've had for the last month, I've been kind of quiet on this issue, but some comments were made today about how we've bashed the City of Chicago and now we need to help the City of Chicago. Well, I hope we have that help when we need to wipe out that \$185 million that it's going to take to open up the grade schools and high schools in the City of Chicago this fall. They talked about jobs. They said, 'No jobs are going to Indiana'. Well, you drive up to Kennedy and you look at the Bulls' Stadium. You don't see people in the projects that live around the Bulls' Stadium working to rebuild the stadium. You see license plates from Indiana, from Iowa, from Wisconsin. Yes, this is a boon for just certain people in this state, and someone..."

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Morrow, bring your remarks to a close."

Morrow: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And someone's mentions that the trickle-down effect...Well, that's an old Bush ploy, trickle down. When's the jobs and the money and the contracts from this project going to trickle down to my community? There will be no trickle down. They'll be standing on the street corner watching as the cars go by with those license plates from Indiana, and Iowa, and Wisconsin. And, finally, someone said that this is a difficult vote. The difficult vote is what we should be dealing with - and we only have four more days to do it - and that's the budget. That's the difficult vote. This is an easy vote! When are we going to get about the business of what we've been sent down here to

162nd Legislative Day

June 26, 1992

Speaker McPike: "Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk...Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this Amendment, there are 48 'ayes' and 46 'noes'. Amendment #29 is adopted. Further Amendments?"

do and serve the people? This does not serve the people."

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #30, offered by Representative Capparelli, Saltsman and McAuliffe."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Capparelli."

Capparelli: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and with that Amendment passing, I would like now to try to amend this and try...to protect some of the jobs for the policemen and firemen of Chicago. What the Amendment does, 'The authorities shall enter in a contract with the City of Chicago under which the City of Chicago shall provide, at its actual cost, all personnel for fire and police protection and emergency and medical services.' This Amendment is simple. All we're trying to do is save those jobs for the Chicago firemen and policemen after the new authority. I would ask for adoption of Amendment, and I'd ask for a Roll Call Vote. Thank you."

Speaker McPike: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of the Amendment, and on that, Representative Saltsman."

Saltsman: "Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. At O'Hare Field there is a stable public service program. Why? Because we have well trained personnel that have the training facilities to educate the highest standard of qualifications it takes to man the risk in this type of a facility. If the billions of dollars that are spent on this program, if they become a reality we'd better have the trained personnel and the agencies in that area that can man the necessary equipment

162nd Legislative Day

June 26, 1992

for both police and fire and have the cooperation and professionalism that we have at this location. This is a very important part of the program. Without it...this, the Amendment that preceded us, it will not be a healthy Amendment at all, and I ask for the passage of this Amendment."

Speaker McPike: "Representative McAuliffe."

McAuliffe: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Amendment would protect the jobs of approximately 600 Chicago police officers and 400 Chicago fire fighters who currently have contracts with the City of Chicago. This would continue their contracts. It would not...The way this...Bill is set up now their contracts would be null and void. This is a pro-union vote and this is a vote for the policemen and firemen that live in my district and Representative Capparelli's district Representative Madigan's district, Representative Laurino's district. So, if you want to help the policemen and firemen in your district, to make sure they have a job after this airport Bill passes, this is a vote that you can count on. Vote 'aye' on this Bill and help protect the jobs of these policemen and firemen. They've already been They work at O'Hare Airport currently and working there. they work at Midway Airport and under the new Bill they would be working at the new airport at Lake Calumet. So, I strongly urge all the Members from Chicago and all my Republican Members from Downstate. This will not cost state or Downstate taxpayers any money at all. It'll just ensure that union contracts are honored."

Speaker McPike: "Speaker Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen, it's very understandable that this Amendment would be viewed as a

162nd Legislative Day

June 26, 1992

laudable Amendment because what it says is that certain people who have jobs today, working in the fire houses at the airport, would be guaranteed their jobs by operation of Illinois law. So that's what it says: that certain people who have jobs in Chicago airports today would be quaranteed those jobs by operation of Illinois law. The agreement between the Mayor and the Governor does not provide for this Amendment, so that those who are supporting the agreement are in opposition to this Amendment. The facts are that the employees in question are very good employees, very well qualified, and, in all likelihood, they would be viewed an asset to the authority who would be as responsible for operating the two airports, three airports, excuse me. And so in all likelihood, the newly appointed authority would want to retain these people as employees at the airports, and for those reasons, Mr. Speaker, I stand in opposition to the Amendment."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Kubik."

Kubik: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would, with all due respect to the Sponsors of this Amendment, would rise in opposition to the Amendment. I don't think the issue is...I recognize the Speaker has outlined the issue in terms of the present day, but what we're talking about here is an authority that spans two states, and I think that we ought to allow the authority, if we indeed are going to pass this Bill, the authority to make those decisions regarding security...at the airports. So, I would think that while this Amendment is well intended and I have, like many others have been a long time supporter of law enforcement and police and firemen, I think this Amendment is ill-timed and would be detrimental to the agreement. So I would urge a 'no' vote."

162nd Legislative Day

June 26, 1992

Speaker McPike: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I also, respectfully, object to the Amendment. Unfortunately, what we have is a very complex arrangement between two states and a city, and in order to maintain the agreement that was signed, not by the State of Illinois and not by the City of Chicago, but by the State of Indiana, this Amendment becomes a violation of that agreement. As much as I would like to favor this Amendment, as much as I would like to be able to suggest that this isn't inappropriate...my fear is the adoption of this Amendment will ultimately cause severe problems with the participation of those three governments in the final analysis of the Bill. For that reason, although I admire the objectives of the Sponsor and those that support it, I stand - and I urge colleagues to join me - in opposing the Amendment."

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Capparelli, to close."

- Capparelli: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Speaker Madigan was right. I am trying to protect those jobs for the firemen and policemen. I don't see anything wrong with protecting the jobs of those people who may be losing their jobs with the new enactment of this new authority. I would ask for the adoption of this Amendment, and I would thank everyone."
- Speaker McPike: "Question is, 'Shall Amendment #30 be adopted?'

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

  Hicks."
- Speaker McPike: "Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this Amendment, there are 43 'ayes' and 47 'noes', and

162nd Legislative Day

June 26, 1992

Amendment #30 is defeated. Further Amendments?"

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #31, offered by Representative Giglio."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Giglio."

Giglio: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Amendment 31 just says that, 'At least one of the directors shall be a resident of Calumet City.' The complete east side of the City of Chicago will be demolished. The town of Burnham will be demolished and Calumet City takes...would about one-third, and in all fairness, to have some voice on the airport, I would suggest that we have one from Calumet City, and that's what the Amendment does, and I would ask for your support."

Speaker McPike: "Speaker Madigan."

- Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, again, one would think or one could think that this would be a laudable Amendment. Unfortunately, the proponents of the agreement, relative to the authority for northeastern Illinois and those who are promoting the construction of the Lake Calumet Airport, are opposed to this Amendment, and, for that reason, I would stand in opposition to the Amendment."
- Speaker McPike: "Question is, 'Shall Amendment #31 be adopted?'

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

  voted? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?

  The Clerk will take the record. On this Amendment, there

  are 33 'ayes' and 59 'noes', and Amendment #31 is defeated.

  Further Amendments."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #32, offered by Representative Giglio."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Giglio."
- Giglio: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #32 says that if something happens with

162nd Legislative Day

June 26, 1992

the board, if something happens with the acquisition, development, finance or construction of Lake Calumet is denied that either one of the three sites will be chosen for the airport, which would be Peotone, Bi-State and Kankakee. And like I said before in my remarks, that if something should happen at the federal level, if something should happen with the committee that we have, and we want to see a third airport in Illinois, then this is the Amendment. I would ask for your support."

Speaker McPike: "Speaker Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen, this Amendment is directly contrary to the nature of the agreement between the Mayor and the Governor. The agreement between the Mayor and the Governor provides for the construction of an airport at the site of Lake Calumet and, specifically, excludes a green grass site. As a matter of fact, there was a vote at the Bi-State Commission where a majority of the Commission voted against a green grass site, and for those reasons, Mr. Speaker, I stand in opposition to the Amendment."

Speaker McPike: "Question is, 'Shall Amendment #32 be adopted?'

All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Mr. Balanoff,
to explain his vote."

Balanoff: "Yes. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House,

I think it's important to understand something. There is a

GAO investigation going on because at \$7.5 million of
taxpayers money was spent on something called the TAMS
Consultants Reports, and those...The sites have never been
ranked, but the one that rates dead last, all over the
place, is the Lake Calumet site. For a host of reasons it
certainly should never be built. But certainly to say that
this is the only site or the best site is absolutely wrong,

162nd Legislative Day

June 26, 1992

and I would urge a green vote."

Speaker McPike: "Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this Amendment, there are 46 'ayes' and 48 'noes', and Amendment #32 is defeated.

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3275, a Bill for an Act to amend the Airport Authorities Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Speaker Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, the Bill is now on Third Reading. It has been thoroughly discussed. I move for the passage of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Question is, 'Shall House Bill 3275 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'.

Representative Curran, to explain his vote."

Curran: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. For those of you, those few of you, who have not made up your mind on this legislation, I'd like to remind you once again, this year, everybody in this chamber knows, we're going through some of the most difficult times in the financial history of this state. This is absolutely the wrong time to attempt to build the most expensive airport in the history of the planet. I ask you to vote 'no'."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Churchill."

Churchill: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I had wished that I would have a few moments to ask some questions for legislative intent. Might the Sponsor of the Bill grant me those few moments?"

Speaker McPike: "Yes. Mr. Churchill, proceed."

Churchill: "Thank you. Mr. Speaker, to the Sponsor of the legislation, Section 25-5 requires that the board adopt a

162nd Legislative Day

June 26, 1992

five year capital plan and that all capital projects involving an expenditure of \$5 million or more must be included in the capital plan, am I correct?"

Madigan: "Yes."

Churchill: "Is it your understanding that any proposal to construct a runway costing \$5 million or more would have to be included in the capital plan?"

Madigan: "Yes."

Churchill: "Section 15-20(d) contains a supermajority provision requiring that a majority of the Governor's appointees must approve each capital plan for O'Hare and Midway, am I correct?"

Madigan: "Yes."

Churchill: "Reading Section 15-20(d) and Section 25-5 together, is it your understanding that construction of any new runways at O'Hare at a cost of \$5 million or more would require supermajority approval of the Governor's appointees to the new board?"

Madigan: "Yes."

Churchill: "So when the board is comprised of five mayoral appointees and two gubernatorial appointees, both of the Governor's appointees would have to approve construction of a new runway at O'Hare if it cost \$5 million or more, correct?"

Madigan: "Yes."

Churchill: "And when the board composition changes and there are three mayoral appointees and three gubernatorial appointees on the board, two of the Governor's appointees would have to approve construction of a new runway at O'Hare if it cost \$5 million or more, correct?"

Madigan: "Yes."

Churchill: "Is it also your understanding that the Bill does

162nd Legislative Day

June 26, 1992

nothing to alter the Governor's current power to veto runway construction at O'Hare under the Illinois Aeronautics Act?"

Madigan: "Yes."

Churchill: "As I read it, Section 20-5 of the Bill requires the board to conduct an investigation of aircraft operations at O'Hare and Midway, including, but not limited to, flight patterns and tracks, preferential runway usage programs and noise abatement and compatibility procedures as soon as practical after the date of this Act. Am I interpreting that language correctly?"

Madigan: "Yes."

Churchill: "And am I also correct that Section 20-5 requires the board, as a result of that investigation, to recommend to the FAA either changes or no changes in aircraft operations at O'Hare and Midway within 12 months?"

Madigan: "Yes."

Churchill: "Under Section 15-20(g) of the Bill, the recommendation to the FAA concerning change or no change in the aircraft operations at O'Hare and Midway can be made only on a supermajority concurrence of a majority of the board members appointed by the Governor and a majority of the board members appointed by the Mayor, is that correct?"

Madigan: "Yes."

Churchill: "So, basically, the authority has to study all aircraft operations at O'Hare and Midway, including flight patterns and make a recommendation to the FAA either to make changes or maintain the status quo, correct?"

Madigan: "Yes."

Churchill: "And whether that recommendation is to make changes or to maintain the status quo, either way the recommendation is subject to the supermajority requirements, is that

162nd Legislative Day

June 26, 1992

correct?"

Madigan: "Yes."

Churchill: "Any change in 'aircraft operations' appears to me to be a fairly sweeping term. Is it your intent, for example, that any recommendation for a cap on annual operations at O'Hare or Midway would be subject to the supermajority requirements of Section 15-20(q)?"

Madigan: "Yes."

Churchill: "Is that also true for any recommendation for a curfew or other restriction on nighttime operations at O'Hare or Midway?"

Madigan: "Yes."

Churchill: "And is it also true, for example, that recommendations to the FAA concerning the direction that planes take when arriving or departing at O'Hare or Midway are subject to the supermajority requirements?"

Madigan: "Yes."

Churchill: "So, hypothetically speaking, if the current status quo is to direct incoming nighttime flights over a residential area instead of over expressways, commercial property or forest preserve land, and a majority of the board wanted to recommend maintaining the status quo to the FAA, the Governor's representatives could block that recommendation, is that correct?"

Madigan: "Yes."

Churchill: "Both Section 15-20(g) and Section 20-5 specifically refer to 'noise compatibility and abatement procedures.'

Is it your understanding that those sections require that a Part 150 study for O'Hare or Midway must have the affirmative vote of a majority of the Governor's appointees to the board before it could be submitted to the FAA?"

Madigan: "Yes."

162nd Legislative Day

June 26, 1992

Churchill: "It is my understanding that the City of Chicago has prepared a draft Part 150 study for O'Hare that has not yet been released. Is there any possibility that the City will try to rush to submit the O'Hare Part 150 study before the authority is formed in order to avoid the requirements of this Act?"

Madigan: "I have been advised 'no'. My staff has been advised by representatives of the City of Chicago that the city will not submit a Part 150 study for O'Hare before the authority is formed. Second, I am advised there simply is not time to complete the Part 150 study, hold public hearings on it and submit it to the FAA before this Act takes effect and the members of the authority are appointed. Third, even if I did not have the City of Chicago's commitment and it was possible for the City to complete and submit the Part 150 study to the FAA before the authority is formed, I find it extremely hard to believe that the FAA would not return the City's study to the authority for reconsideration given that it will be the authority, not the City, that will own and operate O'Hare Airport."

Churchill: "As I understand it, Mr. Speaker, this Bill also creates separate noise commissions for O'Hare and Midway, is that correct?"

Madigan: "Yes."

Churchill: "Each noise commission will have five members, all of whom will be appointed by the Governor, is that correct?"

Madigan: "Yes."

Churchill: "With respect to the O'Hare commission, it is my understanding that three of the Governor's appointees must come from DuPage County and the remaining two from suburban Cook County, is that correct?"

Madigan: "Yes."

162nd Legislative Day

June 26, 1992

Churchill: "The noise commissions also will have to consent to any recommendations to the FAA to change flight tracks and preferential runway usage at O'Hare and Midway, respectively, is that correct?"

Madigan: "Yes."

Churchill: "The noise commissions will also be responsible for selecting soundproofing projects and pursuing federal funding for the projects that they select, am I right?"

Madigan: "Yes."

Churchill: "And for the soundproofing projects selected for federal funding, this Bill requires the Authority to pay half of the local match, is that correct?"

Madigan: "Yes."

Churchill: "Last year, we passed the Permanent Noise Monitoring Act which required the Illinois Department of Transportation to purchase and install noise monitoring equipment for O'Hare. There was no provision in that Act to fund the cost of that equipment, however. It is my understanding that this Bill requires the authority to pay for the cost of that equipment up to a maximum of \$2.9 million and to pay the annual operating and maintenance costs up to \$400,000 annually."

Madigan: "Yes."

Churchill: "I understand that this Bill requires the authority to pay up to \$100,000 of the annual administrative expenses of each of the noise commissions. Are the commissions free to pursue funds from other sources?"

Madigan: "Yes."

Churchill: "Is there anything in this Bill which prevents the noise commissions from pursuing funding from nearby noise-impacted municipalities or other organizations?"

Madigan: "No."

162nd Legislative Day

June 26, 1992

Churchill: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I think that your answers have satisfied my questions, and I think that this is a good Bill, and I'm going to be voting 'aye'."

Madigan: "And, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker McPike: "Yes."

Madigan: "Continuing with legislative intent, let the record show that it would be my legislative intent that the powers described above are limited to noise abatement proceedings and cannot be used to recommend a shutdown of operations at Midway Airport."

Speaker McPike: "Representative McCracken, to explain your vote." McCracken: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of this vote, and really what this Bill does is two things: not only does it provide for the future by going to Lake Calumet, it also requires the creation of a long sought dream of suburban citizens and other people in this state, and that is regional control over O'Hare. That is what this Bill is important about, among other things. And why is it important? Because we are affected by the O'Hare operations, the metropolitan aircraft operations, as much as the City. This is a dream that has been sought in this General Assembly for as long as I've been here, and I'm sure for much longer before that. There is no cost to the This project will be done with revenues provided, both from the Federal Government and from the users of these facilities. Lake Calumet was the only place to go. It was the only one with a consensus."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Harris."

Harris: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, is this the best arrangement possible? No, it probably isn't. Is it the only arrangement possible? Yes, it probably is. As a Legislator from the northwest

162nd Legislative Day

June 26, 1992

suburban area, going around O'Hare, I certainly have a concern. What was put in this Bill dealing with the noise problems at O'Hare is beneficial. There are some teeth here, and I think they are teeth that bite. The two issues in my mind are separate. I think O'Hare and the citizens around O'Hare in my area that are concerned about noise do indeed get a beneficial element out of this Bill, and for that reason I'm voting 'yes'."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Ropp."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of Ropp: the House. I can have a lot of sympathy for those people who may be moved from this particular site. I happen to live on a farm that was cut up very severely when you go around the northwest edge of Normal, because that's where my mom was born and raised, but it's kind of sign of the times, a sign of change, and I don't think that in every ought to be opposed to change and being somewhat futuristic. As a Downstater, someone might say, 'Well, no advantage for you,' but from a farmer's standpoint I think there's tremendous opportunity, internationally, business wise, and, in fact, I hope we don't put this aside and not keep in mind the need for high speed rail. That's important. Air safety is important. This will be a curb with this particular Bill when it's urge your support of this because of passed. I of the future of the State of Illinois, of this importance country and of the world, and we need to be in the forefront of that."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Balanoff."

Balanoff: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is a travesty of justice at the highest levels, and I want to respond to a couple of Legislators. Representative

162nd Legislative Day

June 26, 1992

Hasara, to say that land is superior to people absolutely crazy and an outrage. Representative McCracken, maybe you should ask the Suburban O'Hare Commission about the dream because they oppose House Bill 3275. like to read a letter from their chairman: 'Mike Tristano has advised us that proposed Amendment #25' (and we talking about Amendment 29 because this was something that they had written this morning not knowing what number Amendment would be), 'purports to give O'Hare residents protection by requiring a supermajority to approve existing levels of operations. Mike has advised us that Legislators are being told by the Governor's staff that this provision would be the function or equivalent of ironclad flight caps and curfews for O'Hare. Unfortunately, that position is simply not true. Any attempt to restrict existing O'Hare operations is likely to face fierce opposition in the Federal Aviation Authority and possibly vetoed by United States Secretary of Transportation. Thus, supermajority requirement offers no protection at all.' I've told everybody here about the many reasons to oppose this legislation and I'm going to reiterate just a few of them now. The fact that my home, my neighborhood and 8,000 people that are my friends and my neighbors' homes would be bulldozed. Fifty thousand people; 50,000 people would be displaced. That's more people than in any but 20 municipalities in the State of Illinois. Fifteen hundred acres of globally...in some cases globally significant wetlands, hundreds of businesses and thousands of paying industrial jobs and at the cost of job creation of \$270,000 per job created..."

