166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

Speaker Giorgi: "The House will be in order. The Members will be in their seats, please. And this morning, because of the enormity of the situation, we're going to have two ministers give invocation. The Chaplain for today is, one Chaplain is Richard Eident, the Minister of Christian Church in Windsor, Illinois. Mr. Eident is the guest of Representative Noland, and our guests in the gallery may please rise and join us in invocation and the next minister will follow."

Reverend Eident: "Oh Lord, our God, we're so grateful for Your love for each of us and God, we are thankful for these individuals, Lord, who are so important to this state. God, we just pray today that You would bless them as handle the business before them. We pray, Lord, that You would help them to do their very best. And God, we're so thankful that we live in this land of America and we have the freedoms that we have, the freedom to be able to...to share together, the freedom to be able to even protest, the freedom to worship, the freedom to vote. God, today we just ask Your blessings upon those who have assembled here and we just pray, Lord, that...that You would help them to be able to realize the job that they're doing is a that's very important, a job that's beneficial. And God, we just ask that You would direct them, that they would...they would look to You, realizing Lord, You're the author, the finisher of our fate, You're the giver of all the good and precious gifts that we have. God, we thank You again for the privilege of living in this State of Illinois. This is our prayer today, in Jesus' precious and holy name, Amen."

Speaker Giorgi: "Thank you, Reverend. And now, for those of us that need the second set of prayers, Reverend Dennis Beatty of the Newman United Method Church. Reverend Beatty."

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

- Beatty: "Let us pray. Almighty God, from whom all thoughts of goodness and truth and peace proceed, instill in our hearts, we pray, and in the hearts of all human kind, the true love of truth and justice that inspired our ancestors to found this nation and our state. Guide us, we pray Lord, with Your wisdom and truth, and all those who take responsibility to lead others, that their leading might bring about the peace and true shalom of Your promised kingdom, and that all might share and grow in the joy of Your everlasting love, Amen."
- Speaker Giorgi: "Thank you. He is a guest of Representative Weaver. We will be led in the Pledge of Allegiance by Representative Stepan."
- Stepan et al: "On this very important day of the Session, let's hear it from everybody. 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: "There is never too much prayer, Reverends.

 Thank you. Roll Call for Attendance. Roll Call for Attendance. Representative Kubik, on excused absences."
- Kubik: "Mr. Speaker, the Republicans are all here today."
- Matijevich: "The only excused absence I have is Andy McGann on the passing of his wife."
- Speaker Giorgi: "Take the record, Mr. Clerk. Is Shirley Jones...okay. There being 117 present, a guorum is present. Take the Roll, Mr. Clerk. Representative Burzynski on...Mr. Clerk, read House Bill 3418. Representative Burzynski, on House Bill 3418. Mr. Clerk, read it."

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 3418, a Bill for an Act to amend the Local Governmental Tax Collection Act, together with Senate Amendments #1 and 3."
- Speaker Giorgi: "Representative Burzynski, on House Bill 3418."
- Burzynski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the

 House. I would move that we nonconcur with Senate

 Amendments #1 and 3."
- Speaker Giorgi: "You heard the Gentleman's Motion. Is there any No discussion. The question is, 'Shall the discussion? House nonconcur to House Bill 3418 with Senate Amendments?' All in favor signify by saying 'aye'; those opposed...and the 'aye'...House does not concur to Senate...to House Bill 3418 and Senate Amendments 1 and 2, and asking that a Conference Committee be formed. Amendments 1 and 3...we don't ask for the Conference Committee Report, the Senate does. Representative LeFlore, do you want to call House Bill 4070? Out of the record. Under Agriculture and Environment, Representative Obrzut. Out of the record. Under Civil and Criminal Law, Representative Stange. Out of the record. Also, Representative Kirkland under Civil and Criminal Law. Out of the record. Representative Lang, for what reason do you arise? Representative Lang?"
- Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On...on House Bill 1181,

 Representative Stange's Bill, I'm the Co-Sponsor, and he
 asked me if I would nonconcur."
- Speaker Giorgi: "So the Motion is to nonconcur to House Bill...Mr. Clerk, read House Bill 1181, please."
- Clerk O'Brien: "House Bill 1181..."
- Speaker Giorgi: "And the Motion, Mr. Lang..."
- Clerk O'Brien: "...a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois

 Marriage and Dissolution of Marriage Act, together with

 Senate Amendment #1."

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

Speaker Giorgi: "So the Motion by Mr. Lang is to nonconcur to House Bill 1181 with Senate Amendment #1. Is there any There being no request for discussion, debate? question is, 'Shall the House nonconcur to House Bill 1181 with Senate Amendment #1?' All those in favor will signify by saying 'aye' and those opposed by voting 'no'; House Bill 1181. House does nonconcur t.o Representative...Bruce Richmond in the Chair."

Richmond: "Can I have your attention, please, for a moment. You may recall, a few weeks ago, we passed a Resolution honoring the World Championship Bar-B-Que Team, and so am privileged to...to present them to you. todav I are called the 'Apple City Bar-B-Que team', they're from my hometown, Murphysboro, and have become quite famous and made the town guite famous as well as bringing a lot of accolades to the State of Illinois. So, therefore I think you should share in these accolades and help me honor them here today. They, in Memphis, in May of this year, they won the World Championship Bar-B-Que contest. Now, let me tell you the scope of that contest. There were 160...176 other teams, and they were from 14 states and 4 foreign countries. It took 400 hundred judges to finally name this team as the number one team in the world. And also, this is the second time they have won this honor. They did it in 1990. You know, Memphis is considered the Bar-B-Que And so this was the front page Capital of the world. headlines in Memphis and 'Memphis Commercial Appeal', says, 'The yanks reign supreme in south's backyard.' Now of course Murphysboro to a lot of you is way down south, but if you're from Memphis, why, we're yanks. And this...these are the yanks that came away with the honors two different years and the worldwide champions. I would

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

like to introduce to you the...the head of this organization and he can introduce the others and tell you about an upcoming event that perhaps some of you would like to visit, Mike Mills."

Mills: "Thank you, Bruce, for asking us here and we'd like to thank the House for the proclamation that was presented to the Apple City Bar-B-Que team. And if I could at this time. I'd like to introduce our team mates. To my right is Karen Emerson, Dennis Fager, his wife, Nancy Fager, Kathryn Twinhoffel, her husband, Martin Twinhoffel, Kathy Maze and Leonard Pullas. We have two other teammates that were unable to make it. Pat and Aileen Burke. Again, I'd like to invite you all to a contest, a Bar-B-Que contest that we hold in Murphysboro, Illinois, each September, this year being the 24th, 25th and 26th of September. There will be about 15 states represented in this contest, some 40 teams. Approximately 250 judges from about 18 states. It also is by a proclamation that was passed on House Ωf Representatives here with you all's help and Bruce's, it is also known as the Illinois State Bar-B-Que cook off, which we're very proud of and brings a lot of prestige to the Bruce, we'd like to thank you for all Bar-B-Que circuit. of your endeavors and all the help that you have given team and the city of Murphysboro, and especially being a fine Representative. You represented us well. Thank you."

Speaker Giorgi: "Harris."

Harris: "Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. With the hour of noon arriving, I was simply curious, perhaps one of the Gentlemen from Cook county, either Representative Hoffman or Representative Schoenberg could tell us if our deli sandwiches are going to arrive on time."

Speaker Giorgi: "Representative, I...Schoenberg and

166th Legislative Day

- June 30, 1992
- Representative Hoffman, I believe left to...to meet the plane to pick up the package. So, it probably should be very shortly."
- Harris: "So there's no danger here that they may have taken the money and absconded, have they?"
- Speaker Giorgi: "No, I think they...neither one of them are in the chamber, so they must've went out to the airport.

 Representative Hoffman."
- Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I understand there was some concern about the lunches coming in. I want to rest assured that my partner, Mr. Television, himself, is working on that situation right now, and it's on its way from the airport. It should be here momentarily for everyone."
- Speaker Giorgi: "Well, that's...that's what...I informed the body, Representative Hoffman, that you and Schoenberg went out to the plane to make sure it would be nice and warm to bring it back."
- Hoffman: "My partner is so busy with television shows right now, so busy doing television newscasts that he doesn't have too much time to do this, but I'm handling it, Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker Giorgi: "I'm glad it's in good hands. Representative Hoffman, for what reason do you rise, sir?"
- Hoffman: "Mr. Speaker, the...the caravan has arrived from the airport with the lunch. It's down at the Secretary of State's office, right in front of his office. Anyone that would like to go down that has ordered their corned beef sandwich, it's downstairs right at the Secretary of State's office. All ready, just go ahead and Mr. Schoenberg is down there right now. Thank you."
- Speaker Giorgi: "Some of the Members asked, Representative, they forgot to give you the money yesterday. Can they give you

166th Legislative Day

- June 30, 1992
- the money today? Is there enough there for some extra sandwiches?"
- Hoffman: "We have enough corned beef that, if we stay in Session for the next three days, we'll have corned beef."
- Speaker Giglio: "Lang, for what purpose do you rise, sir?"
- Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On House Bill 180, the First Conference Committee Report failed. Representative McPike asked me to move that a Second Conference Committee be appointed."
- Speaker Giorgi: "You heard the Gentleman's Motion. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and a Second Conference Committee is appointed to House Bill 180. Representative Peterson in the chamber? Bill Peterson? House Bill 3435. The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Peterson. Mr. Clerk, it's on concurrence."
- Peterson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move for concurrence on Amendment...Senate Amendments 1, 2 and 3. These are Amendments that have to do with the proposed low level radioactive waste that is shipped to a disposal facility that would be sited in Illinois. There are several items to the Amendments. The Amendments, as far as the Illinois Environmental Council, they are neutral on these Amendments and I ask for the House to concur with Amendments 1, 2 and 3."
- Speaker Giorgi: "Any discussion? The Gentleman from Coles, Representative Weaver."
- Weaver: "Thank vou very much, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
- Speaker Giorgi: "Indicates he will."
- Weaver: "Representative, just to get a couple of things clear in the record as far as this Bill as amended...as your

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

concurrence Motion would produce here, this does prohibit mixed waste as defined by the Federal Government. Is that...is that correct?"

Peterson: "That's correct, Representative."

Weaver: "Now, if the Federal Government's definition of mixed waste changes, does it still require that the General Assembly of Illinois and the Village of Martinville or whoever signed a contract with IDNS, they still have to have final approval?"

Peterson: "That's right."

Weaver: "And does this prohibit permanent storage of processed waste? From out of state, excuse me."

Peterson: "Mixed waste. Permanent mixed waste from being stored there."

Weaver: "Well, this Bill also allows for processing of waste on site, waste that does not originate in either Illinois or Kentucky. Is that processed waste allowed to stay in the state at this facility?"

Peterson: "No, it isn't, Representative."

Weaver: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Giorgi: "The Gentleman from Kankakee, Representative Novak."

Novak: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I believe it's very important that we pass this legislation now, and not delay it until November. We have to send a positive message to Congress that the Central Midwest Compact of Illinois and Kentucky is moving forward in meeting federal guidelines. The State of Kentucky will be holding a special session this summer, and they must pass this identical language concerning the compact. They will not act until Illinois does. After the summer session, they will not meet again until next year, past

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

January, the January 1st, 1993 deadline. It is imperative that we have Congress to ratify these compact changes prior to January 1st, 1993. If this process is delayed any further, every hospital in the State of Illinois is quite possibly going to become a temporary low level waste facility. So, we cannot underscore the importance of passing this legislation and getting it on to the Governor's Office for approval. Thank you."

- Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Parke."
- Parke: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would just like to ask the Sponsor, there are a number of these kinds of Bills out, and I was just curious as to what groups might oppose this Bill that I'm not aware of."
- Peterson: "I just explained that, Representative. There are no groups that are opposed to it. The Environmental...Illinois Environmental Council is neutral on this...on the concurrence of these Amendments."

Parke: "Thank you very much."

- Speaker Giglio: "Further discussion? Hearing none,
 Representative Peterson to close."
- Peterson: "I just ask for concurrence with the Amendments...Senate Amendments 1, 2 and 3 to House Bill 3435."
- Speaker Giglio: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments #1, 2 and 3 to House Bill 3435?' And on that question, all those in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed 'no'. The voting is open. This is final action. Representative Currie."
- Currie: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd just like to explain my vote. There's been a lot of concern expressed by Citizens for Better Environment, the Illinois Environmental

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

Council, and VPI. The major policy changes that would be adopted by concurrence with these Senate Amendments. Their hope was that we might do only those things that we needed to do, as it were now to deal with mixed waste issues respect to the potential Martinsville site, but leave the other questions, for example, does the compact commission get to make by itself, does that three member group get to make by itself the decision whether or not Illinois shall enforce out of state, low level radio active waste until there is time for discussion and debate and perhaps pass those larger changes in the fall Veto Session? The environmental groups have a serious concern that legislature gives up too much authority by virtue of these Senate Amendments and that there was not adequate time discuss and debate these questions on the substantive measures in this Bill. This Bill left this chamber shell, so the language that we see before us was not seen by many people until very very recently. And it's those concerns that I wish to bring to the Members of this chamber as you're thinking about how you want to vote on the concurrence Motion on House Bill 3435."

Speaker Giglio: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 84 voting 'yes', 17 voting 'no', and the House does concur in Senate Amendments #1, 2 and 3 to House Bill 3435, and this Bill, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Lang, for what purpose do you rise, sir?"

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On House Bill 1181, I made a

Motion to nonconcur. That was an erroneous Motion. I

would now move to reconsider that and...either that or

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

table it."

Speaker Giglio: "Having voted on the prevailing side, the Gentleman moves to reconsider the vote by which House Bill ll...the concurrence of...the House nonconcurred in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1181. He wants to reconsider the vote. Does the Gentleman have leave? Hearing none, leave is granted by the Attendance Roll Call. Representative Stange."

Stange: "I move to concur with Amendment 1 on House Bill 1181."

Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman moves to...that the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1181. Any discussion?

The Gentleman from Warren, Representative Hultgren."

Hultgren: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of I believe this is a issue that's been before us House. before, and if I'm not mistaken. Yes, I believe...I believe I'm correct. It's Senate Amendment #1 deals with the issue of visitation and the modification and custody wherein if a parent asks leave to remove a child from the jurisdiction, that is the custodial parent, that that then is a matter of law is the noncustodial parent, the basis for a petition for modification. For those of you who are not schooled in the Divorce Act here in Illinois, let me...let me just give you a brief background. In order for the noncustodial parent to petition the court for a change in custody, it requires that...what the law calls a change in circumstances. The policy behind this is that we don't want children yanked back and forth like a yo-yo between their now separated and divorced parents. This Senate Amendment #1 will, as a matter of law, give the noncustodial parent the basis for petitioning for a change of custody if the custodial parent petitions for leave to file...leave to remove the child from the State

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

Illinois. Why would the noncustodial...or the custodial parent want to remove the child from this state? Perhaps divorce, there are other iob separation and opportunities. Perhaps upon remarriage, the family has to move to a new location, and this then, is going to pit the two parents against each other once again in the court room with, of course, the loser in that court battle being the This is exactly what the Divorce Act was minor child. intended to prevent when they made changes in custody more difficult and when it was necessary then to prove a change in circumstances in order to change the custody. I believe this is not in keeping with the fundamental and underlying of the Divorce Act. I believe it would be a policies mistake to concur in Senate Amendment #1. I would...I plan to vote 'no', and would encourage others to do the same."

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

Levin: "Would the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Giglio: "Indicates he will."

Levin: "The way this was described to me, and tell me if it's wrong, if a woman petitions for permission to be able to take a child out of the State of Illinois, then you're opening up grounds for a change of custody for the husband to come back in, or it could be a reverse situation. So, what you're doing, is you're making women, or it could be a man for that matter if he has custody, prisoners of the state...within the State of Illinois. If they dare to want to take a child out of the state, they're going to make themselves liable for a new custody fight. Am I reading this right? Are the opponents correct in what they're saying, or they're wrong?"

Stange: "Thank you, Representative. I think they're wrong. This

Amendment was provided by the Bar Association. It was

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

basically more a technical Amendment more than anything. If you check with your legal people on your side, they recommended this Amendment. It was voted 57 to nothing in the Senate. It provides that purposes of a custody modification proceedings, change of circumstances of a child and it's custodial...has occurred if the custodial has a temporary...removing the child for more than 60 days versus 30 days, and some other minor technical changes."

Stange: "All right. To continue it on, I think that the original vote was the correct vote. I think there's a lot of questions about this Bill. There's a lot of opposition. It appears to make radical changes, and I don't think we should concur. I think we should defeat this Motion and send the Bill into conference and if it is, indeed, intended to be purely technical, let's get out the language which is offending everybody, which appears to make it more than technical. This seems to make a major change in terms of rights, and I would urge a nonconcurrence."

Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman from Champaign, Representative Johnson."

Johnson: "This is a very good Bill that Representative Stange has and I think the opponents, I'm not sure, understand the nature of the Bill or they wouldn't have risen to it. What this Bill does is to provide as opposition follows: if you have a custodial parent living in state with a custody and visitation decree entered in this we need this language to provide that the noncustodial parent has the basis for simply filing a changes...in substantial petition alleging material material change in circumstances to get the issue before the court as to whether the prospect of the custodial parent moving out of the State of Illinois is in the

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

child, and the court makes that interest οf the There's a muddled state of the law. determination. clarifies the law. The whole direction of this legislature over the last ten years, has been to favor Illinois courts and to realize that when you propose to move a child to another state away from their family...away from possibly their brothers and sisters, probably their friends, grandparents and so forth, that that constitutes a dramatic change in life, not to keep them prisoners, but to allow that to be considered as a...as a significant factor in the courts determination. And that's all this Bill does. gets you before the court to make that determination, and it clarifies a gray state of the law and makes Illinois insofar as this is concerned, paramount on an issue where it ought to be paramount. This Bill is not what It's not making someone captive, and it's opponents say. simply giving some sense and direction to a law that was overwhelmingly approved, Representative Marovitz sponsored it a few years ago and has been reiterated time and again Representative Stange, contrary to a well in the law. with respect known issue that we disagree on to grandparents visitation, has an excellent idea, and this ought to get an overwhelming vote...a vote of approval here in this chamber."

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

Preston: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I respect the previous speaker greatly and I respect the Sponsor of this Bill greatly, but I disagree with both of them on this occasion. I have two complaints, two objections to this Bill in its present form. Firstly, I think as has already been stated that this Bill would

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

have a chilling affect on a parent who has custody of a child who may for reasons of health, reasons of employment, reasons of convenience, reasons of joining family, have to move out of the state. And yet that same parent who has custody of a child, if this becomes the law, will not do that, will change their life decisions because of chilling affect this may have in opening up the extremely painful and costly possibility of again going through a custody fight. That's my first objection. My second objection is that this may very well, in many cases, really amount to child abuse. There is simply nothing that is more detrimental to the well-being of a child than seeing his or her parents fight each other on a very serious It...it crumbles relationships. It crumbles the emotions. It is extremely traumatic. Once having gone through this, initially, and having a court decide on custody, which may have been at the result of a custody fight, to now have to again have all that pain, all those wounds opened up again so that child is again traumatized by parents at war with one another is simply child abuse. For those reasons, I'd ask you to vote 'no' on concurrence Motion."

Speaker Laurino: "Representative Laurino in the Chair. Further discussion. Representative Cowlishaw."

Cowlishaw: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentleman of the House. I am in accord with the views of the previous speaker. It seems to me that, if you, particularly, in the event that you are a woman who has custody of children, and you are truly determined to try to provide for them to the best of your ability, that you may find employment opportunities some place outside of Illinois. What this Bill would do would be to cause any

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

woman who may have that opportunity to be reluctant to accept it and truly fearful of what will happen to her custody of those children in the event she takes that job opportunity and opens up this whole custody question again only because she is trying to advance her own employment in the interests of her children. I think the speaker who mentioned that this makes a prison of the State of Illinois for custodial parents certainly was correct, but most of all, a prison for women who have custody of their children, because it is women who have the most difficult time with employment and advancement in For those reasons, and because it seems to me employment. that this Bill is not only a terrible disservice but to the children who have already custodial parents, been through one of these battles once. Twice is too much. We ought not to keep people in Illinois out of fear that is based upon their love for their stand in children. Ι strong opposition to this Bill."

Speaker Laurino: "Further discussion. Representative Lang." "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of this Lang: concurrence Motion. I believe strongly that the people this either have not read this or opposed to are overdramatizing this situation. This does not make a prison out of the State of Illinois. It simply says that if a custodial parent is going to remove a child from the state for a great length of time, and that removal from the state amounts to a denial of visitation rights, then the noncustodial parent should have the option of going into court' and having a judge determine whether those visitation rights will be denied. Surely, we would think that just because the custodial parent wants to move out of state the noncustodial parent should lose all

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

rights. This Bill would simply allow the noncustodial parent to make a motion to bring a petition to a court and say, 'Judge, when the custodial parent removes my child from the State of Illinois for six months, I'm not going to see that child, and I just want the option of you telling me whether you think it's reasonable that I have those visitation rights or not, and perhaps we should revisit the issue of custody for those six months.' That's all this This doesn't make the State of Illinois a prison. does. It's not child abuse. It's not revisiting the entire issue of custody. It's a simple question. Will the removal of the child from the state for a length of time deny the noncustodial parent rights to visit the child? Rights that we all believe that noncustodial parents should have. that's all this Bill does. A judge will make a decision. There's nothing automatic about it, and I believe that rights and the noncustodial parent, although that parent doesn't have custody, certainly the visitation rights of a noncustodial parent are just as important as the custodial rights of the custodial parent. That being the case, when the custodial parent asks for permission to take the child out of the state, the noncustodial parent certainly having equal rights, certainly should have the right to say, 'Well, wait. If you take that child out of the state, you're denying me my rights.' I think you should take another look at this, and I think you should overlook the drama that's been brought on the floor today and just take a look at what this Amendment does. Please vote 'aye'."

Speaker Laurino: "Further discussion. Representative Schakowsky."

Schakowsky: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The fact that this Bill passed the Senate

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

overwhelmingly certainly is not reason enough for me to say that we should vote for this very bad Bill. I think that the opponents of this Bill, the women's groups and the children's groups, were probably offended by implications in this debate that they either haven't read or don't understand this Bill. They have both read it and they understand it, and they know that this Bill is neither good for women nor children. If you vote for this Bill, you will engage the wrath of those women's groups and children's groups. That's the plain and simple fact. I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Laurino: "Further discussion. Representative Homer."

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

Speaker Laurino: "Indicates he will."

Homer: "Isn't the Sponsor Representative Stange?"

Speaker Laurino: "Correct."

Homer: "Okay. Representative Stange, there seems to be some confusion on this side about what happened to a provision in the original Bill. The provision of concern is on page 2 of the original Bill, lines 15 through 17 that provide that a change in circumstances shall be deemed to have occurred if a petition has been filed by the custodian under Section 609 for leave to remove the child from Illinois. Now that was...that was in the original Bill."

Stange: "That's correct."

Homer: "Now, with the amended version, is that still a part of the Bill?"

Stange: "One second. Representative. To my knowledge it's...it has taken...it was taken out. They've included the 30 to 60 days, some technical changes. This was, again, recommended by this Bar Association to put this in here. So, we're just taking their recommendations."

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

Homer: "Okay. Well, let me...let me just say this, Representative Stange, that our staff is talking to LRB as we speak and it's their opinion that that is not out of the Bill by this Amendment. We may stand corrected if we find out we don't have the enrolled version and it's difficult for us to analyze it, but it is your intention, is it not, to delete that portion of the Bill?"

Stange: "That's what the intentions were. If you'd like, why don't we..."

Homer: "Let's do this..."

Stange: "...take it out of the record."

Homer: "Yeah. That's a good suggestion, if you wouldn't mind, because..."

Stange: "I have no problem at all. We have plenty of time this afternoon, I understand."

Homer: "That'd be fine. Mr. Speaker, he wants...the Sponsor wishes to take the Bill..."

Speaker Laurino: "The Gentleman wishes to take the Bill out of the record. So be it. The Chair would like to make an announcement that all unauthorized persons not entitled to this House floor please remove yourself immediately. All unauthorized persons please remove yourself immediately. Page 6 on Concurrence, House Bill 4070, Representative Bob LeFlore."

LeFlore: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 4070. I'd like to concur with Senate Amendment #2 that authorizes bond guarantees for private sectors project. Now we went through this yesterday, and I just hate to keep on repeating. This is a good Bill. It's a Surety Bond Bill, and if you have any questions, I'm free to answer the question. I'd just like to have a favorable vote to concur to Amendment...Senate Amendment 2."

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

Speaker Laurino: "Further discussion. Representative Black."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. We visited this Bill yesterday. I again rise in opposition. I don't want to beat the proverbial dead horse, but if you'd look very carefully at this Bill, it allows the State Treasurer, without the advice and consent of the General Assembly, to issue bonds to create a Small Business Surety Bond Guarantee Act. Now, as far as I know, there's no problems in the quarantee bond market out in the marketplace today. That's one of the major services performed by surety bonding companies, is to prequalify those companies before they issue a bond. Now you're asking the State of Illinois to assume this responsibility of some, perhaps, questionable principles. No matter well intentioned that idea is, it's a mistake. You are...you are opening the state to guaranteeing poor risks Now, the and then the state assumes all liability. logical step would be to say, 'Let's just outlaw all surety bonds, and we...we, the state, will just simply guarantee all projects.' Now Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, in a fiscal crisis that we are in, to open ourselves to the prospect of any Constitutional office holder being able to issue bonds, and there's no cap, there's a cap by project, but not a total cap as I read this Bill, they could issue millions of dollars worth of bonds without the advice or consent of either House of the General Assembly, and could very well face default on many of the ventures they were backing. I don't know why in an atmosphere of crisis, when we're cutting, cutting, cutting, we want to add millions of potential liability dollars to our bonded indebtedness. I would urge you to vote 'no' on this Bill, and I thank you for your time, Mr. Speaker."

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

Speaker Laurino: "Further discussion. Seeing none,

Representative LeFlore, the Gentleman from Cook, to

close...Oh, I'm sorry. Representative Davis."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of Davis: This is a piece of legislation that I proudly rise to support. CMS supports it, the State Treasurer it, and it does not say that high risk people will be given loans. What it says is that these people will not be given loans, because they will be screened just as any other people are screened for a loan. Ιt says they'll have...some different people will have an opportunity. people who are capable of maintaining that business status. It will help create employment. It will stop some of this unemployment that we have in the State of Illinois, and I don't think, Representative, we should be so afraid that someone else might get some assistance from the State of Illinois. Now if CMS has looked at this legislation and supports it 100 percent, if the State Treasurer has gone on record supporting this legislation...okay...then as certainly we in this General Assembly should abide by that decision and support this legislation."

Speaker Laurino: "Further discussion. Representative Wennlund."

Wennlund: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. After having just spoken with representatives from CMS, I'm informed that they have no position on this whatsoever. They are not in favor of it. They have taken no position on it whatsoever, and what it really boils down to is, is the state saying that we're going to stand as surety for ourselves. So, it really doesn't make any difference and really doesn't benefit anybody, and you ought to know that before you vote on it, but to correct the record, Central Management Services is not in favor of this proposal."

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

Speaker Laurino: "Further discussion. The Gentleman from Cook,

Representative LeFlore, to close."

Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, LeFlore: "Thank you, Mr. especially Representative Black. Representative Black, this Bill is not going to cost the state one penny first year if it's signed by the Governor. Now we just passed out of here the Calumet Airport Bill which would cost the state a large sum of money. Now this Bill will help minorities, small business leaders, the ones who was (sic were) dealing with construction. You know, whenever something come (sic comes) up in this House, if it's for a small business, everybody is opposed to it, but when something come (sic comes) up that is going to cost state a lot of money, everyone is for it. And I understand your position. Now CMS was in support of this. They have crafted this piece of legislation. The Treasurer's office worked very close with us to help craft this legislation. The black contractors came forth, the hispanic contractors came forth. So there is a need of this Bill out there, and I would hope that people who look at this Bill real hard and give some support and the passage of 4070. Thank you."

Speaker Laurino: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 4070?' All in favor vote 'aye', those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. This is final passage. Representative Black, for what reason do you rise, sir?"

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. The Gentleman in closing used my name in debate. I would just like to respond, if I might. May I proceed? Thank you very much. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, first of all, let's make one thing perfectly clear. It may not cost anything in the

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

first year, but if you issue million dollars, millions of dollars in surety bonds, and the company fails or the project goes under, who are you kidding? The state pays the bill. If the not the first year, then the second and third year. As to the airport financing, in which both the Gentleman and I both voted for, I'm taking the Mayor of Chicago at his word, that the airport was going to be financed with federal money, not state money. So, I think that...that issue should not be confused with the state's bonding authority, because I can assure you that if a surety bond fails, and the state is guaranteeing that bond or that venture, then the state will pay the bill, and the state taxpayers will get stuck with the tab. So I still say, in all due respect to the Sponsor, a 'no' vote is advisable."