Speaker McPike: "Well, Mr. Balanoff, that's the second time I put the one minute timer on. So, I'll put it on one more

162nd Legislative Day

June 26, 1992

time."

Balanoff: "You know, it's kind of...And really I would tell you that just the fact now that they want to limit my opportunity to defend my neighborhood and my home is an It's morally wrong, and I would respectfully ask everybody in this chamber, as people have saying when it their neighborhood, to let those in to neighborhood and if you look at all the Legislators surrounding this Lake Calumet area, they're all voting 'no' and there's a reason. Because they know it's wrong and the people in our community, after community, just do support this project. I know they're going around twisting I can see them on the floor now. The phones are...you know, the people have been talked to. But for the first time in this Legislature, let's do something that's right. All we have on our side is right. We don't have roads, bridges, jobs or anything like that that we can promise you. All we have is right, and I would respectfully ask every Legislator on this floor to respect our community."

Speaker McPike: "Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this Bill, there are 61...Representative Robert Olson votes 'no'. On this Bill, there are 61 'ayes' and 50 'noes'. House Bill 3275, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate...House Bill 3440, Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, House Bill 3440 is a Bill that I need for a Conference Committee. So I move to nonconcur to Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3440. I know of no objection to the move."

Speaker McPike: "The Gentleman moves to nonconcur on Senate

162nd Legislative Day

June 26, 1992

Amendment #1 to House Bill 3440. All in favor say 'aye', opposed, 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the House nonconcurs. Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3440, and the Chair stated that the House nonconcurs in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3440. Representative Flinn."

Flinn: "Mr. Speaker, I move..."

Speaker McPike: "This would be on House Bill 3495."

Flinn: "Mr. Speaker, I move to concur in Amendments #1 and 2.

(Amendment) #1 is sort of a nothing Amendment. I would suggest that it may not be necessary, but rather than delay the time of the House and the Senate, I would move to concur in #1. And #2 is eliminating paperwork for the State's Attorney from not having to make reports on something that he does not handle. I would move for adoption of both Amendments. Concurrence. I move the concurrence of both Amendments."

Speaker McPike: "The Gentleman moves to concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2. Is there any discussion on that There being none, the question is, 'Shall the Motion? House concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 3495?' All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Mautino, 'aye'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. Representative Stange. He's got his light on. Somebody please turn it off. Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Motion, there are 115 'ayes' and no 'nays', and the House does concur to Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 3495, and this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Lang." "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Having voted on the prevailing Lang:

side on the vote upon which Senate Bill 2134 passed, I move to reconsider the vote."

162nd Legislative Day

June 26, 1992

- Speaker McPike: "All right. There being no opposition to the Gentleman's Motion, the Attendance Roll Call will be used, and the Motion carries. That Bill is...The vote by which that Bill passed has now been reconsidered. Mr. McNamara. Representative McNamara. Representative Black."
- Black: "Well, I...Unfortunately, I don't think my request is timely, Mr. Speaker. I was going to ask you what we were reconsidering but I think we've already reconsidered it."

Speaker McPike: "Yes, we did."

Black: "I see. I'll try to be a little quicker on my feet.

Thank you."

Speaker McPike: "Eternal vigilance, Mr. Black. Mr. McNamara."

McNamara: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to...to move from the table and...extend the deadline of Senate Bill..."

Speaker McPike: "(Senate Bill) 1685."

McNamara: "(Senate Bill) 1685."

- Speaker McPike: "(Senate Bill) 1685. The Gentleman moves to extend the deadline on this until June 30th...to take from the table and extend the deadline on this Bill until June 30th of this year."
- McNamara: "I believe that the Motion is stated as January 13th.

  Is that correct?"
- Speaker McPike: "All right. The Gentleman would like to change the Motion to extend the deadline until January 13th of '93, and on that, Mr. Black."
- Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Question of the Sponsor."

Speaker McPike: "Yes."

Black: "I certainly have no problem with your Motion. What I need some assurance is...on is that negotiations will be taking place because some school districts win under this formula but on the other side some school districts lose on

162nd Legislative Day

June 26, 1992

this formula."

McNamara: "You're precisely right. That's the reason we...the ...Bill."

Black: "Okay. All right. Thank you."

McNamara: "Negotiations..."

Speaker McPike: "All right. There's no opposition to Gentleman's Motion. The Attendance Roll Call will be used and the Motion carries. Senate Bill 1685 has been taken off the table and the deadline extended until January 13th of '93. Mr. Turner. Representative Hultgren, Senator Munizzi, would you please hold it down? Senator Munizzi. Senator Munizzi, please, hold it down, Hold it down. Representative DeLeo, would you hold hold it down? it...have her Please. Please. Representative Hultgren, on 3810."

Hultgren: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I move to concur in Senate Amendment #1. You will remember the underlying Bill is the one that provides for the recodification of the Illinois statutes. It passed the House 115 to nothing. After it passed here, the Circuit Clerk in Cook County, Mrs. Pucinski...raised some concerns. It was amended in the Senate to address her concerns. I know of no opposition to the underlying Bill or to the Amendment, and again, would move to concur in Senate Amendment #1."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Hultgren, the noise level was such that we couldn't hear your Motion."

Hultgren: "Move to concur."

Speaker McPike: "Would you like to explain the Amendment that you're going to concur in?"

Hultgren: "I did, Mr. Speaker, but, again, the underlying Bill is the Bill that provides for the recodification of the...Illinois statutes. It passed here unanimously, 115

162nd Legislative Day

June 26, 1992

to nothing. It was amended in the Senate to address a concern of the Circuit Clerk of Cook County, Aurelia Pucinski. I know of no opposition to the underlying Bill or to the Amendment."

- Speaker McPike: "All right, the Gentleman moves to concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3810, and there is no discussion, the question is, 'Shall this Motion pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this Motion, there are 105...106 'ayes' and no 'nays', and the House does concur in Senate Amendments #1 to House Bill 3810. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Giglio, in the Chair."
- Speaker Giglio: "On the Order of Concurrences, appears House Bill 3815, Representative McGann. Representative McGann. The following Representatives have Bills on this Order: Representative Hoffman, Balthis, McNamara and Parcells. Representative McGann, on House Bill 3815."
- McGann: "Yes. Mr. Speaker, I move to concur with Senate
  Amendment #1 on House Bill 3815. It adds a section
  amending the Dental Practices Act to permit the department
  to recognize examinations given by regional testing
  services for central licenses. I'd move
  its...concurrence."
- Speaker Giglio: "Any discussion? The Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black."
- Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I feel I must rise in opposition to the Gentleman's Motion to concur with Senate Amendment #1.

  Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, a year ago there was great hysteria sweeping this chamber about reports of a

162nd Legislative Day

June 26, 1992

dentist in the area who had AIDS, who may or may not have infected some of his patients. This Amendment, in my opinion, lessens the requirements for a license to practice dentistry in the State of Illinois. I don't think you want to do that just a year after the hysteria that swept this chamber about a dentist with AIDS somewhere in the vicinity of Springfield. If you vote to concur, you're saying that a qualification of a dental license may be a successful completion of a clinical or preclinical examination, so then they don't have to take the department's examination. It's...It also spends additional money in the Department of Professional Regulation that we simply don't have, and so I rise in opposition to the Concurrence Motion and urge that you vote 'no'."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative McGann."

- McGann: "Mr. Chairman, in view of that information that I did not...In my interpretation was a little different, but I can agree with Representative Black's. So I'd ask to change to move to nonconcur with Amendment #1."
- Speaker Giglio: "You've heard the Gentleman's Motion to move to nonconcur. All those in favor say 'aye', opposed, 'no'.

  The 'ayes' have it, and the House nonconcurs with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3815."
- McGann: "Thank you. I didn't think it was that deep. I just thought it was in testing. I didn't think it..."
- Speaker Giglio: "Representative Hoffman, on 3884. Representative Hoffman in the chamber? Out of the record. Representative Balthis, House Bill 4083. The Gentleman from Lansing, Representative Balthis."
- Balthis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. I move to concur with Senate Amendment #1, which simply allows villages and towns the same authority that cities currently

162nd Legislative Day

June 26, 1992

have under statute in regard to cemeteries."

Speaker Giglio: "Any discussion? Hearing none, the question is,
 'Shall the House concur with Senate Amendments #1 to House
 Bill 4083?' All those in favor, signify by voting 'aye',
 opposed, 'no'. The voting is open. This is final action.
 Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have
 all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this
 question, there are 110 voting 'yes', none voting 'no', and
 the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House
 Bill 4083, and this Bill, having received the required
 Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed.
 Representative McNamara, House Bill 4112. The Gentleman
 from Cook, Representative McNamara, on House Bill 4112."

McNamara: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wish to concur with Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 4112. What these Amendments do is, is they do not create a special agency. What they do is, it's an agreed Amendment over in the Senate, to allow the...Housing Development Authority to go along and...provide the information necessary. So I would urge the agreement of..."

Speaker Giglio: "Any discussion on the Amendments? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall the House concur with Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 4112?' All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed, 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On this question, there are 113 voting 'yes', none voting 'no', and the House does concur with Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 4112, and this Bill, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Hoffman, House Bill 3884, the Gentleman from St. Clair."

162nd Legislative Day

June 26, 1992

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to make a Motion to nonconcur on Senate Amendments 1, 2 and 3."

Giglio: "You heard the Gentleman's Motion. Speaker Any discussion? Hearing none, all those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed, 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the Motion carries to nonconcur with Senate Amendments #1, 2 and 3 to House Bill 3884. Representative Parcells. Is Representative Parcells in the chamber? Out of the record. All right, on the Order of Human Services, Concurrences, the following Representatives have Bills: Representative Currie, Black, LeFlore, Phelps, Matijevich, Regan, Brunsvold, Currie, Homer, White, Peterson, Kulas, Hasara and Johnson. And on that, appears House Bill 707, Representative Currie. Do you wish to have The Lady from Cook, Representative this Bill called? Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. The underlying Bill creates opportunities for people to leave welfare by virtue of self employment opportunities. The Amendment was recommended and requested by the Department of Public Aid. It's a technical Amendment to that same proposal, and I would urge concurrence with this Amendment."

Speaker Giglio: "Any discussion? Hearing none, the question is,

'Shall the House concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House
Bill 707?' All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed, 'no'.

The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all

voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record,

Mr. Clerk. On this question, there're 113 voting 'yes',

none voting 'no', and the House does concur with Senate

Amendment #1 to House Bill 707, and this Bill, having

received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby

162nd Legislative Day

June 26, 1992

declared passed. Representative Black, on House Bill 2723. The Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The underlying Bill established conditions under which the Department of Professional Regulation could issue a temporary nursing permit. I believe it passed out of the House unanimously. It was some clean-up language, because it was making it more difficult for an Illinois resident to come back and be relicensed than was ever intended under the original Act. Senate Amendment #1 was placed on it by Senator Rea. It is...grandfathering a professional engineering license to a...individual who graduated from Southern Illinois University in 1970, has been licensed in a neighboring state in 1980 and has eight years of experience. I would move to concur with that Senate Amendment."

Speaker Giglio: "Any discussion? The Gentleman from Jefferson, Representative Hicks."

Hicks: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the
House. Just a question, Representative Black. Is this
similar to the same type of Amendment I had concerning
the...engineering technology at Southern Illinois
University?"

Black: "I don't believe so, Mr. Hicks. A very good question and I certainly get your point. As far as I know, this is to take care of one individual...who, because he was licensed to practice engineering - he is a professional licensed engineer and a graduate of SIU - he missed a window of opportunity to get an Illinois license, and what this Amendment does is to grandfather him with an Illinois license."

Hicks: "Representative Black, though, the Gentleman who graduated

162nd Legislative Day

June 26, 1992

from Southern Illinois, did he not graduate with a degree in engineering technology?"

- Black: "I do not know that. It says simply, as far as I know, it says 'a professional engineering license'. I do not know what his degree was in or how he came about that license."
- Hicks: "Well, Representative Black, as I understand the situation and...with this particular instance, in fact, I believe the Gentleman also graduated with the engineering technology degree that we talked about on an Amendment that I placed on Representative Steczo's Bill a couple of days ago and the same licensing procedure that is available in some 37 states in this country. I believe it is the same situation, and I guess I would urge the adoption of your Amendment, also. Thank you. Excuse me, the concurrence with your Bill, Representative Black."
- Speaker Giglio: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2723?' And on that question, all those in favor vote 'aye', opposed, 'no'. The voting is open. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question, there're 114 voting 'yes', 1 voting 'no', and the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2723, and this Bill, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative LeFlore. Representative LeFlore. Bob? House Bill 2994."
- LeFlore: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I do not wish to concur with 2994. I would like to send this particular Bill to Conference Committee where the group who are working with this particular measure will continue to work. This is dealing with general assistance and the number of dollars that we're trying to get into

162nd Legislative Day

June 26, 1992

- this particular ... "
- Speaker Giglio: "You heard the Gentleman's Motion to nonconcur.

  All those in favor signify by...Representative Black.

  Representative Black. George? Black?"
- Black: "Yeah. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. It's getting very difficult to hear in here. I thought the Gentleman made a Motion to concur in the Senate Amendment?"
- Speaker Giglio: "No, it was to nonconcur? Nonconcur. Do you agree, Representative Black?"
- Black: "Well, I'm not sure I agree, but the department has just told me that they are willing to continue negotiations, so perhaps the Gentleman's Motion is now in order."
- Speaker Giglio: "All right. All those in favor of the Gentleman's Motion to nonconcur signify by saying 'aye', opposed, 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the Motion's adopted. House Bill 3005, Representative McGann."
- McGann: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to concur with Senate Amendments #1, 3, 4 and 5 to House Bill 3005. As House Bill 3005 left as a committee-structured Bill from the Mental Health Committee, passed out of the House unanimously, went over to the Senate, there were some concerns. Those concerns have been addressed in these Amendments 1, 3, 4 and 5, and everyone is on board now, and I would ask to have us concur with those Amendments on House Bill 3005. They pertain to...the social workers' clarification. They pertain to the sheriffs and the areas, as far as removal of a mental health patient. I'd be happy to answer any questions."
- Speaker Giglio: "Representative Levin."
- Levin: "Representative, what is the position that the...Does the

  Illinois Association of Social Workers have a position on

# 162nd Legislative Day

June 26, 1992

these Amendments?"

McGann: "Yes, they're in agreement of...with the Amendments."

Levin: "They're in agreement with the Amendments?"

McGann: "Absolutely, Representative."

Levin: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Giglio: "Further discussion? Representative Black."

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

Speaker Giglio: "Indicates he will."

Black: "Representative McGann, I had a call from the administrator of a mental health facility in my district.

I know at one time he was very concerned about the...eliminating the requirement that sheriffs transport persons to mental health facilities. I think his concerns have been cleared up in Senate Amendment #4 but is that correct? Is that your understanding?"

McGann: "I...Mr. Speaker, I cannot hear totally, but I do want to say that this Amendment #4 does not eliminate the sheriffs' participation."

Black: "So in other words, if that administrator wants to work out some arrangements with the county sherriff, he's still free and able to do so, is that correct?"

McGann: "It's permissive rather than mandatory."

Black: "All right. Thank you very much, Representative. I again congratulate you on putting together a very complex and complicated and omnibus Bill that I think reflects a lot of good things. And I certainly intend to concur on your Motion."

McGann: "Thank you, thank you, Representative."

Speaker Giglio: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur with Senate Amendments #1, 3, 4 and 5 to House Bill 3005?' All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed, 'no'. The

162nd Legislative Day

June 26, 1992

voting is open. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question, there are 109 voting 'yes', none voting 'no'...Marinaro, 'aye'. Petka, 'aye'. Hicks, 'aye'. Anybody else? On this question, there are now 112 voting 'aye', none voting 'no', and the House does concur with Senate Amendments #1, 3, 4 and 5 to House Bill 3005, and this Bill, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Phelps, you have two Bills. House Bill 3045. The Gentleman from Saline, Representative Phelps."

Phelps: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the I wish to concur with Senate Amendment #1. The Amendment...changes the original Bill that we passed out of here in House form, only in the fact that it adds a little bit more flexibility for the Department of Public Health and the Department of Insurance to utilize other alternatives other than what we stated in the original Bill quaranteeing that the nursing homes purchase about insurance to guarantee that all residents' funds and assets are secure from loss, theft or insolvency. So what this Senate Amendment did is just add a little bit alternatives for the (sic - Department of) Public Health and the Department of Insurance to...consider rather than just the surety bond and the insurance that I passed in the first Bill."

Speaker Giglio: "Question is, 'Shall the House concur with Senate

Amendment #1 to House Bill 3045?' And on that question,

all those in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed, 'no'.

The voting is open. This is final action. Have all voted

who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who

162nd Legislative Day

June 26, 1992

wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question, there are 110 voting 'yes', none voting 'no', and the House does concur to Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3045, and this Bill, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Phelps, on House Bill 3160. The Gentleman from Saline, Representative Phelps"

Phelps: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This...I'll move to concur with Senate Amendment 1. This Bill, with Senate Amendment 1, now does really two things. It incorporates the provision that we had...that we passed out of here at a big vote of...House Bill 3854 which actually authorizes the...Department of Public Health to delegate to local boards - health boards - the duties that it has authorized to enforce, such as setting fees for service or regulatory activity, and it underlying Bill was the...implementing and...recommendation to the University of Illinois College of Medicine at Rockford to require the Center for Rural Health, within the Department of Public Health, to incorporate within its programs response to the health care needs of Downstate medically underserved areas by focusing on enrolling, training and graduating an increase of primary care physicians. That's our shortage, and that's what... The two things that are in this Bill now."

Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman moves to concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3160. Any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall the House concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3160?' And on that question, all those in favor vote 'aye', opposed, 'no'. The voting is open. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take

162nd Legislative Day

June 26, 1992

the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question, (there're) 112 voting 'yes' and 1 voting 'no', and the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3160, and this Bill, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Matijevich, House Bill 3266. The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Matijevich."

- Matijevich: "Yes. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would move to nonconcur with Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 3266. The Senate Sponsor informs me that there's some work yet to be done with the agency on this Bill. So I would therefore move to nonconcur."
- Speaker Giglio: "You heard the Gentleman's Motion. All those in favor say 'aye', opposed, 'no'. The Gentleman's Motion carries. House Bill 3282, Representative Regan. The Gentleman from Will, Representative Regan."
- Regan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I move to concur in Senate Amendment #1. Senate Amendment #1 is the result of the CHIP Board and an...an agreement with the State Bar Association and the Trial Lawyers Association, intended to assure that the CHIP funds are not used to pay for medical expenses resulting from injuries which are caused by a third party in which CHIP insured has already received a large settlement. I...I move to concur."
- Speaker Giglio: "Any discussion? Hearing...Who? Representative Lang."

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

Speaker Giglio: "Indicates he will."

Lang: "Representative, is this the same language you and I
 discussed?"

Regan: "Yes, Senator...or Representative. It's identical to the language that was on the other Bill."

162nd Legislative Day

June 26, 1992

Lang: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Giglio: "Question is, 'Shall the House concur to Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3282?' All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed, 'no'. The voting is open. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. question, there are 111 voting 'yes', none voting 'no', and the House does concur to Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3282, and this Bill, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared Representative Brunsvold. The Gentleman from Rock...Rock Island, Brunsvold. House Bill 3323."

Brunsvold: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Amendment #2 (which is actually an Amendment that I had drafted and Senator Jones was good enough to put it on the Bill), deals with breast implant removals. Working out language, this Amendment would specify that insurance companies will be required to remove implants if they were done for reconstructive or injury reasons and not for cosmetic reasons - and then cosmetic reasons are defined in the Bill - and I would ask for your support, and I move for concurrence with Senate Amendment #2."

Speaker Giglio: "Any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall the House concur to Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 3323?' And on that question, all those in favor vote 'aye', opposed, 'no'. The voting is open. This is final...Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 103 voting 'yes', none voting 'no', and the House does concur to Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 3323, and this Bill, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Let

162nd Legislative Day

- June 26, 1992
- the record indicate that Representative Martinez wishes to be recorded as 'aye' on that last vote. Representative Martinez."
- Martinez: "Speaker, I would like the record to show that I would have voted 'yes' on 3160. I would like to change my vote from 'no' to 'yes'."
- Speaker Giglio: "On 3160, he wishes to be recorded as voting 'yes'. Representative Martinez. Let the record indicate, Mr. Clerk. Representative Currie, 3394. Is the Lady in the chamber? Representative Currie? Out of the record. Representative Homer. Representative Homer, on House Bill 4078. The Gentleman from Fulton, Representative Homer."
- Homer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would move to nonconcur in Senate Amendment 1. This Bill is a vehicle Bill for the purpose of implementing a hospital assessment plan if and when an agreement is reached, and we need to keep the Bill alive by putting it in a Conference Committee."
- Speaker Giglio: "You heard the Gentleman's Motion. Any discussion? Representative Black."
- Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I have absolutely no reason to question the Gentleman's intent. I think his integrity is well known in this chamber. However, I simply rise to express concern on my side of the aisle. It wasn't but five or ten minutes ago that we passed another Public Aid shell Bill that will go into Conference Committee. This is the same thing. I'm not sure we need two, three or four Public Aid shell Bills out there that can be used for hospital assessment or possible Public Aid office closure and reorganization, and, in all due respect, Representative Homer, I realize one or both of those may indeed be a red herring on this issue, but I would just ask my...people on my side of the aisle, we think there are sufficient Public

162nd Legislative Day

June 26, 1992

Aid vehicles in the Conference Committee. I don't think we need any more. A 'no' vote might be advisable."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Homer, to close."

Homer: "Well, again, this is a vehicle Bill for an agreement that may be made on a hospital assessment plan. I can't understand why we would want to prematurely take a position in opposition to what we don't know might be coming that's absolutely necessary for us to balance our budget. So, I would ask that the chamber join me in moving this issue along and put it into a Conference Bill. I urge support for the House Bill...urge support for the Motion to nonconcur."

Speaker Giglio: "You heard the Gentleman's Motion to nonconcur.

All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed, 'no'.

In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it. The House nonconcurs to Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 4078.

Representative White, House Bill 4079. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Jesse White."

White: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would like to nonconcur in Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill...4079."

Speaker Giorgi: "Any discussion? You heard the Gentleman's Motion to nonconcur. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed, 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it. The House nonconcurs to Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 4079. House Bill 3380, Representative Stern. The Lady from Lake. Proceed."

Stern: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, House Bill 3380 was one requested by Lake County and deals with the...septic sludge situation. There was no problem with it. Representative Klemm had a request on it when it first came into the House. We accommodated him. It says that units

162nd Legislative Day

June 26, 1992

of local government can charge a fee for dealing with septic sludge. The Senate Amendments simply say that that fee shall be a reasonable fee. It inserts the word 'reasonable', and I don't think there's anything a bit controversial about it. I urge a concurring vote."

- Speaker Giglio: "Any discussion on the Lady's Motion? Representative Black."
- Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I really don't know what we're going to do about the noise level. I thought I heard the Sponsor say that this Bill as amended requires all the sewer sludge to be sent to Lake County. Is that what I heard you say?"
- Stern: "No, Sir. To Calumet. Lake Calumet. We're going to use it...No, that was a joke."
- Black: "What...what...you said something about sewer sludge and Lake County."
- Stern: "This is a Bill which authorizes waste water treatment facilities owned or operated by a unit of local government to accept septic system sludge from residents of the unit of local government, and the Amendment simply says that the fee charged shall be 'reasonable'."
- Black: "Okay. I remember this Bill now. We had it before.

  Thank you."

Stern: "You bet."

Speaker Giglio: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur to Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 3380?' And on that question, all those in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed, 'no'. The voting is open. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 115 voting 'yes', none voting 'no', and the House does concur to Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to

162nd Legislative Day

June 26. 1992

House Bill 3380, and this Bill, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Ackerman? House Bill 3329. The Gentleman from Tazewell, Representative Ackerman."

Ackerman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentleman of the House. I move to concur in Senate Amendment #2 of House Bill 3329. This just expands the definition of a pipeline and facilities and...helps in inspecting lines to prevent explosions."

Speaker Giglio: "Any discussion? Hearing none, the question is 'Shall the House concur with Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 3329?' All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed, 'no'. The voting is open. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. question there are 112 voting 'yes', none voting 'no', and the House does concur to Senate Amendment #2 to House and this Bill, having received the 3329. Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared Representative Kulas, House Bill 3605. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Myron Kulas."

Kulas: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would move that the House concur to Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3605. Senate Amendment #1 is a result of the negotiations between the EPA and the environmental groups and the Illinois Bankers Association. It limits the residential property exemptions established in the Bill to individuals who own no more than ten dwelling units. It also changes the conclusive presumption in the original Bill to rebuttable presumption. It also clarifies who shall conduct phase 1 environmental audits, and requires environmental professionals to carry a minimum

162nd Legislative Day

June 26, 1992

of \$500,000 of professional liability insurance, and I would move for concurrence."

- Speaker Giglio: "Any discussion? Hearing none, the question is,
   'Shall the House concur to Senate Amendment #1 to House
   Bill 3605?' And on that question, all those in favor vote
   'aye', opposed, 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted
   who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who
   wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question,
   (there are) 110 voting 'yes', none voting 'no', and the
   House does concur to Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill
   3605, and this Bill, having received the required
   Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The
   Lady from Sangamon, Representative Hasara, on House Bill
   3773. Proceed."
- Hasara: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to concur in Senate
  Amendment #1 to House Bill 3773. The Bill is the Abandoned
  Mines Reclamation Administration Bill. The Senate made a
  technical Amendment which simply changes a date."
- Speaker Giglio: "Any discussion? Hearing none, the question is,

  'Shall the House concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House
  Bill 3773?' All those in favor signify by voting 'aye',
  opposed, 'no'. The voting is open. On this question there
  are 115 voting 'yes', none voting 'no', and the House does
  concur to Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3773, and this
  Bill, having received the required Constitutional Majority,
  is hereby declared passed. Representative Johnson, House
  Bill 4040. The Gentleman from Champaign, Representative
  Johnson."
- Johnson: "I would move to concur with the Senate Amendment #1, which is a technical Amendment. It simply clarifies the intent of the legislation."
- Speaker Giglio: "Any discussion? Hearing none, the question is,

162nd Legislative Day

June 26, 1992

'Shall the House concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 4040?' All those in favor vote 'ave', opposed, 'no'. The voting is open. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question, there are 111 voting 'yes', none voting 'no', and the House does concur to Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 4040, and this Bill, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of Concurrences under Revenue and Banking, appears the Representative with House Bills: Parke, Hasara, Lang, Sieben, Flinn, Keane, McAfee, Capparelli, Hicks, Sieben. And on that Order appears House Bill 2016. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Parke, 2016."

Parke: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move to concur on Senate Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 20...to House Bill 2016."

Speaker Giglio: "Any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall the House concur to Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2016?' All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed, 'no'. The voting is open. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 113 voting 'yes', none voting 'no', the House does concur to Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 2016. Representative Rice, 'aye'. There are now 114 The House does concur to Senate Amendment #2 to 'ayes'. House Bill 2016. This Bill, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Peterson, on House Bill 4039. That was under Agriculture, and I overlooked that. I'm sorry. Representative Peterson, House Bill on 4039.

162nd Legislative Day

June 26, 1992

Representative Black."

Peterson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to concur with Senate Amendment 1, 2 and 3 to House Bill 4039. Amendment 1 — I'll go through the Amendments — Amendment 1 amends the Environmental Protection Act, provides for deductible required to access to the Leaking Underground Storage Tank Fund, shall be \$10,000 as opposed to 100,000 with respect to underground storage tanks installed after July 20th, 1989. It has an immediate effective date. Amendment 2 deletes everything and then comes the Bill. It rewrites Amendment 1 with language provided by the IEPA. Amendment 3 adds reclaimed asphalt pavement to the definition of clean construction or demolition debris. I move for concurrence with Amendments 1, 2 and 3 to House Bill 4039. I know of no opposition."

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

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

Speaker Giglio: "Indicates he will."

Lang: "Representative, I just want to be clear that Amendment 1
 has been deleted by Amendment 2?"

Peterson: "Yes."

Lang: "So, the Bill is in fact..."

Peterson: "Since it was adopted, Representative, we have to...Since it was adopted we have to move for concurrence to Amendment 1."

Lang: "I understand. I just wanted to make sure that Amendment 2 does what my file says it does."

Peterson: "Yes, it does, Representative."

Lang: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Giglio: "Further discussion? Representative Balanoff."

Balanoff: "Yes. Yes. Just for a question. Is...is this the

162nd Legislative Day

June 26, 1992

Bill that was going to be used as the...for the Governor's environmental package?"

Peterson: "Originally, yes. But..."

Balanoff: "Do you know now...I'm just curious if you know now where the Governor's environmental package is going to be?

You know, what..."

Peterson: "It's still being negotiated."

Balanoff: "Thank you."

Speaker Giglio: "All right. The question is, 'Shall the House concur to Senate Amendments #1, 2 and 3 to House Bill 4039?' And on that question, all those in favor vote 'aye', opposed, 'no'. The voting is open. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? On this question, there are 112 voting 'yes', none voting 'no', and the House does concur to Senate Amendments #1, 2 and 3 to House Bill 4039, and this Bill, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of Revenue and Banking appears House Bill 2817. Representative Hasara, House Bill 2817."

Hasara: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2817. I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker.. This Amendment was at the request of Senator Cullerton and Representative Mautino, and it's identical to House Bill 2766 that passed on the House Consent Calendar and didn't get out of the Rules Committee, and it deals with taxing on out-of-state athletes."

Speaker Giglio: "Any discussion? Hearing none, the question is,

'Shall the House concur to Senate Amendment #1 to House
Bill 2817?' And on that question, all in favor vote 'aye',

opposed, 'no'. The voting is open. This is final action.

162nd Legislative Day

June 26, 1992

Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Black, are you seeking recognition? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 113 voting 'yes', none voting 'no', and the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2817, and this Bill, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Lang on House Bill 25...2954. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Lang."

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would move to concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2954. It does two things. It extends the Chicago Home Rule Motor Vehicle Use Tax from a temporary collection by the Department of Revenue to a permanent one and extends the same privileges to the Cook County Home Rule Motor Vehicle Use Tax. It's supported by the New Car and Truck Dealers, and I would move concurrence."

Speaker Giglio: "Any discussion? Representative Kubik."

Rubik: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentleman of the House. I would rise in opposition to the Gentleman's Motion. I think we ought to know exactly what this particular Amendment does, and I think it's important...for the Members to know what these Amendments do. As you may be aware, earlier in the year the...the County of Cook passed a sales tax...and a vehicle sales tax. Under this Amendment, the Senate Amendment, what we would now do is the Department of Revenue would collect the sales tax for Cook County. So if you live in a contiguous county from Cook, you will be affected by this. In addition, this is a cost which has been put upon the state in order to collect the sales tax for Cook County, the new sales tax. I would also point out that this particular Bill requires that the

162nd Legislative Day

June 26, 1992

sales tax that the department begin collecting the sales tax by September 1st of 1992, roughly two months from now. That is a rather short period of time in which to...try to put together the necessary bureaucracy et cetera and the tracking mechanism that is important in following this information. Now, I realize that there are certain groups that are in favor of this, but I think we ought to think about this carefully because it does cost the state dollars additional in order to collect this I might also point out that this particular...this tax. is not a very easy tax to collect. For example, if you buy a vehicle in another county, but you live in Cook County, they will track you and collect this tax. So, you know, you're going to have that problem. There is also a problem in that there are currently 30 municipalities, municipalities which overlap Cook County and so it is difficult to determine who lives in what county simply by talking about living in a particular community. So the Department of Revenue doesn't have that information. The people who have the information as to the county in which people reside would be the Secretary of State. He would have the information on the vehicle registration. you buy a car and you live, for example in Barrington Hills, which split into four counties, it's very is difficult to determine which county you live in just by filling out a this is clearly a very tax form. So, complicated issue. It's clearly a very difficult issue to work through, and I would suggest that this is not timely. I would suggest it's time for the County of Cook to sit down with the Department of Revenue and work out this proposal. I might also point out that this is not a part of the Governor's budget at this point in time, and...he is

162nd Legislative Day

June 26, 1992

not...in favor of this proposal. So for reasons of cost, for reasons of clarity in terms of how this particular Amendment or this particular new provision would work, would be very leery in voting in favor, or in concurring with, these Amendments. So if you're from Cook County or you're from a contiquous county, this particular Bill will allow them to collect a sales tax. So if you're against the sales tax, I think you ought to think carefully about being for this particular Amendment. So I would rise in opposition. I think this clearly is not the time to move this particular proposal. I think it's time to sit and talk about this, and we just don't have the money. The money isn't in the Department of Revenue budget, especially after...what has been done to the Department of Revenue budget by the plan by the Democratic Majority party plan. I don't think we have a whole lot of money in the Revenue Department budget to even enact this - not only...not only to enact it, but enact it within two months. So I would rise in opposition and would encourage a 'no' vote, 'present' vote."

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

McNamara: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I also rise in opposition to this Amendment. What we are doing in this Amendment is, is authorizing another collection of a tax. No matter which way you slice it, it is a bad concept. There is absolutely no reason for the taxes to be collected outside of the boundaries of Cook County. There is absolutely no reason also for the taxes to be in the municipalities already, but that is already done. It's an unfortunate situation. I would think that it would probably be better to nonconcur in the Senate Amendment and

162nd Legislative Day

June 26, 1992

send it back to a Conference Committee so we can get a more reasonable approach to the program. So I urge your 'no' vote in the concurrence of the Senate Amendment."

Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman from Madison, Representative Wolf."

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

Speaker Giglio: "He indicates he will."

Wolf: "Representative Lang, acknowledging that many of the remarks that the previous two speakers have made are possibly true, but isn't it also true that the State of Illinois will retain a 2% collection fee for collecting these taxes?"

Lang: "That is correct, Representative. That state gets a 2% fee, which is estimated over \$400,000."

Wolf: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Cronin."

Cronin: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentleman of the House. I rise in opposition to this. As a practical consequence the way this Bill will operate if it becomes law, is if you live in Cook County and you want to buy a car, for example, you know that you're going to pay up for it in Cook County because the sales tax there is already higher than anywhere else in the state. But if you travel outside Cook County to DuPage, Will, McHenry, anywhere Downstate to buy an item, if you buy that item, Cook County will now collect the tax that they would have been able to collect in Cook County already. It hurts businesses outside of Cook County, and it hurts taxpayers inside of Cook County. I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Giglio: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Currie."

162nd Legislative Day

June 26, 1992

Currie: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I rise in support of the legislation. Whether you're for or against the recent sales and use tax hikes in Cook County has nothing to do with this Bill. If this Bill does not pass, any taxpayer who lives in Cook County and buys a car in DuPage county will still be liable for the Cook County The problem will be how Cook County collects sales tax. that money. This proposal says the Department of Revenue will do the collecting. The unwary Cook County resident who buys in DuPage County will not be flummoxed by the dealer into thinking that the sales tax is not due and owing. The real issue is one of efficiency so that Cook County can get its money and taxpayers know what's due from them up front, right away, not six months later when they've already spent the money that belongs to the county instead. The Department of Revenue will be recompensed for any costs that it faces by virtue of being required to collect this tax for us. Finally, if you live in Cook County, and you care about economic development, if you care about jobs, if you care about making sure that our businesses don't move over to the line to some other county, the way to protect those businesses is with a 'yes' vote now. The Cook County Car Dealers are on their way to Will, to DuPage, to Kankakee unless we make sure the Department of Revenue collects these money's. Anybody from the County of Cook, whether you were for or against the tax to begin with, if you want to protect your local business, you'd better be voting 'yes' on this Concurrence Motion."

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

McAuliffe: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I also rise in opposition to this Bill. We are

162nd Legislative Day

June 26, 1992

going to try and suck the last possible ounce of blood out of the taxpayers with these crazy Bills. I sometime the President of the County Board is going to set up toll booths along the Cook County/DuPage County line and Cook County/Lake County line to see if anybody goes to the malls up there and charge them the tax when they buy their iceboxes up there or their television sets. Let's give the poor taxpayers a break and stop trying to suck the last ounce of blood out of them that they have. When I want to buy something I...when this tax goes into effect in September, I'm going to go up to Lake County and DuPage county and buy all my major purchases so they can't chisel the last drop of blood out of me in Cook County, which is what they're trying to do right now. They're going to drive all the business people across into DuPage and Lake County so they can avoid these nickel and dime taxes."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Lang to close. Excuse me. I'm sorry. Representative McCracken."

McCracken: "Thank you. Just for the record, there is a collection fee that would be imposed. However, that collection fee will go to GRF. It is not dedicated to the Department of Revenue. There is no guarantee that it will go back to the Department of Revenue. There is no connection between the fee and any net amount realized by the department to fund these new requirements. In fact, it's subject to the annual appropriation process and is from GRF. So if next year is anything like this year, you should not conclude that it's safe to assume that they'll have the money to...to fund this operation. It just isn't so."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Lang to close."

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Those who have said this is a new

162nd Legislative Day

June 26, 1992

tax, it is not a new tax. This Bill does not present a tax at all. This Bill is merely a collection Bill. It creates a mode and a method for collecting the tax that has already been imposed. Second, this is not statewide, as some have alluded to. This relates to Cook County and the Collar Counties only. It is not a statewide Bill. Finally, there a 2% administrative fee that will be paid. Perhaps it goes to GRF, but the budgeteers aren't finished and once they know they're getting this 2% fee, they can take care of that in the budget negotiations. There's certainly no problem with the Department of Revenue getting this \$420,000 to pay their administrative fee in the program. Let's help the county and help the city collect the money due them. Vote 'aye'."

Speaker Giglio: "The question is, 'Shall this House adopt'...or

'Shall the House concur to Senate Amendment #1 to House
Bill 2954?' And on that question, all those in favor
signify by voting 'aye', opposed, 'no'. The voting is
open. Representative Homer, one minute to explain your
vote."

Homer: "We ought to all be supporting this Bill. This Bill is strongly supported by the New Car and Truck Dealers. It does not impose any additional tax. It simply has to do with collection of an already imposed tax, extending it beyond its sunset so as to make sure there's a level playing field among car dealers in the Chicago metropolitan area. It's the least we can do for the new car dealers. This business about a new tax is a smoke screen. It does not exist in this Bill. We ought to have a lot of green votes."