Speaker Laurino: "Have all voted who wish? Representative Balanoff, for what reason do you rise?"

Balanoff: "To explain my vote, Mr. Speaker. You know, I think it's kind of strange in here. A few days ago when we debated a Bill that was an \$11 billion airport Bill they said, 'well don't worry about it'. You know, no taxpayers' dollars. You know that the bonding for this thing is all right. You never have to worry'. Now we're talking about helping out some small businesses and they say, 'Don't worry. You know, you have to worry about this stuff. Everybody be real careful, because the taxpayers of this state are going to pay when these bonds fail.' I think that's pretty outrageous, and I really think that people ought to look at this thing more carefully and there should be a whole lot more green votes up here."

Speaker Laurino: "Further explanation of votes, Representative Jones. Lou Jones."

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

- Jones: "Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I would like to say that this year, this Bill's not costing one dime, and it will be less than a million next year. And after then, it will be self sufficient. Also, the contractors after then will be paying a fee for this service, and I would ask some more 'aye' votes up there."
- Speaker Laurino: "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 53 'aye', 58 'no', 1 voting 'present', and this Motion fails. Representative LeFlore."
- LeFlore: "Take this Bill out of the record, Mr. Speaker. I was trying to get you, but you didn't recognize the switch."
- Speaker Laurino: "Sir, the...it was announced."
- LeFlore: "Mr. Speaker, could I have a Second Conference Committee

 Report on this Bill? Mr. Speaker, I would like to move to

 nonconcur on House Bill 4070."
- Speaker Laurino: "The Gentleman moves to nonconcur on House Bill 4070. Representative Black, for what reason do you rise?"
- Black: "An inquiry of the Chair, Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker Laurino: "Proceed."
- Black: "On a Motion to concur, which was defeated, the Bill was called, the board was closed. By what rule is he now calling for a nonconcurrence Motion?"
- Speaker Laurino: "I announced that the Motion to concur failed.

 I did not announce that the...that he could not now nonconcur, so the Bill...the question is, 'Shall this Bill be sent to nonconcurrence?'"
- Black: "And...so that...that is the ruling of the Chair?"
- Speaker Laurino: "That's the ruling of the Chair."
- Black: "Well. All right. I appreciate you taking my inquiry under advisement."

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

Speaker Laurino: "All right. The Gentleman moves to nonconcur in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 4070. All those in favor indicate by saying 'aye', opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. The Gentleman nonconcurs."

LeFlore: "Thank you."

Speaker Laurino: "We will now proceed to Senate Joint Resolution 113. Representative LeFlore."

LeFlore: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. SJR 113 establishes a 24 member task force be created to study the issue of utilizing of narcotic forfeit proceeds. This Bill passed the Senate with a majority of the votes. This Bill will also give assistance to the communities. I understand there is some opposition to this piece of...task force."

Speaker Laurino: "Representative LeFlore, hold your remarks for a moment, Sir. There are two Amendments filed for this Resolution. Do you want to deal with them now? They're both your Amendments."

LeFlore: "We'll withdraw Amendment #1."

Speaker Laurino: "Withdraw Amendment #1. Amendment #2."

LeFlore: "Amendment #2. We would like to go with that one. I move to adopt..."

Speaker Laurino: "The Gentleman moves to adopt Amendment #2 to
Senate Joint Resolution 113. All those in favor indicate
by saying 'aye'. Representative Black, for what reason do
you rise?"

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Before we vote on the Amendment, I would like to hear an explanation from the Gentleman as to why he withdrew 1 and now why he wants us to accept #2."

Speaker Laurino: "Representative LeFlore, would you like to respond to the Gentleman's inquiry?"

LeFlore: "Yes. Number one, Amendment #1 would have been in the

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

State Police and Amendment #2 would put us into the AG's office."

Black: "And this...the underlying Resolution deals with forfeiture of property, right?"

LeFlore: "Yes, it's true."

Black: "Okay. Well, thank you very much. Mr. Speaker and Ladies of the House, I...I fail to understand and Gentlemen Amendment #2. If we're dealing with forfeiture property, and that has been debated on this floor on more than one occasion this Session as to potential abuses in that, I don't know why we'd want to transfer from the Department of State Police, which is a law enforcement arm of the state and could use that forfeiture of property for law enforcement activities, and then transfer authority to the Attorney General's office. And I'm sure the Attorney General is also certainly involved in enforcement of the law in the State of Illinois, but not to the same degree, I think, as the Department of State Police. So, Amendment #2 simply says that that the task force on utilization of narcotics forfeiture proceeds shall become part of the office of the Attorney General, and so that all the task force findings would go out under the Attorney General's staff and that the staff support for the task force would come from the Attorney General's office. I think you need to give the authority for the front line troops, the people that are out there putting their lives on the line, trying to do something to stem the tide of drugs in our fair state. The State Police are the ones who make the stops. The State Police are the ones who make the The State Police are the ones who would ask for forfeiture and then be able to use that money for undercover buy money, or unmarked cars, or forfeiture of

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

assets. It makes no sense. It makes no sense from a law enforcement standpoint to move this Forfeiture Act from the Department of State Police to the Attorney General. Let's back the people who put their lives on the line every day of the year. That's the State Police. I rise in opposition to Amendment #2."

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

you, Mr. Speaker. This Resolution merely LeFlore: "Thank establishes a task force to look at those dollars that's coming in to these law enforcement agencies. Now, we feel that the AG office will give us a fair deal on this They have committed themselves in letting Resolution. their staff work with the task force once it has been appointed. There's none of the people that would be appointed to the task force from the state to the So, you know, I don't know what the last speaker's talking about, and I think this is something that is needed, people in the communities need, and they deserve some of these dollars to go into education, housing and treatment." Speaker Laurino: "The Gentleman moves for adoption of Amendment #2 to Senate Joint Resolution 113. Representative Weaver, you'll get a chance to explain your vote. Representative LeFlore close on his Amendment. Sorry, Sir. The Gentleman requests a Roll Call vote on Amendment #2 to Senate Joint Resolution 113. All those in favor indicate by voting 'aye', opposed 'may'. The board is open. all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Schoenberg 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. This Amendment, having 61 'aye', 50 'nay', and 0 voting 'present' is adopted. Representative LeFlore on

Senate Joint Resolution 113."

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

- LeFlore: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to move for immediate consideration."
- Speaker Laurino: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Senate

 Joint Resolution 113. Representative Black."
- Black: "Well, I just object to immediate consideration. I think people should slow down, calm down, take a long look at this Resolution. Plenty of time to vote on this, but if he insists with his call, I just simply object. People should read this. Be very careful with their vote."
- Speaker Laurino: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Senate Joint Resolution 113. All those in favor will indicate by voting 'aye', opposed 'nay'. The board is open. Representative Black, do you still wish to explain your vote?"
- "Well, I'll explain my vote on the Resolution. Black: read this Resolution, you're simply allowing the forfeiture of property and dollars to accrue to the Attorney General's office rather than the people you expect to go out there and put their lives on the line to arrest the drug traders. That just doesn't make any sense. I mean, how can you ask the State Police to go out there day after day and do this job and then not give them the benefit of what the Narcotics Forfeiture Act is all about, to give them additional equipment, to buy undercover cars, to buy even, for God's sake, even bullet proof vests. This is a silly vote. You're transferring it to the Attorney General who only sees them in court and taking it away from the on-line police officer who puts his or her life on the line to stop this drug trade. I can't understand an 'aye' vote."
 - Speaker Laurino: "This Resolution to adopt takes 60 votes. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. This Resolution, having received 64

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

'aye', 49 'nay' and 0 voting 'present', having received a hereby Constitutional Majority, is The Chair has been advised by passed...adopted. Representative Schoenberg that the deli on the second floor is about to close, so if anyone has not received their corned beef sandwich, go down to the second floor, adjacent to George Ryan's office, Secretary Ryan's office, and get your pickles and corned beef. House will go to page 5 on the Calendar, House Bill 1181, Representative Stange. Representative Stange?"

- Stange: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to not to concur in House Bill 1181."
- Speaker Laurino: "The Gentleman moves to nonconcur on Amendment #1 to House Bill 1181. All those in favor indicate by saying 'aye', opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. The Gentleman has been successful in his nonconcurrence.

 Senate Bill 1823. Representative Bugielski."
- Bugielski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I ask for the adoption...for the passage of Conference Committee #1 to Senate Bill 1823. Senate Bill 1823, the Conference Committee, it authorizes the Cook County Forest Preserve District to enter into purchase or lease agreements involving annual payments over a maximum period of 40 years. It authorizes the district to adapt an appropriation ordinance before the commencement of its fiscal year, increases the district's working cash fund from \$7 million to \$14 million outstanding at any one time, the bonds issued for improvements for the adds that may not exceed \$27 million outstanding at Brookfield Zoo any one time. As you know, this is the...for Brookfield Zoo. The Brookfield Zoo is a...one of our biggest tourist attractions here in the State of Illinois.

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

We have people from all over the state and throughout the United States that come and visit it. In the article that was in the paper this past weekend, they showed that there are over 2 million visitors visit this establishment, and a lot of this is for the Zoo improvements, and I ask for its passage."

Speaker Laurino: "Further discussion. Representative Harris."

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

Speaker Laurino: "He..."

- Harris: "Representative, at one point I believe this Bill had a...had a provision dealing with tax exemption for property which was in forest preserve districts. Is that...is that accurate? Is there anything in there dealing with that subject matter?"
- Bugielski: "It just deals with the Zoo as far as I know.

 Currently, all forest preserve districts downstate are

 exempt from taxation, and this includes Cook County."
- Harris: "There are, I believe, residences on...on forest preserve property where some of the superintendents live. Is that correct?"
- Bugielski: "Those houses will be exempt from the taxation."
- Harris: "Those houses would be exempt from taxation, because of..." $\footnote{\coloredge}$
- Bugielski: "Just as it is downstate right now."
- Harris: "In other words, we're making a change in...are they exempt from taxation because of what we are doing with this...with this Bill?"
- Bugielski: "That is correct."
- Harris: "May I ask, the people who live in those houses, how much do they have to pay to live there?"
- Bugielski: "It's based on a sliding scale according to the services that they do for the forest preserve district."

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

- Harris: "Do you think it would be fair for those people to pay property taxes just as...just as me, who is a property owner, has to pay my property taxes?"
- Bugielski: "Well, they're employees of the forest preserve district, so this is..."
- Harris: "Well, I'm an employee of the State of Illinois."
- Bugielski: "They also are doing a security basis. They're providing security during the off-hours to make sure that nothing is happening during the off-hours."
- Harris: "I'm...I'm sorry, Representative. I was distracted.
 Would you please..."
- Bugielski: "They are also doing security. They act as security at night when...by them being on the premises at night."
- Harris: "I understand what you're saying. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, to the Bill. All of the provisions of the Bill, I think, are laudable and admirable and especially ones dealing with Brookfield Zoo. I call attention though, to this one particular provision which...which grants tax exemption to those residences which are on the forest preserve district's property. There are people who live in these houses who, I grant you, are member...employees of the forest preserve district, and they do perform a function, a supervisory function, a security function while they're there. But nonetheless, I have to pay my property taxes. Why shouldn't they pay some The property taxes that are paid benefit property taxes? all of the units of local government which rely on the tax, in other words the schools, the park districts, the muni...well, not so much the municipalities, the Cook County...those property taxes benefit everybody. All of a sudden we're saying these particular residences we're going to exempt from the property tax. I don't think

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

it's fair to grant this exemption just to these one category of employees, and for that reason I think you ought to take a look at this Bill and perhaps go to a Second Conference Committee Report and vote 'no' on this adoption."

Speaker Laurino: "The Chair would like to take this opportunity to welcome Representative Jesse Madison, a former Member of the House. Welcome, Jess. Further discussion. Representative Jack Kubik."

Kubik: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in support of this Conference Committee Report, and would encourage Members to vote in favor of the Conference Committee Report. I don't think there's anybody who's more conservative about taxation than I am. I think this is a...this is a good provision. What it allows the forest preserve district to continue to operate their capital program and, unfortunately, the preserve district is in a...in a position where they have to come to the Legislature to have their provision changed. They can't do it by county ordinance. They can't do it by ordinance of the forest preserve district. Let me point out that the key provision in this is for the Brookfield Zoo, which is, as you may know, generates almost 2 million visitors a year. That's 2 million visitors to Cook County, 2 million visitors to Illinois. It is a worthwhile proposal. I might also point out that this provision...the provision to this particular Bill, and the management of the forest preserve district property and the management of the forest preserve district has been a very conservative management. For example, had there been caps in Cook County? The forest preserve district would be below caps. As a matter of fact, in three of the last...in two of the

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

three last years, the rate for the forest preserve district has been reduced. This Bill passed the Senate with 49 votes. I think it's a reasonable proposal. I think it's a good proposal. I would hope all my colleagues would support it so that we can continue the good work of the forest preserve district and the Brookfield Zoo. Thank you."

- Speaker Laurino: "Further discussion. Seeing none,
 Representative Bugielski to close."
- Bugielski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just ask, as the former speaker, Representative Kubik, he did a fine job on the closing, and I ask for the passage of...for the acceptance of Conference Committee #1 on Senate Bill 1823."
- Speaker Laurino: "The Gentleman asks for the adoption of the House...do adopt Conference Committee Report #1 to Senate Bill 1823. This is final action. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. This Bill, having received 75 'ayes', 34 'nay', 1 voting 'present', the House does adopt Conference Committee Report #1 to Senate Bill 1823 and the Bill, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Resolution 2284, Representative Zeke Giorgi on the Motion."
- Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, I move that...I move that pursuant to Rule 77(a), I move to discharge the committee on State Government from further consideration and advance to the Order of Speaker's Table for immediate consideration. The Resolution has been reproduced and distributed on the Members' desks, and it has to do with mid-referee legislation."

Speaker Laurino: "Representative Black, for what reason do you

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

rise, sir?"

- Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. An inquiry of the Chair, does this Motion require 71 votes? And is the Motion in writing, as the rules clearly state? The Motion is in writing? Does it not take 71 votes?"
- Speaker Laurino: "The Motion is in writing, and your assumption is correct, it does need 71 votes."
- Black: "Thank you very much."
- Speaker Laurino: "You heard the Gentleman's Motion to discharge committee and move for immediate consideration for House Bill 22...House Resolution 2284. All those in favor...Representative Regan, for what reason do you arise, Sir?"
- Regan: "To request a recorded Roll Call if this comes up for vote."
- Speaker Laurino: "It seems to me it's already been announced that it would...71 votes and, to be honest, that's the only way we can count."
- Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the dean of the House being my seat mate, he has been feverishly working on this matter for the last few days and since this may be our last day, it may not, I would urge...all we're going to do is allow the Members to hear the debate on this issue that is very important to him, and sitting next to him, I know it...he's so intense about it because his daughter is involved in this issue also. So, I would urge the Members and my good friend Black, Bill Black, to let the dean of the House, there's not many more things he's gonna do on the floor of the House, and urge the Members to go along and give him the necessary votes so we can hear the debate on this issue."
- Speaker Laurino: "You heard the Gentleman's Motion.

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

Representative Johnson, for what reason do you arise, Sir?" Johnson: "Well, in further support of this Resolution. There's a Bill that was introduced by Representative Giorgi, I was a co-Sponsor of it, that because of the crush of the Session, really never had an opportunity to have the hearing that it needed. A number of Amish people from our area came to testify on it and otherwise. And rather than take his ball and go home, Representative Giorgi has simply tried a different approach, in a lot more modest way, to address the subject matter that we really never had a chance to have an adequate hearing on. And I really think this is a very modest attempt to address a serious issue, and I certainly join with the others in asking that Representative Giorgi have the opportunity to have this Resolution heard and also have a chance, hopefully, to have it passed and the subject matter adequately addressed."

Speaker Laurino: "Representative Ryder, for what reason do you arise, Sir?"

Speaker Laurino: "Proceed."

Ryder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for your kindness and courtesy.

I stand in opposition of this for a very simple reason.

The drafting of the Resolution requires...requires that this group come back with a mechanism for licensing. It does not give this group the option of saying 'yes' or 'no'. It requires a group to come back and say how to license this specialty. It requires a group to come back and say, 'License this specialty'. The language is inappropriate and restricts the opportunity for the group to do its work and, as such, I would ask the Members to reject this Motion. It needs additional work. This

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

Sponsor is simply trying to do today, in the confusion of the last day, that which he was unable to do in Committee, that which he was unable to do on the Floor of the House. This proposition has failed and failed repeatedly throughout the General Assembly and, as such, I would ask that you give this matter your attention and that you vote 'no' on this Resolution."

- Speaker Laurino: "Further discussion? Seeing none,
 Representative Giorgi to close."
- Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker. The last Speaker was out of order in discussing the contents of the legislation, but I'm glad he alerted the Members to the need for the legislation. think he's a Member that knows that Midwifery Services are going on throughout the state, and he should know as attorney having the knowledge of that and not doing something about it could be a reason for malfeasance charge in his area. So I feel that we ought to air the subject, let's support me on the Motion. Let's hear the subject that I tried to air in April when the Committee did give me a fair hearing. There was no confusion, everyone knew what we were about. The witnesses were very intelligent, very articulate. There's no mystery shroud about this Resolution. Please urge me in removing it from Committee."
- Speaker Laurino: "You heard the Gentleman's Motion, all those in favor will indicate by...Representative Ryder, you've already spoken on debate."
- Ryder: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, but he called me a malfeasor, and
 I take umbrage at that. Additionally, I wish to verify and
 ask for a oral or for a Roll Call vote."
- Speaker Laurino: "You heard the Gentleman's Motion. All those in favor will indicate by voting 'aye', opposed vote 'nay'.

 The Board is open. This takes 71 votes. Have all voted

166th Legislative Day

- June 30, 1992
- who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record Mr. Clerk. This Motion, having received 71 'aye', 35 'nay'...Representative Ryder, do you wish to verify the Roll Call? Poll the absentees Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk McLennand: "Those not voting: Representatives Balthis.

 Harris. LeFlore. Parcells. Bernie Pedersen. Stange
 and Wojcik."
- Speaker Laurino: "Read the Affirmative Roll Call."
- Clerk McLennand: "Those voting in the Affirmative: Ackerman. Balanoff. Brunsvold. Burke. Burzynski. Conkling. Davis. Deering. DeJaegher. Currie. Flinn. Flowers. Frederick. Giorgi. Doederlein. Dunn. Granberg. Hartke. Hasara. J. Hoffman. Homer. Hultgren. Johnson. Lou Jones. Shirley Jones. Kirkland. Lang. Laurino. Levin..."
- Speaker Laurino: "Mr. Clerk, one second. Representative Deering wishes to be verified."
- Clerk McLennand: "Marinaro. Martinez. Matijevich. Mautino. McAfee. McDonough. McGuire. McNamara. McPike. Morrow. Noland. Olson. Petka. Phelan. Phelps. Mulcahey. Rice. Richmond. Saltsman. Pullen. Ropp. Satterthwaite. Schakowsky. Shaw. Sieben. Stepan. Tenhouse. Trotter. Turner. Wait. Walsh. Stern. Weaver. White. Williams. Wolf. Woolard. Anthony Young. Wyvetter Younge and Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker Laurino: "Representative LeFlore, for what reason do you rise Sir? Vote him 'aye'. Representative Edley wishes to be recorded as 'aye'. Representative Burke, for what reason do you rise? Representative Burke wishes to be recorded as 'no'. Representative Phelan, for what reason do you rise?"

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

Phelan: "Mr. Speaker, please record me as 'present'."

Speaker Laurino: "Record Mr. Phelan as 'present'."

Speaker Laurino: "Representative J. Hoffman wishes to be recorded as 'present'. Representative Hartke is in the well. He wishes to be verified. Representative Rotello wishes to be recorded as 'aye'. Representative Pedersen what...wishes to be recorded as 'present'. Bernie Pedersen. Are there any questions of the Affirmative Roll Call, Mr. Ryder?"

Ryder: "Thank you, Representative Granberg?"

Speaker Laurino: "Representative Granberg? Is the Gentleman in the chamber? Representative Granberg? Remove him."

Ryder: "Representative Wyvetter Younge?"

Speaker Laurino: "Representative Wyvetter Younge? Wyvetter Younge? Remove her."

Ryder: "Representative Ackerman?"

Speaker Laurino: "Is Representative Ackerman in the chambers?

Remove him."

Ryder: "Representative Preston?"

Speaker Laurino: "He's in his chair, Sir."

Ryder: "Thank you. Representative Dunn?"

Speaker Laurino: "Representative John Dunn? Representative John Dunn? Remove him."

Ryder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative Art Turner?"

Speaker Laurino: "Representative Art Turner? Art Turner?

Representative Williams is down here at the center of the console and wishes to be verified. Representative Art Turner in the chambers? Remove him."

Ryder: "Representative Bob Olson?"

Speaker Laurino: "Representative Bob Olson? Is the Gentleman in the Chamber? Representative Olson in the chamber? Representative Tim Johnson wishes to be verified."

Ryder: "After you remove Representative Olson I'll verify

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

Representative Johnson."

Speaker Laurino: "Representative Olson is not in the chambers.

Remove him."

Ryder: "Thanks. Representative Johnson is verified. Thank you.

Representative Pullen? Representative Pullen?"

Speaker Laurino: "Representative Penny Pullen? Is the Lady in the chambers? Remove her. Representative Weaver wishes to be verified. Representative Keane wishes to be recorded as 'aye'."

Ryder: "Representative Satterthwaite?"

Speaker Laurino: "Representative Ackerman has returned."

Ryder: "Representative Satterthwaite?"

Speaker Laurino: "Representative Ackerman? Put him back on the Roll Call. Representative Keane did you change him? Thank you. For what reason does Representative Parke arise?"

Parke: "I'd like to be recorded as a 'present' vote please."

Speaker Laurino: "Record Representative Parke as 'present'.

Representative Wyvetter Younge has returned."

Young: "Vote me 'yes'."

Speaker Laurino: "Vote her 'aye'. Representative Rice, for what reason do you rise, Sir? Record Representative Rice as 'present'. Representative Martinez wishes to be recorded as 'present'. Proceed Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Representative Satterthwaite?"

Speaker Laurino: "Representative Satterthwaite? Is the Lady in the chamber? Representative Satterthwaite in the chamber? Remove her."

Ryder: "No further Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Laurino: "This Motion, having received 64 'ay...Representative Jeffrey Schoenberg wishes to be recorded as 'aye'. This Motion, having received 65 'aye', 33 'nay', 8 voting 'present', fails."

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

- Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, on the 30th day of June, I'd like to thank the 65 people that had the courage to stand up against the Medical Society. They are outstanding Americans."
- Speaker Laurino: "This Bill, Senate Bill 4079, Representative Jesse White. Representative White?"
- White: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move to adopt Conference Committee Report on House Bill 4079...Conference Committee Report #1. This Bill has been around a while. It's one that got out of the House for the past two years. It deals with a scholarship program. Pardon me. I'm sorry. This Bill will allow...I'm okay Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 4079 is one that will allow individuals who are homeless to accumulate up to \$1,000 which will be the equivalent of their first months rent so that they can then go out and get their own apartment. I move for its adoption."
- Speaker Laurino: "Representative Lang, for what reason do you rise?"
- Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure...I thought that this had not been distributed, but I have it now. Thank you."
- Speaker Laurino: "Representative Black, for what reason do you rise, Sir?"

Black: "Well, I just wanted to ask the Sponsor a question?"

Speaker Laurino: "He indicates he will answer."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Representative, we visited the Podiatry Scholarship Act several times and I couldn't hear all of your explanation as to..."

White: "Wrong Bill."

Black: "A wrong Bill. Okay. Oh yes. So, this becomes what we saw before in House Bill 3409. Correct?"

White: "That is correct."

Black: "Alright, and what is the...do you have an idea of the

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

cost impact on that Bill? As..."

White: "The original estimate by the Department of Public Aid was \$100,000."

Black: "Only a \$100,000?"

White: "Yes, this is a Bill that has a lot of merit,

Representative. It's one that will allow homeless people
to move out of shelters and into their own apartments and
to also, hopefully, become gainfully employed. I think
when that happens all of us are winners."

Black: "Is there a job training component in this?"

White: "Not in this Bill, but I'm told that it's being addressed in another piece of legislation."

Black: "Alright. Thank you for your patience, Representative.

Thank you Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Laurino: "Further discussion? Representative Schakowsky."

Schakowsky: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in support of adoption of the Conference Committee Report. In reference to the costs of this program, it's minimal and even the Department of Public Aid acknowledges that it's minimal. There is no analysis that shows that General Assistance Recipients are presently being cut off because they have saved money which is the only thing that would cost in this. This would just assure that people can move from homelessness to housing. That they can save a measly \$1,000 so they can put a down payment. This Bill passed out of here before. I urge an 'aye' vote for the sake of the people who want to just have their own place to live and get off the street and out of the shelters. An 'aye' vote is the humane vote on this legislation."

Speaker Laurino: "Further discussion? Seeing none,

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

Representative White to close."

White: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. It's a fine piece of legislation, one that will allow our homeless to realize their dreams and that they will have a roof over their heads, and I think that this Body should put green votes on the board, because this is probably one of the finest pieces of legislation that we will address dealing with the subject."

Speaker Laurino: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of the First Conference Committee Report to House Bill 4079. All those in favor will indicate by voting 'aye', opposed 'nay'. This is final action. The board is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. Representative Deuchler for what reason do you arise Ma'am?"

Deuchler: "Vote me 'aye'."

Speaker Laurino: "Representative Deuchler wishes to be recorded as 'aye'. Representative Lou Jones for what reason...'Aye', she wishes to be recorded. Lou Jones, 'aye'. Representative Stange? Vote him 'aye'. Further changes? None. Representative Wolf wishes to be recorded as 'aye'. The First Conference Committee Report, having received 88 'ayes', 17 'nay' and 6 voting 'present', the House does adopt the Conference Committee Report to House Bill 4079, and the Bill, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. This supplement to the Calendar #2 on the Conference Committee Reports appears Senate Bill 837, Representative Trotter."

Trotter: "Thank you very much Mr. Speaker, Members of the House."

Speaker Laurino: "Excuse me, for a moment, Representative

Trotter."

Trotter: "Yes."

166th Legislative Day

- June 30, 1992
- Speaker Laurino: "Representative LeFlore, for what reason do you rise?"
- LeFlore: "Mr. Speaker, could you record me on (Senate Bill) 4079

 please? I did not vote on that Bill and I'd like to vote
 'yes'."
- Speaker Laurino: "You won't be voted. It will just indicate...the record will just indicate that you wish to be recorded as voting 'aye'. Representative Trotter."
- Trotter: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House.

 I'm going to be very brief knowing the time that we have here is short. This Bill creates an Alternative Health Care Delivery Act and for these purposes what this Act creates is a sub-care hospital, and this designated site will provide medical specialty care for patients who need a greater intensity or complexity of care for themselves.

 It's an agreed upon Bill on both sides of the aisle and would like for its adoption and its passage at this time."
- Speaker Laurino: "Further discussion? Seeing none, the Gentleman, Representative Black."
- Black: "Yes, thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Just rise to support the Gentleman's Bill. Urge an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Laurino: "Representative Weller, for what reason do you rise?"
- Weller: "Just as quick Representative. It's agreed language, agreed to by everyone involved and all the health care groups are supporting this legislation as is the Department of Public Health and everyone that has been involved. It's a good..."
- Speaker Laurino: "The question is, 'Shall the House adopt
 Conference Committee Report #1 to House Bill...Senate Bill
 837?' All those in favor indicate by voting 'aye',
 opposed, 'nay'. The vote is open. This is final action.

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? This Bill, having received 113 'ayes', 0 voting 'nay', 0 voting 'present', the House does adopt Conference Committee Report #1 to Senate Bill 837, and the Bill, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1665, Representative Brunsvold."

Brunsvold: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. (Senate Bill) 1665, as it came from the Senate, added a few provisions regarding tightening up the language dealing with the quarter cent sales tax provisions for the Quad City Economic Development Authority. The Conference Committee now would simply be limited to Rock Island County only, and would require a front door referendum to raise monies for a program to attract 4500 jobs from the Department of Defense, and that's all the Conference Committee does, and we would ask for your support and ask for the adoption of Conference Committee #1 to (Senate Bill) 1665."

Speaker Laurino: "Further discussion? Representative Stern."

Stern: "Will the Gentléman answer a question?"

Speaker Laurino: "He indicates he will."

Stern: "I note in the Conference Committee Report,
Representative, a reference to the US Department of Defense
for a contract for the development of the US Finance and
Accounting Services facility. I wonder if this is the same
one that Lake County is trying to attract to our area?"

Brunsvold: "There are two other...two other sites in Illinois that are bidding for these jobs, and yes, that might be one of the people that...one of the groups that are looking for 4,500 jobs."

Stern: "Do I understand that this would make the Quad Cities area

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

have a different sales tax than the rest of the state?"