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

Keane: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. All I...I rise in support of the

162nd Legislative Day

- June 26, 1992
- previous speaker. This is a tax...It's just a collection Bill. To vote against this is to vote against appropriate collections. I'd urge an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Giglio: "On this question, there are 60 voting 'yes', 48 voting 'no', and the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2954, and this Bill, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Sieben, on House Bill 3128."
- Sieben: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move to concur on Amendment #1 to Senate Bill...to House Bill 3128. Amendment #1 is a technical Amendment necessary to differentiate between the Illinois Banking Act and the Corporate Fiduciary Act. I move to concur."
- Speaker Giglio: "Representative Black."
- Black: "Well, thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I have an announcement. You might want to complete the Gentleman's...business, and if you would then come back to me for purpose of announcement, I'd be grateful."
- Speaker Giglio: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur to Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3128?' All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed, 'no'. The voting is open. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 111 voting 'yes', none voting 'no', and the House does concur to Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3128. This Bill, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black."
- Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen

162nd Legislative Day

June 26, 1992

of the House. We're doubly blessed today. Our colleague, Jerome Clark, is celebrating a birthday today. We now think he might be old enough to vote. We hope so. But also, a colleague on the other side of the aisle is celebrating a birthday - none other than the distinguished Representative Homer. We have a piece of birthday cake with only one candle. The Fire Marshal would not let us put the sufficient number of candles on to recognize his true age, but we do wish him a happy birthday."

- Speaker Giglio: "Representative Lang, on Senate Bill 3243. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Lang."
- Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would move that the House concur on Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3243. This is the validation Bill for the tax levy ordinance for the forest preserves. This...With this Amendment it covers Cook County and Downstate forest reserves districts."
- Speaker Giglio: "Any discussion? Hearing none...Representative Wennlund."
- Wennlund: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Does that...does the Bill now include Cook and DuPage? Thank you very much."
- Speaker Giglio: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3243?' and on that question, all those in favor vote 'aye', opposed, 'no'. The voting is open. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question, (there are) 102 voting 'yes', 2 voting 'no', and the House does concur to Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3243, and this Bill, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Flinn. Monroe Flinn, on a Motion. The Gentleman, moves pursuant to Rule 73(a) and having voted on the prevailing side, he

162nd Legislative Day

June 26, 1992

moves to reconsider vote by which House Bill 3495 was passed. Represent...the Gentleman...Monroe Flinn moves now to nonconcur with Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 3495. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed, 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the Motion to nonconcur...reconsider and nonconcur to House Bill 3495 prevails. Representative Flinn, on House Bill 3568. The Gentleman from St. Clair, Representative Flinn."

- Flinn: "Mr. Speaker, I move to nonconcur on Amendment #1 on House Bill 3568."
- Speaker Giglio: "You heard the Gentleman's Motion. Any discussion? Hearing none, all...The House nonconcurs with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3568. Representative Keane. Jim Keane, on House Bill 3594. Out of the record. Representative McAfee, on House Bill 3630. Gentleman from Cook, Representative McAfee."
- McAfee: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would move to concur with

  Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3630. It contains

  language proposed to and agreed by the Illinois Retail

  Merchants' Association and the Community Bankers to allow

  customer deposit accounts to begin with the check number

  other than #101."
- Speaker Giglio: "Any discussion? Hearing none, the question is,
   'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House
   Bill 3630?' All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed, 'no'.
   The voting is open. This is final action. Have all voted
   who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who
   wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question, there
   are 109 voting 'yes', none voting 'no', and the House does
   concur to Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3630, and this
   Bill, having received the required Constitutional Majority,
   is hereby declared passed. Representative Capparelli,

162nd Legislative Day

June 26, 1992

House Bill 3674. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Capparelli."

Capparelli: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to concur on House Bill...Amendment #...Senate Amendment #1...3674. What the Bill does, it authorizes state banks and saving banks to merge or consolidate with healthy thrifts, notwithstanding the current bank branching laws. It authorizes state banks or saving banks to relocate the branches if be targeted thrift with, in a certain time frame and geographic area. This Bill is proposed by Illinois Bankers and the Community Bankers. I understand there's no opposition. I would ask for a favorable roll call."

Speaker Giglio: "Any discussion? The Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black."

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

Speaker Giglio: "Indicates he will."

Black: "Representative, can you, for the record and bear with me, there's an Amendment floating around that was added to a Bill in the Senate that had an adverse effect on some farm credit institutions, and I'll be very honest with you, I don't know where that Amendment is. I just want your word that there's nothing in this Amendment that would be harmful to farm on credit agricultural lending institutions."

Capparelli: "You have my word on that."

Black: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Giglio: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3674?' And on that question, all those in favor vote 'aye', opposed, 'no'.

The voting is open. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who

162nd Legislative Day

June 26, 1992

wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question, there are 113 voting 'yes', none voting 'no', and the House does concur to Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3674, and this Bill, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Hicks and then Representative Sieben. Representative Hicks in the chamber? Out of the record. Representative Sieben, on House Bill 3823. The Gentleman from Henry County, Representative Sieben."

Sieben: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would move to concur to Senate Amendment #1 to 3823. The underlying Bill in 3823 deals with credit card factoring by credit card companies and Amendment #1 was introduced on behalf of Illinois Bell in the Senate to exempt telecommunication carriers from the provisions of this Act. I know of no opposition, and I move that we concur in this Amendment."

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

Levin: "Yes. You mentioned Illinois Bell had introduced...was responsible for Amendment #1. Can you indicate what their interest was and what proportion of the Amendment they were interested in?"

Sieben: "Illinois Bell introduced Senate Amendment #1 on their behalf to exempt telecommunication carriers that include charges of other parties and billings to its subscribers and persons whose charges are included in the billings of telecommunication carriers to its subscribers so that they would not at all be included in this issue of factoring by the credit card companies."

Levin: "Can you give an example of what it would be without this exclusion and what it would be like with this exclusion?"

162nd Legislative Day

June 26, 1992

Sieben: "I'm not sure that I can give an example of what it would be without the exclusion. I guess I can refer back to the underlying Bill that deals with the...I think possibly you're getting an explanation now from the representative of the Commissioner of Banks and Trust Companies."

Levin: "Thank you."

Sieben: "You're welcome. I believed the question has been asked...answered, Mr. Speaker, and I would move again that we concur in Senate Amendment #1."

Speaker Giglio: "The guestion is, 'Shall the House concur to Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3823?' All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed, 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. question, there are 113 voting 'yes', none voting 'no', and the House does concur to Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3823, and this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. All right. On the Special Order of Concurrences, Education, appear Bills sponsored by the following Members: McNamara, Cowlishaw, Satterthwaite, Stern, Hensel, Curran, Leitch, Hanniq, Kubik, Granberg, Hultgren, Keane, Santiago, Jay Hoffman, McDonough, Flowers Satterthwaite. And on that Order appears House Bill 1081, Representative McNamara, the Gentleman from Cook."

McNamara: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 1081 as it came back from the Senate had Amendment on that tried to resolve a problem in current law. No mechanism exists in current law to resolve disputes regarding the residency of students and residential treatment centers, nor is there a mechanism for paying for the district which is actually providing for these services. What this Amendment does is resolve both of those problems. I concur with the Amendment and move

162nd Legislative Day

June 26, 1992

for your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Giglio: "Any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall the House concur to Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1081?' All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed, 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question, there are 110...Manny Hoffman, 'aye'...Hultgren, 'aye'. On this question, there are now 111 voting 'aye', none voting 'no', and the House does concur to Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1081, and this Bill, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Cowlishaw? Representative Cowlishaw in the chamber? House Bill 1132. The Lady from DuPage, Representative Cowlishaw."

Cowlishaw: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I am sorry for the delay. I move to concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1132. That Amendment was...offered by Senator Holmberg and it simply restores the provision in the current law that district report cards must indicate the percentage of students placed in the top and the bottom quartiles of nationally normed achievement tests, and it must also include the parental involvement component that was previously required in those reports. I am in accord with Senator Holmberg's view and so I would move that we concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1132."

Speaker Giglio: "Any discussion? The question is, 'Shall the House concur to Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1132?'

And on that question, all in favor vote 'aye', opposed, 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question, there are now 113 voting 'yes', none voting 'no',

162nd Legislative Day

June 26, 1992

and the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1132, and this Bill, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. We're gonna skip a few to get to Representative Keane, because he's coming in the Chair. Representative Keane, on House Bill 3555. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Keane."

Keane: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3555. My understanding is it's an agreed Amendment, and it's the...Senate Amendment 1 is the language...it's identical to House Bill 2166, which was sponsored by Representative Cowlishaw and Steczo concerning revisory changes to the statutes governing the Illinois Students' Assistance Commission. It passed the House 114 to 4, and I'd move for the concurrence."

"Any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, Speaker Giglio: 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3555?' All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed, The voting is open, and this is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 113 voting 'yes', none voting 'no', and the House does concur in Senate Amendments #1 to House Bill 3555, and this Bill, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Let the record indicate, Mr. Clerk, that Representative McGuire wanted to vote 'aye' on that 3555. Representative Keane Chair."

Speaker Keane: "House Bill 1890, Representative Satterthwaite."

Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker, before we proceed on this matter, I wonder if I could have Members' attention to introduce one of our former Members, Eugenia Chapman, who is here on the floor with us...Eugenia has not been back for some time,

162nd Legislative Day

June 26, 1992

and we should welcome her. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, on House Bill 1890, I wish to concur Amendment #1. The main Bill itself deals with the testing procedures and changes recommended by the Board The Amendment deals with some of the concerns of the people with special education students and children and families. They still have a little bit of concern, and so, for purposes of legislative intent, I would like to note that the Board of Education is committed tο establishing a task force made up of parents and special education professionals to work with their staff, putting in place...their ways of doing the alternative assessment process and how they will define 'reasonable the students who need to have those accommodations' for accommodations. The State Board has indicated that they will have this task force working and have the advice from that task force before they promulgate the rules that will be necessary by this piece of legislation. And with that quarantee. I believe we should move forward to concur in Senate Amendment #1."

Speaker Keane: "Representative Black."

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

Speaker Keane: "She indicates she will."

Black: "Representative, forgive me if you said this, but I, you know, for the umpteenth time today, the noise level in this place is unbelievable. All I want you to clarify, is this Bill, as amended, actually reduces the number of hours that a student will be subjected to testing. Yes or no?"

Satterthwaite: "Yes."

Black: "Thank you very much. It's about time."

Speaker Keane: "Representative Cowlishaw."

162nd Legislative Day

June 26, 1992

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

Speaker Keane: "She indicates she will."

- Cowlishaw: "Representative Satterthwaite, I believe there was one other...minor concern about Senate Amendment #1 and that was whether, in fact, the task force that the State Board of Education will create would be able to do what is necessary in a timely way and if you could answer that question I'm sure that then there would be no problem with this at all."
- Satterthwaite: "Yes. The State Board indicates that they have no problem with the time limits in the Amendment."
- Cowlishaw: "Thank you very much. I rise in support of the Lady's Motion."
- Speaker Keane: "Any further discussion? The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1890?' This is final action. All those in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. On this Bill, there are 111 voting 'aye', none voting 'no', none voting 'present', and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1890, and this Bill, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2166, Representative Cowlishaw."
- Cowlishaw: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Representative Woolard has an...a portion of this Bill that is very important to him and to his district. The Senate added an Amendment that is not agreeable to Representative Woolard, and so, in his behalf, I would like to move to nonconcur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2166."

162nd Legislative Day

June 26, 1992

Speaker Keane: "The question is, 'Shall the House nonconcur in Senate Amendment #1 on House Bill 2166?' All those in favor say 'aye', all opposed, 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the House nonconcurs in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2166. House Bill 2679, Representative Stern."

Stern: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, we wish to concur in Senate Amendment #1. Let me remind you about the Bill. This is the Bill which would permit a school district, which includes a military base, to disconnect the military base and in an effort to force the government...the U.S. Government to the table to talk to us about improving impact aid. They have bankrupted one school district in my county and nearly bankrupted another because they will not The Bill, when it first came out of the House, passed out of here 104 to 4, and the 4 were concerned because they were afraid - my seat mate in particular that the youngsters would be caught in the hinge. Amendment in the Senate, I believe, takes care of that concern, and I think it improves the Bill. The Amendment in the Senate - and the Senate Sponsor stands at my right the Amendment in the Senate requires the youngsters - in the event of such a disconnection - to return to schools in which they have been going and the government, the U.S. Federal Government, stands responsible for their This strikes me as a eminently fair, decent, capital A/American way to handle this situation. have any questions?"

Speaker Keane: "Representative Ropp."

Ropp: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A question of the Sponsor. I think this is a laudable idea. I guess the question is, 'Can you, through this Amendment, demand that the Federal Government pay for their education of these kids?

162nd Legislative Day

June 26, 1992

or...if...we're kind of short of money in the state, can we demand that they come up with some additional dollars for a lot of things? How for sure are you that it's going to happen?"

Stern: "Well, this Bill is doing that. I suppose the future alone will answer your question. I believe that it's absolutely legitimate that they pay for the expenses they incur in each school district. I assume they are not going to take this lying down, Representative, and I would imagine this is not the last we will hear of this."

Ropp: "If I recall in committee you started a number of other states, or at least several states, where the Federal Government was, in fact, being more responsible in this situation..."

Stern: "Oh yes."

Ropp: "...And what is it that these other states are doing that we either haven't been doing and if we haven't, maybe this is what...the thing that's going to do it."

Stern: "In West Point, New York, and at Fort Knox, Kentucky, the children are being...subsidized to the tune of about \$5,000 per youngster. In school district lll in Highland Park, Illinois, they are being subsidized to the tune of \$2,100 while it costing us over \$6,000 per youngster. So, we feel that there is...unjust, inequitable treatment being...handed out."

Ropp: "I think this is a good, a good Amendment and a good Bill and a good Conference Committee Report. I just hope that the Federal Government would comply with the...law that...should the Governor sign it. Thank you."

Stern: "Well, they're going to have to defy us if they don't.

We'll see. I ask your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Keane: "Representative Davis."

162nd Legislative Day

June 26, 1992

Davis: "Thank you. According to the Amendment, Representative, it states that the district from which the new district was detached shall continue to educate the students. Now, which district is the district from which the new district was detached?"

Stern: "The larger district which has detached the military...the land on which the military base is located, has been educating these youngsters. So these youngsters will return to the schools they have been going to right along."

Davis: "They will not be on the base? Is that what you're saying?"

Stern: "There is no school on the base."

Davis: "I say...They will not. I mean, they won't be going to Highland Park?"

Stern: "Yes, they will be going to Highland Park."

Davis: "And that's the school that..."

Stern: "That they have been attending."

Davis: "So in other words, we will not disrupt their education..."

Stern: "We will not disrupt..."

Davis: "...until this dispute is settled..."

Stern: "That's correct."

Davis: "Or until you get those dollars these children will be allowed to continue their education. Is that correct?"

Stern: "That's correct. That's what the Amendment says."

Davis: "Then we certainly do...We support your concurrence."

Stern: "Thank you."

Speaker Keane: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2679?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Representative Lang votes 'aye'. Have all voted who wish? Representative Schoenberg

162nd Legislative Day

- June 26, 1992
- votes 'aye'. Representative Schoenberg votes 'present'.
- Schoenberg: "Yes. With my wife's law practice, I am voting 'present'."
- Speaker Keane: "Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this there are lll voting 'aye', none voting 'no', 3 voting 'present', and the House concurs in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2679, and this Bill, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2726, Representative Hensel. Representative Hensel."
- Hensel: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I move to concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2726. What Senate Amendment does is authorizes school districts to establish volunteer service credit programs that enable secondary school students to earn credit towards graduation through performance of community service. It passed the Senate by a vote of 53 to nothing. I know of no opposition. Ask for a favorable vote."
- Speaker Keane: "Is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt Amendment #1 to House Bill 2726?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 113 voting 'aye', 1 voting 'no', none voting 'present', and the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2726, and this Bill, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2755, Representative Curran."
- Curran: "Mr. Speaker, I move to concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2755. The underlying Bill simply extends the

162nd Legislative Day

June 26, 1992

existing pupil contract for transportation on a year-to-year basis, even though another interested contractor requests that the contract be let by bid. This Bill got 116 votes to nothing when it passed out of the House. All the Senate did was add an immediate effective date. I'd be glad to answer any questions. Move for a favorable roll call."

Speaker Keane: "Any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2755?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all 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 109 voting 'aye', 1 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present', and the House concurs in Senate Amendment...Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2755, and this Bill, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2940, Representative Leitch."

Leitch: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The Senate Amendment, as it came over, was a very good idea. I wish I'd thought of it. It recommends that two annexing school districts...make an agreement on how they're handling their bonded indebtedness before the...referendum annexation is...the referendum on an annexation is actually held. It's a good idea, and I'd move for concurrence of this Amendment."

Speaker Keane: "Any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt Amendment #1 to House Bill 2940?' Those in...those in favor vote 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have the record. On this Bill...on this question, there

162nd Legislative Day

June 26, 1992

are 109 voting 'aye', none voting 'no', none voting 'present', and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2940, and this Bill, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3070, Representative Hannig. Representative Hannig.

Hannig: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. would move that we concur in Senate Amendments 1 and The underlying Bill dealt with detachments and provided that...when a petition is filed with the regional board that it be filed with the board of trustees where the regional superintendent supervises and controls. Senate, Senator Watson added two Amendments that provided that local education service agencies are eligible grants, loans or program authorizations or any other assistance provided to local education agencies by the state board. And he also provided an Amendment that deals with the reimbursement by the State Board of Education for background checks for part-time substitute teachers that says that the state regional superintendents...that the local regional superintendents can collect the directly, and there was no opposition to this proposal in the Senate, I would move that we concur to Senate Amendments 1 and 2."

Speaker Keane: "Any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 3070?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 115 voting 'aye', none voting 'no', none voting 'present', and the House does concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to

162nd Legislative Day

June 26, 1992

House Bill 3070, and this Bill, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3115, Representative Kubik.

Kubik: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 31...I would move to concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3115. The underlying Bill creates an inter-agency board for the hearing - impaired, behaviorally disordered children in the state. What Senate Amendment #1 does is making this, rather than mandating it, makes it permissive. It was suggested by the Illinois...by the Illinois State Board of Education. I support the Amendment and would br happy to respond to any questions. Would move to concur."

Speaker Keane: "Is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Amendment #1 Senate...to Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3115?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 113 voting 'aye', none voting 'no', none voting 'present', and the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3115, and this Bill, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3252, Representative Granberg. Out of the record. House Bill 3385, Representative Hultgren. Representative Hultgren."

Hultgren: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would move to concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2. Senate Amendment #1 provides that the election of school board members at large and without reference to an area of residence within a congressional township in a community that unit school

162nd Legislative Day

June 26, 1992

district formed prior to January 1, 1975, that meets certain prescribed conditions. They can switch electing in the townships to election at large. Senate Amendment #2, offered by Senator Berman, addresses a situation. It prohibits petitions for a school district boundary change, dissolution, conversion or organization within 2 years rather than 1 year of an unsuccessful attempt, unless the petition is substantially different from those filed during the previous 2 years of the school district has been placed on the Academic Watch List, the Financial Watch List, or has been certified as being in financial difficulty. The underlying Bill passed the House without dissenting votes, and the Amendments that were added in the Senate were not controversial and passed there without dissenting votes as well. Again, would ask for concurrence."

Speaker Keane: "Any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 3385?' and all those in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 105 voting 'aye', 1 voting 'no', none voting 'present' and the House does concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 3385, and this Bill, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby 3695, Representative McNamara. passed. House Bill Representative McNamara."

McNamara: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 3695...has a

Senate Amendment #1 which allows the school districts to
obtain Medicare reimbursement from the Federal Government
to qualified health services provided to the students. It

162nd Legislative Day

June 26, 1992

allows a joint educational program to borrow up to 50% instead of the current 85% of state payments that are due, and changes that date to 'due' rather than '30 days afterwards', and allows the Chicago Board of Education to sell some property to a parochial school that has been leased at that area for 10 years for use as a school. I concur with the Amendment..."

Speaker Keane: "Is there any discussion? Representative Cowlishaw."

Cowlishaw: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. I believe there has been some discussion and perhaps even some misunderstanding about one this element in this...in Amendment with which Representative McNamara would like to concur. I stand in support of his Motion and of this concurrence, but I want to assure the Members of the House that that provision that has to do with the Chicago School District being able to sell a piece of property with a school building on it to a parochial school that's been occupying that property for more than 10 years without having to go to any kind of competitive bidding is simply based on the premise that that parochial school has been paying rent to the Chicago public schools for years and therefore the schools have already received a good deal of money from that property. And I think that it is only fair since parochial schools are very much a part of the system of education in Illinois, that we should concur with this Senate Amendment. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Keane: "Representative Davis."

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

Speaker Keane: "He indicates he will."

Davis: "Well, first of all, I don't see anything here that applies to a parochial school, and, in truth, Chicago has

162nd Legislative Day

June 26, 1992

been taking over parochial schools. They have been taking over those buildings which have been vacant, and I'd like to know from the Gentleman exactly what properties might you be talking about?"

McNamara: "These properties that they were speaking of I am not familiar totally with it. The property that they are speaking of is a Northside school that has been rented from the public school system, and I believe the public school system has been rented for over 10 years when the public school system had a problem with the building or whatever."

Davis: "Well, I would urge..."

McNamara: "It is also my understanding that they put extensive work and they want it and the public school system also wanted to maintain it as a school facility for that area."

Davis: "I would urge the Chicago Legislators to truly listen up here, because what we're talking about, it states, any sale of real estate having a fair market value of more than \$25,000 which has continually been leased by the same entity and used as a school attendance center for at least 10 years may be negotiated and shall not require notice or competitive bids."

McNamara: "And that's correct."

Davis: "Now, my understanding is there are some downtown locations that are using Chicago public schools' facilities, and they are renting these properties, and as a member of Chicago, a citizen from there and a voter from there, Representative from Oak Lawn, I am very concerned when we talk about selling real estate in Chicago with noncompetitive bids. I don't think it's a good idea. I don't think it's fair for Chicago to do that. Our school system is hurting for dollars, and if they have property that can bring them in a good buck, we should be permitted

162nd Legislative Day

June 26, 1992

to do that just as any other school system would be able to do."

McNamara: "Is that a statement or a question?"

Davis: "Both."

McNamara: "Okay. I'll be happy to respond to what you're saying. First of all, this language was put on in the Senate Legislators Chicago who are operating, with my understanding, for the Chicago school system that wish to do this, but they were done for one simple reason: It's limitation language. It pertains to one site, because if we read each and every word of it, 'and used as a school attendance center for at least 10 years'. Now, as a school attendance center means that the classrooms, that school building, which is not utilized by the Chicago Board of Education, can be sold by that Chicago Board of Education under a negotiated price to a school that has operating in that area, in that building, for 10 years and paying the rental fee on it. My understanding of this Amendment - which was almost unanimously presented out of the Senate and presented over here - was that it was agreement for this one single school to be negotiated between them..."

Davis: "Do you know...do you know the name of the school?"

McNamara: "No, I don't."

Davis: "Is it named in the Bill?"

McNamara: "No, it isn't."

Davis: "Well, then according to this Amendment, any property that is owned by the Chicago Board of Education..."

McNamara: "That is used..."

Davis: "...being as poor as it may be, any school that is renting space and has been for the past ten years, (and there are probably many of them), that they can buy this property on

162nd Legislative Day

June 26, 1992

a non-bid basis. As a resident of Chicago, who speaks for parents, who speaks for the children who live there, for the parents who pay taxes there, for people who suffer every year of whether we're going to have enough money for this system or not, I think it's a very bad Amendment, and I hope that those of us who are from Chicago, or those of us who believe that Chicago should get a fair market value for the price for its real estate, that you will certainly vote 'no' on concurrence of this Senate Amendment."

Speaker Keane: "Representative Lang."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support Lang: Concurrence Motion. Firstly, the Senate Sponsor, Sponsor of the Senate Amendment is Senator Berman. We all know that Senator Berman is sort of the education guru of the General Assembly, and Senator Berman would not be interested in doing anything that would hurt the Chicago Board of Education, so that's the first comment. second comment is that the school that Representative McNamara is referring to is in my district. I'm very familiar with it. This school has used this building for many, many, many years, and the purpose of the Amendment is not to...to hurt the cash flow of the Chicago Board of Education, but to make sure that the children who have been using this school continuously for over ten years, are continued to be able to use it, and so the families will continue to be able to use it. It's a reasonable Amendment. The Board of Education will negotiate a amount of...a fair dollar for that property. It's good for It's good for the children in my community who children. use that school. Please vote 'aye' for them."

Speaker Keane: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3695?' All those in

162nd Legislative Day

June 26, 1992

favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 100 voting 'aye', 14 voting 'no', and none voting 'present', and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3695, and this Bill, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3746, Representative Santiago. Representative Santiago.

Santiago: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move..."

Speaker Keane: "Representative Hicks, while we're waiting for the
Clerk to put this on the board, we're on the Order of
Concurrence, Education. No, we're not using the Regular
Calendar."

Hicks: "I thought you were at ease, Mr. Speaker, looking for something to do, and I did have a couple that you passed over. I was...had to step out for a moment, and I was simply trying to get back to those. If you could get back to 3689, I think it's a noncontroversial type thing, and I'd appreciate it."

Speaker Keane: "If you would like to come up and talk to the Parliamentarian, we'll go back to them. Okay."

Santiago: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. May I proceed?"

Speaker Keane: "Proceed."

Santiago: "I move to concur with Senate Amendments 1 and 2."

Speaker Keane: "Okay, the board...The Clerk informs me he can only put one number up, but the...what we're talking about is Senate Amendments #1 and 2."

Santiago: "One and two. First of all, this is not an education

Bill. This is a transportation Bill. What...Most
importantly is that this...these two Amendments have been
agreed upon by the State Police and the Department of

## 162nd Legislative Day

June 26, 1992

Transportation and also the Municipal League. What these...this Amendment #1, what it does is changes the Vehicle Code for converters dolly and adds the definition of truck to the Vehicle Code and adds language to prohibit semi-trailers from using the weight exemption allowed under the refuse and rendering materials, and also allows one mile access from interstate highways for larger trucks. Amendment #2...what it does, this...It sets up...Its schedule for overweight truck stops and local roads and the schedule is agreed to, as I've said before, by the Municipal League. I move do passage."

- Speaker Keane: "We'll take this Bill out of the record until we get the board squared away. Out of the record. House Bill 3882, Representative McDonough. Out of the record. House Bill 4156, Representative Satterthwaite. Representative Satterthwaite."
- Satterthwaite: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I move to concur with Senate Amendment #1 on House Bill 4156. The Amendment places the responsibility for the implementation of the Bill with the various systems of higher education rather than with the Board of Higher Education. I know of no opposition and move for its adoption."
- Speaker Keane: "Is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 4156?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? I'm sorry, Representative Black."
- Black: "I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker. I thought this Bill abolished
   the Board of Regents, but I've just been told that's not
   what it does, so I apologize."
- Speaker Keane: "Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 112 voting 'aye', none

162nd Legislative Day

June 26, 1992

voting 'no', none voting 'present', and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 4156, and this Bill, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. We will now proceed to Concurrences on Transportation. House Bill 2741, Representative Klemm. Representative Klemm."

Klemm: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of House. House Bill 2741, the underlying Bill, created the Adopt-A-Highway program in Illinois. It provided all features that we talked about before, and Senate Amendment 1 added some health and safety precautions that we wanted to tighten up on, and it specified that animal carcasses do not have to be picked up by the participants. It also gave Department of Transportation and the sponsoring jurisdiction some authority to identify unsafe sections of highway if necessary. I also wanted to...to add, for legislative intent, that this Bill was the Adopt-A-Highway Bill the intention was not for of having...replacing jobs and workers and highway people whether its for AFCSME or from the Teamsters Union or anything else. This is a Bill, I think, of a cooperative nature of letting obviously volunteer programs to clean up our highways, and I do move its adoption and concur with Amendment...Senate Amendment #1."

Speaker Keane: "Any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2741?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 107 voting 'aye', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill

162nd Legislative Day

June 26, 1992

this Bill having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Bill 2979, Representative Woolard. Representative Woolard. Representative Brunsvold, would you tap Representative Woolard on the...Do you wish to call your Bill on Representative Woolard. Concurrence? Representative Woolard, why don't you get yourself organized and we'll get back to you after we do another Bill or two. House Bill 3027, Representative Olson. Representative Olson."

Olson: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. I rise to ask your support in concurrence on Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3027. The underlying Bill dealt with modification of county subdivision plats. It passed out of this House 117 to 1. Senate Amendment #1 limits the population of the counties that applicable to and narrows it down to the only county that would be affected by this is McLean County, which asked for this particular legislation. I ask your concurrence."

Speaker Keane: "Is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3027?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 109 voting 'aye', 0...110 voting 'aye', 0 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present', and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3027, and this Bill, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3060, Representative Kulas. Representative Kulas?"

Kulas: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move that the House concur to Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 3060. The Amendments are two House Bills that we passed out of here

162nd Legislative Day

June 26, 1992

sponsored by Representative Giglio. House Bill 3063, which would required construction equipment that is capable of being moved to have the name on the side of the company of which it is employed by, and House Bill 3064 also would have sub-contractors have their names on, and I would move for concurrence."

Speaker Keane: "All right, Representative Kulas, our records show there is only one Senate Amendment."

Kulas: "Pardon me?"

Speaker Keane: "There's only one Senate Amendment. There's only one Senate Amendment on House Bill 3060."

Kulas: "Oh, I'm sorry. You're right. That is one Amendment which contains the two Bills that I mentioned previously, House Bill 3063 and 3064, which passed out of this House, but did not get out of Rules in the Senate."

Speaker Keane: "Representative Black."

Black: "Yes. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate the Chair clearing up the confusion we had on the second Amendment, but I do need to ask the Sponsor a question if he'd yield."

Speaker Keane: "Proceed."

Black: "Representative, the original Bill prohibited or limited the width of certain farm vehicles. Is that still in the Bill?"

Kulas: "Yes, that's the original Bill which would prohibit farm agriculture...over 8 feet 6 being transported where any construction is being done, just in areas where construction is taking place."

Black: "Okay, so in other words the...this isn't going to impact some farmer trying to get from one parcel to another on a county or a township road?"

Kulas: "No...no."

162nd Legislative Day

June 26, 1992

Black: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Keane: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3060?' All those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is favor vote 'ave', all open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. this Bill, there are 107 voting 'aye', 0 voting 'no', voting 'present'. Representative Morrow and Representative Balanoff vote 'aye'. On this Bill there are...On this question, there are 109 voting 'aye', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3060, and this Bill, received the required Constitutional Majority, is herebydeclared passed. House Bill 3139, Representative Representative Homer."

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

Speaker Keane: "Proceed."

Homer: "I would like to move to concur with Senate Amendment #1 which is identical to House Bill 3869, which passed the It was held in the Senate Rules Committee. This Amendment...provides that circuits with at least not more than 335,000 population shall but have 11 associate judges and also makes provision for...one associate judge in Cook County for each 29,000 population. The current law is 30,000. The effect of the Amendment is preserve the status quo with respect to the number of associate judges authorized in those circuits prior to the change in the 1990 census. I would move for concurrence of this Amendment."

Speaker Keane: "Representative Black."

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

162nd Legislative Day

June 26, 1992

Speaker Keane: "He indicates he will."

Black: "Representative, I recall this Bill in the House. I know we had some concerns about lowering the threshhold for associate judges...given the fact that so many counties lose population - or have in the last census. The growth, obviously, has been up north. I'm not real sure. It appears to me that Senate Amendment 1 did what we opposed earlier, but then Senate Amendment 2 put the same population threshhold back. Is that your understanding of the Bill or...?"

Homer: "Well, no, the Senate Amendment #2 actually had to do with Cook County where there was a declaration in that Amendment that vacancies created in the ranks of associate judgeship would be converted to sub-circuit judgeships, so, frankly, Amendment #2 is somewhat confusing. I think the effect of that Amendment is to ultimately do away with the five associate judges in Cook County that Amendment 1 seeks to preserve, but it would accelerate the transition into the sub-circuit districts and would...would accelerate the time within which five positions within the sub-circuits would be created."

Black: "All right. Then with the other Senate Amendment then...I

guess what I'm trying to get at is, is this an attempt to

keep the number of associate judges the same even though
population may have been reduced?"

Homer: "Yes, the effect of Senate Amendment #1 would be to allow those circuits that lost population to retain the same number of associate judges that they enjoyed prior to the taking of the 1990 census."

Black: "Well, let me...let me defer to your legal expertise. At what point should we be careful that most every county will come here and say, 'well I know we lost 10,000; 20,000

162nd Legislative Day

June 26, 1992

people in the year 2000 census, but we don't want to eliminate any associate judge. I mean, could we be headed in that direction?"

Homer: "Well, now this is not a county issue, this is circuit."

Black: "A circuit issue. All right."

Homer: "And then there are only 22 circuits, I believe, plus Cook

County which is a circuit in and of itself and so we did

already take this action last spring for the 7th Circuit,

which includes Sangamon County and Macoupin County and some
others. This would...would make that consistent."

Black: "All right. Well then, the only other question, I need then (and I appreciate your patience for clarification), the board says you're concurring in Senate Amendment #1.

Is it your intent to concur in Senate Amendment #1 and #2?"

Homer: "No, my intention is to concur in 1 and to recede from...I mean to non concur in #2."

Black: "Okay. Thank you very much, Representative."

Speaker Keane: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3139?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all 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 73 voting 'aye', 36 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present', and the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3139. The Gentleman now moves to nonconcur in Senate Amendment #2. All those in favor say 'aye', all opposed, 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the House does not concur in Senate Amendment #2. House Bill 3187, Representative DeJaegher. Representative DeJaegher."

DeJaegher: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the General
Assembly. I wish to concur with Senate Amendment 1 to
House Bill 3187. There are four different parts to the

162nd Legislative Day

June 26, 1992

Amendment analysis. These...The wording and the draft was authored by the Office of the State's Attorney Appellate Prosecutor. The Bill originally amended the Illinois Vehicle Code, provides that a person's considered arrested for driving under the influence when the arresting officer travels into an adjoining state where the person was transported for medical care to investigate a motor vehicle accident that occurred in this state to issue uniform traffic ticket. So this was done. The wording of the Amendment was done by the Office of State's Attorney Appellate Prosecutor. I feel that I have no reason to belabor this Bill, and I just hope for concurrence."

- Speaker Keane: "Is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall the House concur on Amendment #1 to House Bill 3187?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 111 voting 'aye', 0 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present', and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3187, and this Bill, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3246, Representative Granberg. Representative Granberg."
- Granberg: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Amendment #1 was added with the...unanimously in the Senate. It is agreed to by the New Car and TRuck Dealers, and I would move for concurrence with Senate Amendment #1."
- Speaker Keane: "Is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3246?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who

162nd Legislative Day

June 26, 1992

wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are lll voting 'aye', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3246, and this Bill, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. We will now go back and pick up House Bill 2979, Representative Woolard. Representative Woolard."

Woolard: "I move to concur with the Senate Amendment #1. This just further codifies the language that was in our original Bill. I think that it's totally agreed in the Senate, and I would feel very comfortable, and I would encourage everyone to support the concurrence."

Speaker Keane: "Representative Black."

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

Woolard: "Yes."

Speaker Keane: "He indicates he will."

Black: "Representative, does this do...Does this address the problem we talked about earlier this year - people who lease cars, in Illinois, are kind of getting a double hit, I think. (The Department of Revenue doesn't agree with me.) But if you lease a car in Illinois, you pay sales tax up front on the purchase price. Then if you buy that car after the lease period, you're going to pay tax again and so many of the people in my district on the border are going to Indiana to lease their vehicles. Does this have anything to do with that item?"

Woolard: "No."

Black: "That's too bad, I...Maybe we can visit that at a later point in the Session. This is a good Bill. I think we also need to take a look at our leasing arrangements and

162nd Legislative Day

June 26, 1992

how we're taxing those because I think the state is losing money on it."

Speaker Keane: "The question is, 'Shall this...shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2979?' All in favor vote 'ave', all opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. Bill, there are 109 voting 'aye', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2979, and this Bill, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared Bill 3707, Representative passed. House Representative Ronan? Out of the record. On the Order of Concurrence, Civil and Criminal Law. Read...Civil and Criminal. On Concurrence, Civil and Criminal Law, House Bill 661, Representative Sieben. Representative Sieben."

Sieben: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move to concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 661. All the Amendment does is transfer the Bill's operative language from Paragraph D of this section to Paragraph G, and I would move to concur in that Amendment."

Speaker Keane: "Is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 661?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 112 voting 'aye', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', and the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 661, and this Bill, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1181, Representative Stange. Representative Stange?

162nd Legislative Day

- June 26, 1992
- Is this...Representative Lang, is this your Bill? Do you want to handle this?"
- Lang: "I'm not certain what Stang, wants to do, so take it out of the record."
- Speaker Keane: "Out of the record. House Bill 2132,

  Representative McDonough. Representative McDonough."
- McDonough: "I move to concur with Senate Amendment #1 on House
  Bill 2132. The Amendment lowers the penalty of the offense
  of an organizer of an aggravated insurance fraud conspiracy
  from a Class X felony to a Class 1 felony and changes the
  effective date from January 1, 1992, to January 1, 1993."
- Speaker Keane: "Is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt Amendment #1 to House Senate...shall the House adopt Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2132?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are 110 voting 'aye', 0 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present', and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2132, and this Bill, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby passed. House Bill 2677, Representative Homer. Out of the House Bill 2640...2694, Representative Kirkland. Out of the record. House Bill 2750, Representative Noland. Out of the record. House Bill 3210. Representative Hoffman, Jay. Hoffman. Representative Hoffman."
- Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move to concur on Senate Amendment #1. This basically just cleans up the Bill and makes a few technical changes which were required in the Senate Judiciary Committee."
- Speaker Keane: "Is there any discussion? There being none, the

162nd Legislative Day

June 26, 1992

question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3210?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all 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 113 voting 'aye', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3210, and this Bill, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2677, Representative Homer."

- Homer: "Speaker, I was wanting to be recognized on 2767, which the Chair skipped. Would it be possible to go to that Bill, 2767?"
- Speaker Keane: "I'm sorry, I misspoke. Mr. Clerk, it is House Bill 2767."
- Homer: "Yes. Thank you. Mr. Speaker, I would move to nonconcur in the three Senate Amendments."
- Speaker Keane: "You heard the Motion, the Gentleman's Motion. All those in favor say 'aye', all opposed vote 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the House nonconcurs in Senate Amendments #1, 2 and 3. Representative Homer, did you want House Bill 3261, Representative Currie. to call...okay. Out of the record. House Bill 3284, Representative Giorgi. Out of the record. House Bill 3288, Representative Currie. 3315, Representative Out of the record. House Bill Giorgi. Out οf the record. House Bill 3371. Representative John Dunn. Representative Dunn."
- Dunn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House.

  I move to concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3371.

  Senate Amendment #1 makes a technical change in the Bill, and I know of no opposition."
- Speaker Keane: "Is there any discussion? There being none the

## 162nd Legislative Day

June 26, 1992

question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3371?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill, there are...on this question, there are 112 voting 'aye', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3371, and this Bill, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3445, Representative Currie. Representative Currie."

- Currie: "I move that the Senate...that we not concur in the Senate Amendment. There was a technical error in the Amendment adopted by the Senate on this Bill. I would like to put the Bill in Conference Committee so we can clean up that technical problem and present the Bill to you substantively exactly as I would have presented it, had I made the other Motion."
- Speaker Keane: "The Lady moves for nonconcurrence. All those in favor say 'aye', all opposed, 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the House nonconcurs in Senate Amendment #1.

  Representative Currie, do you want to go back to 3261?