- Brunsvold: "We, yes...we would go to referendum in Rock Island

 County for the quarter cent and we've done that already in
 a previous situation, and if it's adopted, it could only be
 spent on these jobs. I mean, if we don't get the jobs, of
 course we won't have the referendum, so it comes down to
 that point."
- Stern: "This money will not be used to attract the jobs. Is that correct?"
- Brunsvold: "This money is to provide the facility necessary a \$45,000,000 bonding effort to provide the facilities for the Department of Defense so they can come to Rock Island Arsenal with these 4,500 jobs."
- Stern: "It was my understanding that we were trying hard in Illinois to keep the sales tax the same all over the state in different municipalities and counties. This would be a variation, would it not?"
- Brunsvold: "We've had some variations across the state. The 1986

 Sales Tax Revisory Act that we did with, I believe, Senator

 Netch at that time, was to clean up all the language within

 the state and set all the processes the same for collection

 of the sales tax. It didn't preclude a county from going

 out and raising its own quarter cent sales tax."

Stern: "Thank you, Sir."

Speaker Laurino: "Further discussion, Representative Kubik."

Kubik: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. Would the Gentleman yield for a couple of questions?"

Speaker Laurino: "He indicates he will."

Kubik: "Representative, just out of curiosity, how many sites are in Illinois are being considered for this facility?"

Brunsvold: "Well, there are three sites, to my knowledge, that are putting out requests for the proposals for the 4,500

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

iobs."

- Kubik: "Rock Island, Lake County?"
- Brunsvold: "Rock Island, there's two more. The Governor's office has looked at all three of them."
- Kubik: "Okay, but Lake County is the other one, and where's the last one, just out of curiosity?"
- Brunsvold: "I don't know. Maybe Rantoul."
- Kubik: "Okay. Alright. What...now my understanding is of this particular Bill, I just want to make sure I understand it, is that you would, by front door referendum, by the voters of Rock Island County..."
- Brunsvold: "Right."
- Kubik: "...Would run a referendum to increase the sales tax by a quarter percent?"
- Brunsvold: "A quarter cent. Right."
 - Kubik: "Okay. It would apply only to Rock County?"
- Brunsvold: "The Bill is drafted so it would apply only to Rock Island County."
- Kubik: "Now, would this sales tax mirror the state's sales tax?
 In other words, would it be exactly the same as the state sales tax?"
- Brunsvold: "Well, it would be on top of what...you know we have a sales tax now that is, I think, 6.25% in Rock Island County. We'll go to 6.50% if they approved it. Revenue would get a 2% for collection of the tax."
- Kubik: "And I guess my question though is that we have certain exemptions in sales tax in Illinois. You know?"
- Brunsvold: "It would fall...it would fall within the criteria of the state Sales Tax Revisory law that happened in 188...1986."
- Kubik: "And that...and those...that's really the only provision
 left in this Bill?"

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

Brunsvold: "That's all that's in this Conference Committee and if, Representative, if...there are a lot of people around the country vying for these jobs, if we would not be, you know, in the final 10 or would not get the jobs, of course this sales tax would not be imposed and it could only be used for this."

Kubik: "Thank you for responding to those questions, Representative."

Speaker Laurino: "Further discussion? Representative DeJaegher."

DeJaegher: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the General Assembly. I rise in support of Senate Bill 1865 (sic - 1665). This is a front door referendum. The only community it has adverse effect, if you consider it an adverse effect, is Rock Island County. What we're trying to do is generate additional money for economic development. That's all it is. Basically, we're trying to assist this community to acquire funding for procurement of jobs. I ask for a 'yes' vote on 1865 (sic - 1665)."

Speaker Laurino: "Further discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt Conference Committee Report #1 to Senate Bill 1665. All those in favor will vote 'aye', opposed 'nay'. The vote is open. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Wyvetter Young wishes to be recorded as 'aye'. Have all voted who wish? Take the record Mr. Clerk. This Bill, having received 84 'aye', 26 'nay', 3 Bill, having received voting 'present'...this the Constitutional Majority, shall adopt the Conference Committee Report #1 to Senate Bill 1665. Senate Bill 2049, Representative Barnes. Jane Barnes? Out of the record. Senate Bill 2068, Representative DeJaegher."

DeJaegher: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move con...for...First

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

Conference Committee Report to Senate Bill 2068. There is a provision in it that, basically, Illinois Department of Public Aid agrees to. It's pertaining to a single case that (sic - has) arisen in our area where a patient wanted to go to a local hospital, which was in Iowa City, Iowa, to receive treatment for this bone marrow transplant instead of St...instead of Barnes Hospital in St. Louis. This has been agreed to. There are...there is a provision in this Bill, of course, that would make it difficult unless the Federal Government agrees to because the standards of the Federal Government must be adhered to before the second part is a part of Senate Bill 2068. I move support for this legislation."

Speaker Laurino: "Further discussion? Representative Lang."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise reluctantly in opposition Lang: to the First Conference Committee Report. Not as to the first part of it dealing with this individual that needs the medical procedure, but to the second part of the Conference Committee Report. The second part of the Conference Committee Report refers to...freezing the benefits of welfare recipients that move into Illinois from other states and while, on the surface, it seems to make sense that we should try to prohibit people from other states coming into Illinois to get larger welfare benefits, it appears very clear that this is unconstitutional. was a Supreme Court case called 'Shapiro versus Thompson' directly on point and in that...and in that Supreme Court case the court found that the statute violated equal protection clause of the Fourteenth Amendment because it found that the right under the Constitution for people to engage in interstate travel supercedes the states' right to deal with their budget problems and so, accordingly, I

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

suggested to the Sponsor of the Bill, of the Conference Committee Report, that he find some way to amend this section, to either find some way to put exceptions into it (because there are certainly exceptions that make some sense, for instance, people that come into the State of Illinois to take care of a sick relative), or they try to limit it to three months or six months. That was not possible during our conversations, and so I rise in opposition to this because it's unconstitutional, because it creates an undue burden on people traveling...from state to state, and the Constitution...under the...under our Constitution, a fundamental right in this country is the ability to move from state to state. So, I would ask for 'no' votes on this."

Speaker Laurino: "Representative Black."

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

Speaker Laurino: "He indicates he will."

Black: "Representative, I don't know whether I can ask you a question or not because I think this Bill was just declared unconstitutional, but I'm not certain. Let me ask you a question anyway. The part of the Bill...that's been added on here simply freezes Public Aid clients who relocate to Illinois from other states. We keep them at the same level for six months. Is that what you understand this..."

Brunsvold: "Twelve months."

Black: "Twelve months? I thought it was only six months."

Brunsvold: "My aide says 12 months, Representative Black. They would have to be a resident for 12 months before they would qualify for..."

Black: "Qualify for Illinois rates if they were higher? Well, that sounds like welfare reform to me. I think you've got

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

a good Bill here, Representative."

Brunsvold: "Well, thank you, Representative Black."

Black: "Well, anything I can do to help you save the state money,

I'm gonna support. I vote 'aye'."

Brunsvold: "Just push green."

Speaker Laurino: "Representative Trotter."

Trotter: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker... I couldn't hear all of the arguments because of the noise level in here. It's just so high. But, however, what I did hear is that this Bill is proposing some type of discrimination in the system of which we have. I think what we should be doin' is tryin' to open up the system and not tryin' to close it down, realizing, of course, that we are in financial constraints. We need to understand that what we're proposing here is an unconstitutional measure. let's...let's not get in trouble by doing the wrong thing. Today, we're supposed to be trying to correct some of the ills of our society and correct some of the ills of our state, and, in this case, correcting the ills of the people. This isn't somebody getting rich. This isn't somebody getting over. This is definitely something that we're trying to...to address. This type of restriction may be reviewed as the restriction of residency and, therefore, it is truly a violation of the equal protection rights the Fourteenth Amend...the Constit...Fourteenth Amendment under the Constitution, and we, we...we need to this time pass, not pass this Bill, but kill it right now and try to address this problem in some other way. you."

Speaker Laurino: "Representative Williams."

Williams: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Assembly. I wish that we'd take a moment to understand the

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

serious nature of this legislation that is before us. concept that a person, as they deal with equal rights and equal protection, means that if I have a right, that's gonna be given to me or given to some person and then that same right should be given to all. The reality of this Bill is what we're going to say is that, if Ι locate from another state or come to this state, and I receive one level of benefits that happens to be lower than Illinois level of benefits, when I get to Illinois, I will be kept at the lower level of benefits, in spite of the fact that Illinois has a higher cost of living; in spite of the fact that everybody else in Illinois was receiving another set of benefits; in spite of the fact that I happen to be indigent and I happen to be poor, I happen to not be able to eat. This means nothing. They wanna keep me at a level below what everybody else in this state will receive. This Bill is wrong. This Bill is unconstitutional. This Bill is extremely serious in its application and then just think about the administrative nightmare. Think about you work for the Department of Public Aid. You have to keep a record of where everybody in the country who moves into this state will receive benefits. You have to determine what that level would be. You have to keep separate bookkeeping. The amount of dollars saved would be lost in This is a horrible piece of legislation. bookkeeping. This legislation is discriminatory, and the fact that we're tryin' to say that we as a state wanna discourage people from moving here because of the fact that they might be receiving less benefits in another state, the reality says that's not true. It hasn't happened in any other state. It hasn't happened in California. It hasn't happened any place. We cannot afford to pass this legislation and brand

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

Illinois as a prejudiced state, as a state that discourages people on the basis of their particular income level. The fact that they cannot make it someplace else and they're gonna come here and they're gonna receive a lesser benefit in a state with a higher cost of living. This Bill is wrong. I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Laurino: "Representative Davis, for what reason do you arise?"

"I just...excuse me...thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in Davis: opposition to this legislation. I think Representative Paul Williams has certainly spoke (sic-spoken) eloquently on it. I think not only is it probably unconstitutional, but it says to people that the State of Illinois doesn't care very much about individuals and what a person could do to circumvent this legislation is simply move someplace first that they didn't plan to stay, where the grant is lower or higher I should say, and then move to Illinois. I think it would lead the State of Illinois to a lot of bureaucratic, administrative cost and if our goal is to keep costs down I don't think we want to add a lot of unnecessarily, (sic - unnecessary) unconstitutional, that would create chaos for a prohibitive language department that really is not faring very well, as it is. I would certainly urge a 'no' vote on this piece of legislation and ask each and every citizen in here to tell us what you would do if this, perhaps, were going to guide your future."

Speaker Laurino: "Representative Weller, for what reason do you rise, Sir?"

Weller: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Laurino: "He indicates he will."

Weller: "Representative, as I und...looking at your welfare

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

reform initiative that you have here, I see this as an effort to reduce the incentive to move to Illinois. Is that your objective here, Representative?"

DeJaegher: "Yes."

Weller: "The a..."

DeJaegher: "For a specific purpose, of course. Go ahead."

Weller: "So, Representative, the intent, then, of this legislation is to prevent Illinois from becoming a welfare magnet? Is that true?"

DeJaegher: "Yes."

Weller: "Well, Representative, I wholeheartedly support this legislation. This is welfare reform. It's simple welfare reform. If you want Illinois to avoid being a welfare magnet, then you should vote 'yes'. It's simple legislation. It's welfare reform legislation. It's gonna help the taxpayers of Illinois. A 'yes' vote is the right vote. I urge a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Laurino: "Further discussion? Representative Phelps."

Phelps: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in support (sic - of) my seat mate's objective here, and I...I know that it's a sad situation when we're pitted against, one state against another, just because the level or the standard of living or because of the health care standard that we haven't embraced as a whole country, as the federal government should do, and so that's why we find ourselves in this situation. So, it's a sad one, but yet it's reality. We have overdue bills in this state which I have supported trying to increase the reimbursement rates for the poor and the indigent, but, yet, now we're pittin' 'em against each other because where I come from and same way as Representative DeJaegher, we border different states. I have Kentucky, Indiana,

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

Missouri that have a much lower level of paying rate, so this is an attractive element to some of those people who desperately need the help, and I don't think we should deny them in many terms, but when we don't have the money ourselves, we've gotta do something so we can protect those who already live here, paying taxes, and those who can't afford to pay taxes. So, it's...it's a bad scenario here because we refuse to look at universal health care and fix So, those of you who are talking in the big question. terms of that this is a magnet, to try to fix the idea of a magnet, of drawing those from other states who are in our area, perhaps you will look at it as lowering our standard to pay those people so they will go out of our state to the other, so we can reverse this rationale for those of you who seem to be concerned in that regard, but I don't think that's the bottom line here. What this Bill says before any of this can be acted upon the federal waivers, the Federal Government, has to approve all of this, and so it's contingent upon federal approvement. So, look at that in that regards, and I think we need more 'aye' votes."

- Speaker Laurino: "Further discussion? Seeing none,
 Representative Brunsvold, to close. All right, DeJaegher
 to close."
- DeJaegher: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I believe my seat mate,
 Representative Phillips...Phelps gave you a clear
 definition of how this Bill would affect individuals. We
 are not...we are not in...in quandary regarding the Federal
 Constitution. The Federal Constitution is still intact.
 We are not destroying the intent of the Federal
 Constitution. For this, I ask your 'yes' vote."
- Speaker Laurino: "The question is, 'Shall the House adopt Conference Committee Report #1 to Senate Bill 2068?' All

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

those in favor will indicate by voting 'aye', opposed, 'nay'. The board 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. This Bill, having received 87 'aye', 27 'no' and 2 voting 'present', the House does adopt Conference Committee Report #1 to Senate Bill 2068, and the Bill, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Mannie Hoffman, for what reason do you rise, Sir?"

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A point of personal privilege.

I have the honor to introduce Walter and Helma Hopp from
Gunnsberg, Germany who are my guests here today. They are
only two people of three hundred who will be visiting the
Tinley Park area this summer and I'd like you to, please,
help me welcome them to the General Assembly. Thank you."

Speaker Laurino: "Welcome to the General Assembly of the State of Illinois. Senate Bill 2138, Representative White."

White: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this piece of legislation has been with us for the past two years and on each occasion it has passed out of the committee, out of the House and out of the Senate and has gone as far as to the Governor's desk. It is a program by which...three scholarships would be...would be presented to students attending the Dr. Scholl's School of Podiatry and they would have a commitment by which they would do their...They would practice in some of our 38 underserved counties in the State of Illinois. That is the Bill. I move for its adoption. Thank you."

Speaker Laurino: "Further discussion? Representative Black."

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

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

Speaker Laurino: "Indicates he will."

Black: "Representative, I think there is some confusion about this Conference Committee Report that you are asking us to...to agree with. Is there any Amendment in this Conference Committee Report...that the dental...the dentists of the state were after considering treatment of...TMJ?"

White: "No, it was in the First Conference Committee...Well, it was in the Bill. It was proposed; it was never offered; and it is not in this Bill. This Bill that's in its...is in its original form by which scholarships would be presented by the Dr. School School of Podiatry."

Black: "Okay. So...so in actuality, the only thing in this Bill is creating a...podiatry scholarship which I think you have brought to us before. Correct?"

White: "Many times."

Black: "Thank you...thank you very much, Representative. Gentlemen of the and Ladies and Speaker House....this...this Bill is certainly...is opposed by the Department of Public Health and Professional Regulation. I don't ... I quess I ... I hesitate to rise in opposition to the Gentleman's Bill, but it...it has the...creates scholarship, but the funding mechanism's never been there. I...I don't know. I don't see that it's in there again, so I think it's kind of a empty exercise, but if...if a funding mechanism was included in the Bill, it's estimated, our staff says, that it would only generate about \$35,000, \$40,000 a year and one scholarship would cost \$15,000 a year. So, I don't know that it addresses the concerns that the Gentleman would like to address. I... I voted against the Bill in the past, and I will continue to...to vote 'no', but I certainly admire the Gentleman's perseverance."

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

Speaker Laurino: "Further discussion? Representative Phelps."

- Phelps: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Just in response to the last speaker's comments, there is a funding mechanism provided in the Bill that comes from the Podiatric Disciplinary Fund. So there is a funding mechanism. Another thing to keep in mind about this Bill, it was rumored that the TMJ (that) the Dental Society wanted, was interested in, would be this Bill, and it is not in this Conference Committee Report. So, I stand in favor of, and I think Representative White's done a good job to bring this thing to the table."
- Speaker Laurino: "Further discussion? Seeing none,
 Representative White, to close."
- White: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this is a fine piece of legislation. It does not have any impact upon any of my constituents. It is designed to take care of some areas in the State of Illinois (and there are about 38 counties who (sic-which) lack this kind of service) and so I ask this Body to join with me as they have in the past in passing out this wonderful piece of legislation."
- Speaker Laurino: "The question is, 'Shall the House adopt Conference Committee Report #1 to Senate Bill 2138?' All those in favor will indicate by voting 'aye', opposed, 'nay'. This is final action. The board is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Hultgren."
- Hultgren: "My switch doesn't seem to be working. Would you have them record me as 'no' and then ask the electrician to come up here and take a look at this, please? Record me as 'yes'."
- Speaker Laurino: "Record Representative Hultgren as 'yes'."
 Hultgren: "'Yes', 'yes' then have a look at the switch, please."

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

Speaker Laurino: "And would the electrician go over to his desk and check his wires out? His wiring? See if he's connected. Maybe there's a screw loose. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. This Bill having received 88 'aye', 20 'nay', and 8 voting 'no' (sic-'present') the House does adopt Conference Committee Report #1 to Senate Bill 2138. This Bill, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Stern, on a Motion for Senate Joint Resolution 180."

Stern: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Senate Joint Resolution 180 is one of the great ideas for this year when we are short of funds and we are watching programs die for lack of resources. This would require...this would require the human service agencies, Public Health and Safety and..."

Speaker Laurino: "Excuse me, Representative. You're on a Motion to discharge Committee not on your..."

Stern: "Am I? Oh, I beg your pardon."

Speaker Laurino: "Yes Ma'am."

Stern: "I beg your pardon."

Speaker Laurino: "Mr. Clerk, would you please post that on the Board? Proceed on your discharge Motion, Representative Stern."

"I...I...make a Motion to discharge Committee, Mr. Chair." Stern: "Very eloquent. The Lady moves for discharge...the Committee on Executive Discharge and this Motion will take 71 votes. The Chair would like to remind the Body that all unauthorized persons will remove themselves immediately. All unauthorized persons will remove themselves from the floor immediately. Thanks for your cooperation. The Lady has Motion to Discharge

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

Committee. The Motion will take 71 votes. All those in favor will indicate by voting 'aye', opposed 'nay'. Board is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted wish? Representative Hultgren, how vour electrician? Representative Hultgren wishes to be recorded This Motion, having received 100...take the record, Mr. Clerk. This Motion, having received 108 'aye', 1 voting 'no' and 5 voting 'present', passes. Proceed to Senate Joint Resolution 180, Representative Stern."

Stern: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. This Resolution asks that the Departments of Public Aid, Children and Family Services, Rehabilitation Services, Mental Health and Developmental Disabilities, Aging, Alcoholism and Substance Abuse and Public Health review their current rules and looking to reduce unneccessary regulations regulations and field audits. You know, we're at a time most major nursing homes have a room and a full time staff person dedicated to the use of the visiting state agency field auditor or inspector. There's a mountain of paperwork that has to be done by all these agencies every day. There are redundant and conflicting and contradictory rules for all of them. This simply asks that they examine their procedures and their internal rules and come up with ways in which they can short circuit some of the excess paper work that they do. The State of New Jersey adopted this Resolution with significant success and we that we can reduce by 20% the amount of busy work that is done by the departments of Illinois. I ask your support."

Speaker Laurino: "Representative Black. Further discussion? Representative Black."

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

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

Stern: "Sure."

Black: "Representative, this Resolution calls on various state agencies to reduce paper work. Correct? On the behalf of the community based providers?"

Stern: "Correct."

Black: "Then does it turn around and ask the community-based providers to provide paper to show that the paper work has been reduced because of this paper work reduction paper?"

Stern: "No, Sir, I do not believe it does do that."

Black: "Well, alright. Thank you very much. I...Mr. Speaker,
Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I don't know how you
can vote against this, but I'll tell you, if you look at
this, what this is, is government at its best. We want to
reduce paper work, but we want you to file a report to tell
us how to reduce the paper work and then file a report to
tell us whether we reduced the paper work by 20% or 10% of
30%, then we'll examine the report, send you another report
to tell you you didn't reduce your paper work enough so
send us a report to tell us why you didn't reduce your
paper work enough. No wonder people laugh at us."

Speaker Laurino: "Further discussion? Representative Novak."

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

You know I find it kind of disconcerting in some of this
debate concerning this good Resolution. You know a few
years ago, President Ronald Reagan, who just happens to be
a Republican, issued...put together a Commission to reduce
paper work in the federal government and they certainly had
reports written and typed and they certainly did a heck of
a good job. So, I think the same principle can be done on
the state level to save needed dollars and I urge your
support."

Speaker Laurino: "Further discussion? Seeing none,

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

Representative Dunn."

- Dunn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Unless we put an end to this the transcribing of this debate will be a lot of extra paper work. so I move the previous question."
- Speaker Laurino: "The Gentleman moves the previous question. It wasn't necessary. No one else was seeking recognition. Representative Stern to close."
- Stern: "I just want to say that I think Representative Black might be commended if he was correct. This asks simply that there be a report back on the results. It doesn't need to be duplicated a thousand times. In fact, perhaps we can make it an oral report if the Representative wishes. I think this is an excellent Resolution. I think we will be thanked by our departments, our agencies and the community service organizations. I ask your 'aye' vote."

Speaker Laurino: "Bill Black wishes to respond."

- Black: "Mr. Speaker, my name was used in debate by a Member of this Body that I hold in the highest regard and on a subsequent reading of this Resolution, by golly, she may be on to something here. I'm for reducing paper work. I intend to vote 'aye' on this outstanding piece of paperwork."
- Speaker Laurino: "The Lady asks for the adoption of Senate Joint Resolution 180 and all those in favor will indicate by voting 'aye', opposed voting 'nay'. The board is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. This Bill, having received 150...or this Senate Joint Resolution 180 having received 115 'aye', 0 voting 'nay', and 0 voting 'present', is hereby declared passed. Proceed to page 6 on the calendar, House Bill 4119, Representative Lang will handle the Bill. Representative Lang."

166th Legislative Day

- June 30, 1992
- Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to concur in Senate

 Amendment #1."
- Speaker Laurino: "The Gentleman moves to concur with Amendment #1 to House Bill 4119. Further discussion? Representative Black?"
- Black: "Yes, thank you very much Mr. Speaker. Can you briefly explain what the Amendment does?"
- Lang: "Yes, Sir, the Amendment would amend the Home ownership
 Made Easy Act by changing the following sections that
 require participants to reinvest their deposits from the
 Treasurer's Account to a certified financial institution
 within 30 days in order to stay eligible for the program.

 It allows for an amount equal to the real estate transfer
 tax to be refunded to their participant under certain
 circumstances, allows for counties to waive the amount
 equal to certain taxes once the participant has treasurers
 notification certificate, and requires the State Treasurer
 to notify the Directors of the Department of Revenue and
 IHDA that the participant is a eligible home buyer and some
 other provisions."
- Black: "I appreciate that explanation. An inquiry of the Chair?

 Has this Concurrence Amendment been...or has this Amendment been printed and distributed? I've got all kinds of House Amendments, but I don't have a Senate Amendment."
- Speaker Laurino: "Representative Lang, for what reason do you rise Sir?"
- Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. For Representative Black's edification, I'm advised that the language in Senate Amendment #1 is an agreed clean-up Bill section with the Department of Revenue."
- Black: "Noticing a...an absolute lack of DOR people around me, I must assume that that's the case."

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

Speaker Laurino: "Further inquiries Mr. Black?"

- Black: "No. I think...I appreciate the Gentleman's patience. We really did not have the Amendment, but the Department of Revenue just came down and said they are an agreed.

 Certainly, we'll vote with the Gentleman's Motion."
- "Representative Lang moves for the adoption of Conference Committee Re...Report #1 to House Bill 4119. All those in favor will indicate by voting 'aye', opposed voting 'nay'. The voting is open. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Hultgren, is your switch working now? Fine. Have all voted who wish? Take the record Mr. Clerk. Vote Representative John Dunn 'aye', please. This Bill having received 115 'ayes', 0 voting 'nay', 0 voting 'present', the House does adopt the Conference Committee Report #1 to House Bill 4119, and the Bill, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared Supplemental Calendar #3 under nonconcurrences is Senate Bill 221, Representative Steczo. Out of the record. Senate Bill 911, Representative Mannie Hoffman."
- Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On Senate Bill 911, I refuse to discharge and ask for a Conference Committee. I refuse to recede and ask for a Conference Committee on this."
- Speaker Laurino: "Further discussion? Representative Jack
 Kubik."
- . Kubik: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just to let the Sponsor know that I'm listening and I care."
- Speaker Laurino: "Further discussions? Seeing none,
 Representative Hultgren moves to...he refuses to recede
 from Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 911 and requests a
 Conference Committee. Senate Bill 1667, Representative
 Curran."

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

- Curran: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to nonconcur in Senate...I move to refuse to recede from House Amendments 1 and 3 in Senate Bill 1667. Ask for a Conference Committee."
- Speaker Laurino: "Further discussion? Seeing none, the Gentleman refuses to recede from numbers 1 and 3 to Senate Bill 1667 and requests a Conference Committee. All in favor indicate by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Senate Bill 1939, Representative McPike. Representative McPike? Representative Lang, for what reason do you rise Sir?"
- Lang: "Thank you, on behalf of Representative McPike, I would move that the House refuse to recede with House Amendment #2."
- Speaker Laurino: "Representative McPike refuses to recede from the House Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 1939. All those in favor indicate by saying 'aye', opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it, and the Conference Committee Report will be appointed. Senate Bill 221, Representative Hartke."
- Hartke: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House.

 The House...I would ask for a Conference Committee. The

 House refuses to recede from House Amendment #1 and.I ask

 for a Conference Committee."
- Speaker Laurino: "The Gentleman asks...refuses to recede from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 221. All those in favor indicate by saying 'aye', opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it. The Conference Committee Report is being requested and will be so appointed. House Bill 2767, Representative Homer. Out of the record. House Bill 4188, Representative Lang."
- Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move that the House adopt the First Conference Committee Report to House Bill 4188. The Conference Committee includes all provisions that we passed previously. In fact, I had agreed to now concur in Senate

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

Amendment #2 which makes certain changes in expungement provisions. The additions to this Amendment...the additions to this report include a suggestion by Representative Homer regarding allowing certain counties to lower certain fees by ordinance, and I would ask for the adoption of the report."

Speaker Laurino: "Further discussion? Representative Hultgren.

Further discussion? Seeing none, the Gentleman moves for
the adoption of the First Conference Committee Report to
House Bill 4188. All those in favor...Representative
Black, for what reason do you rise, Sir?"

Speaker Laurino: "He indicates he'll answer."

Black: "Representative, I just happened to notice that neither of the House Republicans appointed to the Conference Committee signed this, Representative Hasara or Representative Deets.

Was there a reason why they didn't sign it or..."

Hartke: "I'm informed by a staff that after diligent inquiry that could not find those two Representatives. That's the only reason Mr. Black."

Black: "Okay. Thank you very much."

Speaker Laurino: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of the First Conference Committee Report to House Bill 4188. All those in favor will indicate by voting 'aye', opposed 'nay'. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record. Mr. Clerk. This Bill, having received 111 'aye', 3 voting 'nay', 0 voting 'present', the House does adopt Conference Committee Report #1 to House Bill 4188, and the Bill, having received the required Constitutional Amendment is hereby declared...the majority is hereby

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

declared passed. Senate Bill 2048, Representative Wennlund. Out of the record. To a Motion on the Senate Joint Resolution 141, Representative Edley."

- Edley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the General Assembly. As we've known on the House Task Force on higher education governance, over the last decade, much of the state appropriated funds that we appropriated for higher education was consumed not instruction, but in the cost of administration. This Resolution urges that the...that that change and that a report be made to the General Assembly upon what actions would be required to...to change the distributional funds among university functions."
- Speaker Laurino: "The Gentleman has a discharge Motion from Committee On Exec for Senate Joint Resolution 141. Further discussion? Seeing none. All those in favor will indicate by voting 'aye', opposed 'nay'. The board is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. This Motion, having received 114 'ayes', 0 voting 'nay', 1 voting 'present', is hereby declared passed. Representative Edley, on Senate Joint Resolution 141."
- Edley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the General Assembly. This is essentially the same...is the same...explanation that I made on the discharge Motion and I would ask for a unanimous Roll Call."
- Speaker Laurino: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Senate Joint Resolution 141. Eurther discussion? Seeing none.

 All those in favor indicate by voting 'aye', opposed 'nay'.

 The board is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? This Motion...this Senate Joint Resolution 141 having received 115 'ayes', 0 voting 'no', 1 voting

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

'present' is hereby declared passed."

Speaker Young: "Anthony Young in the Chair."

(Speaker ?): "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, due to the fact our recent corn beef luncheon was such a huge success, we have some additional funds left over and we are going to donate the additional funds to the Misacordia Heart of Mercy Village in honor of Andy McGann's wife and also to the Hope School for the Blind the Mentally Handicapped here in Springfield. We want to thank everyone that participated and they'll be getting the money in our name. Thank you."