  (House Bill) 3288? House Bill 3483, Representative Hasara.

  Representative Hasara."
- Hasara: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to nonconcur in Senate

  Amendment #1 to House Bill 3483. The Senate Sponsor has

  asked to have it go to Conference so that some of their

  concerns may be addressed."
- Speaker Keane: "The Lady moves to nonconcur in Senate Amendment #1. All those in favor say 'aye', all opposed, 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the House nonconcurs with Senate Amendment #1. (House Bill) 34...House Bill 3493,

162nd Legislative Day

June 26, 1992

Representative Lang. Representative Lang."

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would move to nonconcur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3493."

Speaker Keane: "You've heard the Gentleman's Motion. All those in favor say 'aye', all opposed, 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the House nonconcurs with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3493. House Bill 3633, Representative Regan.

Regan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I move to concur in...Senate Amendments 1, 3 and 4 on House Bill 3633 if I can find... This is a result of the task force that was formed due to President Rock's request, a joint Senate task force on ritualistic abuse of children. Amendments 1, 3 and 4 are results of the final hearing after traveling from Chicago - one hearing in Chicago, two hearings here. in Springfield. We have added Ohio...language to the Bill, increased the penalties for ritualistic abuse of children in regards to areas that weren't covered before. (They're covered in Idaho law.) And I concur with Amendments 1, 3 and 4."

Speaker Keane: "Representative Homer."

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

Speaker Keane: "He indicates he will."

Homer: "I'm interested in this Amendment #4, this Senate
Amendment #4. Have you looked at that, Representative
Regan?"

Regan: "Yes."

Homer: "Where did that come from?"

Regan: "That's the Idaho language...that describes ritualistic abuse of a child. That's the state law from Idaho. It's cleaned up to eliminate duplications which was (sic-were) already in our laws, such as cannibalism."

162nd Legislative Day

June 26, 1992

Homer: "Well, what's the penalty for conviction of...ritualized abuse of a child?"

Regan: "The first offense is a Class 1 felony."

Homer: "And then a second offense is a Class X felony?"

Regan: "Yes."

Homer: "And then you've got ritualized... You've got a 'natural life' in here for some combination here. What is that?

'A defendant convicted of a second or subsequent offense of ritualized abuse of a child may be sentenced to a term of natural life imprisonment'?"

Regan: "Yes."

Homer: "So, a court could sentence somebody to a term of natural life for a second conviction of this offense?"

Regan: "Yes."

Homer: "I draw your attention then to...par...to sub-paragraph 3 of Section A. It says, 'a person is guilty of this offense if, in the presence of a child, that the person forces ingestion of non-prescribed drugs'. So, if I, as a parent, force my child to take some Tylenol, would I be guilty of this offense?"

Regan: "No, this is in...described as part of a ceremony or rite...as in the description..."

Homer: "Or as to similar...what is...or as part... If I did that as part of a ceremony, rite or any similar observance, then I would be guilty of this...Class I felony? So, isn't that a fair interpretation that if I gave my child a non-prescribed drug, like aspirin or Tylenol, that I would be subject to prosecution for this...this offense?"

Regan: "I...I don't I don't think so, Representative, unless it was in regard to some ritual in which all of these offenses and all of these descriptions which read like Marquis de Saad are always at the top...is the fact is that it's part

162nd Legislative Day

June 26, 1992

of a ceremony or rite or ritual and giving a child aspirin is...certainly doesn't qualify for that definition."

Homer: "So, in this paragraph 1, it says that persons guilty of this as part of a ceremony that the person in the presence of a child actually or in simulation sacrifices a warm-blooded animal. What are...what are warm-blooded animals?" Regan: "Most mammals are warm-blooded animals."

Homer: "Well, I mean, are insects? What are they? They're not warm-blooded?"

Regan: "No, they're not animals either."

Homer: "How about worms?"

Regan: "...No."

Homer: "So, as a part of a ritual of baiting a hook and going fishing if I mutilated a worm or a minnow, would I be guilty of this offense that could subject me to a natural life of prison?"

Regan: "Some people think that's a fair sentence for using worms as bait."

Homer: "All right now. They have a...they have a thing in my district that's been subject to controversy involving live pigeon shoots and part of the controversy is that they send kids out after they shoot these pigeons and they wring their necks, and, now wouldn't that be...wouldn't that fall within the definition of ritualized abuse of a child?"

Regan: "Not in my qualifications as far as a ceremony, a rite or religious... This is a part of hunting, and this is not part of a ritualist rite."

Homer: "When, I was a kid we had some neighbors that (sic~who) had chickens and they used to have us over and they'd show us how you wring a chicken's neck and then...It was kind of gruesome, but my neighbor never got sentenced to life in prison so far as I know, but would...would he have been

162nd Legislative Day

June 26, 1992

subject to this penalty had this Bill been in effect at that time?"

Regan: "No, certainly he wasn't dancing around the campfire, dressed in robes with horns on his head and the pentagons on the grounds, so that this is what we're after. We're not after someone...preparing chicken for dinner."

Homer: "This also, #5 says, 'if you place a child into a coffin'... It would be ritualized abuse of a child?"

Regan: "Yes."

Homer: "Well, let me ask you this, Representative Regan,
where...where did...Who drafted this? Where did the
draft... It came from some Idaho statute?"

Regan: "Yes. It was enacted... It's on the laws in Idaho."

Homer: "Well, this..."

Regan: "It came up in three task force meetings quite commonly as...the most sophisticated language and definitions of ritualistic abuse."

Homer: "And a..."

Regan: "One member of...Tom Dunn is a Co-Chairman and Granberg, the other Co-Chairman, and they took the Idaho law... I gave 'em the Idaho law, they took it, and they made it similar to Illinois law."

Homer: "Okay. So, this paragraph 6, it says that a person that commits this offense if he threatens...serious harm...to a child or to pets in the family...to...pets...So if someone threatens to do harm to somebody's pet and they do that in front of a child, would that be...Would that be ritualized abuse of a child?"

Regan: "The...the reason that that's in there is that one of the things that they do to keep a child from testifying or going to...telling anybody about what's happening in regards to these cults is they threaten the life of the

162nd Legislative Day

June 26, 1992

child or the neighbor's child or the mother, the father. They threaten the life of the child's pet to place fear in his heart so that he is quiet about this type of abuse. If you say, 'If that dog wets on the rug again, I'm going to kick its rear end,' that has nothing to do with ritualistic abuse."

Homer: "All right. So, so if the dog...if the dog goes on my rug and I say I'm gonna...I'm gonna wring that dog's neck and I say that in front of the kids and your Bill says and it...and it gives that child a well-founded fear that the threat will be carried out, have I committed ritualistic abuse?"

Regan: "I...I don't think that any court in the land would hold you responsible as ritualistic abuse for training your dog not to wet in the carpet."

Homer: "All right. Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. I... I don't to give Representative Regan a hard time because he's a very fine Legislator and an excellent member of the Judiciary Committee and he's...he's tried to address this issue of ritualistic...suicides that I supported him on. (In fact, the Bill itself, the main Bill that he the House, I felt was a good Bill.) It... It tries to address the situation where someone induces suicide, then there were some Amendments added in the Senate, Amendments 1 and 3, that are good Amendments that further tighten up and...deal with that issue, but then, all of a sudden, they put on this Amendment 4, which attempts to create this idea from Idaho of ritualized abuse of a child and while, you know, as a parent of two children, I...I am absolutely, adamantly opposed and horrified by anyone who would abuse a child in any way, particularly part of any ritual. If you read the language I think you'll conclude

162nd Legislative Day

June 26, 1992

that this is not well written and with...and would lead to possible prosecutions where a parent has forced the child to take Tylenol for a fever when the child didn't want it, would subject people to prosecution for threatening a pet to do harm to some animal in front of a child, would subject people to prosecution for assimilating or sacrificing a warm blooded animal, whatever that is, front of a child and not only is it a penalty - you know we get a lot of people creating these misdemeanor cases that we argue about - but this is a Class 1 and on a second conviction you can be sentenced to life imprisonment for doing this and I understand the Gentleman's I would only suggest to him what he should do intentions. is to concur in Senate Amendments #1 and #3, non-concur Senate Amendment #4, send this back to the Senate and respectfully ask that they recede from what I'm sure was a well intended Amendment, but one that is what is totally flawed and would subject us to severe ridicule I believe, not to mention a serious deprivation of constitutional rights should we approve this Amendment #4."

Speaker Keane: "Representative Granberg."

Granberg: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The Amendment #4 to Senate...to House Bill 3633, with great respect to Representative Homer. This Idaho Statute...no offense, Tom...this Idaho Statute was reviewed and was the subject of two hearings. One in Chicago and one in Springfield where we took testimony from panels of Psychologists, Psychiatrists, States Attorneys and Physicians in from Chicago Hospitals and this was their judgments. We took testimony two days on this language and I understand Representative Homer's concerns and I think they're well founded because they did take testimony, the

162nd Legislative Day

June 26, 1992

ingestion of a drug is with the intent recollection to have the child to resist to any criminal activity, so clearly his example would not apply. We're not going to force Tylenol on our child for criminal activity, so with due respect to that this is at the request of Senator Rock, we had hearings, we had panels of experts and this is the judgement, this is what came out of those hearings, and I would request...I would request that I concur in Senate Amendments 1, 3 and 4."

Speaker Keane: "Representative Preston."

Preston: "Thank you Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of I think that the objections to Amendment #4 that House. were discussed by Representative Homer are very well founded. I brought some of those up at the Committee Hearings and I quess my basic problem with this Amendment is that we place the ritual abuse of a child in a status separate and I quess above non ritualized abuse of that same child where under this Amendment it becomes a Class X felony for a repeated...act that if it is not a part of a ritual it is far less than a Class X or Class 1 felony. It was my belief then as it is now that abuse of a child indeed a child wrong under abuse of any set circumstances and subject to harsh punishment under any set of circumstances and the fact that its done under context doesn't make it any better or worse than under others, but to get specific when one part of this Amendment and there is no question that this is very well intended and the hearings were had and lots of time was put into this and I know Representative Regan has studied this problem at length, but concerning the first par...subparagraph under A about actually or in simulation, tortures, mutilates or sacrifices any warm blooded animals.

162nd Legislative Day

June 26. 1992

You know the kosher killing of food is part of a ritual, is part of a religious ritual and it is not unusual for classes of children to go and observe how cattle are killed in a kosher manner. That's an actual killing of an animal that a child observes and that becomes if you are a teacher or a parent that has your child sent to a slaughter watch how food is killed and prepared for the grocery store and ultimately for the table that could be in violation of this law and that's a Class 1 felony for doing it once if you have two children they both go you just went think this Amendment needs Class х. reconsideration and I urge you to vote to non concur in these Amendments."

Speaker Keane: "Representative Johnson."

"This is not Representative Regan's Amendment and so he really is not the intended recipient of my comments. to begin with. It is a Senate Amendment. didn't have anything to do with it. He's just carrying the Bill back here. You know we talk about over crowded prisons and we talk about a hodge podge criminal justice system and the need to streamline it to make it consistent, to make it commensurate with defenses and then we just come in here and every year and create two or three new crimes. big thing of the year to creat and make new That's our crimes. Senator Cullerton well used to say that eventually we're going to reach a stage in Illinois where everybody would be in the penitentiary and we'd just pass exceptions, like the legislature when it's in session and things like that. It really has not gotten that far yet, but when we do this now creating the offense of ritualized abuse of a child, Class 1 felony, and a second offense is a Class X felony. We really are cluttering up the criminal statutes

162nd Legislative Day

June 26, 1992

when we can address the activities that are intended to be addressed through current criminal law and through various provisions of the...Code that allows the Department of Children and Family Services to intervene in an appropriate We don't need to create a new offense with vague guide lines that opens up the tremendous flood gates abuse in the application of the real world of prosecutors and judges around this state, some of which might interpret this appropriately and with the intention of the legislature in mind and we're all against ritualized abuse of children. No doubt about that, but others of which will interpret it and prosecute it in areas that nobody ever intended to do. Let's use battery, lets use attempted homicide, lets use the provisions of the Children and Family Services and their guidelines to address serious situations, but lets don't just double the size of Chapter 38 again to reach areas that don't need to be addressed. We need to address this problem, but it's addressed under current law and it can be prosecuted under current law and we'don't need to add a new crime to do it."

Speaker Keane: "Representative Regan to close."

Regan: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Let me go over a few things with you here. First of all circumcision and Jewish rituals in regards to cooking meat is excluded from this Bill. We found that out two years ago that certainly we didn't want...in jail. So that's out of the front. Now, the first part of this Bill says a person is guilty of ritualized abuse of a child if he does these following things as part of a ceremony, rite or similar observance and here's what they do and we have testimony to the fact that they do these things to children. They force ingestion of narcotic drugs, hallucinates for the purpose

162nd Legislative Day

June 26, 1992

of dulling sensitivity recollection and resistance to any criminal activity such as sodomy. They force them to drink urine and blood and sperm. They rape the child. Multiple rapes of the child. They place the child in a coffin to scare or they put a human corpse in the coffin or they put something like a human corpse in the coffin. They threaten death, serious harm to the child. They unlawfully disect mutilate corpses, animals as well as humans. I don't think there's enough room for anybody who commits this type of a crime that we'll find room for.We'll get them off the street and away from children and that's what I'd urge you to go with this Bill and lets get the job done because these things do happen. I urge concurrence on 1,3 & 4."

- Speaker Keane: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments 1, 3 & 4 to House Bill 3633?' All those in favor vote 'aye', all opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Matijevich to explain your vote."
- Matijevich: "I'd like to explain my vote because I think the Gentlemen who spoke in opposition to 4 makes good points, so I'm in the position where I feel the other Amendments are proper, but because Amendment #4 which I thought they made excellent points, especially Representative Johnson, who said we have existing law to cover those situations. I'm going to vote present because of the Amendment 4."
- Speaker Keane: "Representative Giglio wants to vote 'aye'.

  Representative Edley votes 'aye'. Representative Turner

  votes 'no'. Representative Shirley Jones votes 'present'

  votes 'no'..Representative Shirley Jones votes 'no'.

  Representative Phelan votes 'no'. Representative Morrow

  votes...Representative Morrow, how do you wish to vote?

162nd Legislative Day

June 26, 1992

- 'No'. Representative LeFlore votes 'no'. Anyone else wishing to change their votes? Representative Burke votes 'no'. Anyone else wish to change their vote? Representative Homer do you want to explain your vote?"
- Homer: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. Should this Bill end up with the requisite number of votes I would ask to verify..."
- Speaker Keane: "Representative Deering votes 'aye'. Representative Hicks votes 'no'. Representative Saltsman Does anyone else wish to change their vote? votes 'no'. Representative McGuire votes 'no'. Have all voted who Representative Schoenberg votes 'no'. Have all wish? voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk take the record. On this question, there are 66 voting 'aye', 36 voting 'no', 8 voting 'present' and the House concurs in Senate Amendments #1, 3. Okay I'm sorry, verification. The Gentleman has requested a verification. The Sponsor has requested a Poll of the Absentees. Poll the absentees Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk McLennand: "Those not voting Representative Giorgi,
  Martinez, Matijevich, Schakowsky, Stang and Williams."
- Speaker Keane: "Representative Matijevich."
- Matijevich: "In my explanation I said I'm voting 'present' but the Board was already closed so please record me as 'present'."
- Speaker Keane: "Vote the Gentlemen 'present'. Representative
  Mulcahey. Wishes to vote 'no'? Is...does the Gentlemen
  have leave to be verified Representative Homer?
  Representative Mulcahey? Representative Kulas requests
  leave to be verified? You may proceed with the Affirmative
  Vote."
- Clerk McLennand: "Those voting in the Affirmative. Balthis.

  Barnes. Black. Bugielski. Burzynski. Capparelli.

162nd Legislative Day

June 26, 1992

Churchill. Conkling. Cowlishaw. Cronin. Currin. Daniels. Deering."

Speaker Keane: "Mr. Clerk...Representative Burke votes 'aye'.

Representative Keane votes 'no'. Keane votes 'no'.

Proceed."

Speaker Keane: "Representative Lou Jones? Representative Lou Jones votes 'no'. Proceed."

Clerk McLennand: "Deets. DeLeo. Edley. Farley. Flinn. Giglio. Granberg. Hannig. Harris. Hasara. Hensel. J. Mannie Hoffman. Kirkland. Hoffman. Kulas. Leitch. Marinaro. Mautino. McAfee. McCracken. McDonough. McGann. McNamara. Mulcahey. Noland. Novak. Obrzut. Olsen. Parcells. Parke. Bernie Pedersen. Persico. Bill Peterson. Phelps. Pullen. Regan. Richmond. Ronan. Rotello. Ryder. Santiago. Sieben. Steczo. Tenhouse. Wait. Weaver. Weller. Wennlund. Wojcik and Woolard."

Speaker Keane: "Representative Homer."

Homer: "Representative Ronan?"

Speaker Keane: "Representative Ronan in his Chair."

Homer: "Representative Farley?"

Speaker Keane: "Representative Farley is...Representative Farley in the chambers? Remove him from the Roll Call."

Homer: "Representative DeLeo?"

Speaker Keane: "Representative DeLeo? Is Representative DeLeo in the chambers? Remove him from the Roll Call."

Homer: "Representative Mautino?"

Speaker Keane: "Representative Mautino? He's in front of in the well."

Homer: "Representative Santiago?"

Speaker Keane: "Representative Santiago? He's in the well of the House."

162nd Legislative Day June 26, 1992

Homer: "Representative Black."

Speaker Keane: "Wishes leave to be verified."

Homer: "Representative Capparelli?"

Speaker Keane: "Is Representative Capparelli...he's in the well."

Homer: "Representative Bugielski?"

Speaker Keane: "Representative Bugielski? Is Repr...he's in the back of the chambers."

Homer: "Representative Klemm?"

Speaker Keane: "Representative Klemm is in his seat."

Homer: "Representative Flinn?"

Speaker Keane: "Representative Monroe Flinn? Is Representative in the chambers? Remove him from the Roll Call."

Homer: "Representative Richmond."

Speaker Keane: "Representative Richmond? Representative Richmond in the chambers? Remove him from the Roll Call."

Homer: "Representative Kirkland."

Speaker Keane: "Representative Kirkland. One second,
Representative Kirkland? Is Representative Kirkland in the
chambers? Remove him from the Roll Call."

Homer: "Representative Ryder?"

Speaker Keane: "Representative Ackerman wishes to have leave to...oh, he wishes to vote 'aye'. Representative Deuchler votes 'aye'."

Homer: "Representative Ryder?"

Speaker Keane: "Representative Ryder? Representative Ryder in the chambers? Remove him from the Roll Call."

Homer: "Representative Parke?"

Speaker Keane: "Representative Parke is in front of his chair.

Representative Doederlein would...hold on Representative

Doederlein wishes to vote 'aye'. Proceed."

Homer: "Representative Petka?"

Speaker Keane: "Representative Petka? Is the Gentleman in the

162nd Legislative Day

June 26, 1992

chambers? Remove him from the Roll Call. He's voting 'no'. Alright. We'll leave it."

Homer: "Representative Persico?"

Speaker Keane: "Representative Persico is in the back.

Representative McDonough votes 'no'. Representative

McDonough votes 'no'. Representative Capparelli votes
'no'. Representative Marinaro votes 'no'."

Homer: "Representative Phelps?"

Speaker Keane: "Representative Phelps? Is the Gentleman in the chambers? Remove him from the Roll Call. Representative Ryder has returned. Return him to the Roll Call."

Homer: "Representative Cronin?"

Speaker Keane: "Representative Cronin is in the back of the chambers."

Homer: "Representative McNamara?"

Speaker Keane: "Representative McNamara? He's in the back of the chambers. Representative Phelps? Do you wish to vote 'aye' Representative Phelps? Representative Phelps votes 'aye'. Any further questions? Representative Farley votes 'aye'."

Homer: "Representative Peterson?"

Speaker Keane: "Representative Peterson is in his chair.

Representative Peterson? Both Peterson's are in their chair. Any further questions? Any further questions?"

Homer: "Representative Klemm is asking..."

Speaker Keane: "Representative Klemm wants to vote 'aye'."

Homer: "Nothing further."

Speaker Keane: "On this question there are 63 voting 'aye', 39 voting 'no', 5 voting 'present' and the House does concur in Senate Amendments #1 through 4 to House Bill 3633 and this Bill having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. As you can tell

162nd Legislative Day

June 26, 1992

Ladies and Gentlemen, we're moving right through Concurrences on Civil and Criminal Law. We are now at the mercy of the attorneys, and we'll go to the next Bill. House Bill 3672, Representative Cronin. Representative Cronin."

Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Cronin: "Thank you, Mr. House. This Bill came...about as a result of a tragic double homicide that happened to...two Elmhurst residents and then the assailant subsequently killed himself. The murder weapon that was used in that offense was seized by the police and subsequently the assailant's family and estate has requested to recover the murder weapon. It's the belief of the victim's families and the belief of the law enforcement authorities that there can be no good reason to...for that request to recover that gun. believe that it would lead perhaps to some publication, some sort of story or some sort of...effort to profit from this horrible act. So we made a modification to the existing law about confiscation of weapons. In this case we seek to confiscate a weapon which was used commission of a homicide. It's a limited...impact. NRA is not opposed to it; however, this does allow for enforcement authorities to confiscate a weapon...in the case such as this where there is no criminal case or any criminal prosecution. It's kind of a loophole in the law right now. The law right now provides for confiscation weapons when there is a prosecution. In this case, where the assailant killed himself, there is no prosecution, there still is a need to confiscate the weapon. I ask for your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Keane: "Representative Lang."

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

162nd Legislative Day

June 26, 1992

Speaker Keane: "He indicates he will."

Lang: "Representative, I heard your...I heard your explanation to concur in the Senate Amendment. The information I have on Senate Amendment 1 deals with where a weapon goes in the case of a death. It talks about giving custody of a weapon to next of kin. Is that what this is about?"

Cronin: "Yes."

- Lang: "Well perhaps you can explain that, because I don't think that's what you explained?"
- Cronin: "Well, I explained the original Bill. Now you're asking me specifically about this Amendment. I apologize if I didn't touch on that. It's just as you state. In the case where a weapon belonged to the victim, the representative of the estate of the victim, or the victim's next of kin, may file a claim with the court to obtain custody of the weapon and upon a finding that the weapon belonged to the victim, the court shall transfer the weapon to the representative of the victim's estate or the victim's next of kin."
- Lang: "Representative, let me ask you if there's any exception in this Amendment in case the next of kin is a child or a minor?"
- Cronin: "I've just read the Amendment, and I don't see any such exception."
- Lang: "So, it's conceivable that...that under this Amendment that you want us to concur in a minor child could petition the court, and the court could award custody of that gun to a minor child. Is that correct?"
- Cronin: "Well, that certainly wouldn't be my intent. I can't speak on behalf of the Senator that submitted this Amendment."
- Lang: "Well, I understand it's not your intent, and I...That's

162nd Legislative Day

June 26, 1992

fine, but, to the Amendment...to the Motion to concur. I would recommend a 'no' vote on the Motion to concur. Under the Senate Amendment that's before us any next of kin of the victim could petition the court for custody of a weapon. If that next of kin is someone who is 17 years old or 16 years old, a court, although, obviously, they should not do it, a court could conceivably award that weapon to a child. I don't think we want weapons in the hands of children. I think it would be very important that we vote 'no' on the Concurrence Motion."

Speaker Keane: "Representative Black."

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

Speaker Keane: "He indicates he will."

Black: "Representative, Senate Amendment #1, the question has come up, and as I read this I don't think it is, but let me get your answer, for the record. The question has come up that Senate Amendment #1 may be drafted incorrectly because the intent was to make it a Jack Ruby Amendment, where in an infamous crime, the state may want the weapon back. And if that's the case, I don't think it's drafted in that fashion."

Cronin: "You're referring to the Senate Amendment?"

Black: "Yes. The Senate Amendment #1."

Cronin: "Right. Well, your statement may be true. I for one can't tell you exactly what the reason or purpose is behind Amendment #1. If the objection is simply to that Amendment, perhaps we can do something in these final days to address that."

Black: "Well, I...I might ask you, especially since

Representative Lang has expressed his opposition, you might

want to make a substitute Motion to nonconcur in Senate

162nd Legislative Day

June 26, 1992

Amendment #1, work out your language in a Conference Committee. I...That's your call, not mine."

Cronin: "Okay. That's a good recommendation, Representative Black, and I think I may take that under advisement. I'll do that."

Speaker Keane: "Representative Black? Representative Cronin?"

Cronin: "Mr. Speaker, I apologize. With the indulgence of the Body, I would like to amend my Motion here and the Motion would now be to nonconcur in the Senate Amendment. This wasn't the intent of myself as the original Sponsor and I can see that the Amendment has kind of caused a lot of confusion. So I would like to make a Motion to nonconcur."

Speaker Keane: "Well, okay. What we'll do is, if you would, please withdraw your original Motion and..."

Cronin: "Withdraw my Motion to concur."

Speaker Keane: "The Gentleman withdraws his original Motion and now moves that we...the House nonconcur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3672. All in favor say 'aye'. All opposed, 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the House nonconcurs with Senate Amendment #1 to 3672. We will now go back and pick up House Bill 2750, Representative Noland."

Cronin: "Thank you."

Noland: "Mr. Speaker, I move to concur with Senate Amendment #1
which clarifies the offense of unauthorized videotaping so
that it does not overlap with the offense of eavesdropping.
It deletes the section requiring law enforcement officials
to acquire a court order and I...There are no objections."

Speaker Keane: "Is there any discussion? Representative Lang?"

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

Speaker Keane: "He indicates he will."

Lang: "Representative, I was...I was occupied when you were

162nd Legislative Day

June 26, 1992

explaining this. Can you...you explain the Amendment again please?"

Noland: "Yes, the Amendment is to make sure we don't overlap with the offense of eavesdropping. This offense would be a Class A misdemeanor, unauthorized videotaping. We don't want it to overlap with the offense of eavesdropping, which is a Class IV felony, and it also deletes the section requiring a court order for law enforcement officials."

Lang: "So, is it the current law that enforcement officers need a court order to wiretap?"

Noland: "No. No. What do you mean by wiretap?"

Lang: "Well I'm asking you a different question. Right...right now the court...the court...You can't wiretap somebody's phone without a court order. Is that correct?"

Noland: "That's correct."

Lang: "So why would we allow videotaping of somebody without a court order?"

Noland: "Well, for the state...This is a State Police recommendation."

Lang: "Well, that's not an answer to the question. I mean, are...the State Police recommend a lot of things. The question is, 'Why do you want this Amendment?'"

Noland: "Well, that is current law."

Lang: "What is current law?"

Noland: "They can now videotape, the State Police."

Lang: "With a court order."

Noland: "They can videotape if there's no sound. They can videotape without a court order in current law."

Lang: "If there's no sound?"

Noland: "Correct."

Lang: "So, what you're telling me is that be...there's no sound so we...we need a court order to wiretap and so it's not

162nd Legislative Day

June 26, 1992

construed as wiretapping, they can videotapen without sound without a court order?"

Noland: "Correct."

Lang: "Does that really make sense to you?"

Noland: "Well, it was not...It was not my Amendment. This..."

Lang: "I know, but you're asking this House to concur in the Amendment, so you either agree with it or you don't agree with it. So, do you agree with it?"

Noland: "Yes."

Lang: "So why do we need it?"

Noland: "Well, my initial response was for tanning salons, a problem with tanning salons and restrooms with videotaping and we've had problems with unauthorized or unlawful videotaping. I want to stop that through this...through this Bill."

Lang: "This Bill...this Amendment will stop unlawful videotaping."

Noland: "It will make it a Class A misdemeanor."

Lang: "But you're allowing more videotaping by allowing it to happen without a court order, are you not?"

Noland: "I don't think there's a change. It's no current...no current videotaping. The State Police won't affect...It won't change their procedures based on this. They're presently doing that."

Lang: "Well, thank you. To the Motion, Mr. Speaker. Perhaps I don't understand what I'm reading but what I read is a Bill...is a Senate Amendment that purports to allow law enforcement officers to videotape people without a court order. Now we require them to have a court order to wiretap and, indeed, we would require them to have a court order to videotape if there was sound for the same reason that we don't allow them to wiretap without a court order,

162nd Legislative Day

June 26, 1992

so why in the world would we allow them to videotape people without sound with a court order? What if the State Police have good lip readers. I mean, I don't understand the point of this. This is a violation of people's right to privacy. If we're not going to allow wiretapping without a court order and that's a good law - and we're not going to allow videotaping without...with sound without a court order - and that's a good law - it's ludicrous. It makes absolutely no sense to allow silent...silent photography of people without a court order. It's a fundamental right of privacy that's being violated. I vote...I would say we should be voting 'no' on this Motion."

Speaker Giglio: "Further discussion? Representative Wennlund?"
Wennlund: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Can we take this out of the
record for a minute? Can we take this out of the record
for a minute?"

Speaker Giglio: "Does the Sponsor want to take it out? Take it out of the record. Take it out, Mr. Clerk. All right. (House Bill) 3769, Representative Regan. The Gentleman from Will, Representative Regan, on House Bill 3769."

Regan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I move to concur on Amendments 3, 4, 5 to House Bill 3769. The original Bill simply states that DCFS doesn't necessarily have to go to court; they can have the people in the agencies go to court in a case of abuse. They actually are more familiar with the case in the first place and that alleviates the work of the DCFS worker to go out on other cases of abuse. The Amendments clarified for some requests in committee that the private agency or an employer of a private agency have personnel thorough knowledge and facts of the case (and in all cases they do mostly), and that furthermore the court finds in the best interest of the

162nd Legislative Day

June 26, 1992

minor that an employee of DCF must appear as well. That's also there, and if DCFS wishes to go, as well, they can do, too. I urge the concurrence in all the Amendments 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5."

Speaker Giglio: "Any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall the House concur with Senate Amendments #1, 2, 3, 4, 5 on House Bill 3769?' All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed, 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question, there are 113 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and the House does concur in Senate Amendments #1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 to House Bill 3769, and this Bill, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Regan, on 3770. The Gentleman from Will, Representative Regan."

Regan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Can you just pull this out of the record for a while and come back to it?"

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

Representative Farley. Is Farley in the chamber? Would you...do you want to go with House Bill 3857? Concurrence.

All right. We'll take it out of the record.

Representative Regan, how about 3921?"

Regan: "(House Bill) 3921?"

Speaker Giglio: "That's another..."

Regan: "How about 3770, now that I've found that one?"

Speaker Giglio: "Do you want to go back? (House Bill) 3770?"

Regan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Giglio: "Proceed."

Regan: "Members of the House. I move to concur in Senate
Amendment #1. Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3770
simply codifies the language for One Church, One Child
Advisory Board, to place children in black churches to help

162nd Legislative Day

June 26, 1992

find permanent homes. The things are being done right now, but this codifies it and puts it in the law, and I move for its concurrence."

- Speaker Giglio: "Any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3770?' and on that, all those in favor signify by voting 'ave', opposed, 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this voted who wish? question, there are 112 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill received the 3770, and this Bill, having required Majority, is hereby declared passed. Constitutional Representative Flowers, House Bill 3898. Lady from Cook, Representative Flowers."
- Flowers: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move to non concur with House Bill 3898. There needs to be some clean-up language on that Bill."
- Speaker Giglio: "You heard the Motion. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed, 'no'. The Motion carries. The House nonconcurs...all Senate Amendments to House Bill 3898. Representative Black."
- Black: "Yes. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. An inquiry of the Chair. On the Bill that's currently on the board, we've had both concur and nonconcur on the board and, in all honesty I don't know what we did. Did we concur or nonconcur?"

Speaker Giglio: "We nonconcurred."

Black: "Nonconcurred. All right. Thank you."

Speaker Giglio: "Nonconcurred by a voice vote on 3898. All right. Let's go back a few Bills and call 2677, Representative Homer. The Gentleman from Fulton,

162nd Legislative Day

June 26, 1992

Representative Homer."

Homer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is the anti-stalking Bill that was amended in the Senate in a way that...strengthens the Bill, tightens the language, addresses Constitutional concerns that were raised after the Bill passed the House. I, in a moment, will be moving to concur with Senate Amendments 1 and 2, which will place this Bill in the identical form as Senate Bill 1555 that passed out of here earlier in the week. I wanted to draw the attention of the Body to a headline story in the Chicago Tribune today. For those who didn't see it on the front page, it's titled 'Diary of a stalker: How I killed my wife, and it's chronical of a Wayne Cheney, who on March 27th murd...was killed...excuse me, was killed in a gunfight with police after having, a short time before that having gunned down his estranged wife, Connie, at her place of employment in Mt. Prospect. And this is a pretty eerie article because when they shot this Cheney in this shoot-out, they found in his motel room this diary that he had kept from the fall of 1990 until he murdered his wife in March of this year in which he details his feelings towards his wife, the hostility, his intentions to kill her, his frustrations when he was unable to kill her and her boyfriend, and...it gives you an insight, I think, that otherwise you wouldn't have into the mentality of some of these people who are more and more frequently engaging in this conduct known as stalking. Under current law there's absolutely lacking a protection available to the victims of stalkers because the police are not equipped under current law to go out and arrest someone who is merely - I say merely - threatening, following, harrassing someone. oftentimes the victim is told, 'Well, we'll have to wait

162nd Legislative Day

June 26, 1992

until the person actually does something before we can help you.' Well, all too often, Ladies and Gentlemen, something is a tragic incident which results in death or serious bodily harm to the victim. Unfortunately, this phenomena of stalking is a growing phenomenon, and it is occurring in more and more domestic disputes between wives and husbands, between girl friends and boyfriends, between those who are mentally deranged and We have an opportunity here today by their victims. concurring in these Senate Amendments, to provide protection to victims of stalkers in the State of Illinois to give Illinois the toughest stalking law in the entire nation, one that I believe will become a model, and I would urge that we resoundingly...support this Motion. I would like to first of all, however, thank Minority Leader Daniels for his significant contribution and that of staff to the writing of this Bill, the DuPage County State's Attorney's Office, that lent their expertise to the various drafts of the Bill, to the House Democratic Staff, who labored long and hard to put this Bill together and to the many victims who traveled to Springfield and to other about the state to provide their emotional firsthand testimony of what it's like to be the victim of someone who is engaging in this terrible reprehensible conduct known as stalking. I would answer any questions (although I think we've discussed this Bill thoroughly in the past) and would simply urge you to join today, resoundingly, to support this much needed legislation. I, now at this time, Mr. Speaker, move to concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 2677."

Speaker Giglio: "Any discussion? Hearing none, the question is,
'Shall the House concur on Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to

162nd Legislative Day

June 26, 1992

House Bill 2677?' All in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed, 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. Any more? Okay. Take the record. On this question, 112 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and the House does concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 2677, and this Bill, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Farley, House Bill 3857."

- Farley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would move to concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3857. What this Amendment does is attach language to penalize those that are convicted of looting to a 100 hours of community service and retribution and repaying...those...that they looted against, and I would move for the approval."
- Speaker Giglio: "Any discussion? The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 3857?' All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed, 'no'. The voting is open. Final action. Have all voted who Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question, 110 voting 'aye', none voting 'no', and the House does concur in Senate Amendments #1...#2 to House Bill 3857, and this Bill, having received the required Constitutional Majority, hereby declared passed. Got to go back up to Representative Noland's Bill, Bill House 2750. Representative Noland."
- Noland: "Mr. Speaker, I wish to withdraw my Motion to concur and move to nonconcur on Senate Amendment #1."
- Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman moves to nonconcur in Senate

  Amendment #1 to House Bill 2750, and on that question, all

# 162nd Legislative Day

June 26, 1992

those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed, 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the House nonconcurs in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2750. Representative Regan, on 3921. Representative Regan? Out of the record. Representative Williams. Representative Paul Williams? Representative Cowlishaw, on House Bill 4030? Representative Cowlishaw? House Bill 4030? Do you wish to have this Bill called, Mary Lou?"

- Cowlishaw: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I need to...I need to take this out of the record just for a few minutes if I may, please."
- Speaker Giglio: "Okay. All right. Representative Keane in the chamber? Out of the record. Representative Leitch, on 4105. Representative Leitch, do you want to call 4105? The Gentleman from Peoria, Representative Leitch, on House Bill 4105?"
- Leitch: "I'd move that we concur with the Amendment."
- Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman moves to concur in Senate

  Amendment #1 to House Bill 4105. Any discussion?

  Representative Leitch, do you want to explain the

  Amendment?"
- Leitch: "The Amendment puts some...the Bill...the underlying Bill has to do with Public Aid and the provision that people who come to work for the state have the...and be checked out to see that they are current with Public Aid Child Support payments. What the Amendment #1 does is tighten those procedures to avoid any opportunity for harrassment."
- Speaker Giglio: "Any discussion? Hearing none, the question is,

  'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House
  Bill 4105?' All those in favor signify by voting 'aye',

  opposed, 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who
  wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?

162nd Legislative Day

June 26, 1992

For what purpose do you rise, Representative Regan? You're seeking recognition? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question, 109 voting 'yes', none voting 'no', and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 4105, and this Bill, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Lang, on House Bill 4128. House Bill 4128, Representative Lang for Representative Homer. Representative Homer, on 4128, for Representative Williams."

Homer: "Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm handling this Bill on behalf of Representative Williams who had to...to return to his district briefly. The...Amendment removes shelter care as a form of detention for which credit will be given for time on dispositional orders to avoid time in foster care homes being construed as time in detention. The Bill itself had a provision that juveniles would be given credit for time served against any subsequent dispositional order, and there was a concern in the Senate that that child would receive credit for time spent in foster care and that was not the intent of Representative Williams, and so he's in support of this Amendment, which would clarify that the only credit would be given for time that the juvenile actually spent in detention. And I think noncontroversial. I would move that we concur in Senate Amendment #1."

Speaker Giglio: "Any discussion? Hearing none, the question is,

'Shall the House concur to Senate Amendment #1 to House
Bill 4128?' All those in favor signify by voting 'aye',

opposed, 'no'. The voting is open. This is final action.

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

162nd Legislative Day

June 26, 1992

question, 113 voting 'yes', none voting 'no', and the House does concur in Senate Amendments #1 to House Bill 4128, and this Bill, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Regan, 3921."

Regan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I move to concur in Senate Amendment #1, House Bill 3921. The basis of the Bill was that we raise the fine for child pornography to 100,000, which is the federal level, and taking the balance of that fine and giving it to the agencies that treat children that (sic - who) have been abused through pornography. The Bill originally called for the money to go to Public Health, but Public Health doesn't do this kind of thing. It should go to DCFS, and that's what this Amendment does, and I urge a Concurrence in 1."

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

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in opposition to the Lang: Concurrence Motion, and it's not because of the substance of the Amendment or the substance of the Bill. I rise in opposition because just yesterday this House, with over 100 votes, passed a Resolution requiring an audit of because of the waste and abuse of money at DCFS, and this Senate Amendment would require that DCFS gets this money. So why we would give DCFS extra money to pass around at their discretion when over 100 of us said, 'They're wasting money. They're abusing the money they have. But let's give them a lot of money so they can give some more money out and abuse some more money.' I don't think that's a real good idea, and I think to vote to give them this money, when we voted yesterday that they're wasting money and throwing money around without a lot of care, I think

162nd Legislative Day

June 26, 1992

would be a bad vote on the...by the House of Representatives. I would ask for a 'no' vote."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Regan, to close."