Speaker Young: "Supplemental #3 on the Order of Conference

Committee Reports, House Bill 2767, Representative Homer.

Representative Homer? Read the Bill Mr. Clerk."

Clerk McLennand: "House Bill 2767, a Bill for an Act.to amend the Criminal Code of 1961, Conference Committee Report #1."

Speaker Young: "Representative Homer?"

Homer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Conference Committee Report has several provisions, all of which I think are either without significant totally non-controversial or opposition. I would...I'll run through them very briefly. The first section of the Bill makes an exception to the Juvenile Confidentiality Court Records to specify that law enforcement officials may communicate with each other about potential dangerous individuals who are under 17 years of age. The second provision is a request of the Cook County State's Attorney's office that has to do with definition of institutionalized severely or profoundly mentally retarded persons. The next provision provides that is a request of the LaSalle County State's Attorney's Office that changes the provisions with respect to reckless homicide to provide that instead of the use of the word 'prima facie' evidence, but that we would substitute the

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

actual legal definition of 'prima facie' evidence. next section of the Bill is requested by the Coalition Against Sexual Assault. It would establish the offense of sexual exploitation of a child which would be a Class A The next section of the Bill is a request to the Fulton County State's Attorney that would include correctional institution employees in the definition of resisting or obstructing a peace officer. Then, the next provision was a request of Representative Kirkland that was in a Bill that he had, having to do with...with home monitored electric monitoring device primarily a technical change in the law, that has a very minor consequence. Then, the next provision was a request of the Fulton County State's Attorney having to do with good behavior. who are in jail prior to the sentencing would specify that whether they were in jail prior to sentencing or after, they would receive the day per day good time credit that is given to those who are out on bail prior to sentencing. Then, there's a provision in the Bill having to do with the execution of the death penalty that specifies that there only...there need be six witnesses that deletes the provision that I had required in addition to six witnesses that there be two physicians who witness the death penalty and there's a provision in the Bill having with...with a situation where an automobile repair shop operates on a commission basis and pays his salesman according to commissions. In this Bill, it would provide that, if such a repair shop has a commission program, file a statement with their would be required to application for licensing specifying that they had such a program, and also they would have to post notice of that commission program in the area where the customers would be

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

able to see it as well as the repair shop. This provision is in response to the recent revelations in California regarding the Sears repair shops where it was determined there were some deceptive business trade practices going on. Then, finally, there's a provision that is a recommendation of one of the State's Attorneys. It comes from the States Attorney's Association that provides for the purpose of aggravated DUI that currently requires there be two prior DUI's. This would provide that there could be one prior DUI and coupled with a reckless homocide in which the person was determined to have been under the influence of alcohol which would seem to be a very modest change of and then final provision again relates to the deceptive business practice provisions that puts paragraph 13 that would make it a deceptive specific business practice for a person to misrepresent condition of someone's property with the intent to induce that person to enter into an agreement or contract So that's a rather lengthy repairs of the property. explanation, but I wanted to touch on each of the sections of the Bill. I would try to answer any questions. I would appreciate your approval of this Conference Committee Report."

- Speaker Young: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of the First Conference Committee Report to House Bill 2767. On that question, Representative Black."
- Black: "Yes, thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
- Speaker Young: "He indicates he'll yield for a question."
- Black: "Representative, just two or three quick questions. In Section 8 of the Conference Committee Report. I'm sorry, it's my analysis of Section 8, not the report, we are

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

repealing a law requiring physicians to participate in the act of execution, and you said 'witness'. Now, is it that we are excusing them as witnesses in the act of lethal injection or are we saying that they can not inject the solution in the act of capital punishment?"

Homer: "Okay, well this provision has nothing to do with their participation. The current law says that, whenever there is an execution, it must be witnessed by two physicians together with six other witnesses. This change would simply take out the requirement that there be two physicians there as witnesses. It does not deal with certification or pronouncement of death or administering the drug."

Black: "Okay. I appreciate that, and then in the other...the other two questions that revolve around the language about auto repair shops, auto dealers, et cetera. Is it the intent of this Bill that, if a technician at a automobile repair facility is on commission, that has to be posted at the place of business or posted with the Secretary of State?"

Homer: "Well, actually, it would be in both places. So, when the application is filed to...for licensing as an auto repair dealer, there would have to be a disclosure to the Secretary of State that the...that the applicant intends to implement a commission basis compensation program. Then, in addition, the applicant would have to post notice of that program in the customer waiting room as well as in the repair shop. So, its a disclosure and notification provision."

Black: "Is it notification and disclosure only if they are on commission?"

Homer: "Yes."

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

Black: "What if they are on a flat rate or book rate?"

Homer: "No. No. Only if they are on commission, and I again refrain, too. I'm sure you saw in the media the reports on a California where, I believe it was Sears, in that case, although there may have been others, who were charged with deceptive practices on the basis that their employees were performing repairs and selling auto parts that were not necessary, and this is our attempt to respond to them. We're not saying that we would outlaw commissions in Illinois. We're saying that, if you have them, you have to disclose it and give notice, that you have such a program."

Black: "Okay let...one more question about the misrepresentation of the condition of a person's property.? In other words, I assume what you're getting at there is, if somebody says if the battery on my car is bad and I find out later that it wasn't bad, I have a case of then deceptive trade practice against that individual?"

Homer: "Yes, it would require active misrepresentation. It's similar to the home repair fraud provisions we passed a few years back. Yes, you have stated it correctly."

Black: "Alright. Thank you very much, Representative. I appreciate your time. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. As in most Conference Committee Reports, there's some really good parts in this Conference Committee Report. There are also a couple that have attracted some opposition. I refer to the Attorney General of the State of Illinois as quoted in the paper today. If he is quoted accurately, that his office has only had eleven complaints in the last year against Sears Roebuck facilities repairing automobiles in this state and that he thought that number was so low as to certainly not to constitute any problem or pattern of abuse and, yet, there are two sections in this

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

Conference Committee Report that I think, I think are aimed at what we have read on Sears and Roebuck practices in the Now, they, in California, those State of California. charges may or may not be true. I don't know if there has been a court hearing or whether they are even going to go to court or whatever, but once again, I think because of two auto related provision in this Conference Committee Report, we are automatically assuming that anyone in the auto repair business is somehow not on the up and up. I'll tell you, it gets tougher and tougher and tougher for a small businessman or a small businesswoman to do business in Illinois. We make them post this. We make post that. They pay this. They pay that. I don't think there's been a pattern of abuse in the State of Illinois by auto repair shops, and I think we maybe jumping the qun just a little bit by putting this in Conference Committee Report, and this is not a report that I would like to vote against because there are outstanding features in it, but I would just simply rise to tell you that the business community I don't think were consulted on this. The retail merchants are opposed to The new car and truck dealers are opposed to this this. and perhaps if they had been consulted or worked with, maybe language could have been put in here to not only protect the consumer, but to also protect those people who simply trying to make a living, and I think government makes that tougher and tougher and tougher. So, given those two provisions, I would ask Members on my side of the aisle to vote no."

Speaker Young: "Further discussion? Representative Deering."

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

Speaker Young: "Indicates that the Sponsor will yield for a

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

question."

Deering: "Representative, I notice in here a section that makes it a Class A misdemeanor for an inmate in a Correctional center who accosts a correctional institution employee. In plain English, for us non-attorneys, what's a Class A misdemeanor?"

Homer: "That would be up to 364 days in jail and/or a fine of \$1,000."

Deering: "So to a person already committed to a prison, that could mean a longer prison term, right?"

Homer: "Yes."

Deering: "Thank you."

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

Homer: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I can't for the life of me understand how anyone could be opposed to that part of the Bill that deals with the deceptive practice issue. It was revealed last week, in a series of national articles in news media accounts, of a scheme that was taking place in the State of California. However, presumably, it was not isolated in that State where auto repair shops were putting their sales people on commission and encouraging them to inflate the cost of repairs that people have on their cars. Now unfortunately, a lot of us aren't auto mechanics. And a lot of senior citizens depend on the honesty and integrity of the repair shop when having their car repaired. oftentimes, they have not reason to complain. If somebody says you need carburetor reworked, vou need new brake linings, you need...you need this, you need that, most of us have to say, 'Well, if I need it, go ahead and do it'. And the senior citizens are even all the more vulnerable. Now there were some in response to that said, 'Hey, we

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

ought to outlaw commission practices altogether because that just encourages this kind of conduct'. other said, 'No. That's going too far.' We had not ought to outlaw commissions. But what we ought to do is say that if an auto repair shop does give commissions, then they ought to at least make a disclosure of that and to post a notice in the repair shop. Now that's all that this provision does. It's a disclosure and notification. It doesn't prohibit business from doing anything. It simply says that if you're in the auto repair business and you pay your employees on a commission, in other words, they make money by the more repair work they do on a car, then the notice of that policy ought to be disclosed and ought to be Now, if you can vote against this Bill because of that, then you should have a hard time ever convincing any consumer group in the State of Illinois that you give a hoot about consumers. This is the most tame, modest kind of protection measure that we could even think of. If you're going to oppose the Bill on that basis, then you might as well tell your constituents who care about consumer issues, 'The heck with you, because any time a special interest group says boo, I'm going to jump'. So I would urge a green vote in this Bill. And would hope that it would get over a hundred or more votes."

Speaker Young: "The question is, 'Shall the House adopt Conference Committee Report #1 to House Bill 2767?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. And this is final action. Representative Hicks to explain his vote."

Hicks: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Mr. Speaker, I am shown as a hyphenated co-Sponsor on the Bill. Because of changes in the Bill, I'd like to

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

be taken off the as a hyphenated co-Sponsor."

- Speaker Young: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. Mulcahey, 'aye'. Representative Wait to explain his vote. Representative Wait, 'aye'. Representative Bernard Pedersen. Representative Wojcik, 'no'. Representative Walsh, 'aye'. Walsh, 'aye'. Parcells, 'no'. Balthis, 'no'. Manny Hoffman, 'no'. Noland, 'no'. Curran, 'aye'. 'no'. Curran, 'present'. Hicks, 'present'. Novak, 'present'. Hicks, 'present'. Novak, 'present'. Schoenberg, 'present'. Schoenberg, 'present'. Shaw. 'present'. Granberg, 'present'. Hoffman, 'present'. Jay Hoffman, 'present'. White, 'present'. Barnes, 'present'. Regan, Weller, 'present'. Rice, 'present'. Hensel, 'present'. 'present'. Davis...Representative Davis to explain her vote."
- Davis: "No, I'm not explaining my vote. It's just something that we don't know. I mean, I'm trying to figure out what's going on here. The Bill had more than the requisite number of votes to pass. And, now, I see people raising their hands. But I haven't heard anything. Did something different come up that we don't know about? There's something that changed? I mean would somebody come and tell us what this is all about while you're trying to kill this Bill?"
- Speaker Young: "McPike, 'no'. Persico, 'present'. Deuchler,
 'present'. Stange...Stange, 'no'. Stange, 'present'.
 Clerk, Mr. Clerk, let's stop this Roll Call and start
 again. The question is, 'Shall the House adopt Conference
 Committee Report #1 to House Bill 2767?' Representative
 Homer, your light was on."

Homer: "Yes. Speaker, I want to at this time to move for a

166th Legislative Day

- June 30. 1992
- second Conference Committee Report. And hope that all these members have their golf outings all scheduled so that they can...never mind."
- Speaker Young: "Take this Bill out of the record. The Gentleman requests a second Conference Committee Report be appointed.

 Representative Black, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"
- Black: "Well, just let the record reflect I haven't played golf in 4 years. Thank you."
- Speaker Young: "Okay. Representative Homer moves that the House not adopt the First Conference Committee Report to House Bill 2767 and requests that a Second Conference Committee be reported. Representative Ropp."
- Ropp: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have an announcement. I'd like Representative Capparelli and Representative Mike Curran to come over here. As all of you know, each year, when the House plays the Senate in softball, we ask for contribution from each of you in order to go for a worthy cause. Today, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to contribute your money that you have donated to this worthy cause. It is \$500, and we are contributing it on behalf of the House and Senate softball game. And all of you have who contributed to the many Minnie O'Bern Crisis Nursery to Mike Curran, here, congratulations. I think the round of applause, in fact, should then go to him. It was one of his former aids, administrative assistants. And this will be a very worthy cause."
- Speaker Young: "Again. on House Bill 2767, the question is,

 'Shall the House refuse to adopt the First Conference
 Committee Report?' All those in favor say 'aye'; those
 opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And the House
 refuses to adopt the First Conference Committee Report to

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

- House Bill 2767. On that same order, House Bill 3445, Representative Currie. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk McLennand: "House Bill 3445, a Bill for an Act in relation to Domestic Violence. Conference Committee...the First Conference Committee Report."
- Currie: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. The Amendments that were adopted to this Bill in the Senate made this Bill identical to Senate Bill 400 which passed a There was, however, a technical error in few days ago. that Amendment and that's the reason that we offer this Committee Report. The two Bills, as you Conference remember, House Bill 3445 and Senate Bill 400, initially both dealt, but in some slightly different ways, with issues in the arena of domestic violence. Both the Senate President and the State Attorney General had convened task The ultimate forces to look at problems in that area. decision was to make the Bills identical. I would be happy to answer any of your questions. And would appreciate your support for adoption of this Conference Committee Report."
- Speaker Young: "Okay. The Lady moves for the adoption of Conference Committee Report #1 to House Bill Bill 3445. On that question, the Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black."
- Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. An inquiry of the chair. Some of my colleagues have indicated to me that this Amendment or Conference Committee Report has not been on their desk for an hour. In fact, it's only been on their desk for 26 minutes. If the Spea...the Sponsor will take it out of the record and give 2 or 3 of these people about 10 minutes to read it, I'm sure we can come back and I'm equally as confident it will pass."
- Speaker Young: "Would you take this Bill out of the record? Page

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

6 of the Calendar, under the order of Concurrence appears
House Bill 3692. Representative Harris. Representative
Harris."

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

 Amendment #1 to House Bill 3692."
- Speaker Young: "The Gentleman moves that the House nonconcur to Senate Amendment #1 on House Bill 3692. On that question, is there any discussion? Hearing none, all those in favor say 'aye'; those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the House nonconcurs to Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 3692. On Supplemental #3 on the Order of nonconcurrence, appears Senate Bill 221, Representative Steczo."
- Steczo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I move that the House refuse to recede from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 221 and ask for the appointment of a Conference Committee."
- Speaker Young: "The Gentleman moves that the House refuse to recede from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 221. On that motion, all those in favor say 'aye'; those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the House refuses to recede from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 221 and requests that a Conference be appointed. Page 5 of the Calendar appears House Bill 1495, Representative Steczo. Representative Steczo."
- Steczo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I would move that the House concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1495. The language contained in Senate Amendment #1 is permissive language that provides for manufacturers involved in the heat treating industry to apply or petition their municipalities for exemption of their utility tax for the processing part of their

166th Legislative Day

- June 30, 1992
- business. It allows them to petition voluntarily and it's permissive on a municipality's part. I would ask that the House concur in Senate Amendment #1."
- Speaker Young: "The Gentleman moves that the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1495. And on that question, Representative Black."
- Black: "Yeah. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
- Speaker Young: "Indicates he'll yield for a question."
- Black: "Representative, what does...what is in this Amendment that has something to do about radio magnetic waves, fiber-optics? Are we taxing it, not taxing it or what?"
- Steczo: "Representative Black, what the situation is now, as with other manufacturers, those involved in what we would call the heat treating industry, have asked that they be allowed to approach the municipalities that they're located in for an exemption on the processing part of their business from their local utility tax. That's what the Amendment does. Permissive only."
- Black: "All right. Is this a...is this identical language to Senate Bill 1628?"
- Steczo: "Yes, Representative Black. It is."
- Black: "I don't have the pleasure of serving on the House Revenue Committee. But this Bill, this identical Bill that's embodied in this Amendment was held in House Revenue subcommittee by a vote of 2 'aye', 3 'no'. Representative Obrzut attempted to discharge this Bill from Committee and that failed 70 to 44. I mean, if we visited this twice before in this chamber and have not seen fit to move it, what's different about it today?"
- Steczo: "Representative Black, I can't answer the question because I was not the House Sponsor of the...of that

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

particular Bill. However, it's not uncommon in the House Revenue Committee to have Bills that are held in subcommittee whether they be good ideas or not. So by the fact that the House Revenue Subcommittee, or the House Revenue Committee, for that matter, kept a Bill in doesn't necessarily mean it was a bad idea."

Black: "I shouldn't mean to imply that. But obviously, as you know, that's a committee that takes their work very seriously. Is this...Is this Bill...the provisions of this Amendment available to all businesses throughout the State of Illinois or is it somewhat site specific?"

Steczo: "There are approximately 28 of such businesses that are located throughout the State of Illinois. And the genesis of the Bill is that while they pay the normal utility taxes on the types of items that businesses normally do, heat, lights, et cetera, et cetera, the fact that these are energy intensive industries would suggest that they be allowed to approach the local municipality for some relief. It would be up to the municipality, voluntarily, to approve such relief if they so chose."

Black: "Well, I guess that's what has me confused. If this is permissive and voluntary, why does staff tell me that the village of Northlake, in which this particular factory that may, may be requesting this is located, that the village of Northlake is so vehemently opposed to this legislation?"

Steczo: "Representative, I believe, in that particular case, if my facts are correct, the village has never in itself taken a position for or against this Bill. I think the Mayor may have on his own but had some objection to it, perhaps."

Black: "Would the mayor be acting on his own or in his authority as Mayor?"

Steczo: "Well, as you know, in villages, generally things that

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

happen on behalf of villages need concurrence of the village trustees or the city council."

Black: "All right. Thank you very much, Representative. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This...I really am having some difficulty in understanding what this Amendment does. It appears to me that if a village wants to exempt gas and electricity sales from municipal utility taxes, then they could do so. I could think of a couple of instances where that might not be a bad idea. But all I would do is...I would just point out to members on both sides of the aisle that this identical Senate Bill failed to get out of committee. Failed on a discharged motion. I think you should take a look at this Amendment. If you think it's changed, vote accordingly."

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

Steczo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I would just point out to the members of the House that whether or not a similar Bill was approved or disapproved by the House Revenue Committee or House Revenue Subcommittee is absolutely irrelevant. What is relevant, however, is jobs in the State of Illinois. There are heat matter of intensive industries that have asked for the ability to be able approach a local municipality to ask for a reduction in the utility tax for the processing part of their businesses only. In that respect, the municipality may say yes or the municipality may say no. But the fact is, there are a couple of these industries throughout the State of Illinois who, in fact, may move to Indiana Indiana, in fact, does allow these provisions to occur and this kind of permissive authority to be given. I would suggest to you that this is important. It's something that

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

is permissive as well, and it's something that I think makes good sense for us to do. I would ask for your 'yes' votes."

- Speaker Young: "The Gentleman moves that the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1495. All those in favor vote 'aye'; those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. This is final passage. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 46 voting 'yes', 63 voting 'no', 8 voting 'present'. And the House does not concur in Senate Amendment #1. Representative Steczo."
- Steczo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would move then that the House nonconcur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1495."
- Speaker Young: "The Gentleman moves that the House nonconcur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1495. All those in favor say 'aye', those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the House nonconcurs in Senate Amendment #1. On Supplemental Calendar #3 appears Senate Bill 2048, Representative Wennlund. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk McLennand: "Senate Bill 2048, a Bill for an Act to amend a

 Bingo License and Tax Act. First Conference Committee

 Report."
- Speaker Young: "Representative Wennlund."
- Wennlund: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen for the record. Conference Committee Report on (Senate Bill) 2048.

 I worked very hard with Representative McGann to be able to provide language so that civic centers can rent to charitable organizations on a percentage basis. So it makes it equitable for the charity and for the civic center. They can...currently, under Illinois law, you can't do it on a percentage basis. This will provide that

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

you can so that a charity doesn't get really nicked for high rent in the event that they allow bingo to be conducted on the premises by a charitable organization. The second thing it does is it provides that the...that in an Amendment to the Joliet Regional Port District Act to clarify that the sole regulation of river boat gambling and the taxation of it is done by the Illinois River Boat Gambling Act and not by the Joliet Regional Port District. In addition to that, it makes a technical change that the Department of Revenue has suggested in depositing certain funds with the Metropolitan Pier and Exposition Authority. And, lastly, it contains And they're in favor of it. Representative Monique Davis' Amendment regarding a study of the effects of casino qambling. And I move for its adoption."

Speaker Young: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Conference Committee Report #1 to Senate Bill 2048. On that question, is there any discussion? Hearing none...the Lady from Cook, Representative Parcells."

Parcells: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Sponsor yield?"
Speaker Young: "Indicates he'll yield for a question."

Parcells: "Representative, you have a...on the last page, we talk about casino gambling. And there would be a task force of three members...All right. The Sponsor's come over and answered my question. Thank you."

Speaker Young: "Further discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt Conference Committee Report #1 to Senate Bill 2048?' All those in favor vote 'aye': those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. This is final passage. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 65 voting 'yes', 44 voting 'no', 4

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

voting 'present', and the House does adopt Conference Committee Report #1 to Senate Bill 2048. And the Bill, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3445, Representative Currie. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

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

Speaker Young: "Representative Currie."

Clerk McLennand: "House Bill 3445, a Bill for an Act in relation to domestic violence. First Conference Committee Report."

Currie: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. As we began discussing this Bill earlier, there was a technical problem with the Amendment that was adopted to this Bill in the Senate, and the Bill, as it comes back to us, conforms Bill we originally passed with some additional provisions and some changes that were agreed to during the course of discussion with the advocates and people with question about both Senate Bill 400 and House Bill 3445. These are changes in the Domestic Violence Act. Many things were requested and were of concern to the victims of domestic violence and their advocates, and we worked closely with the bar associations and with others on specific provisions of the Bill, and I'd be happy to answer your specific question. But this language is identical to that which we passed last week in Senate Bill 400."

Speaker Young: "The Lady moves for the adoption of Conference Committee Report #1 to House Bill 3445. On that question, is there any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt Conference Committee Report #1 to House Bill 3445?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; those opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open and this is final passage. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

are 117 voting 'yes', none voting 'no' and none voting 'present'. The House does adopt Conference Committee Report #1 to House Bill 3445. And this Bill, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Wennlund, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Wennlund: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To announce that the Republicans will have a conference at 5:00 in Room 118. Please, remember to be there. Five o'clock, Room 118 in the Capitol. Thank you."

Speaker Young: "Representative Giglio."

Giglio: "Mr. Speaker, the Democrats will caucus in Room 114, at 5:00."

Speaker Young: "Representative Stern, for what purpose do you
seek recognition?"

Stern: "There is some confusion down here. There's a Republican caucus at 5:00. Is there a Democratic caucus? Yes? Yes."

Speaker Young: "Yes. There will be a Democratic caucus at 5:00."

Stern: "Thank you."

Speaker Young: "Representative Giglio."

Giglio: "The members on the Democratic side weren't listening to the caucus chairman. The Democratic caucus at Room 114 at 5:00. Is that understood? Did everybody hear that? Democrat's in Room 114 at 5:00."

Speaker Young: "5:00 having arrived, there will be a Democratic caucus in room 114; a Republican caucus in room 118. And the House now stands recessed until the hour of 6:00."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Kulas, for what reason do you rise, sir?"

Kulas: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. While there's a lull in the action, I'd like to rise on a point of personal privilege. Most of you know that for the last 14 years I have been the

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

chief mushroom in the Royal Order of Mushrooms here in House...in the State House. And since...I wanted to thank all my faithful followers. As you can see, even today we're still all mushrooms. But I just wanted to let you know that since some of the fungus among us are moving to bigger and better things, I just wanted to let you all know that as of June 30, 1992, the Royal Order of Mushrooms is hereby dissolved."

- Speaker Giglio: "The Chair would like to make an announcement.

 There was a gold button here that was found on the House floor. Some...somebody...She'll have to describe it to me, Representative Black."
- Speaker McPike: "The House will come to order. Representative McPike in the chair. We have ordered pizza. And the pizza will be here at approximately 8:00 p.m. We will be in session until midnight. So if you want to order something else for yourselves, please do so. Representative Novak."
- Novak: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. I was under the impression we were supposed to have chicken tonight."
- Speaker McPike: "Well, you're wrong."
- Novak: "Well, I don't want Representative Saltsman upset by not having chicken tonight. We don't want to upset Representative Saltsman. He's been looking forward for (sic) chicken."
- Speaker McPike: "Mr. Clerk, has Supplemental #4 been distributed?

 House Bill 3504, Representative Shirley Jones. Shirley

 Jones. It's the First Conference Committee Report.

 Representative Jones."
- Jones: "Can you hold on one second? Mr. Speaker, I move the adoption of the Conference Committee Report #1. And this authorized the Medical Center commissions to acquire

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

construction or permanent construction of commercial development that are considered and necessary for the support of the facilities within the medical center district. This permits the Commission to participate in the development of a new retail shopping center on the southwest corner of the intersection of Roosevelt Road and Ashland Avenue. I would like for a favorable vote."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Black."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I just rise and support the Lady's Bill. I understood every word she said. We're in absolute agreement with this Bill. This is a good Conference Committee Report. We intend to support the Sponsor."

Jones: "Thank you."

Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall the House adopt the First Conference Committee Report to House Bill 3504?' All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this Motion, there are 113 'ayes' and no 'nays'. And the House does adopt the First Conference Committee Report to House Bill 3504. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Keane...Representative Obrzut, Senate Bill 1768."

Obrzut: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I move that we accept the First Conference Committee Report to Senate Bill 1768. The Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1768 contains the following provisions dealing with three different subject matters: household batteries, tires and solid waste. On batteries, it creates an 18 member battery task force. In regards to tires, it defines tires subject to the new 1 dollar tax to that of automotive

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

tires. It exempts re-processed tires and it also requires suppliers of tires, not retailers, to pay the new 1 dollar tax to the Department of Revenue. It also, in regards to the quantity-based garbage fees, it requires municipalities of 5 thousand or more population in a county of 1 hundred consider implementing thousand population, to quantity-based user fees for residential customers that promote waste reduction recycling. It also requires the Department of Energy and Natural Resources to provide each municipality with a population of over 1 thousand dollars (sic) in a county of 1 hundred thousand with it's report on quantity-based garbage fee structures. I would appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker McPike: "On the Gentleman's motion, the question is,
 'Shall the House adopt the First Conference Committee
 Report to Senate Bill 1768?' All in favor vote 'aye',
 opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who
 wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this Motion,
 there are 102 'ayes', 10 'nos'. And the House does adopt
 the First Conference Committee Report ot Senate Bill 1768.
 And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority,
 is hereby declared passed. Representative McGuire, Senate
Bill 1904."

McGuire: "Yes, sir. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I've got a Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1904. I'd like to move to concur. I'd like to adopt the Conference Committee Report, Mr. Speaker, to Senate Bill 1904. It's a Transportation easement Bill."

Speaker McPike: "All right. On the Gentleman's motion,
Representative Kubik."

Kubik: "Question of the Sponsor?"

Speaker McPike: "Yes."

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

Kubik: "Could we have just maybe a brief explanation of what it does?"

McGuire: "Sure. Sure. The report has the following: authorizes the Department of Transportation and Conservation to convey and release property to certain entities for the assessed value. It grants leasing powers to the Department of State Police and local law enforcement agencies on property that is exclusively..."

Kubik: "Representative. Representative, is this the Department's
 annual Conveyance Bill?"

McGuire: "Yes."

Speaker McPike: "Question is, 'Shall the House adopt the First Conference Committee Report to Senate Bill 1904?' All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this Motion, there's 112 'ayes', 4 'nos'. Senate Bill 1904, having received a Constitutional Majority...and the House does adopt the First Conference Committee Report to Senate Bill 1904. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Keane, are you ready? Senate Bill 3594, Representative Keane."

Keane: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is the second Conference

Committee Report of a Bill that we discussed yesterday

dealing with training facilities. I'd be happy to answer

any questions and ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker McPike: "Representative McCracken."

McCracken: "Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Bill. I understand this is the second time it's been called. I was surprised at the results yesterday just as was the Sponsor surprised. He thought that he was Sponsoring a Republican big business Bill. And he was very uncomfortable doing it

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

saw him this morning and he was still red with embarrassment at sponsoring that big business Bill. asked me to stand up and explain to my friends on this side of the aisle that, indeed, this is good for big business. That Republican's ought ot be for this Bill because, after as Republicans, like money. Now, let me explain what this is. This is to correct to what I respectfully call an aberration of the Department of Revenue. They are seeking to impose the hotel-motel tax on corporate conference centers where they are used only for the employee's purposes. In the case where they claim not to be subject to the hotel tax, they are lodging only their employees who are there for employment purposes. Those employees pay no fee. I respectfully submit to you that at the time this hotel tax was originally enacted, we intended to never cover this type of situation. Clearly, intended to cover was the typical hotel or motel operation where the operation is open to the public and a fee Now, to the extent that these facilities host charged. other than employees, they pay the tax. That's not at Al that is at issue is whether when put up their own employees for business purposes, should they be taxed? We never intended it to be so. And for that reason the Bill says, 'This is declarative of existing law.' That was always our intent that it not apply under these circumstances. I stand in support of this Bill and ask my colleagues on this side of the aisle to join me."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Lang."