Regan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. If the Bill remains the way it is, the money will go to the Department of Public Health, which has nothing to do with it, because they do not treat children that's (sic who've) been sexually abused. The agencies that work with DCFS are the ones that deserve this money because they're the ones that (sic - who) work with the children that (sic - who) have been abused. It makes sense. What we're trying to do here...We have no money to spread around. what I'm trying to do with this legislation is get money from those that (sic - who) are abusing the children, those who are causing the need for this treatment, and take the money from them and give it to the department and to the agency that treats these children that (sic - who) have been abused, and I urge its Concurrence."

Speaker Giglio: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3921?' All those in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed, 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question, there are 82 voting 'yes', 26 voting 'no', and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3921, and this Bill, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Anthony Young, House Bill 4147. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Anthony Young."

Young: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move to concur with Senate Amendment #1. The underlying Bill was sponsored by the Juvenile Justice

162nd Legislative Day

June 26, 1992

Association to keep Illinois in line with federal guidelines so we could keep receiving federal money. The Amendment adds to the underlying Bill that minors charged with a status offense and taken into temporary custody cannot be placed in a jail, municipal lock-up, detention center or correctional facility. I move to concur on the Amendment."

Speaker Giglio: "Any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 4147?' And on that, all those in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed, 'no'. The voting is open. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question, there are 112 voting 'yes', none voting 'no', and the House concurs in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill Bill 4147. And this Bill, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Hasara, on House Bill 4168. The Lady from Sangamon, Representative Hasara."

Hasara: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to concur in Senate
Amendments 1 and 2 on House Bill 4168. This is the Project
Heart adoption legislation, and the Amendments were put on
in the Senate to address some of the concerns of circuit
clerks around the State. I move for its adoption."

Speaker Giglio: "Any discussion? Hearing none, the question is,

'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to

House Bill 4168?' And on that question, all those in favor

signify by voting 'aye', opposed, 'no'. The voting is

open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?

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

this question, there are 111 voting 'yes', 1 voting 'no'.

Representative Shirley Jones, 'aye'. Shirley Jones,

# 162nd Legislative Day

June 26, 1992

- 'aye'. Now the record is 112 voting 'aye', none voting 'no', and the House does concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 4168, and this Bill, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Lang, on House Bill 4188. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Lang."
- Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would move to nonconcur in Senate Amendment #2."
- Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman moves to nonconcur in Senate
  Amendment #1 to 'House...2 and 3..."
- Lang: "I move to nonconcur in Senate Amendment #2 only."
- Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman moves to nonconcur to Senate
  Amendment #2 to House Bill 4188. Any discussion? Hearing
  none, all those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed,
  'no', and the Motion carries."
- Lang: "Now I would move to concur in Amendment #3. Amendment #3 provides for a \$3 transaction cost on each restitution payment. This is requested by the clerks of the Circuit Court."
- Speaker Giglio: "Any discussion on Amendment #3? All those in favor...All those in favor of concurring on...Representative Black."
- Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield to a question on Senate Amendment 3?"
- Speaker Giglio: "Proceed."
- Black: "Representative Lang, what is your intent...or what is
   your interpretation on the \$3 transaction fee? Does it go
   to the...victim?"
- Lang: "No, that goes to the court, the clerk of the court.

  That's a fee for handling. When the payments are made through the court for restitution and they're made on a periodic basis, each payment would have an additional \$3

162nd Legislative Day

June 26, 1992

fee added to it for the clerk's handling charge."

Black: "The question that staff wants clarified, is this \$3 fee a deduction...from what is given to the victim? Or is it over and above that \$3 paid by the perpetrator?"

Lang: "It's over and above."

Black: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Giglio: "Question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #3 to House Bill 4188?' All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed, 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question, there are 104 voting 'yes', 2 voting 'no', and the House does in Senate Amendment #3 to House Bill 4188. concur Representative Hoffman, Jay Hoffman, 'aye'. Representative John Dunn, 'aye'. Anybody else? The roll now is 106 voting 'aye' and 2 voting 'no', and the House does concur Senate Amendment #3 to House Bill 4188. Representative Mautino in the chamber? Out of the record. Representative Barnes. Jane Barnes, House Bill 3037. Lady from Cook, Representative Barnes."

Barnes: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I wish to nonconcur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3037."

Speaker Giglio: "Any discussion? Hearing none, the question is,
 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House
 Bill 3037?' And on that question, all those in favor vote
 'aye', opposed, 'no'. The voting's open. Nonconcur? I'm
 sorry. All those in favor of the Lady's Motion to
 nonconcur signify by saying 'aye', opposed, 'no'. In the
 opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the Motion to
 nonconcur on Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3037 is
 adopted. Representative Mautino, do you want to do 1516?

162nd Legislative Day

June 26, 1992

Okay, the Gentleman from Bureau, Representative Mautino on House Bill 1516."

- Mautino: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. (House Bill) 1516, as amended. This amends the Limited Health Service Organization Act. Makes it consistent with early...the earlier Voluntary Health Service Organization Act, and it came out of committee as a shell. We sent it to the Senate. What it is is an Agreed Bill between Department of Insurance, Dental Concern, First Commonwealth Corporation and Dental Plus, and this...It says, 'With respect to the availability of licensed organizations to offer a point of service product to the enrollees under the plan.' I ask for Concurrence on Senate Amendment #1."
- Speaker Giglio: "Any discussion? Hearing none, the question is,
   'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House
   Bill 1516?' All those in favor signify by voting 'aye',
   opposed, 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who
   wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?
   Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question, there are
   lll voting 'yes', none voting 'no', and the House does
   concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1516, and this
   Bill, having received the required Constitutional Majority,
   is hereby declared passed. Representative Hicks, for what
   purpose do you rise, Sir?"
- Hicks: "Yes, Sir. Earlier in the day, we went by House Bill 3689, Savings and Loan Act. I don't know of any objection that anyone has to this, and I would question the Chair as to whether we might be able to go to this Bill for Concurrence?"
- Speaker Giglio: "Representative Hicks, what Bill do you want be called?"
- Hicks: "Yes, Sir. Mr. Speaker, 3689, please."

162nd Legislative Day

June 26, 1992

Speaker Giglio: "(House Bill) 3689, under Revenue and Banking?"

Hicks: "Correct, Sir."

Speaker Giglio: "What's your pleasure?"

Hicks: "Yes, Sir. I would move to...concur with Senate

Amendments #1, 2 and 4 to Senate Bill...House Bill 3689."

Speaker Giglio: "Any discussion? Representative Black."

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

Speaker Giglio: "Indicates he will."

- Black: "Representative, just very quickly. It's late in the day, and I'm not reading as fast as I could this morning. At one time, there was some opposition to this Bill. It appears that the Senate has just completely rewritten it. As far as you know...most everyone has signed off on this, I assume, at this point."
- Hicks: "Yes, Representative Black. Originally, there was some initial opposition. I believe that was from some of the foreign bank interests. That language now is no longer part of this Bill. It's really been...become an administration Bill dealing with the Savings and Loan Act. It contains a number of technical changes involved that the Savings and Loan...Department of Savings and Loan wanted, and I know of no one having any opposition to this whatsoever."
- Black: "Let me just ask you one question that I had to ask earlier this morning, because I simply can't read through these Amendments fast enough. There is an Amendment somewhere that the farm credit institutions are very, very much opposed to. That isn't in this as far as you know. Is it?"
- Hicks: "As far as I know, Representative, absolutely not. I know of no one opposed to any one of the three Amendments. I

162nd Legislative Day

June 26, 1992

know of no organizations that are opposed to it. It's simply really clarifying language. It does a number of different things, but I know of no one being opposed to any of it."

Black: "I see that it passed the Senate unanimously, so I...I would assume that this is a good Bill, and I appreciate your patience, Representative."

Hicks: "Thank you, Representative Black."

Speaker Giglio: "Question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1, 2 and 4 to House Bill 3689?' And on that question, all those in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed, 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question, there are 108 voting 'yes', none voting 'no', and the House does concur in Amendments #1, 2 and 4 to House Bill 3689, and this Bill, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Hicks."

Hicks: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen...If the Chair would please, to also look under the areas of State and Local Government, 3479. It's another Bill that I believe that all problems with that Bill have been worked out with this Senate Amendment, and I know of no opposition to it if the Chair would..."

Speaker Giglio: "Any discussion? House Bill 3479."

Hicks: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would move to concur with...Senate Amendments...Is there 2...l and 2 to House Bill 3479. What this Amendment does really was simply extend the deadline. We had originally proposed to do this next year. We've proposed to move that one year out with a Senate Amendment.

162nd Legislative Day

June 26, 1992

Ask for your positive vote."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Black."

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

Speaker Giglio: "Indicates he will."

Black: "I...I notice that this was somewhat of a partisan roll call, Representative, when it went out of the Senate. I don't know whether it's the immediate effective date or the public radio and television grant program language, but can you explain to me why this had so many negative votes in the Senate?"

Hicks: "Representative, I cannot explain to you why it has so many negative votes. I know the agencies have come to me. The Amendment #1 which changed the Bill's reporting deadline from 12/31/92 until December 31st of 1993, and it changed the effective date to 7/1/93 was administration proposal to do that. They came to me and with that in, I know CMS for one withdrew their objection to the Bill. The changes dealing with Amendment #2, which was clarifying language for, I believe, Northern Illinois University and their public broadcasting. I do not know of anyone opposed to that. So I think it simply may be a matter of the principle of the Bill and the span of control language. Originally, we passed it out of this House, I know, without any difference. The only people against it then was some of the administration people who now, with the change in the...effective dates, have informed me they have withdrawn their objections, and I...I know of no one who has come tome with any objections to it."

Black: "All right. Again, thank you very much for your patience,
Representative. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the
House, the Department of Central Management Services is

162nd Legislative Day

June 26, 1992

neutral on this Bill. Let me make that very clear. They are not taking a negative position on the Bill. However, they are saying that there could be about a \$100,000 cost...involved here, and I've got to be honest with the Sponsor and my Members on my side of the aisle, I'm not sure that anybody knows what Senate Amendment #2 does. It does something to the Public Radio and Television Grant Program Act. I...I'm not going to urge any of my Members to vote 'no'. I think you should look at your analysis and vote accordingly, but because it does have a cost of \$100,000, I intend to vote 'present'."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Hicks."

Hicks: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm not aware of the cost numbers now that Representative Black is coming forth. I think, though, the one thing that we, as Members of this Legislature are concerned about, is good government, and I think this is a good government Bill. This is a Bill simply says that instead of having one-on-one or one-on-two that we ought to look at employee ratios in this state. That we ought to be considering how many of the bureaucrats are really, as I explained it to a few people, queen bees do you have and how many worker bees you have. This Bill, called a span of control, says that an agency ought to have workers in that agency, not just a lot of people who do nothing but shuffle the paper around and try to make, as I say, queen bees. That's what we have in some areas of State Government. This is a good efficiency Bill for state government. That's what the bottom line is with I would urge you a green vote on this."

Speaker Giglio: "Question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate
Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 3479?' And on that
question, all those in favor signify by voting 'aye',

162nd Legislative Day

June 26, 1992

opposed, 'no'. The voting's open. Representative Black."

Black: "Yeah. I know I spoke in debate, and excuse me, Mr.

Speaker, I...I don't want to do anything - and I don't think I have - I don't want to do anything to kill the Gentleman's Bill. Central Management Services just came down and told me they could live with it. I respect Representative Hicks' view, and if he says it's good government, I'll change my 'present' to 'yes'."

- Speaker Giglio: "Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question, there are 108 voting 'yes', 3 voting 'no', and the House does concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 3479, and this Bill, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Turner, on House Bill 3808."
- Turner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to concur on Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3808. What Amendment does...What Amendment 1 does is it allows IDA to seek assistance from trade organizations such as the Illinois Association of Realtors and the Illinois Homebuilders, in cases where IDA is having trouble determining the effects of the Bill and what effect it may have on housing when assessing the costs of housing construction. There are no opponents to this Amendment. IDA is neutral on it, and there is an agreement between the Realtors and the homebuilders on this Amendment, and I move for..."
- Speaker Giglio: "Any further discussion here? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall the House concur on Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3808?' All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed, 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question, lll voting 'yes' and none voting 'no', and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to

162nd Legislative Day

- June 26, 1992
- House Bill 3808, and this Bill, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative McPike, on House Bill 2833. Gentleman from Madison, Representative McPike."
- McPike: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to nonconcur in Senate
   Amendment #1."
- Speaker Giglio: "Gentleman moves to concur...nonconcur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2833. Any discussion? Hearing none, all those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed, 'no'. In the opinion of the chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the House nonconcurs in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2833. House Bill 2834, Representative McPike."
- McPike: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to nonconcur in Senate
   Amendment #1."
- Speaker Giglio: "Any discussion? All those in favor of the Gentleman's Motion to nonconcur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2834, signify by saying 'aye', opposed, 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the House nonconcurs in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2834. Representative Hicks, for what purpose do you rise?"
- Hicks: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A question of the Chair, please.

  I have under State and Local Government, House Bill 3188
  dealing with Real Estate Licensure Fund. It had been my
  intention to concur with those Amendments...to Senate
  Bill...I mean...excuse me, House Bill 3188, but I
  understand that there's still some negotiations going on
  trying to work out some problems with this Bill. But if I
  do not nonconcur today or if I do not concur today, will I
  still have an opportunity tomorrow to do so? To do both."
- Speaker Giglio: "Yes."
- Hicks: "Because it's very important I work the problems out with
  this Bill. So..."

162nd Legislative Day

June 26, 1992

Speaker Giglio: "All right. Under Government Administration, appears House Bill 3583, Representative McPike."

McPike: "(House Bill) 3583."

Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman from Madison."

McPike: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Amendment #1 would limit the scope with this Bill to those government entities that have at least \$10 million in outstanding debt. So it limits the Bill, and I move to concur in Senate Amendment #1."

Speaker Giglio: "Any discussion? Representative Black."

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

Speaker Giglio: "Indicates he will."

Black: "Representative, you normally have an outstanding voice and I can usually hear it exceedingly well, but I...What does Senate Amendment #1 do?"

McPike: "It limits the scope of this Bill. This Bill is for interest rate swaps, and this would limit that to those units of government that have \$10 million in outstanding debt, and the guess is that it would roughly limit this to units of government in excess of 25,000 people. That's a rough guess."

Black: "Okay. Now I know what it...Some of the language that came up on puts and calls...There are safeguards in there now about that? All right. Representative Wennlund tells me that's out. I stand in support of your Motion."

McPike: "Thank you."

Speaker Giglio: "Question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate

Amendment #1 to House Bill 3583?' And on that question,

all those in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed, 'no'.

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

wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?

162nd Legislative Day

June 26, 1992

Take the record. On this question, there are 109 voting 'yes', none voting 'no', and the House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3583. And this Bill, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Agreed Resolutions."

Clerk O'Brien: "House Resolution 2248, offered by Representative DeJaegher; House Resolution 2249, offered by Representative DeJaegher; House Resolution 2250, offered by Speaker Madigan; House Resolution 2251, offered by Representative Hasara; House Resolution 2252, offered by Representative White; House Resolution 2253, offered by Representative White; House Resolution 2254, offered by Representative DeJaegher; House Resolution 2255, offered by Representative DeJaegher; House Resolution 2256, offered by Representative DeJaegher; House Resolution 2257, offered by Representative DeJaegher; House Resolution 2258, offered by Representative DeJaegher; House Resolution 2259, offered by Representative Turner, 2260, offered by Representative Novak."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Matijevich moves for the adoption of Resolutions. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The Resolutions adopted. All right. The Chair would like to announce that the House will come in tomorrow at 9:00 a.m., work...work to approximately 12:00 noon, adjourn and then return Sunday evening at 6:00 p.m. Nine o'clock tomorrow morning to about noon and then return at 6:00 p.m., Sunday evening. Representative McPike now moves that the House stand adjourned until tomorrow morning, Saturday, at 9:00 a.m. All those in favor say 'aye', opposed, 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The House now stands adjourned."

REPORT: TIFLDAY PAGE: 001

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

92/09/29 14:21:32

JUNE 26. 1992

Hb-3380 CONCURRENCE

H8-3385 CONCURRENCE

HB-3410 CONCURRENCE

HB-3440 NON-CONCURRENCE

	JUNE 20+ 1992		
HB-0661	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	129
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	73
HB-1081		PAGE	102
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	103
HB-1516	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	166
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	104
H3-2016	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	87
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	130
HB-2134		PAGE	67
HB-2166	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	106
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	12
HB-2434	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	13
HB-2645	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	3
HB-2677	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	155
HB-2679	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	107
HB-2723	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	74
HB-2726	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	110
HB-2730	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	3
HS-2741	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	121
H3-2750	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	158
HB-2 <b>7</b> 55	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	110
HB-2767		PAGE	131
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	89
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	13
	OUT OF RECORD	PAGE	14
	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	172
	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	172
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	111
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	90
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	128
	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE PAGE	75 76
	CONCURRENCE CONCURRENCE	PAGE	122
	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	165
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	78
	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	4
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	122
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	112
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	4
HB-3100	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	5
HB-3105	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	6
HB-3115	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	113
HB-3126	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	14
HB-3128	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	97
HB-3139	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	124
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	79
HB-3187		PAGE	126
	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	15
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	130
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	98
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	127
	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	80
	SECOND READING	PAGE	39
	THIRD READING CONCURRENCE	PAGE PAGE	57 15
HB-3281		PAGE	80
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	81
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	85
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	131
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	16

PAGE

PAGE

PAGE

PAGE

83

113

17

66

7 7 3

REPORT: TIFLDAY PAGE: 002

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

92/09/29 14:21:32

JUNE 26. 1992

	30112 201 1772		
HB-3445	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	132
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	168
	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	
	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	
	OUT OF RECORD	PAGE	
	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	
		PAGE	
	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	
	CONCURRENCE		
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	
	OUT OF RECORD	PAGE	
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	
	OUT OF RECORD	PAGE	
HB-3754	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	
HB-3770	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	
HB-3773	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	
HB-3808	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	171
HB-3810	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	
HB-3815	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	70
HB-3823	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	101
HB-3857	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	158
HB-3884	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	73
HB-3898	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	155
HB-3921	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	161
HB-4039	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	88
HB-4040	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	86
HB-4078	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	82
HB-4079	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	83
HB-4083	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	71
HB-4105	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	159
HB-4112	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	72
HB-4128	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	160
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	162
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	120
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	
	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	
	ADOPTED	PAGE	
	RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	

## SUBJECT MATTER

HOUSE TO ORDER - SPEAKER GIORGI	PAGE	1
PRAYER - REVEREND ROGER KILSER	PAGE	1
PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE	PAGE	1
ROLL CALL FOR ATTENDANCE	PAGE	1
REPRESENTATIVE MCPIKE IN THE CHAIR	PAGE	39
REPRESENTATIVE GIGLIO IN THE CHAIR	PAGE	70
REPRESENTATIVE KEANE IN THE CHAIR	PAGE	104
REPRESENTATIVE GIGLIO IN THE CHAIR	PAGE	153

4 . 6 2

PAGE: 003

REPORT: TIFLDAY

STATE OF ILLINOIS 87TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES DAILY TRANSCRIPTION OF DEBATE INDEX JUNE 26. 1992

PAGE

PAGE

174 174

92/09/29 14:21:32

SUBJECT MATTER

AGREED RESOLUTIONS ADJOURNED