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to support the adoption of the second Conference Committee Report. Like the Sponsor of the Bill, I normally am not on the side of big business either. But it seems to me, as the previous speaker said,

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

what's fair is fair. This Bill is drafted narrowly. So it applies only to certain training facilities. There was never an intent in the law for these training facilities to be hotels. In fact, they aren't hotels. They shouldn't have to pay taxes as if they are hotels because they don't offer any hotel accommodations to the general public. This tax was never intended to apply to business employees. But since the Department of Revenue has tried to tax these facilities as hotels, this legislation is necessary. This clarification in the law will not cause any loss in State revenues because the State has never collected this particular tax from these entities before. So there was no loss in State dollars and I would recommend an 'aye' vote."

Speaker McPike: "Question is, 'Shall the House adopt the second Conference Committee Report to House Bill 3594?' 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 Bill, there are...On this Motion, there are 92 'ayes' and 20 'nos'. And the House does adopt a second Conference Committee Report to House Bill 3594. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 2057, Representative Phelps."

Phelps: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to concur with this Conference Committee Report. This particular change or addition to the underlying Bill has to do with employees who are covered by a collective bargaining agreement that mine examiners shall be covered under that collective bargaining agreement. I believe we have an agreement on the other side of the aisle, and of course, the underlying Bill was for the ICC to track the mission allowance. So we'll give it back to General Assembly so they'll know how

166th Legislative Day

June 30. 1992

that's going on for the future legislation. Appreciate your support."

Speaker McPike: "There being no discussion, the question is, 'Shall the House adopt the First Conference Committee Report to Senate Bill 2057?' All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this Motion, there are 113 'ayes' and 1 'no'. And the House does adopt the First Conference Committee Report to Senate Bill 2057. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Schakowsky, Senate Bill 2075."

Schakowsky: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move to adopt Conference Committee Report #1.

All it does is correct some technical errors that were made in the drafting of the Bill. This is legislation on school visitation that passed both Houses, and I urge your adoption of this Conference Committee Report."

Speaker McPike: "On the Lady's Motion, Representative Wojcik."

Wojcik: "Yes, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I would like to compliment the Sponsor for her fine compromising that she had met with the rest of the people. And I thank you very much for offering to agree to our suggestions. So I also concur."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Lang."

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to ask the Sponsor a question, her legislative intent."

Speaker McPike: "Yes. Proceed."

Lang: "Representative, I understand that it is not the intent of
Senate Bill 2075 to grant additional time off to employees
who are already receiving personal time which could be used

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

for school visitation. Rather, Senate Bill 2075 is intended to facilitate an employee's ability to attend parent-teacher conferences and other school activities when there is not benefit time already available for such purposes. Is that correct?"

Schakowsky: "That is correct. And with that intent, all known opponents are now supporters of this legislation."

Lang: "Thank you."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Klemm."

Klemm: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the Sponsor will vield?"

Speaker McPike: "Yes."

Klemm: "I notice that the Senate Bill...Senate Bill amended on page 3, line 25 by changing the 5 to 20. And I don't have that in front of me. Do you know what that pertains to?"

Schakowsky: "My understanding is that it's just a technical change in the numbering."

Klemm: "It's a technical change of changing what?"

Schakowsky: "I believe it was in just the numbering."

Klemm: "Are we changing hours, days, money? You don't know what it means at all? All right. Well, thank you."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Black. Mr. Klemm, were you finished?"

Black: "Yeah. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. We need clarification on the by changing 5 to 20. If the chair will bear with us for a second, we'll look up and see what that change is. Yeah, we'd appreciate the indulgence of the chair. It's changing Section 5 to Section 20. So, I don't think anybody has to worry about 5 days off to 20 days off. That's not what the change is all about. It simply changes a section number."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Hultgren."

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

Hultgren: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker McPike: "Yes."

Hultgren: "Representative Schakowsky, I was listening to the dialogue between you and Representative Lang. And I understood your response to his question that this is not intended to create additional time off where there is already a personnel policy or an employment contract in effect where there would be personal leave that that employee could take. So that if they have personal leave, it is your intent that they should use that leave first before they would get any additional leave as a result of this legislation. Is that what I understood you to say?"

Schakowsky: "That is correct."

Hultgren: "Now, that being your intent, can you direct my attention to someplace in Senate Amendment...or in Amendment #1 or Amendment #2 as to where that intent is contained in the language of the Bill? I have both of them in front of me. If you could give me an Amendment number and a line number as to where that language which evidences that intent is contained in the Bill."

Schakowsky: "It gives the employer authority to work out the time...I'm sorry, Representative. I don't have the Bill in front of me. I know I should. But I know that the language gave the employer the opportunity to work out that leave time with the employee. And also, in the Amendment...the last Amendment we added we said, 'It may not be unduly disruptive to the employer.' Which could also mean that they could request that they use their personal time."

Hultgren: "I see you have someone behind you. It looks to me
like they might have a copy of those Amendments. I wonder
if they can assist you and also assist in responding to my

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

question as to which lines of the Amendment, either Amendment #1 or #2, contain the relevant provisions."

Speaker McPIke: "Representative..."

- Schakowsky: "Look, Representative, this responded to all of the concerns of all of the opponents of this legislation.

 Central Management Services service the...and read all the people who had any remaining concerns about this legislation were satisfied by the language I agreed to as our legislative intent. There are no opponents that I know of to this Bill, now."
- Hultgren: "But there is no language in the Bill that backs up your statement of intent as you responded to Representative Lang earlier in the debate? Is that correct?"
- Schakowsky: "I believe that this clarifies existing language in the Bill that gives employers rights. That talks about not being unduly disruptive. This satisfies the opponents of the legislation."
- Hultgren: "Thank you, Representative. If I may for a moment to the Bill, I listened to the...to the statement of intent as it was given by the Sponsor in the debate earlier. But in reviewing both Amendment #1 and Amendment #2, I regret that I can't find any language in the Bill which would evidence that intent. And I'm wondering maybe if a Second Conference Committee Report might be helpful to expressly provide in the legislation what I think the Sponsor intends. And certainly it was her response in the debate earlier."
- Speaker McPike: "Look who's back in the House. Look who came back to visit. Welcome back, Tony. Welcome back. Tony lives in Chatham. Representative Schakowsky."
- Schakowsky: "Yes. I just wanted to, once again, urge adoption of the Conference Committee Report. There is nothing new in

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

here except for a clear expression of legislative intent. This Bill has passed both Houses. There are no opponents that I know of. Everybody is in agreement and I would urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker McPike: "Question is, 'Shall the House adopt the First Conference Committee Report to Senate Bill 2075?' All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this motion, there are 99 'ayes' and 16 'nos'. And the House does adopt the First Conference Committee Report to Senate Bill 2075. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Kirkland, (House Bill) 2694. House Bill 2694."

Kirkland: "Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I would ask that the Motions for concurrence be separated. Senate Amendments #1 and #2."

Speaker McPike: "Yes. Amendment #1."

Move for concurrence on Senate Amendment Kirkland: "Thank you. #1 to House Bill 2694. Senate Amendment #1 is commonly known as the Child Accident Prevention Law. It involves responsible handling of loaded firearms by people. Involves a Class A misdemeanor or possible civil liability for any person who stores or leaves within a premises under his control a loaded firearm, and I emphasize a loaded firearm. This does not apply to anybody who keeps their firearm If the person knows or has reason to believe unloaded. that a minor 13 or under is likely to gain access to that firearm without his parents or guardian's permission and, further, if that firearm...if access is gained to firearm by the minor and a death or great bodily harm results, that's the only situation in which this law would

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

go into effect. Furthermore, it would not go into effect if a person stores their firearm with a triggerlock mechanism or keeps it in a securely locked box Further, if a person is uncomfortable with either of those two storage processes, they can also place in some other place the firearm...in some other location that a reasonable person would believe to be secure from a minor 13 years or under. The Bill also exempts from its application a situation where that minor gains access to the loaded firearm and uses it for self defense or defense of another, lawful self defense or defense of another; a situation where there is an unlawful entry by the minor or another and through that process the minor gains access. This Bill, when amended in the Senate with Senate Amendment #1. passed the Senate 57 to nuthin...nothing. predecessor, Senate Bill 1600, which we, frankly, didn't have the votes to get out of committee in the House, passed the Senate 55 to nothing. I move for concurrence on Senate Amendment #1. Be glad to take any questions."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Doederlein, on the question...on the Motion."

Doederlein: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. For gun control advocates, success are (sic) easy to claim.

Any legislation that in any way restricts or regulates the use of any gun is a victory. Even that legislation that really doesn't accomplish its purported purpose.

Triggerlocks merely block the access of a trigger. It does not block a hammer. It does not block the firing pin, and it does not block the loading mechanism, and with a...with a trigger lock on, it doesn't fire correctly and it can misfire, and it can go anywhere it wants to go. I think that...I would like to draw your attention to the bulletin

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

that Handgun Control put out, 'Will the Real NRA Please Stand Up'. They have listed 5 states: Florida, California, Wisconsin, Iowa and Maryland, and said that the NRA helped the trigger lock Bill go in those states, but what they didn't tell you was that...Florida has a pre-emption Bill. That California has a pre-emption Bill. That Iowa has a pre-emption Bill. That Maryland has a pre-emption Bill. We offered this to the Representative Kirkland and he would I think that we need to have have no part of that. pre-emption in the State of Illinois. Pre-emption means that the state makes a law and that the local communities cannot make a law stronger than the state. We need that protection, but I would like to...talking about education and safety of firearms, I would like to see the NRA program They have a pre-school all the schools. into the children not to touch a curriculum that teaches firearm. My children were raised with guns in the house. My grandchildren are raised with guns in the house. 14. they wouldn't touch a gun unless they had permission. You have to raise children with respect for other people's property. How many of you people have put everything away from a 2 year old's touch? Does that help your child learn what is theirs? I would like to see the NRA program going into all the schools. Of course, the NRA does have a lot of educational programs. They believe in safety first. if you saw the handgun control program 'At Home with Guns', sponsored by the NRA, NRA does believe in the safe direction of firearms and the safe storage of firearms. I would like to say that safety first is one of all do. the things that all qun owners use. And we need to have no more qun laws until pre-emption is one of the bargaining chips. Thank you."

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

Speaker McPike: "Representative Santiago."

Santiago: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of this Bill. The Chicago Tribune today came out with an editorial that states in big bold letters, 'The Main Objective of this Bill is to Save Children from Gun Tragedies.' This is a child safety Bill, and I would like to repeat that. is a child safety Bill. This is not an anti-gun Bill. is estimated that about a thousand children die and another 25 thousand are injured because of gun accidents. And this Bill does not take away guns from anyone. What it does, it prevents anyone from owning a gun to keep it in a safe We're not taking guns away from anyone. So the place. right thing to do here today is to think of children first, and save the children in our State. So I ask everyone that is concerned with child safety, and this includes all the gun lovers and non-gun lovers. We're not talking about quns. We're talking about children. Save our children by voting 'yes' on this Bill. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Hicks."

Hicks: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. You know, I don't know how often I've heard this now for the 10 years I've been here. It seems like every night the closing sessions we have some kind of Bill like this. We have an attempt to a..."

Speaker McPike: "Let's give the Gentleman some attention, please."

Hicks: "...an attempt by the same members of the House over and over again to trv to make points, I guess you would call it, or...I don't know quite what they're doing, but I guess they have to play that show for some of the crowd back home, but let's just talk a little bit about accidents and preventing accidents. All of you got today a little yellow

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

sheet of paper. It says...it talks about accidental deaths in children from 0 to 14. A very leading one on the list is motor vehicle accidents as we'd all probably assume was. Thirty one hundred children aged 0 to 14 years of age die every year because of motor vehicle deaths. The number 2 on the list in accidental at poisonings. deaths, eleven hundred. Drownings is 1,250. Fires and Pedalcycles, bicycles, tricycles - 400. burns - 860. Suffocation. That's from plastic bags being put over their heads by themselves or being a toy they're playing with or a package that they took off, 270. From falls, falling out of a high chair or falling off a couch, 150 kids. The same number as killed with firearms in the state...in the whole country last year, 150 by firearms. Now, who are you kidding? You want to ban something. You want to save kids ban 'em being around...being around motor lives. vehicles. Ban them from riding in your car. Why don't you do that? It makes a whole lot more sense. Why don't we get off of this and quit doing this. It just doesn't make any sense. Thank you."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Monroe Flinn."

Flinn: "Mr. Speaker, I move to the previous question."

Speaker McPike: "The Gentleman moves to the previous question.

The question is, shall the previous question be put? All

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

previous question is put. Representative Kirkland to

close."

Kirkland: "Thank you. Mr. Speaker. Well, Representative Santiago pointed out today's editorial in the Chicago Tribune and it made some very good points about the estimated thousand children who die and 25 thousand more injured each year from accidents with handguns. I might respond to

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

Representative Hicks by obviously saying this is not a ban Bill by any means. It's a child safety Bill. It follows the precepts of what the National Rifle Association, in fact, would recommend in its 'Safety First' articles where it says, 'Always keep the gun unloaded until ready to use'. This Bill is to try to force that situation. Store guns so that they are not accessible to unauthorized persons. This Bill is trying to support that situation. I'd like to tell you about a situation that brought this Bill home more personally to me involving four classmates of my daughter when she was in third grade. She's behind me here. She's now going into high school. But four of her classmates in third grade went to a...one of the children's homes, a block from our house. They got a hold of two loaded firearms from under the bed, and one of the children shot another of the children to death, obviously accidental. Obviously, the children didn't know what they were doing. This Bill tries to go exactly to that situation. It's has pointed out the NRA has supported this concept in other states. Indeed, it has, and let me just finish by telling you who supports this Bill in this State: the Mayor of Chicago, the Republican State's Attorney of Cook County, Jack O'Malley, the College of Emergency Room Physicians, Mothers Against Gangs, Parents Against Gangs, Justice which is a coalition of over 200 Youth Campaign, organizations, the League of Women Voters, Voices for Children, PTA of Illinois, Illinois Council Against Handgun Violence, Handgun Control, Illinois Chiefs of Police. Many of you know that Chiefs of Police and other law enforcement officials are coming around more and more on this issue because of the violence they see. The accidents they see. The awful things they

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

see come about because people don't take adequate safety (sic) with their handguns, with their firearms, and this tries to correct that situation, and I move for concurrence on Senate Amendment #1."

- Speaker McPike: "Question is, 'Shall the Senate...Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1?' All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Speaker Madigan."
- Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. I rise to explain my 'yes' vote. All of us have different views concerning the question of gun control and use of guns and handguns. But, clearly, this is an issue where everybody can come together and support something which is really a safety measure for children. Something that we ought to do, and I would encourage more and more people to vote green because we've got a long way to go. So, thank you very much."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Brunsvold."

Brunsvold: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A lot of questions aren't answered on this Bill. To put a triggerlock on a gun and keep it in your drawer by your bed. Where are you going to put the key? Is a ten year old kid not going to be able to find that key? Well, sure he can. If you hide the key someplace, intruder comes in. You can't find the key. Wait till I find my key. This is a ridiculous Bill. It's another situation where you're trying to use legal means to remove the guns from honest citizens, responsible citizens. This Bill will not address the irresponsible gun owner. It'll never do that. Let's vote 'no' on this Amendment."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Preston."

Preston: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in support of this measure. The arguments that were given in opposition to it, frankly, don't make sense. One of the previous speakers talked about taking

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

away automobiles because they're dangerous. Taking away plastic bags on cleaning because they're dangerous. we in Illinois require that you pass a test on the safe operation of a motor vehicle before you can get a license Many years ago there was a problem with to drive one. babies, with infants, suffocating on plastic bags. plastic bag industry put warning labels on their plastic bags. They did something to make their product use That's all we're asking for the mighty gun industry to do is to make their product use a little bit safer when it children. Another previous comes to Representative Doederlein, talked about teaching children the safe...the safety connected with firearms. Well, all of us don't have firearms around our house. It's a little odd to think that we should go and teach a child who is learning to read and write and play with blocks to be safe around firearms when we haven't yet taught them what a firearm is. That simply doesn't make sense. We're not all qun nuts. And I think that the proper vote...this isn't anti-gun. This is for children and for the safety involved with keeping an inherently dangerous item in your house. If you're going to have one, you have every right to have one, but just make sure that children are safe when they're around them, and this is saying keep basic safety meas..."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Johnson."

Johnson: "There are a couple of preliminary reasons to be against this. First is, notwithstanding the characterizations the other way, this is really a back door form of gun control. The NRA obviously opposes it. Triggerlocks don't work. They give you a false sense of security, and that's an inherent reason to be against it. Representative Preston's right, we do have limitations on cars. The point is, you

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

have to be of a certain age to own a handgun. We might as well put locks on the ignition to cars and various other unsafe items to coincide with this. But essentially, the reason, all those preliminary reasons to the contrary, that we ought to be against this Bill. You have somebody who has a 8 year old who's accidentally injured or killed by a 6 year old and two days later, you drag the mother and father grieving into court and say, 'Not only have you lost your child in an accident, trigger mechanism wouldn't work anyway, but we're going put you in prison because you didn't comply with this law.' And that's..."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Trotter."

Trotter: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House.

I, too, rise in support of this sensible, responsible piece of legislation. The arguments that have been given against it are totally wrong. I own a gun. I live in a community where you need a gun a lot of times, but what they're saying here is when you're home, you can have the gun lock They don't expect you to sleep with the key. Don't expect you to sleep with the bullets not in your gun, cause no tellin's (sic) whose going to come in, but when you leave that house, that gun needs to be put up and locked. Just take, for instance, if the kids are outside playing with water guns, your kid doesn't have a gun. knows that you keep your gun up under the mattress of your bed. He goes into the room, grabs that gun, runs out in a playful way, pulls the trigger, someone's dead. was on there, that wouldn't have happened. It is a fold deal here. If that gun is stolen with that lock is on you ask, most people keep their guns at home. Don't carry them with them. - when you...and that gun is stolen, when they try to take that lock off, it destroys the firing

166th Legislative Day

- June 30, 1992
- mechanism. Now you've destroyed the gun that no one can use. Why steal it?"
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Stern."
- Stern: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I don't want to be repetitive, but someone listed the ways in which children are killed, and the vast number of children that are killed in other ways. This Bill does not purport to make all children safe. It purports to save those children who would have died from gun accidents. It's as simple as that, and they happen far too often. Let's pass this good, sensible, safe legislation for children."
- Speaker McPike: "Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this Motion, there are 49 'ayes and 60 'nos', and the House does not concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 2694.

 Representative Kirkland."
- Kirkland: "Mr. Speaker, move to nonconcur, then, on Senate Amendment #1."
- Speaker McPike: "Gentleman moves to nonconcur on Senate Amendment
 #1. How about #2?"
- Kirkland: "Well, I think if we nonconcur on 1, I can be reasonably sure it will go to conference committee."
- Speaker McPike: "All right. The Gentleman moves to nonconcur in Senate Amendment #1. All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'.

 The 'ayes' have it. The House noncurs in Senate Amendment #1. Representative Ryder."
- Ryder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise for the purposes of a Motion."
- Speaker McPike: "Thank you. At this time I would move to suspend rule 79(e) for House Bills 3663 and House Bill 4037 for the purpose of extending the deadline on both of those Bills."
- Speaker McPike: "Repeat those numbers, please, for the Clerk."

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

Ryder: "I would ask (House Bill) 3663, (House Bill) 4037."

- Speaker McPike: "Thank you. All right. The Gentleman moves to extend the deadline on those two Bills till January 13th of '93. Representative Homer, do you rise on this? No. There being no objections the Attendance Roll Call...the Attendance Roll Call will be used, and the Motion carries.

 Mr. Homer."
- Homer: "Mr. Speaker, staff has pointed out to me that on House...on House Bill 2694 that, in order to send this Bill back to the Senate, we must take some action with respect to Senate Amendment #2. I think we've left an unfinished item."
- think you're correct. Representative Speaker McPike: "I Kirkland. Mr. Black, did you wish to move Mr. to nonconcur in Senate AMendment #2 for Mr. Kirkland so as he can get this into conference? Mr. Kirkland, you technically have to move to nonconcur in Amendment #2. And the Gentleman so moves to nonconcur in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 2694. All in favor say 'aye, opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The House nonconcurs in Senate Amendment #2. Representative Currie...Representative the floor. Representative Currie, the Currie, come to Speaker is looking for you. Representative Currie, the Chair is not sure why the Speaker was looking for you...but perhaps we should ask the Speaker. Representative Currie, what did you say?"
- Currie: "I said I would like to call, Mr. Speaker, a concurrence on House Bill 2758."
- Speaker McPike: "House Bill 2758, Representative Currie."
- Currie: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. This is the Medicaid assessment Bill. As you remember, last year we established a Medicaid Assessment Program that enabled

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

us to match every local provider dollar with \$1.00 from the Federal Government. Everybody was for that program but over the summer months the feds said that we couldn't do that program anymore if we held harmless every institution who participated in the tax. That left us, this year, with a \$735 million hole in the state's budget. The Governor has proposed a new program of assessing hospitals, long term care facilities and developmental disability institutions in order to plug that \$735 million hole. Most of you are familiar..."

You know since we're on one of the biggest Bills of year, it seems like we could give the Lady some attention." Currie: "I think many of you are familiar with the overall perimeters of the program. Let me just remind you that the hospital proposal would impose a tax of 2.5% of net patient revenues; this is down from the Governor's original proposal. The long term care program would restore spousal impoverishment to the full federal benefit. The Governor originally proposed this year to reduce to the federal minimums the Spousal Impoverishment Program in Illinois. That program, the nursing home care program, will enable us to avoid a 30% rate cut in long term care facilities and that program is supported by the Illinois Health Care Association, by the Illinois Council on Long Term Care, by the Catholic Conference of Illinois, by the Lutheran Social Services, and others involved in the provision of long term The developmental disabilities portion of the

program is supported by the Illinois Association of Rehab. Facilities. And as to hospitals, as you know, if there is no hold harmless, some hospitals win and some win a little less than others. But there's no question that, without

Speaker McPike: "Excuse me, Representative Currie. Excuse me.

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

this program, we would be looking at substantial rate cuts for medical providers across the State of Illinois. There is no question that we cannot leave here with a \$735 million hole in the budget. The department and the Governor's Office have worked to mitigate the uncomfortable effects of the program on those hospitals who do not win as much, but remember, the point is that poor people are our responsibility to serve in our long term care and hospital institutions. We have the responsibility to provide care for them. Because poor people tend to live in only some parts of town, not every health care institution serves the same proportion of low income people. In effect, what this proposal does is to say to the providers of care to relatively less proportions of the poor, it says, 'Give us a helping hand in meeting this need'. I'd be happy to answer your questions but I hope you will support this measure which will enable us to craft a state budget for the fiscal year that begins in just a few short hours."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Parke."

Parke: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Will the Sponsor of this...these concurrence answer a few questions for me, please?"

Speaker McPike: "Yes."

Parke: "Representative Currie, it's my understanding that currently the assessment on the people in the private pay portion will have to pay \$6.30 in assessments, is that true?"

Currie: "The facilities will be charged \$6.30 per patient per day for all clients who are private pay..."

Parke: "So, therefore..."

Currie: "...for all patients in the facility."

Parke: "So, that charge is in nursing?"

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

Currie: "That will be a facility cost. If the rate cut of 30% goes through, I'll tell you that the private pay patients will be stuck for a lot more than \$6.30 per patient day. You could be talking \$12.00 per patient per day. You could be talking a cost shift of up to \$20.00 for those private pay patients."

Parke: "And that is because 60% of the people in nursing homes in Illinois are Medicaid patients, is that right?"

Currie: "That's right."

Parke: "So, therefore, the 40% that are remaining will have to be increased because they are the private payers and therefore their costs will go up to them."

Currie: "Well, of course the facilities have the option, if they are profit making centers, to pay the increased costs out of their own profits. In addition, we do intend in this program a follow up Bill will provide for a circuit breaker approach to the problems of the less affluent private pay patients so that we can help reimburse them for any costs that are passed on to them by the facilities themselves."

Parke: "Is it in my understanding that, that could be...that the charge to these people could be up to \$50 million and the circuit breaker is only \$5 million at the highest point?"

Currie: "The circuit breaker does not...it's a retroactive program just as the circuit breaker we provide for real estate taxes has been. That means we will not actually fund that program until fiscal year 1994. The amount of money this legislature chooses to put into that program is a decision that will be made by the next budget making General Assembly."

Parke: "So let me get this straight now. So if these private payers, \$6.30 is the best case scenario. It could go up to \$12, \$18 per person."

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

Currie: "No. Sorry, I think you misunderstood me. What I said is that under this proposal the maximum cost shift for private pay patients in nursing homes would be \$6.30 per day assuming the facility decided to shift the cost in that fashion."

Parke: "It could be a lot higher than that."

Currie: "If we do not pass this assessment program and we're looking at a rate cut of 30%, the cost shift to the private pay patients will be a lot higher than \$6.30 per day. It could be \$12. It could be \$18. It could be as high as \$20. So, it isn't a question whether the private pay patients are going to pay more if facilities decide to cost shift. The question is whether they're going to be paying \$6.30 a day or \$12 or \$15. They'll pay less under this Bill than they would be paying without it."

Parke: "But, regardless, we know that the private payers will pay more, regardless. And that's my point."

Currie: "Only if the facilities decide to do cost shifting."

Parke: "Well, if they don't cost shift..."

Currie: "We know the hospitals traditionally have."

Parke: "Well, what's their option, either to go into their profits or to force them into bankruptcy, is that correct?"

Currie: "Some of them do have...are profit making centers and they could certainly decide that they would like to use some of those profits on this program."

Parke: "I've been told that any number of nursing home facilities in this state...if this is not passed we'll probably go into bankruptcy. Do vou have any concept of what will happen to these nursing homes and the people that are in there expecting to be taken care of?"

Currie: "Well, I think we'd be in very deep trouble if a large number of long term care facilities in this state did shut

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

down. But I think that's an accurate assessment. If we do not pass this measure tonight, the chances are good that many hospitals and many long term care facilities in this state will not be able to survive. And what happens then? Your guess is as good as mine."

Parke: "It's also my understanding that if this 735 million were to be passed on and we get the matching money from the Federal Government, that we're planning on borrowing money to pay the hospitals that went into the assessment program and the nursing home assessments so that they do have that extra money loosened up. Is that correct?"

Currie: "And that's a very important point, Representative. If
this program passes today, the Department of Public Aid
will be able to borrow against the monies anticipated
through the assessment program as early as August. And the
Department of Public Aid will be able to pay its Bills.
Without this assessment program, there is no flexibility.
There is no opportunity for the Department even to begin to
become current on these issues."

Parke: "Would it be a fair assessment, Representative, that if we were to look in a crystal ball and look beyond this say into the fall Veto Session and we have not passed this and we have this glaring hole in the budget and we have hospitals and nursing homes on the verge of bankruptcy, don't you think that there might be some people that say that there ought to be some other source of funding, some other revenue stream to take care of these critical needs of the state and that we, in fact, will have to come back to this concept and some way find the money for these institutions?"

Currie: "I would think that if we are responsible legislators indeed we would. The prospect of low income people without

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

a long term care facility. The prospect of hospitals, yet more hospitals closing their doors in inner city and in rural areas is not one that I think any of us can sleep comfortably with at night."

"Thank you, Representative, to the Bill. I will tell you Parke: that this is a most unpleasant approach to solving problems in the state, and if the Federal Government continues to pass on to the states the spending and costs of government and mandates that we don't have money for. And we find ourselves in a situation now where we have to turn to people who, themselves, are least able to afford it and turn to the hospitals and nursing homes in our area to tell them they have a responsibility to pay for the problems that this state has and that the problems are created by the Federal Government. I'm sick and tired of the Federal think that Government doing that to us, and I approach, as unpleasant as it is, obviously this is the only game in town, and I reluctantly rise to support it."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Tenhouse."

Tenhouse: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the maker of the Motion yield for a question?"

Speaker McPike: "Yes. Yes."

Tenhouse: "Representative Currie, I have a couple of questions if you can hear me. Representative, can you hear me over there? A couple of questions. First of all, I noticed the list of the sole community hospitals that are not required to pay a Medicaid tax, and I'm just curious. I happen to have one hospital in a small town in my area that's called Sarah Culbertson Memorial Hospital in Rushville. Why isn't that on the list?"

Currie: "Because of the proportion of Medicaid and Medicare clients that it serves."

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

Tenhouse: "Even though..."

Currie: "We had to do a very stiff definition because the feds clearly permit an exemption for sole community providers in the legislation that trashed our last years approach. But the definition from the feds was a very stiff one and only those hospitals that meet it, 55% Medicaid that's what we're doing in this Bill."

Tenhouse: "Well, that's curious because they're the only hospital for three counties there, and I was just curious because obviously the definition must be a little different I quess because from a regional stand point we usually think about But that's...and I that hospital covering that area. appreciate your answer. The other question I had, Representative Currie, is regarding the Medicaid providers. I happen to live on the edge of the State of Illinois right along the Missouri line and I guess for those of us who have Medicaid providers in Missouri, Iowa, Wisconsin, Indiana, Kentucky, wherever it may be, that are Illinois Medicaid...that are providing Illinois Medicaid coverage be it a hospital or be it a nursing home. Do they pay the tax or the assessment?"

Currie: "It is under the federal law illegal for us directly to tax them. But it's my understanding that several hospitals have already agreed to voluntarily participate in a taxing program."

Tenhouse: "I would also...I'm also curious, as far as the reimbursement rates. Let's say for instance you go to a nursing home and you happen to be an Illinois citizen but you...but let's say you go to receive let's say hospital treatment across the river in Missouri. Would the rates be the same as they would under the Illinois side?"

Currie: "Yes."

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

Tenhouse: "Well, thank you very much. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, to the Bill. I guess this points out another concern that I have as far as this is concerned. Here we have our Illinois hospitals who sit on our side of the river that are paying a 2.5% tax. Yet, if we go across the river and receive medical treatment in Hannibal or St. Louis they're not subject to that same tax, and to me that seems like an unfair burden to place on Illinois hospitals and is one of the reasons that I am not supporting this Amendment. Thank you."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Ropp."

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

Speaker McPike: "Yes."

Ropp: "Representative, I doubt it if in 14 years I've personally had any more letters on a single issue than we have on this particular one, and it seems that the question is always being asked, 'Why is it that after we have worked a life time, we've paid our taxes for a life time and now we have saved to the degree that now we have to live in a nursing home. Why are we the ones that are being asked to pick up the tab on this particular issue? What is your response to that?"

Currie: "First, Representative, remember that some people have proposed that we raise the income tax, a general tax, to provide for this care. That notion was rejected by many. That left us with a limited number of options. The Governor proposed that we retain the provider assessment program which we initiated last year but that we change it so that it becomes something that the feds will continue to provide support for, that the feds will continue to match. As I said earlier in my answer to Representative Parke, the facilities don't have to pass this charge on. Secondly, we

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

are going to provide a grant program like the current Senior Citizens Circuit Breaker, so that the low income elderly, nursing home patients, will have help being reimbursed for the additional dollars that they pay. And thirdly, of course, remember that every dollar that is paid by a long term care or a hospital facility in this state through this program is matched by one federal dollar in return."

- Ropp: "Well, isn't the circuit breaker...How do you propose to pay that circuit breaker program?"
- Currie: "We intend for it to operate on sliding scale income guidelines and we intend it to be subject to the appropriations that the Assembly next year this same time, same place, decides are appropriate in terms of a funding level. So that the lower income nursing home residents would be likely to get back the full amount that they had been assessed for this program. More affluent individuals would get less of the money returned to them."
- Ropp: "All right. So, if in fact, next year, our economic situation has not improved, we would presumably not have any money to go into that circuit breaker program as, currently, we have no money to fund this program."
- Currie: "The Governor has made a commitment to at least some funding and I would think that you might want to make a commitment to funding as well, so might every .Member of this chamber and the Senate across the rotunda."
- Ropp: "All right, to the Bill, Mr. Speaker and Members of the Legislature. It seems like this is one of the worst public policies we have come forth with in a number of years, and I guess the question always is when you have so many people in your district that say, this is not what we want to do, to turn a deaf ear on them would seem irresponsible. The

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

question always is that if you are to represent your people, why don't you do it. The question is that we have in the Legislature, why don't we have the courage then to provide the funds for these kinds of programs? To make it totally nonsense to have people work their whole life time and, in fact, earn sufficient dollars to take care of their own selves and then they be the ones that we tax. I would almost assure you that, if this Bill passes very soon, you will see more and more people who will be transferring their assets to their own families so that they won't pay this extra \$2500 a year. I think it might be premature to deal with this particular subject now and I think that we could in fact defer this at some later point in time where we can deal with it more responsibly, so that we don't have to vote for a bad public policy because if we don't vote for this bad one it will be even worse."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Trotter."

Trotter: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Would the Sponsor vield?"

Speaker McPike: "Yes."

Trotter: "Okay, just a question, a couple questions of the Sponsor. Representative..."

Speaker McPike: "Well, maybe we could have a few people sit down so we can see the Sponsor here."

Trotter: "Representative, Representative Currie? Thank you.

Just a couple of questions. Looking at the intent of this legislation, if you could explain to me, new Section 5(a)3 of the Code exempts counties over 3 million from the hospital assessment because they're covered by other provisions relating to intergovernmental transfers. And then in new Section 5(a)5, it provides that upon opening a new hospital the provider assessment shall be imposed

166th Legislative Day

- June 30, 1992
- within 90 days. In the case of a new hospital opening in a county over 3 million, which provision is controlling, the exemption or the assessment?"
- Currie: "The exemption provisions would control because the new hospital would also be covered by the intergovernmental transfer provisions."
- Trotter: "Okay. And specifically, as you know, I'm talking about Provident Hospital which we're now looking at to open.

 Other questions. What percentage of hospitals will be actually take a hit from this legislation? Do you have that information?"
- Currie: "It's my understanding that 80% will do better with this program than without it."
- Trotter: "Do better. So 20% without. Okay and also I've heard you also say that there's no taxes or no new revenue coming in. Is there anything else on the table that's going to give this state \$735 million that you know at this point?"
- Currie: "Representative Trotter, if you know about it, let me know because I sure do not."
- Trotter: "Okay. Okay. Thank you very much. To the Bill. I guess at this juncture it's appropriate for me to say that it will be perceived that I have a conflict of interest in voting for this Bill and that I am an employee of Cook County Hospital. However, though my focus is truly on Cook County Hospital. Let it be perfectly clear, there will be other hospitals that will be impacted if this Bill were not passed. Running a hospital is surely a business and it's big business and for some hospitals bigger than others, and because of that we have some hospitals downstate in the inner-city of Chicago closing. But what we need to be addressing here in this Legislature is the quality of health care and access to health care. There is no

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

universal health care plan on the table right now. We do not want to take that big step. There's no taxes that's going to pay us \$735 million on the table right now. So we're going to have to take another bigger step. This isn't a perfect Bill. Most of the Bills we vote on down here are far from it but this is the best thing we have. And I would ask for an 'aye' vote for it at the time."

Speaker McPike: "Speaker Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen. I rise on behalf of the adoption of this Motion to concur in the Senate Amendment. I think everybody in the Body understands what the Amendment. This would provide for is contained in implementation of the Governor's plan for the full funding of the Medicaid Program. There are a lot of things in this plan where people would prefer that it would be something else. So if you were to convene a group of health care providers and let's say there were 10 in the group, there'd be 10 different ideas on how this Bill could be changed. Some people would suggest we ought not to do this plan. What we ought to do is raise the state income tax to pay for this program. We all know that raising the state income tax now is not feasible. We all know that there has been a good faith effort by the Governor's Office and by the Department of Public Aid to work with all of the health care providers in this field to fashion this plan. Anybody could rise on this floor tonight and find something wrong with this plan and say that it ought to be changed here, it ought to be changed there, it ought to be changed somewhere The plain straight out fact is that this represents a \$700 million item in the budget for the next fiscal year. If we don't pass this plan, there must be an alternative, and everybody has worked through the alternatives already

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

and found that with its deficiencies this is the best plan that is available right now. I would strongly suggest to everyone that regardless of your misgivings about the plan, regardless of your misgivings about the nature of how this program will be implemented, an 'aye' vote is strongly recommended on this Motion, so that we can provide full funding for the Medicaid Program in the State of Illinois. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Flinn."

Flinn: "Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question."

Speaker McPike: "The Gentleman moves the previous question. The question is, 'Shall the previous question be put?' All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the previous question is put. Representative Currie to close."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just want for the record to Currie: make the point that the out of state hospitals, many of them do intend to make some bonafide provider related donations under 42 USE Section 1896. And, in fact, St. Louis Children's Hospital and 'Cardinal Glennen' Children's Hospital, both of which are in St. Louis and which Southern Illinois children, intend to make voluntary contributions not to exceed the amount that would have been assessed had they been permitted to participate in the program. So there is language in the · Bill which specifically permits the Department to accept And secondly, again for the record, I want that money. just to point out that the revisions to the children's hospital portion of the formula do not change which hospitals are eligible for the adjustment, and definition of children's hospital in Section 5-5 includes only those hospitals which are defined as children's

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

hospitals under current law. That having been said for the I would just rise to say I think the Speaker hit the nail on the head, as he from time to time does manage This is it. It's \$735 million that we need in order to fashion the coming year's budget. We need to find \$735 million to prevent our inner city and rural and nursing home institution from shutting their doors. are responsible for providing care for people in the state's Medicaid Program. The only way to do that concurring with these Senate Amendments to House Bill 2758, if we want to do it in the coming fiscal year, and if we want to do it in a timely fashion. I urge your votes."

Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 2758?' All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Representative Lang."

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm voting 'present' on this Bill because of a conflict of interest. Thank you."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Leitch."

Leitch: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is reminiscent of a few years ago when Bob Michael came back to Peoria and he was very pleased with a deal that he and Ron Rostenkowsky had worked out on the catastrophic care issue. He felt that for a very small amount of money from people who could afford it they could work on the problem of catastrophic care. He was stunned and I think disappointed later in the public reaction to that tax. The fire storm that resulted is well known to each of us. It wound up in a repeal. And Ladies and Gentlemen, this granny tax is a piker, was a piker compared to what we are about to do, the \$2300 a year tax that we are about to impose on the elderly in our

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

communities who want only to live out their years in a nursing home. This is a tax that is unfair. It is not inventive. It is not creative. It is a tax that is not in any way original. It is one where we have not examined all the alternatives. It is unnecessary. We can deal with this over the next several months and after the election come back and make it retroactive. It is totally unnecessary and is a gross hardship on the people: the sick and on the elderly in our society who should not be taxed in this unfair fashion."

Speaker McPike: "Representative McCracken. Mr. McCracken."

McCracken: "Representative Parke wouldn't let me stand up. the first time in my legislative career, I agree with Representative Currie. I thought the day would never come. I thought I would leave this Body never having agreed with another Legislator but this time she is correct. don't do this, what is the alternative? A lot of people say, well we can wait, we have time, we don't have to Well, there's a \$750 million hole in the decide today. budget. The Governor has already said that, if we don't pass this, the rates are going to be reduced by 30% per patient. What is the alternative we all think there? Do you think we're going to pass in the Veto Session when it requires 71 votes a Bill controversial nature? Is it going to be easier in five months to do it with 71 votes than it is with 60? It's not going to happen in November. It really is now or never."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Cowlishaw."

Cowlishaw: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. To explain my 'no' vote. I have often said and I believe that some famous philosopher once said in much more eloquent language, that the mark of any society is how it treats the most

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

vulnerable of its citizens: the very young, the very old, the weak, the sick. This is a tax on sick senior citizens. That's what it is fundamentally, and if we don't put fancy words to it, it is a tax on sick senior citizens. That is not the kind of society that any one of us should be promoting. It is not the kind of society in which any one of us would want to live particularly when we grow old, fragile and sick."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Davis."

Davis: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in support of this legislation because it preserves the state's ability to capture the federal funds. You know it really concerns me when people say we're not going to do certain things knowing...knowing that it's going to create a condition in which the state cannot go to the Federal Government for additional funds. Now, passing legislation today will enable the state to get this \$735 million from the Federal Government and certainly help to keep that cost down of \$6.30 per day, per occupied bed. You know, sometimes when we ask ourselves what our roles are as Legislators and we look at some of the things that we do support. What could be more significant and more important than passing legislation that will help to keep the nursing homes and those hospitals that need these dollars being available to people who need those services?"

Speaker McPike: "Representative Weller."

Weller: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in opposition to this legislation. I think Representative Leitch hit the nail on the head by pointing out that this is a granny tax. Do you realize that \$6.30 a day comes out to almost \$2400 a year that you're going to impose on the senior citizens of this state? Ask Dan Rostenkowski what they'll think about that.

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

This legislation needs to die. It needs to be killed. And, yes, we do need to come up with a better alternative. If we have to do it in November that's the best time to do it. A 'no' vote's the right vote."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Turner."

Turner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Assembly. I rise for those grannies that live in the areas that are served by disproportionate hospitals. I don't know if they consider it a tax or not but I think that the need for health care is certainly there. Well, every year, it's been 12 years now since I've been here in this Assembly and June 30th about this hour, we start to go through those last minute deals, and as I assess this Session and try to think about what do I tell the people back in my area when I go back. Well, certainly I'll tell them that, 'Well, we did nothing for housing this year, so the issue of the homeless will still be with us.' nothing that we're going to do in terms of G.A. or T.A. whatever you want to call it. So, that program will also be eliminated. Economic development, the great buzz word, no new jobs. And here we have before us the one last proposal, one that has...inner city hospitals, that serve the disproportionate...say we're willing to take our bite, and we're sitting here today debating whether we want to give them their basic needs, that need of health care. I urge all of you to vote on this Bill. It was easy the other night to give \$10 billion to an airport. It ought to be just as easy to provide health care to those who really need it. Please. in your heart, vote 'aye' for this Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Wojcik."

Wojcik: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. I reluctantly rise in opposition to

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

this only because I know that there truly are some areas that are of need, but I feel that there is a compromise that should be met. We have had some proposals that we presented and they were not accepted. If you look at the private pay patient, today they're paying \$100 a day. Now, we're talking \$6.30. Shame on them! Shame on them for planning for the future to ensure that they would not be a burden upon the government. I think it's a crime what we're doing to our elderly. The hospitals in my area, right now, four of them will have to be paying over \$7 million. You want to talk about rate increases? going to have that. Surely, we can help those that are in need, but let's look at the overall picture and let's help everybody. Vote 'no'."

Speaker McPike: "Have all voted? Representative Noland."

Noland: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in opposition. This is an extremely heavy handed tax for two long care facilities in my district: the Illinois Masonic Home and the Illinois Eastern Star Nursing Home. They don't even accept Medicaid dollars. If you're a member of the Masonic Lodge or the Shrine or Eastern Star, you turn your entire assets over whether it's \$10,000 or \$10 million and live the rest of your life there. What this would do is then turn around and tax those people who don't even have any assets left. There's no exemption for them at all. So it's a crazy plan. It ought to be voted 'no'. Thank you."

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...I took the record, Representative Wojcik. Mr. Black, for what reason do you rise?"

Black: "I just want you to know that my light is on in a timely

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

- fashion. In case there's a Motion to nonconcur, I object and would ask for a Roll Call vote."
- Speaker McPike: "There won't be a Motion to nonconcur."
- Black: "All right. I just wanted my light on in a timely fashion."
- Speaker McPike: "No. No. This can just die and we'll stay here until November. Have all voted? The Clerk is taking the record. On this Motion, there are 41 'ayes' and 73 'nos', and the House does not concur with Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 2758. Representative Matijevich."
- Matijevich: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House.

 I would ask leave of the House and use of the Attendance
 Roll Call for that purpose to suspend the posting notice
 and the rule prohibiting a committee to meet while the
 House is in Session, so that the Rules Committee can meet
 immediately in the Speaker's Conference Room to consider
 the exemption of House Bill 180. That's an unemployment
 insurance Bill. I cleared this with Representative Bill
 Black. I ask leave."
- Speaker McPike: "The Gentleman asks leave. Hearing no objections leave is granted. By use of the Attendance Roll Call, the Motion carries. Senate Bill...Senate Bills, Third Reading, appears Senate Bill 1892. The Bill's on Third Reading. The Gentleman asks leave to return it to Second Reading. Leave's granted. The Bill's on Second Reading. Mr. Clerk, are there any Amendments?"
- Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #7, offered by Representative

 McPike, DeJaegher, Flowers, Currie and Rotello."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Currie. Representative Currie."
- Currie: "Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I ask leave to return this Bill to Second Reading."
- Speaker McPike: "The Bill's on Second Reading. We're on

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

Amendment #7."

Currie: "Withdraw."

Speaker McPike: "The Lady withdraws the Amendment. Further Amendments."

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #8, offered by Representative

McPike, DeJaegher, Flowers, Currie and Rotello."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Currie."

Currie: "Withdraw."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Currie withdraws the Amendment.

Further Amendments."

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #9, offered by Representative

Currie, McPike, Flowers, DeJaegher and Satterthwaite."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Currie."

Currie: "Withdraw."

Speaker McPike: "Withdraws Amendment #9. Further Amendments."

Clerk O'Brien: "Floor Amendment #10, offered by Representative

Currie, McPike, Flowers, DeJaegher and Satterthwaite."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. This Amendment would provide mandatory family leave. We've seen proposals like this before. This one is different from the Bill we've been voting on for the last three years, however. This Bill sets a threshold that's 100% higher than the thresholds that we've offered in past years. Instead of applying..."

Speaker McPike: "All right. The Lady...The Lady moves for the adoption of Amendment #10. · All in favor say 'aye', opposed, 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment's adopted. Further Amendments."

Clerk O'Brien: "No further Amendments."

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

Clerk O'Brien: "Senate Bill 1892, a Bill for an Act to create the

166th Legislative Day

- June 30, 1992
- Family Responsibility and Medical Leave Act. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker McPike: "Mr. Clerk, did you read the Bill?

 Representative Obrzut. Representative Obrzut."
- Obrzut: "Mr. Speaker, I'm no longer the Sponsor of this Bill now.

 I'm a hyphenated Chief Sponsor. I would refer to

 Representative Currie on this. She is the new Chief

 Sponsor."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Currie, on the Bill."
- Currie: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. This Bill now contains one issue: That issue is family leave with a threshold that moves 100% from where we were the last time we voted on this measure. The Bill would apply to employers of 100 or more individuals, not just 50 or more, and it would incorporate language that would permit...an employer of 100 or more to exempt among the salaried personnel those essential employees who are in the top 10% of the salary range. In effect, the proponents of this Bill have moved 110% from where we were the last time we asked for your 'aye' votes on this measure. I'd be happy to answer your questions. I think everybody in this chamber, who's already voted on this Bill at least once, knows the issues backwards and forwards. I'd be happy to answer your questions, and I'd appreciate your support."
- Speaker McPike: "And on the Lady's Motion, Representative Kulas."

 Kulas: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Could I have a little order,

 please?"
- Speaker McPike: "Yes, let's give the Gentleman some order. Come on. Give him some order. Proceed."
- Kulas: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. It's with mixed emotions that I rise on this Bill. It's a shame that family leave has become a political game of

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

one-upmanship. The Sponsor of this Bill knows that this is a political sham, because when we pass this Bill, without the endorsement of the business community, we know that it will be vetoed, and we'll be back to square one where we started before. Because without the business community, we won't override the Governor's Veto. I... I will vote for this Bill, Mr. Speaker, if I can get a commitment from the real Speaker, that he will call Conference Committee #1 on Senate Bill 484 which passed out of the Senate with a veto-proof majority of 42 votes; a Bill which has the endorsement of the business community and has a veto-proof majority. I will be voting 'present' on this Bill unless I can get such a commitment from the Speaker. I would ask my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote 'present' also, unless we get such a commitment. If we are serious about family leave, let's send the Governor a Bill which he can sign. Let's send him two Bills. Let him choose. What are we afraid of? Do we want family leave or do we want to play political games with the welfare of the working families in the State of Illinois? For the last six years, Ladies and Gentlemen, we have argued in these chambers that there are no costs incurred by family leave and if there are any, then they are negligible. The Sponsor of this Bill even argued this point on the House floor and now they're against tax credits. Well, the tax credits that we're giving in Senate Bill 484 don't take effect until 4-94 and they will be negligible. Proponents of family leave, labor and women's groups, have previously said that they have no problem with tax credits to business as long as business would support the concept of family leave, like I mentioned before, we extend these tax credits to FY 95. So what happened in the meantime, I ask you? I don't

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

know. I can only surmise. If labor and the women's groups were serious about passing family leave, they would be banging on the Speaker's door right now to call Senate Bill 484 and not playing games. You all know that it's easier to change existing law than it is to get a new law enacted. family leave, then you will demand that the you want Speaker call Senate Bill 484. I cannot. in conscience, Ladies and Gentlemen, support this Bill or play games with family leave and, therefore, I will be voting 'present' because today...today is a sad day for the working families of the State of Illinois, because the party of the working people, labor and the women's groups, want to make family leave an issue and not law. that when I go to sleep tonight, I'll be able to say that I did my best to get family leave enacted into law, and I'll sleep with a clear conscience, and those of you who are participating in this political charade, won't be able to say that."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Parcells."

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

Speaker McPike: "Yes, the Sponsor will yield."

Parcells: "Representative Currie, I couldn't hear above the noise of this House, what Senate Amendment did, and upon looking through it quickly I couldn't find that tax credit. Is this the one that the business community was in support of or is this the one that they object to?"

Currie: "Well, Representative, I haven't heard from them on the provisions of this Amendment. This is a House Amendment, not a Senate Amendment, and it provides two changes from the family leave measures we have voted on before. It changes the threshold so that the old Bills that we voted for are Bills that say that the provisions apply to

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

employers of 50 or more individuals. That number is raised to 100. That is to say a large It is number of employers in this state (in fact, most of the employers of this state) are no longer covered by the There is a provisions of this Bill should we pass it. There's a second change in the Bill, and second change. this was language specifically proposed by the Retail Merchants' Association. It is language that says that of salaried employees, for a company with 100 employees or more, the provisions of this Bill will not apply to the top 10% of those salaried employees if a particular employee is essential to the business operation. Those number changes came from proposals by the Illinois Manufacturers' Association and by the Illinois Retail Merchants' Association. Those business groups proposed, as well, some tax breaks. Those tax breaks are not in Amendment."

Parcells: "Thank you, that was the question I was asking."

Currie: "We've had a lot of discussion about whether a Governor would sign or would not sign a particular Bill. I can't believe that Governor Jim Edgar would sign a Bill offering tax breaks to companies who provide leave to their..."

Parcells: "Thank you, Representative Currie, you've answered my question. I think I have the floor at this moment, and I'd like to move to the Bill..."

Currie: "Oh...good."

Parcells: "Ladies and Gentlemen, I was told by the Illinois

Manufacturers and many other business groups that without
the tax credits they do not, I repeat, they do not support
this Bill. They would support Representative Kulas' Bill
and the Bill that he asked that you vote positively on.
They do not support this Bill without the tax credits, and

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

I would ask for your 'no' vote."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Granberg."

Granberg: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Lady yield?"
Speaker McPike: "Yes."

Granberg: "Representative Currie, I came in, and I apologize.

There are tax credits in the other version of the Bill and do we know the estimate, the revenue estimate, on that?"

Currie: "Representative, I'm a little surprised that we keep talking about a Bill that is not before us, but my understanding is that there is some Bill out there that provides tax credits to the companies that provide In fact, what that means is that we're mandatory leave. paying for it. We do not have specific cost estimates, but I would tell you that the business lobbyists, companies of 100 or more employees, that already provide this benefit to their employees, are tickled pink at notion that this Legislature might offer them this freebie, a new tax credit, to do what they are already doing. quess is that the numbers might not be insignificant."

Granberg: "Thank you, Representative. Mr. Speaker, to the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "I...I cannot see the...I cannot see

Representative...The Chair cannot see who is speaking. So,

maybe if the five lawyers could possibly move out of the

way...All right. All right, Representative Granberg."

Granberg: "Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have voted for Representative Kulas' Bill in the past, and I respect him, but as a member of the Revenue Committee, as is Representative Curran, Representative Kubik, we have sat there all year long and turned down every group that has come before us, every single group for tax relief, everyone: farmers, small business, because the state couldn't afford it, and here we're giving tax credits.

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

It's not the proper time. We have other programs we have to fund, and for us to sit there all year long and turn down every group and at the last second in this Session, to give tax credits to large corporations, just isn't the right thing to do. Thank you."

- Speaker McPike: "Representative Giglio moves the previous question. The question is, 'Shall the previous question be put?' All in favor say 'aye', opposed, 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the previous question is put. Representative Currie, to close."
- Currie: "Thanks, Mr. Speaker. I think it's pretty clear there are no tax credits in this Bill. We are asking employers of 100 or more to provide leave so that people, their employees, those workers, can take care of a sick family member, can welcome a new child. This is not a new issue for this Assembly, but it's a new proposal. It is an offer from organized labor, from all of the women's groups in this state, to try to help us move off the dime on family leave, to offer the Governor a proposal that he cannot refuse, to offer him a proposal that will not cost the state any money but will provide important benefits to our workers. I urge your 'aye' votes."
- Speaker McPike: "Question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1892 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Representative Matijevich, to explain his vote."
- Matijevich: "Well, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, the issue is, 'Do we wanna help families who have serious and, often, death-threatening (sic-life-threatening) illnesses, that those families be together? I'm just amazed, amazed, that people in this Body are more concerned about giving corporations tax breaks. Are you really for the families, or are you for the corporations? That's the issue here. I

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

would hope that all of us would stand here and argue for families; to allow families in need to be near each other; to be there to help that young baby; to be there to help your husband or your wife in case of need. That's what we're really voting for. We don't have to vote for a tax break for corporations, especially those that have been offering this. Continue more votes, everybody, 118 'ayes'."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Homer."

Speaker. This is the only Bill Homer: "Thank you, Mr. that...enacts a real family leave program. The other Bill...makes no sense at all when you consider that at least half of the employees that are now working for companies with 100 employees are already covered under the company's family leave policy that was part of a collective bargaining agreement, and so, to give a tax credit to those companies, would be to simply give away the state's...part of the state's treasury. At a time when we're cutting human services, that makes absolutely no sense. That's a give-away program. I can certainly understand why the Illinois Manufacturers' Association would be for particularly those members who already give this benefit, but it makes no sense from a public policy standpoint, and this is the only opportunity you'll have to vote on a real family leave plan. I urge you support it."

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 78...78 'ayes', 11 'nos', and the...and this Bill, having... On this Motion, there are 78 'ayes', 11 'nos'. Senate Bill 1892, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, Supplemental Calendar

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

announcements."

Clerk O'Brien: "Supplemental Calendar #5 has been distributed."

Speaker McPike: "Committee Reports."

Clerk O'Brien: "The Committee on Rules has met pursuant to Rule 29(c)3. The following Bills have been ruled exempt on June 30, 1992: House Bill 180. Signed, John Matijevich, Chairman."

Speaker McPike: "Supplemental #5, appears House Bill 2824,
Representative McAuliffe. Roger McAuliffe. (House Bill)
2824. House Bill 2824."

McAuliffe: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would move to concur in the First Conference Committee Report on House Bill 2824. The Senate added language which would...the Senate added language which essentially would say if you're at the baseball game and you got hit in the head with a baseball, you couldn't sue the ball park. Basically, that's what it is."

Speaker McPike: "Yes, Mr. McAuliffe."

McAuliffe: "I just explained it."

Speaker McPike: "Pardon?"

McAuliffe: "I just explained it."

Speaker McPike: "All right."

McAuliffe: "I move to concur."

Speaker McPike: "Fine. Any discussion? Being none, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in the First Conference Committee Report to House Bill 2824?' All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will vote John Dunn 'aye'. The Clerk will take the record. On this Motion, there are 110...111 'ayes' and no 'nays' and the House does concur with the First Conference Committee Report to House Bill 2824, and

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3440, Representative Giorgi."

Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, this started out as House Bill 3440 and had to do with the County of Winnebago leasing land for public health purposes and, specifically, to allow an AIDS facility to be built. Then the Bill grew to allow the County of Winnebago also to relieve its prison overcrowding by acquiring a building across the street from the court house but at the present time there is a liquor tenant in there and it's going to allow the liquor tenant's lease to expire. And this same request is needed for the Chicago School Board. It has a building that has been held in trust for them and they'd like the same authority. And the final thrust is that it provides for procedures to remove garbage and debris from unincorporated areas of counties and a method to recapture the costs. I know of no objections to the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Is there..."

Giorgi: "I move the adoption of the First Committee Report."

Speaker McPike: "Is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall the House concur...the First Conference Committee Report to House Bill 3440?' 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 109 'ayes' and 2 'nos'. And the House does concur with the First Conference Report to House Bill 3440, and this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3493, Representative Lang."

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move that the House adopt the First Conference Committee Report to House Bill 3493. This

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

report, it contains two items, both of which were passed out of the House previously. The first involves simplified dissolution of marriage proceedings in situations where the parties have very little assets, no children, no property, so they won't have to higher a lawyer to proceed. The rest of the Bill relates to child support guidelines that have been worked out very carefully with proponents and opponents. In fact, the...for those that (sic-who) were opposed to this previously, I should let you know that since the Bill left the House previously the guidelines have been reduced by 1% across the board, and so I would move adoption of this report."

- Speaker McPike: "On the Gentleman's Motion, Representative Wennlund."
- Wennlund: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Maybe we could have a little order in the House. There's a lot of business to transact tonight, and it's important that...that everybody..."
- Speaker McPike: "The Chair is gonna clear the chambers if we can't have some quiet. We have 50 people in the back over here, and we have another ten over here so, can we have a little bit of quiet? Proceed, Mr. Wennlund."
- Wennlund: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
- Speaker McPike: "Yes."
- Wennlund: "Because of the...the noise level in the House,
 Representative Lang, we...I was unable to hear what
 happened to the guidelines. I heard the word 'guidelines',
 but that's all I heard."
- Lang: "I'll be happy to tell you that, Representative. The Bill is intact...as it left the House except for the guidelines which have been reduced from the House version, 1% across the board."

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

- Wennlund: "Can you tell me where those guidelines are? Have the guidelines...You mean the Bill that left the House increased the guidelines? Is that the Bill that did that?"
- Lang: "That is correct, and this also increases the guidelines but by 1% less than what we had originally passed. It's on page 17 of the report, Representative."
- Wennlund: "So this Conference Committee Report actually does contain an increase in the original House Bill 3493?"
- Lang: "That is correct."
- Wennlund: "And...so for a family of two, what does it do with respect to the standards? Now, this is automatic, like the courts are currently applying it? If you have two children, you're going to pay 32% of your net income towards child support, or gross income?"
- Lang: "Net income. However, I should add, Representative, that there are new credits that are not on the books today that this...these guidelines allow. They allow, for instance, for a credit for a...someone who is paying child support who has new children and a new family, new biological children and a new family. That is a first in the law that has not existed before. So that if you're paying child support to a previous...previous children and you remarry and you have new children, you will now be entitled to a credit for those children against your income for purposes of the child support that you're paying to the first children."
- Wennlund: "That sounds fair. I...I mean the Members of the House would really ought to know how these credits work so...If a father with four children was divorced and he was paying under this Bill 41%, 41% of his net income, and he remarried to...and adopted two children in the second marriage, what type of a credit would he get?"

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

Lang: "Well, I'd have to calculate that for you, Representative, but I should point that the current law is 40%. This is only 1% over the current law which is 40%."

Wennlund: "How 'bout three children? How much is that over the current law?"

Lang: "Three children goes from 32% currently, to 37%."

Wennlund: "It goes from 32% to 37% for three children?"

Lang: "That is correct. And I remind you that these guidelines have not been raised in many, many years."

Wennlund: "And how 'bout two children? How much did that increase?"

Lang: "Two children goes from 25% to 32%."

Wennlund: "So from 25 to 32? And then how 'bout one child?"

Lang: "Twenty to 23(%)."

Wennlund: "How do the credits work? Can you tell us, in general?

How do they..."

Lang: "One moment, Representative. In the case of new biological children, Representative, if I understand the Bill correctly, the obligor would get a credit of one-half the formula as it relates to the children for which he has a prior support obligation."

Wennlund: "One-half the formula?"

Lang: "That is correct."

Lang: "That's correct."

Wennlund: "And...and what other...what other credits are provided for in there?"

Lang: "There's a credit for the first time in the law for stepfathers who are the sole support of stepchildren, where the biological father of the stepchildren is unemployed or

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

not paying under his support obligation."

Wennlund: "Does this Conference Committee Report include any attribution provisions?"

Lang: "Please explain what you mean."

Wennlund: "I believe the prior proposal had a provision regarding attribution and...in which the court, if it determined that you had a non-income producing asset like a farm, the court could order you to sell that farm because its value were...was much greater than the income it was producing, and, therefore, you'd be in a better position to pay increased child support."

Lang: "I don't believe that's in here, Representative."

Wennlund: "In...in addition to the increase in the child support guidelines, what other provisions are contained in this Conference Committee Report?"

"The...well, let me go through the eight...as what Lang: are the eight key provisions of the Bill, if I might. The Bill establishes, for the first time, a credit for non-custodial parents who are supporting children and other The adjusted guideline percentages are only applied to the first \$100,000 of non-custodial parent's income. When a non-custodial parent remarries and is supporting stepchildren of no other source of support, the non-custodial parent is eligible for an income adjustment. Neither a statutory change in the amount of child support nor a change in family status that would permit an adjustment will be sufficient grounds for modification. This is a key thing: This grandfathers existing divorce decrees, so that the thousands of people who have existing divorce decrees will not have the...their guidelines adjusted upward as a result of this law. So the existing decrees are grandfathered in. The Bill would also

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

permit courts to, retroactively, alter child support payments for a period not to exceed three months for a date of filing before modification. It adjusts guidelines, as we discussed. The Bill permits judges to order supplemental child support contributions for child care expenses, unreimbursed health care expenses, private school tuition and extraordinary costs of visitation (and) transportation. This recognizes that these items can be a sizable expense, and that would be what the Bill does, Representative."

Wennlund: "What was retroactive? Three months? What was the three months?"

Lang: "The court could go three months prior to the decree but that's all they could go."

Wennlund: "In...in applying these child support guidelines..."

Lang: "That's correct."

Wennlund: "Okay. Thank you very much for the explanation. I appreciate that."

Lang: "Thank you."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Hultgren."

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

Speaker McPike: "Yes."

Hultgren: "Representative, you spent some time talking about child support guidelines. It's my understanding that this Bill also sets forth a simplified dissolution procedure, but then says that that procedure would be available only in one county in the state. Am I reading that correctly?"

Lang: "Let me review that, Representative. Yes, that is correct."

Hultgren: "What...what's the rationale for this being limited to the one county?"

Lang: "I don't know the rationale, Representative. I... I did not

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992 .

draft the Conference Committee Report."

Hultgren: "Well, then, Mr. Speaker, if I may address the report.

You know, I...I think there's a lot of merit to a simplified procedure. The question that I would raise is:

Do we want to start setting up separate divorce law for the different counties in the State of Illinois? You know, taken to its logical extreme, I suppose we could have 102 different divorce laws. I really think this is a good idea. I think it's a bad idea to limit it in its application to just one county in the state, and for that reason, would suggest to the Sponsor that maybe he'd like to...to do a Second Conference Committee Report and maybe we can do this so that we have a uniform law throughout the country, or throughout the state, rather, rather than a kind of a vulcanization of the divorce law."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Preston. Representative Dunn." Dunn: "First of all, don't get confused. I am not Preston." Speaker McPike: "No, but you both had your mouth full of pizza." Dunn: "The point that I would like to make to the Members is that it was mentioned a moment ago that this Conference Committee Report has some very important subject matter in it which I'm prepared to vote for, but it also contains a provision which needs to be taken out of this Conference Committee Report or changed or modified. There are 102 counties in this state, and the very first part of this Conference Committee Report contains a simplified brand new divorce procedure for only one of those counties, Cook Those of you who live in the 101 other counties. if you vote for this legislation, are legislation which makes two different kinds of divorce laws applicable in this state. That is insane. It is nonsense.

It is crazy. If we're gonna have a divorce law in this

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

state, it should be uniform statewide. If we're gonna have a simplified divorce procedure, it should be uniform statewide. There should be no change in divorce laws applicable in only one county. Please, defeat this Conference Committee Report and send it back so this provision can be taken out and the child support guidelines can be voted upon on their own merits without this baggage. I never heard of such a crazy thing - such unbridled arrogance. I don't know who put this in this Conference Committee Report. You wonder why we downstaters sometimes feel like you're running over us. Who in the name of heaven ever heard of two different kinds of divorce laws one for Cook County and one for the rest of the State of Illinois? That's just nuts. Vote 'no'."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Johnson."

Johnson: "Let me ask a question before I address the Bill.

Representative Lang, the...the substance of the Bill with

respect to guidelines and credits and all that apply to the

whole state, right?"

Lang: "That is correct."

Johnson: "I...I have normally stood on this House floor and opposed what I considered efforts to...unfairly tilt the balance in these cases, but I really believe that the Sponsors of this Bill and its supporters in the process have worked very, very hard on a wide variety of...of contested points to come up with a product that truly represents a compromise. It is a compromise that serves the interests of children in Illinois and serves the interest of fairness to both parents in Illinois. And, for that reason, since we passed this Bill overwhelmingly before and with some concern similar to what Representative Dunn has with respect to the one provision, I think it's a

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

Bill that's worth supporting, and I urge a 'yes' vote."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Laurino. Mr. Laurino."

Laurino: "Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question."

Speaker McPike: "The Gentleman moves the... The Gentleman... Mr. Electrician, could you turn this microphone on? Mr. Electrician, could you turn this microphone on? Thank you. The Gentleman moves the previous question. The question is, 'Shall the previous question be put?' All in favor say 'aye', opposed, 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the previous question is put. Representative Lang."

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This...This has been debated thoroughly but let me just add, as Representative Johnson, it's a strange twist of fate that puts this on one of my Bills because, in the past, I have been one of the people against huge raises in the child support guidelines, but these are not huge raises. This is a fair Bill. It's been negotiated between and amongst the parties. The guidelines proposed here are lower than that originally that passed the House. They are substantially lower than that which the task force recommended. This is a good Bill. I would recommend an 'aye' vote."

Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall the House adopt the First Conference Committee Report to House Bill 3493?' All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "...I just would like to get a commitment from the Sponsor. I, too, have concerns about the simplified divorce procedure only for Cook Countv. I think us in Madison, us in Saint Clair County, also deserve that. We have just as big a court docket. I will...I would ask that the Sponsor agree to, if he can't do it right now, ask that the Sponsor agree to next year bring that back for the

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

entire state."

- Speaker McPike: "Have all voted? Have all voted? Representative

 Currie."
- Currie: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House, just to explain my vote. Cook County is by far the most populous We might consider this somewhat county in the state. If it works in Cook County, experimental legislation. maybe then we would want to apply it to other parts of the state as well, but the underlying program in this Bill, the support changes, negotiated by Representatives child Johnson and Dunn and Lang, by various groups across the state, bar associations and the rest, it's past time to adopt those provisions, and I would urge an 'aye' vote on The simplified procedures are supported by this measure. the County of Cook, and they make particular sense in that county, and the child support guideline changes will make a major difference in the lives of Illinois children. I hope you'll support this Conference Committee Report."
- Speaker McPike: "Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this Motion, there are 50 'ayes' and 54 'nos', and the House does not adopt the First Conference Committee Report to House Bill 1493 (sic House Bill 3493). Representative Lang."
- Lang: "Thank you. I would ask that a Second Conference Committee be appointed."
- Speaker McPike: "The Gentleman asks for a Second Conference Committee. Representative Laurino in the Chair."
- Speaker Laurino: "House Bill 3746, Representative Santiago."
- Santiago: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to adopt Conference

 Committee Report #1. What Conference Committee Report #1

 does, it defines 'converter dolly'. It adds the definition

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

of refuse. It allows for trucks and truck tractors to have access of one highway mile to any street or highway directly adjacent to a Class A highway unless there's a sign prohibiting access. It also allows access of five highway miles to or from a Class I, II or III highway. It also codifies federal regulations to allow a triple saddle mount coupled vehicle to be up to 75 feet on a Class I highway or interstate highway. Basically, almost everything in this Conference Committee has been agreed upon. I move to adopt Conference Committee #1."

Speaker Laurino: "Further discussion? Representative Black."

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

Laurino: "He indicates he will."

Black: "Representative, there's a lot of confusion over one part of this Bill and that is allowing triple saddle mount vehicles on interstate highways within the State of Illinois. Now it's my understanding that we don't have, again, thanks to our friends in Washington, we don't have any choice in this matter. That's mandated by federal law. Is that correct?"

Santiago: "That is correct."

Black: "We don't have to like it we just have to let them do it.

Is that correct?"

Santiago: "Yes."

Black: "Thank you very much. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Even, again, there are parts of this Bill that are federally mandated that some of you don't like. There are also parts of this Conference Committee Report that we need desperately. And the state police, I believe, if not in favor of this Bill have certainly expressed no opposition. One of the Bills in

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

here that I'm very interested in, you now have constituents who get off a state maintained highway to ask directions or to seek a construction site to make a delivery and they now are subjected to outrageous fines by local units of government who don't follow any of the state rules or regulations. This will take that authority away from them. And, in fact, I just had a constituent the other day whose driver got off the highway up around Chicago, stopped at a village police station to ask directions. The police officer came out, saw his truck, took it to a weigh station and the city fined him \$10,000 even though it was legal in the State of Illinois. Now that's ridiculous! This is a good Conference Committee Report. The federal mandate stinks but we ought to be used to that Vote by now! 'ave'."

Speaker Laurino: "Further discussion? Representative Olson."

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

Speaker Laurino: "Indicates he will."

Olson: "This deals with three axle trucks. Does it also deal with weights, as Representative Black mentioned there, weights and lengths?"

Santiago: "There's no change in weight."

Olson: "Pardon?"

Santiago: "No change in weights."

Olson: "Does it deal...Does it allow for changes in weight limits on smaller communities or rural roads, township roads?"

Santiago: "No."

Olson: "So an over the road semi traveling down the interstate still cannot at his random choice pull off and use township roads or county roads?"

Santiago: "That's correct."

Olson: "Thank you."

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

Laurino: "Further discussion? Seeing Representative Santiago moves for the adoption of Conference Committee Report #1 to House Bill 3746. So the question shall be, 'Shall the House adopt Conference Committee Report #1 to House Bill 3746?' This is final action. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. This Motion, having received 106 'ayes', 7 voting 'nay' and 0 voting 'present'. The House does adopt Conference Committee Report #1 to House Bill 3746, and the Bill, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1490, Representative Kubik."

Kubik: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would move to accept the First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1490. Let me, rather than go through all of the provisions of this particular piece of legislation which are rather extensive, let me explain to the Body that all of the provisions of this Conference Committee have been previously passed by this House by overwhelmingly majorities. The elements of this particular Bill have been agreed by both parties and by all participants in the process. I know of no opposition to the Bill. I'd be happy to respond to individual questions on the legislation, but I would appreciate your support in adopting the First Conference Committee on Senate Bill 1490."

Speaker Laurino: "Further discussion? The Gentleman moves for the adoption of the First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1490. All those in favor will indicate by voting 'aye', those opposed will vote 'no'. The board is open. This is final action. Have all voted who wish?

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. This Motion, having received 108 'ayes', 1 voting 'no', 4 voting 'present'. The House does adopt Conference Committee Report #1 to Senate Bill 1490, and the Bill, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1516, Representative Kubik. Representative Kubik."

Kubik: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would move that we accept the First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1516. This Bill was a Bill that we've been working on for quite some time with the City of Chicago and they are now in agreement with this legislation. What this Bill does is to amend the Consumer Fraud and Deceptive Business Practices Act and specifically restricts the kind of immigration assistance service one may offer for compensation. This is a Bill in response to some problems we've been having with those who are cheating those immigrants out of immigration services, and this is in response to that Bill. I think it's an agreed Bill, and I would be happy to respond to any questions you might have on the legislation."

Speaker Laurino: "Further discussion? Representative Black."

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

Speaker Laurino: "He indicates he will."

Black: "The Bill, I assume, no longer has anything to do with immigration? Is that correct?"

Kubik: "It has to do with immigration providers."

Black: "It has to do with immigration where?"

Kubik: "It has to do with people who provide immigration services."

Black: "Oh. I don't understand that. It restricts the kind of

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

immigration assistance service that one may offer for compensation?"

- Kubik: "Correct. What's happening, Representative Black, is that in hispanic communities...Excuse me...Could the Gentleman who's...Representative Black, what's happening in the city, particularly in the City of Chicago, in communities, primarily, new immigrants are being approached by providers who are saying, 'We will get you...We will get you naturalization. We will get you U.S. citizenship'. If we...Representative, there is some major confusion on the part of this Bill. Could you take it out of the record, Mr. Speaker, with your consent? Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker. Could we take this Bill out of the record, Mr. Speaker. please."
- Speaker Laurino: "The Gentleman requests that this Bill be taken out of the record. Senate Bill 1615, Representative Regan."
- Regan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I would urge that this Conference Committee Report finally be It's had little problems here and there with the passed. We've made many Amendments. We've made ACLU. I'll explain to you exactly what this Bill does. This Conference Committee Report is designed to take repetitive sex offenders, repetitive sex offenders, of women and children and other young males, repeated sexual offenders, and it's designed to put them away for quite a It's repeated sexual offenders that (sic-who) have the HIV virus, Ladies and Gentlemen, this Bill attacks, not the normal rapist that you find on the corner of the street, one that's got a killer disease in his body. Now the ACLU, I quess, says that they support people that (sic-who) rape people with the HIV virus because they're

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

opposing the...the wording in this legislation. We have come back. The Senate says that we'll accept an Amendment that says the attorney shows it's relevant in order to prosecute a charge of criminal transmission of HIV viruses. They won't accept it. What they want is a 'compelling need' to show that this person's got the HEV (sic- HIV) virus. We say that's not required, and we say get these people of the streets, and I urge its adoption."

Speaker Laurino: "Gentleman moves for the adoption of the First Conference Committee Report to Senate Bill 16 (sic-1615), and on that, is there any discussion? Representative Lang, the Gentleman from Cook."

"Thank you Speaker. I rise in opposition to the First Lang: Conference Committee Report. There's some language in this Bill, some language in this report, that requires this test result to be disclosed if there's a showing that the test The language that should be in the result is relevant. Bill, which I agreed to sign off on but they chose not to put in, was language requiring a 'compelling need', some special need, to disclose the result. Without this, results will be disclosed. The HIV test, under these circumstances and under these disclosure requirements, Normally, the state must show constitutes a search. probable cause to conduct a search. This Bill allows a search without a warrant and without probable cause, and it reduces the state's burden. A person, because they've been convicted or accused in this manner, should not lose their privacy rights. I would suggest to the Sponsor that he go back to the drawing board and at least require that there be some compelling need to disclose these tests, rather than to create a...a law that would basically require that these tests be disclosed. We must retain the

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

Constitutional right to privacy. If we aren't gonna retain that, and we're not going to retain searches without a warrant, then we're gonna continue to diminish the Constitutional rights of our citizens, and I would recommend a 'no' vote."

Speaker Laurino: "Further discussion? Representative Stern."

Stern: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. It is perfectly appropriate to require the state to show a compelling need, or to show the relevance for this information. The right of privacy does not stop at conviction. I urge a 'no' vote. This is a very important, symbolic Bill. We should not pass it."

Speaker Laurino: "Further discussion? Representative Black."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen I rise to support the Gentleman's Motion. of the House. We just had a case in Vermilion County where a young was arrested and charged with sexual abuse. I don't even know what...I'm not sure the prosecutor, at this point, knows what the final number of young people will be. parents of those people that (sic-whom) this man has allegedly abused, asked the state's attorney to seek an HIV test for this person accused of this crime. People in my home county were shocked when they found out the state's attorney could not, under existing law, order this person, who has since been indicted and is awaiting trial, undergo an HIV test, and that person refused to do so voluntarily. So, you have dozens of families out there worrying and wondering if their children have, indeed, been infected, and they have called my office and said, 'Why, why do the rights of the criminal always supersede the rights of the victim?' They could not understand for the life of them why the state's attorney did not have

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

judicial power or right to demand that this indicted sex abuser be tested for HIV, and it's because of those calls to my district office and the questions that they ask of me, I intend to vote 'yes' and go home and tell them that I think the rights of the victim should be as important, if not more important, than the rights of the criminal. I vote 'aye'."

Speaker Laurino: "Representative Regan, to close."

Regan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. May I repeat, in order for this information to be giving (sic-given) to a...to an attorney to prosecute, this person must have been 'convicted' of raping, sodomizing women and children and young boys - whatever his choice was. He's got to have proven that he's got the HIV virus in his system after he has raped these people. He goes to jail; he gets out in three years; he rapes again; he's killer virus in his body; and he rapes again. prosecuting attorney needs to know this. He asks the judge. (It's confidential.) He says, 'Judge, I gotta find out whether this guy's a killer on our streets. I gotta find out if this is Typhoid Mary running around here. And that judge says, 'Okay, you gotta...You've got a know because you wanta prosecute under another law that says it's illegal to go around sodomizing and raping victims with the HIV in your body'. Come on, Ladies and Gentleman. How far can the ACLU (go) to support convicted rapists with AIDS. I urge your adoption of this Bill."

Speaker Laurino: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of the First Conference Committee Report to Senate Bill 1615. All those in favor will indicate by voting 'aye', opposed, 'nay'. The board is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

record, Mr. Clerk. This Bill, having received 99 'aye', 13 'nays', 0 voting 'present', the House does adopt Conference Committee Report #1 to Senate Bill 1615. Representative Edley wishes to be be voted 'aye', and the Bill, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1717, Representative LeFlore."

- LeFlore: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. This is the First Conference
 Committee Report on (Senate Bill) 1717. This report deals
 with the creation of a new opportunity Earnfare Act, to
 provide jobs for the employment of people who are not
 critical in need, under the State Transitional Assistance
 Program. It creates a new Public Service Employment
 program under the Department of Commerce and Community
 Affairs. It creates a new Earnfare program under the
 Department of Public Aid. It continues..."
- Speaker Laurino: "Excuse me, Representative...Representative

 LeFlore. Can the Chair have the indulgence of the Body,

 and give Representative LeFlore their undivided attention

 please? Thank you. Proceed, Representative LeFlore."
- LeFlore: "It continues the job opportunity to constantly expand It amends the Transitional Assistance its membership. program, the lead current provision requiring the extension of income assistance for six months for persons who are not chronical in need. It makes some necessary revision in the existing Transitional Assistance program to assure coverage for persons who are truly not employable, and it assures applicants receive eligibility the an adequate This (Senate Bill) 1717 report has been determination. prepared by the Chief Sponsors of the House and the Senate, implement recommendation of job opportunities council created last year by the 87th General Assembly to

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

develop a state comprehensive plan designed to employ a person on general assistance determined to be employable. This Bill...This legislation has been developed in cooperation with the Department of Public Aid, the Legal Assistance Foundation of Chicago, the Public Welfare Coalition of Illinois, and other welfare advocate groups. The Department of Public Aid supports this legislation, and this Bill creates no entitlement to assistance. I would like to have a favorable vote on the Bill, and if you have any questions, I'm open to answer the question."

Speaker Laurino: "Further discussion? Representative Black."

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

Speaker Laurino: "He indicates he will."

Black: "Representative, is this the Conference Committee Report that some people have dubbed Earnfare?"

LeFlore: "Yes, it is, Representative."

Black: "Representative, I simply rise to commend you for working out this Bill. There is safeguard language to the State Treasury, and I think...I simply...I don't know if anybody else on my side of the aisle is going to join with me, but I think it's high time that this kind of a Bill is passed by this General Assembly. Other states have tried it. I congratulate you for working out this language. I think it's time that we give Earnfare a fair chance in this state. I stand in support of the Gentleman's Motion, and I hope you all vote 'aye'."

Speaker Laurino: "Representative Dunn. John Dunn."

LeFlore: "You know I'd just to thank Representative Black. But

we still need your support, Representative. Representative

Black?"

Speaker Laurino: "Representative Dunn, you are recognized, Sir."

166th Legislative Day

Dunn:

June 30, 1992

"Thank you Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Just hopefully to, in some small way, establish some legislative intent. This is a good well-meaning Bill, but I want it to be a matter of record that if there are to be the demonstration projects which are called called for in this legislation, that, that should either be state wide or be the last thing funded with funds for this legislation. If the Governor of this state chooses not to fund Earnfare, but chooses to fund a job project in Chicago and East St. Louis to the neglect to the rest of the state, I want this debate to reflect that that is not the intent of this legislation. That people who are in need all across this state have the same needs, and those who have...townships that have been working to get jobs and who have Earnfare in place, should receive benefits on a proportionate basis, and Chicago and East St. Louis should not be singled out in any manner or fashion by this legislation."

Speaker Laurino: "Further discussion? Representative Weaver."

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

Speaker Laurino: "He indicates he will."

Weaver: "Representative LeFlore, about four years ago I had a Bill that we passed into law called Workfare. Very similar in nature, but it had some very severe problems, and I want to make see...I and want to make sure...and I intend to support your Bill, because I believe in the concept, but I want to make sure the same problems don't occur here that occurred with mine. Now as these individuals go to work for local units of government, are they covered by Workman's Compensation Insurance?"

LeFlore: "I understand they are not required to extend that type of benefit."

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

Weaver: "Okay, you see, that was one of the problems that we had.

Because of the types of individuals, and I don't want to classify anybody, but we found that there was a higher incidence of injuries on the job, and the local units of government would call me up, and say 'Hey we don't want this free labor, because they're to expensive. Our Workman's Comp rates are going through the ceiling.' So there is a provision in here that will allow them to opt out of that problem?"

LeFlore: "Representative could you refer to page 5 of the Committee Report?"

Speaker Laurino: "Representative LeFlore, you're gonna have to speak closer to the mike. I don't think he can hear you, because I can hardly hear you."

LeFlore: "Page 5. Can you hear me? Line 16, are you with me, are you with me, Representative?"

Weaver: "Yes."

LeFlore: "Okay. This has has been pointed out to me by the staff, that this the only thing we have in here that pertains to..."

Weaver: "Okay, well, it says, basically, local laws and local civil service rules. If you could assure me that you're gonna work with the Department, even if they have to do it by rule to take care of that problem, I think you got a great idea here, and we'll do everything we can to support it."

LeFlore: "Okay. I understand that it's the intent not to require by rule."

Weaver: "Okay. Very good, thank you."

LeFlore: "Does that answer your question?"

Weaver: "Yes, it does. Thank you."

Speaker Laurino: "Further discussion? Representative Ropp."

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

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

Speaker Laurino: "He indicates he will."

Ropp: "Representative, it appears that one of the provisions in this Bill would state that if you don't cooperate with this program after you get started, we're gonna take your food stamps away. Is that the only thing that will encourage people to be a part of this program?"

LeFlore: "On that, that's left up to the Department.

Ropp: "Pardon?"

LeFlore: "It's left up to the Department of Public Aid."

Ropp: "As to whether or not they'll take their food stamps away?"

LeFlore: "Right. Right."

Ropp: "Okay. What makes this program so unique and different from the other 48 or 50 programs that we have to try to get people back to work?"

LeFlore: "Okay. This program is focused at work activities, not training, not education."

Ropp: "I'm sorry. I didn't hear you, there's so much noise I can't hear you."

LeFlore: "Mr. Speaker, could you ask them to keep the noise down, please? This particular program is focused at training."

Ropp: "Training, okay."

LeFlore: "Work training, right, and not class room training, or the job training. The specific work."

Ropp: "Okay. But, don't we have 20 or 30 other programs that do the same thing? What makes this program so unique and different that we do not already have programs like JTPA and Project Chance, there's at least 45 other programs I can name."

LeFlore: "I understand that these are individuals will have the opportunity of earning their grant, not an assignment."

Ropp: "Earning a grant?"

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

LeFlore: "Earning their grant, if we can find some money for the program."

Ropp: "Don't they fit into any one of the program we already have?"

LeFlore: "I don't know, Sir. I mean, you know, a group of individuals put this program together and I cited that at the very beginning and in giving my presentation. So, this is not one man's show."

Ropp: "I know, and it a unique name, it's a different name, but we've got nearly 50 other programs that are attempting to put people to work and obviously this is another one, and it may pass if we don't have any money, I guess it won't work anyway. But, it just seems like with all the programs that we have, we ought to be able to fit those people into one of the programs that we already have. We already have Project Chance, that obviously may not have worked. We have project Second Chance, then Third Chance, and it just...it seems like we've got enough programs."

LeFlore: "Are you finished Representative?"

Weaver: "Yes Sir, thank you."

LeFlore: "Okay. This is not a project chance program. This is a program that will allow people to earn their grant."

Weaver: "Okay. Thank you."

LeFlore: "And they will not get the grant out front."

Speaker Laurino: "Further discussion? Representative Weller."

Weller: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Laurino: "He indicates he will."

Weller: "Representative LeFlore, it's my understanding that the Governor's Office and the Department of Public Aid is (sic-are) supporting this legislation?"

LeFlore: "Yes."

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

Weller: "Also, it's my understanding that as the money becomes available, this Earnfare proposal is the Governor's chief funding priority?"

LeFlore: "I would hope so."

Weller: "I would hope so, too."

LeFlore: "Things are not happening now."

Weller: "That's right."

LeFlore: "But, I hope someone would come forward and present it...the budget for this program. At the present time, we don't have a budget."

Weller: "Thank you. It's my understanding, Representative, that, you know, according to the title, that the participants must, of course, earn their benefits. It's almost a Workfare concept, so it's not an entitlement."

LeFlore: "No, it's not."

Weller: "All right. Thank you, Representative. To the Bill. I rise in support of this legislation. Many Members of this chamber have called for welfare reform. Real welfare reform that works to break the welfare cycle. Earnfare is an important step forward, and I want to commend the Sponsor, the Governor's office, and all those who were involved in putting this together. This is a good program, let's give it a good try, let's try some real welfare reform here in Illinois. A good vote is a 'yes' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Laurino: "The Gentleman moves for the adoption of the First Conference Committee Report to Senate Bill 1717. All those in favor will indicate by voting 'aye', opposed 'nay'. The Board 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." This Motion having received 114 'ayes' 0 voting 'nay', 0 voting 'present',

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1909, Representative Bill Peterson."

Peterson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move for adoption of Conference Committee Report #1 on Senate Bill 1909, and I'd like the Co-Sponsor, Representative Hartke, to give an introduction and explain the Bill if you could."

Speaker Laurino: "Representative Hartke."

Hartke: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, and Members of the House. Senate Bill 1909 is the windshield replacement insurance legislation that we worked on here in the House quite diligently, and it went to the Senate and had some problems over there, and we've worked very hard getting the agreement between State Farm, Allstate and all the insurance companies and the windshield replacement firms in the State of Illinois. This piece of legislation also has parts of Senate Bill 2153, Barkhausen-Lang, containing provisions as well as House Bill 1516 from Mautino. I would be more than happy to answer any questions that you might have on the Conference Committee Report."

Speaker Laurino: "Further discussions, Representative Peterson.

Pedersen."

Pedersen: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I was deeply involved in this thing in the House side, and worked with Representative Hartke. I had some real reservations as to how it affected insurance agencies and what have you, and those have been resolved, so I recommend an 'aye' vote on this."

Speaker Laurino: "Representative Leitch."

Leitch: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. I too would like to commend, especially Representative Hartke, for his hard work. This took a tremendous amount of work to bring the parties

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

together, and it's to his credit that the parties are together now, and that this, I do not believe, is a controversial Amendment, and I would urge it's adoption."

- Speaker Laurino: "Representative moves for the adoption of the Conference Committee Report #1 to Senate Bill 1909. All those in favor will indicate by voting 'aye', opposed 'nay'. The Board 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. This Bill, having received 111 'ayes', 3 voting 'no', 2 voting 'present', having receiving the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 2176, Representative Brunsvold. Out of the record. On Supplemental Calendar #6, Conference Committee Reports, appears House Bill 3884, Representative J. Hoffman. Is the Gentleman in Okay, out of the record for the time being. chamber? We'll go to Motions on Supplemental Calendar #6, Joint Resolution 159, Representative Davis. Representative Davis, we're waiting for your..."
- Davis: "Oh, I'm sorry, I thought you were going to have him read some...Thank you very much. House Joint Resolution...Senate Joint Resolution #159, is um...it mirrors House Joint Resolution 127 that went to the Senate, and it's the Resolution that asks that um a further investigation."
- Speaker Laurino: "Representative, Representative Davis, this is the Motion to discharge, and that's what you should be speaking to."
- Davis: "All right. I make a Motion to discharge the Committee on this Resolution."
- Speaker Laurino: "The Lady moves for the Discharge Committee and place on the Speaker's Table for immediate consideration,

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

Senate Joint Resolution 159. On that, is there any discussion? Representative, and on it, is there any discussion? Representative Wennlund."

Wennlund: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentleman of the House. Here we are at 9:52, with barely two hours to go till midnight. We have not adopted a budget yet. There are numerous, serious consequences to legislation pending. There is serious substantive legislation pending, and there are severe matters facing the General Assembly in dealing with the budget and hospital assessments, and matters of great importance to the State of Illinois. rise in objection to the Motion, and I ask for a Roll Call vote. We don't need to be considering matters like this at a time when we're almost barely two hours from a scheduled adjournment, when any major legislation is gonna require 72 votes, instead of a usual 60, and here we are bringing up matters and Resolutions like this. This does not need to be voted on, and I object to it, and ask for a Roll Call vote."

Speaker Laurino: "Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I understand that no other Conference Committee Report is on the Call. The Speaker called, I think, and there's a little lull. All we'd have to do is get permission for immediate consideration. It will take about two seconds, because this is exactly like a House Resolution we already adopted. It's a Joint Resolution, I think we ought to give her immediate consideration. It'll take us a minute, and get it over with, and I would urge your support of her..."

Speaker Laurino: "The Lady moves for the discharge. Should the

Committee for immediate consideration be placed on the

Speaker's Table, and on that, all those in favor will

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

indicate by saying 'aye', opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it, and the Discharge Motion is adopted. Representative Davis, on Senate Joint Resolution 159."

- Davis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Joint Resolution 159 is a piece of legislation that has come out of the House, come out of the Senate, with almost unanimous support. And it merely asks that an investigation take place in reference to the beating of Rodney King, and that the United States Attorney General look into the case, and make sure that justice prevail, in order that people who have witnessed this on television, time and time again, can have a feeling that justice does prevail. I urge an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Laurino: "Further discussion... The Lady moves for the adoption of Senate Joint Resolution 159. All those in favor indicate by saying 'aye', opposed 'nay'. The 'ayes' have it, the Joint Resolution is adopted. On Supplemental Calendar #6, appears House Bill 3884, Representative Jay Hoffman."
- Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, House Bill 3884, First Conference Committee, is something that's been worked on this entire session. Agreement has been reached by everybody involved. What it would do is, the Supreme Court recently raised the bail amount for a traffic ticket to \$75. This would say that \$5 it, \$5 of it, would go to a Trauma Center fund. Trauma Center fund, half of that money would then be doubled through the federal program, and it would go through that system. The other half would be collected within a region. So, if you get a speeding ticket or something, in Quincy, half of the money, half of the \$5, would go directly to the Trauma Center within Quincy.

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

Everybody, the Municipal League, county organizations, Cook County, City of Chicago, everybody is in favor of this. Hospital Association is greatly in favor of this. I ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Laurino: "The Gentleman asks for an adoption of Conference Committee Report #1 to House Bill 3884, and on that, is there any discussion? Representative Hasara."

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

Speaker Laurino: "He indicates he will."

Hasara: "Okay. Representative, this fine applies to any fine that is raised to \$75?"

Hoffman: "No, what it does, is the Supreme Court, on it's own, raised the bail amount."

Hasara: "Right."

Hoffman: "If a fine...If a fine is not more than \$55, \$55 or more, this doesn't kick in. If the court...If the court, for instance, by mail, they pay by mail and they pay \$75, then it does apply. So, we're not taking anything away from existing municipalities, what they're getting, what counties are presently getting, what any of the other funds are getting. What we're doing is saying part of this new money is going to go to Trauma Centers which are in great danger of being closed, and getting 20¢ on the dollar."

Hasara: "Okay. Where is the additional amount of the fine going?"

Hoffman: "That is going to be distributed as per what was already established last year, through the percentage basis.

Municipalities...It goes to Municipalities, counties, and then to three other funds, victim's assistance, traffic, a excuse me, law enforcement, and I think the third one is drivers education. None of that will change."

Hasara: "What will the bottom line increase for local

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

government's be?"

Hoffman: "It's going to be...it's gonna...It depends on how many fines that are collected. If a person just pays a \$50 fine, local government's get the same thing they did now. But, it appears that many court are going to begin in conjunction with the Supreme Court, bring that up, and that means that definitely, definitely, there's going to be a lot more money for municipalities, a lot more money for counties, simply by virtue of the bail amount being increased."

Hasara: "Okay. Does the Section 27.6, simply change the way that the percentages in which the money is dispersed?"

Hoffman: "What it does Representative, is there are four counties in the state who last year opted into do it on a percentage basis. This only applies...it does...that's all it does, it says that Trauma Center funds will get a certain percentage. However, it essentially, the practical effect of this, is that it holds harmless these other funds, so that they will not receive any less money than they've already got. Only, if there is more money coming in, will we be taking a percentage, and they will still get a lot...a lot more money than they did in the last fiscal year."

Hasara: "Thank you, Representative."

Speaker Laurino: "Further discussion? Seeing none, the Gentleman moves for the adoption of Conference Committee Report #1 to House Bill 3884, and on that...the question is 'Shall the Bill pass?'. All those in favor indicate by voting 'ave'. opposed 'nay'. The Board is open. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Santiago wishes to be voted 'aye'. This Motion, having received 116 'ayes', 0

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

voting 'nay', 0 voting 'present', having received the required Constitutional Majority, this Conference Committee Report is adopted. We'll go back to Supplemental Calendar #5, Senate Bill 2176, Representative Brunsvold."

Brunsvold: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Conference Committee #1 on Senate Bill 2176, goes back to the original Bill. It is...the Conference Committee stripped off the Amendment dealing with 911, and also removed language on veteran's preference, and the Bill is in its original form now, which addresses a specific situation with the community, and sewage being discharged into underground mines, very narrowly drawn to include only one community, and Senator Welch is addressing that problem, and I would ask for your support in the adoption of the First Conference Committee Report to Senate Bill 2176."

Speaker Laurino: "The Gentleman he moves for the adoption of the

Conference Committee Report #1 to Senate Bill 2176, and on
that, is there any discussion? Representative Black."

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

Speaker Laurino: "Yes."

Black: "With apologies, Representative, it's hard to hear in here. The Conference Committee strips the Bill, right?

Put's it back in its original form..."

Brunsvold: "Original form, right."

Black: "Which was Senate Bill 2176."

Brunsvold: "(Senate Bill) 2176 correct."

Black: "All right. When you amend the municipal code to annex contiguous unimproved unincorporated, I'm sorry, improved territory, what if the people in that area don't care to be annexed?"

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

- Brunsvold: "This situation, Representative, I discussed this with the Municipal League. On Page 2, #4, line 6, it says 'no tract of land in excess of 10 acres has been included in the Ordinance without the express consent of the owner or owners'. This is very narrowly drafted, to include only the individuals that are contaminating the soil, and surveys are going to be done on those, and see which ones are being contaminated. There is a lot of safeguards in the Bill to protect those individuals that are not doing this."
- Black: "Bear with me for a second, because we have some concerns about this Bill. What was the genesis, is it a particular problem in a particular area?"
- Brunsvold: "Yes, there's mines under Streator, Illinois. These mines have been collecting the sewage that's being disposed of in the ground that's right outside the city limits, and it's contaminating the drinking water of the wells of that community, and the city has no way of controlling that contamination of those underground wells."
- Black: "And really, you're not really dramatically changing, as I understand it, existing law. Municipalities already have the authority do they not, to annex land that is contiguous under their existing authority?"
- Brunsvold: "They have that right. I'm not sure this area wants to be annexed, because they know if that situation exists, they're going to go in there and clean it up, and it's, in fact, gonna cost them money."
- Black: "Okay, now that, I think, is the dist of some concerns that have been expressed to me. If it's annexed, and the city goes in there and cleans it up, puts in sewers etc. whatever they have to do, then I, assume..."
- Brunsvold: "They're gonna be assessed as anybody else would be

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

assessed."

Brunsvold: "That's my understanding."

Black: "All right. Thank you very much, Representative."

Speaker Laurino: "Further discussion? Representative Regan."

Regan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the...Would you yield for a question?"

Brunsvold: "Yes."

Regan: "Originally, this Bill has got a back door referendum in it. Now what we've done, is replace the back door referendum with a straight forward assessment?"

Brunsvold: "Restate that question, again, please."

Regan: "Does it still have a back-door referendum in it?"

Brunsvold: "Do you have a specific place on the Bill?"

Regan: "No. It was originally a mark in my book as a back door referendum, and I'm wondering if it's been changed with this Amendment and this Conference Committee Report?"

Brunsvold: "I don't see that section. If you'd point it out to me, I'd..."

Regan: "Well ya gotta get the money to do this somehow, so you're gonna do it just like a water hookup, and that's an assessment then, straightforward."

Brunsvold: "The situation in this community, Representative, is they're sitting there being contaminated, their drinking water is being contaminated. They have no way to address their problem, and the problem is they're going to have to force an annexation here in order to clean-up the ground water."

Regan: "All right. Thank you very much."

Speaker Laurino: "Further discussion? Seeing none, the Gentleman

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

moves for the adoption of the Conference Committee Report #1, to Senate Bill 2176. All those in favor indicate by voting 'aye', opposed 'nay'. The Board is open. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Kubik, 'aye'. Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. This Motion, having received 106 'ayes', 7 'nos', and one voting 'present', having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On Supplemental Calendar #5, there is Senate Bill 1516. That was out of the record. Representative Kubik, are you ready with Senate Bill 1516, Sir? Proceed."

Kubik: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. As I took this Bill out of the record a couple of moments ago to make sure that the Secretary of State had no objection to the Bill, let me tell you that this Bill now, the new Conference Committee Report, formerly has House Bill 4160, that was sponsored by Representative Santiago, which passed out of the House by an overwhelming margin. In addition to that, it contains the provisions of an Agreed Compromise which would request that immigration assistance service providers be registered. people who provide assistance to new immigrants who come to this country, and are seeking citizenship. This Bill is a response to some abuses by those immigration service providers. I know of no opposition to the Bill, and I would move for adoption of the First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 1516, and be happy to answer any questions you might have."

Speaker Laurino: "The Gentleman asks for the adoption of the First Conference Committee Report to Senate Bill 1516, and on that, is there any discussion? Representative Santiago, the Gentleman from Cook."

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

- Santiago: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of this Bill. What this Bill does, it gives specifically the immigrants an opportunity to be treated fair, and also it prevents them from being defrauded. I move to adopt this Conference Committee. I rise in support of it."
- Speaker Laurino: "The Gentleman asks for the adoption of the First Conference Committee Report to Senate Bill 1516. All those in favor will indicate by voting 'aye', opposed 'nay'. The Board 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. This Motion, having received a 113 'ayes', and 0 voting 'nay', 0 voting 'present'. The First Conference Committee Report to Senate Bill 1516, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Keane in the Chair."
- Speaker Keane: "On Supplemental #3, on the Order of Motions, is

 Senate Joint Resolution #81...181, Representative Lang.

 Representative Lang, on Motion on Senate Joint Resolution

 181."
- Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would move to discharge the committee on SJR181."
- Speaker Keane: "Is there leave for use of the Attendance Roll Call to discharge? Representative Black."
- Black: "I hope my light was on at a timely fashion, Mr. Speaker.

 I don't know anything about this Resolution."
- Speaker Keane: "It's on Supplemental Calendar #3."
- Black: "I'll approach the podium, thank you."
- Speaker Keane: "With leave for use of the Attendance Roll Call, the Gentleman's Motion passes. Motion is adopted. Now we will take Senate Joint Resolution #181. Representative Lang."

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would move for the passage of Senate Joint Resolution 181. This Resolution would, in tribute to Michael Howlett and former Governor Thompson, name buildings on their behalf. The Centennial Building in Springfield would become the Michael J. Howlett building, and the State of Illinois Center in Chicago, the James R. Thompson building, and I move adoption of the Resolution."

Speaker Keane: "Any discussion? Representative Black."

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

Speaker Keane: "He indicates he will."

Black: "Representative, I a...It's a very magnanimous jesture, but have you asked the former Governor whether he would...whether he wants this honor?"

Lang: "I have not asked the Governor if he would like the honor, but he's hasn't come to ask me for very much lately, so I thought I would just foist this honor upon him, Representative."

Black: "I suppose the request to divide the question is not timely?"

Lang: "Well."

Black: "Representative, I've been in the State of Illinois
Building, and I would'nt want it named after me, but if
Governor Thompson would like the honor, I'm happy to give
it to him."

Black: "Well I...the point I'm trying to make is I'm not sure that he wants the honor. I mean the man is still alive for God's sake. This is normally reserved to those dedicated public officials who have gone on to that great office building in the sky."

Lang: "Representative, I'm informed we named the Stratton Building, after former Governor Stratton, and he was still

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

alive. The building has served us quite well, and a...but he was...yeah, I can't repeat that Representative, thank you."

Black: "Well, I appreciate your a..."

Lang: "This is not my first Resolution."

Black: "Oh, I understand that, and it's a very interesting
Resolution, and I appreciate your answering my questions."

Speaker Keane: "Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I thought we might reverse and name the Centennial Building after Governor Thompson. It seemed like he was Governor for a hundred years."

Speaker Keane: "Representative Dunn."

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

I think it might be a better idea to name the Comptroller's computer after former Governor Thompson, because he's the one that put us in this fix we're in tonight, and her computer always comes up triple 0's now, and I think it may be a nice thing to do, to name...just name the computer right after that Governor, instead of that building."

Speaker Keane: "The question is, 'Shall the House adopt Senate

Joint Resolution 181?' All those in favor say 'aye', all
opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment is
adopted. We will send an embossed and engraved copy of
this with Senator Black's compliments to both Gentleman
upon their...notification of their death...passing.
Representative McAuliffe, for what purpose do you rise?"

McAuliffe: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I was just wondering who you gonna get to deliver that Resolution to Mike Howlett?"

Speaker Keane: "To Mike Howlett?"

McAuliffe: "Yeah."

Speaker Keane: "Well, we're looking for volunteers if you're interested."

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

McAuliffe: "I don't want to be the volunteer for that. No."

Speaker McPike: "Supplemental #7. Mr. Clerk, for an announcement."

Clerk O'Brien: "Supplemental Calendar #7 has been distributed."

Speaker McPike: "House Bill 3037, Representative Barnes."

Barnes: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentleman of the House. House Bill 3037 has in the original Bill, a amending of the Fire Protection District Act, and it went out of this House on the Consent Calendar. What I have added to the Bill is another Bill that I have worked on since January, with the assistance of the Secretary of State, George Ryan. I don't know how many of you are aware that in all of the districts throughout the entire State of Illinois, youngsters that are under 21 go into liquor stores, restaurants, hotels, that sell liquor with false ID's, and they think they're just being smart and funny. What happens is, the Liquor Control Commission shuts down the business for a day, they are fined, and the youngsters walk away laughing. So, what we've done, is we worked on some language that will really help the small business community throughout the entire State of Illinois. T f false or fraudulent Illinois Drivers License, or Illinois Identification card, is presented by a person less than 21 years of age, attempting to purchase or otherwise obtain and attempting to obtain the serving of any alcohol beverage, the law enforcement, officer, or agency investigating the incident, shall, upon discovery, make a report of this matter to the Secretary of State on a form provided by the Secretary of State. I've had about eight meetings on this Bill to satisfy everybody's questions. my hands, the statewide support of the Illinois have in Sheriff's Association, they'd be very happy..."

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

Speaker McPike: "Does anyone rise in opposition to this? The question is, 'Shall the House adopt the First Conference Committee Report to House Bill 3037?' All in favor '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 107 'ayes' 1 'no'. and the House does adopt the First Conference Committee House Bill 3037, and this Bill. having received...McNamara, 'aye'; Shaw, 'aye'; Weller, Santiago, 'aye'; Steczo, from 'no' to 'aye'. On this Bill, there are 112 'ayes' and no 'nays', and the House does adopt the First Conference Committee Report to House Bill 3037, and this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill Representative Keane."

Keane: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Conference Committee Report #1 on House Bill 4049, deals with advertising signs. It provides that...reduces the maximum size of the billboards to 800 square feet from the current 1200. It provides constitutional and just compensation guarantees supplied to advertising signs, increases the maximum distance from 100 feet between billboards...from 100 feet in municipalities and 300 feet in other areas, to 300 and 500 feet respectively. Provides for a 10 to 40 full increase in state permit fees. It's supported by numerous groups, and I ask for it's passage."

Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall the House adopt the First Conference Committee Report to House Bill 4049?' 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 Bill, there are 109 'ayes', 1 'no', and the House does adopt First Conference

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

Committee Report to House Bill 4049, and this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 4070, Representative LeFore."

- LeFlore: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. (House Bill) 4070, Senate
 Amendment #2 is agreed language between CMS, the Sponsor,
 and the Treasurer's Office. There is a lot of language
 that is in this Bill and it's good language for small
 business. This Bill has been before us three times, and I
 explained the language each time, and now I'm asking for a
 favorable vote on this Second Conference Committee Report."
- Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall the House adopt the First Conference Committee Report to House Bill 4070?' Mr. Wennlund."
- Wennlund: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of House. This measure has been defeated twice in this House. What it does is, wants to let the State of Illinois, in its precarious financial condition, quarantee the bonds of contractors in this state, and allow the Treasurer to be able to do that. Now every risky business, and every risky to engage in that type of contractor that wants construction contract, the State of Illinois should not putting it's neck out on the line, risking it's financial future. It could cost millions of dollars to the State of The state would become a guarantor, a surety, Illinois. for these contractors who may be in risky businesses, often are in the contracting industry, and that's why this proposal has been defeated the last two times. not...We couldn't even get a budget together for crying out loud, but let's afford the millions of dollars that this would cost the State of Illinois. It's been defeated twice before, and it should be defeated again."

Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall the House adopt the

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

First Conference Committee Report to House Bill 4070?' All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. 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 Motion, there are 44 'ayes, 64 'nos', and the House does not adopt the First Conference Committee Report to House Bill 4070. Mr. LeFlore, do you want a Second Conference Committee? The Gentleman asks for a Second Conference Committee be appointed. House Bill 4078, Mr. Homer. Representative Homer. House Bill 4163, Representative Parcells. Parcells."

Parcells: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of This legislation addresses a growing concern throughout the country that health care workers who own a financial interest in health care facilities, may be their those facilities. over-referring patients to potentially resulting in over-utilization of services, increasing health care costs and creating the appearance of a conflict. The legislation is not aimed at those health care workers that actually provide their patients with care. It is not aimed at the doctor that has laboratory or diagnostic equipment in his office, or of that...that of group...of his group, I should say. It is aimed at those doctors that refer patients to health care facilities in which they have a financial interest and only a financial interest. It deals with services only, not goods. Bill will ban such self-referrals by identifying those circumstances where such a referral is inappropriate and identifying where they are appropriate. The Bill is the product of many hours of meetings held under the direction of Representative Matijevich and with all of the interested parties present to address the issue of self-referral in a

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

way that meets the needs of the medical community, the patient community and the general public. The results of these meetings and discussions recognized the need to accommodate rural communities and instances of demonstrated need. Ownership of shares of stock in publicly traded companies, like the pharmacists owning shares in Abbott Laboratories. HMOs, where inherit incentives like this Bill's, is proper utilization and controlling health care costs and doctors, and also doctor-owned hospitals. All of these concerns have been addressed to the satisfaction of all those groups. The Bill is supported by all of the medical community that were present, by the hospitals. I know of no opposition, and I'd ask for your 'aye' vote, and I'm happy to answer any questions on the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Dunn."

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

Will the Sponsor yield for some questions?"

Parcells: "Yes."

Dunn: "All right. This is a complicated Bill, and I, for one, don't understand some things. Can you tell me if the intent of this Bill is to exclude free-standing, radio-therapy centers which provide only therapeutic services?"

Parcells: "Is that the intent of the Bill?"

Dunn: "The question is...Yes...Is the intent of the Bill to exclude...free-standing, radio-therapy centers which provide only therapeutic services and that would be in contrast to diagnostic services."

Parcells: "No, it is not the idea to get rid of them. Those doctors, if it is owned solely by referring doctors, those doctors will divest. There are provisions in the Bill that they will divest, and it will become a public company, and

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

they may own 1/2 of 1% of the stock in the company."

Dunn: "I...I know that. So, you think that if there's a free-standing, radio-therapy center and it provides only therapeutic services, and not diagnostic services, it still is covered by this Bill and is not exempt?"

Parcells: "Yes it would."

Dunn: "Well...Then, what...what effect will this Bill have on the MRI facilities where there are physician/investors who refer patients to that MRI. Are those people covered by this Bill?"

Parcells: "They would be required to convert into a public company by the year 1995."

Dunn: "In other words, they would be covered?"

Parcells: "Yes."

Parcells: "Could you repeat that? Diagnostic only?"

Dunn: "Yes, diagnostic only. Does the Bill prevent or prohibit a doctor who invests...who is also an investor, from referring to a diagnostic entities in which he has an interest as an investor?"

Parcells: "Yes, it would."

Dunn: "Does the Bill exclude physician/investor...investor referrals for therapeutic activity? So, if the referral is not for diagnostic services, it's just for therapeutic activities, but the doctor is an investor in the...in the therapeutic center?"

Parcells: "That would fall within the definition of health services under this Bill."

Dunn: "Does the Bill exclude a doctor/investor who makes referrals to an independent contractor, who makes an independent medical judgment regarding treatment? So that

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

if a doctor is an investor and refers to someone who is an independent contractor and makes an independent medical judgment regarding treatment, but it takes place in this investor referral facility, is the doctor covered by this Bill or exempt?"

Parcells: "If you're referring to somebody like Carle Clinic, they would be outside the scope of this Bill."

Dunn: "I don't know about Carle Clinic."

Parcells: "Well, someone that is an independent contractor would be outside the scope of this Bill."

Dunn: "So, you think an independent contractor...It would seem
that would be the case, if they are free-standing, but so
that the doctor who makes the referral to an independent
contractor and that independent contractor makes an
independent medical judgment regarding treatment, that,
that type of referral would be exempt."

Parcells: "That's beyond the scope of this Bill. It is for doctors who are making a referral."

Dunn: "Thank you, that's fine. Does the Bill exclude a physician/investor referral to an entity if the doctor who is an investor reveals his or her interest to his patient? In other words, the doctor says, 'I'm gonna send you over to this place for...for a referral, and I want you to know that I do own a piece of it.' Is that okay, or is that prevented by this Bill?"

Parcells: "It could fall under the community need exemption; then that would be possible. If there...There are provisions in here."

Dunn: "Well, the community need exemption is something different.

That...that depends...That's a defined area, I think, where there's a...an under-served area."

Parcells: "Right."

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

Dunn: "This...this question is a little different. Does the a...Does the..."

Speaker McPike: "To the Bill, Mr. Dunn."

Dunn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If the doctor discloses that he has an interest, is it covered by the Bill or not? Then I have one more question."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Parcells."

Parcells: "If the doctor owns a part of the facility, and it's not in a community of need, he not...he must divest himself of that by..."

Dunn: "Even if he just says...tells the patient, 'I own a piece of it.' Still must divest? Okay. Okay."

Parcells: "Disclosure is not enough."

Dunn: "Disclosure is not enough."

Parcells: "Then, does the Bill exclude a doctor/investor who makes a referral to an independent contractor who is a non-investor, but the doctor maintains control of the patient, the doctor says, 'Go on over there, but after you're finished, come back.' Does that help? Are you..."

Parcells: "That is not prohibited."

Dunn: "That would be covered by the Bill as well."

Parcells: "Yes."

Dunn: "All right. Thank you very much."

Parcells: "That is addressed in the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall the House adopt the First Conference Committee Report to House Bill 4163?' 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 Bill, there is 111 'ayes' and no 'nays', and the House does adopt First Conference Committee Report to House Bill 4163, and this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

declared passed. Representative Deets."

Deets: "Mr. Speaker, on that last Bill, I just wanted to declare a possible conflict of interest."

Speaker McPike: "House Bill 4078, Representative Homer.

Representative Lang has leave to handle the Bill. Mr.

Lang."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 4078 would create in Lang: Cook County a Child Support Collection program, whereby the Clerk of the Circuit Court could get..involve herself in a cooperative venture with the State's Attorney of Cook County to collect past due child support. This is an important Bill, because as we know, child support isn't getting collected. We have thousands of dead beats all over the state not paying their child support, millions of dollars not being collected, and as we know, the Department of Public Aid just is not getting the job done, and making those collections. The only way the Department of Public Aid can get the job done on making those collections, would be to hire 50, 100, or 200 people, to make collection phone calls all day. Now on the Republican side of the aisle, we have Representative Hasara, who has a Bill to collection agencies, in her view, make these collections, and what the Clerk of the Circuit Court in Cook county wants to do is hire private law firms, and collection agencies, who are experienced in collections, to go out and collect money from deadbeats who are not making the proper payments. There's millions of dollars due and We talked about child support guidelines owing here. talked about future payments, of We future people, who would be responsible for child support, major, major problem in this state are deadbeat dads. Deadbeat dads that don't pay, and don't live up to their

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

responsibilities. If we want them to make these payments, we need to go out and get the money from them. If we're to get the money from them, we need a program that works. This is the program. I would recommend an 'aye' vote."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Wennlund."

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

Speaker McPike: "Yes."

Wennlund: "Representative aware that...I'm Lang, are you surrounded here by Members...employees of the Department of Public Aid, and I'm informed that the attorney's for the Department of Public Aid claim that this will put the Department out of compliance with federal law. The Department of Public Aid currently has governmental agreements with the Cook County State's attorney and other agencies to enforce collection of this in the County of Cook. And that in the event that they're required to do this, it will put them out of federal compliance, and will cost the State of Illinois dollars that would go to public aid recipients in Illinois. And it would put the state in serious jeopardy of even further dollars that now are funneled...federal dollars that pass through the Department of Public Aid and go out to public aid recipients, and which is why the Department of Public Aid is opposed to this, because it could end up hurting the people who could benefit the most from programs put on by the Department of Public Aid."

Lang: "Representative, was that a question or a statement? You asked me to vield for a question, do you have a question?"

Wennlund: "The question is, are you aware that it will put the Department of Public Aid out of compliance with federal regulations?"

Lang: "That is not the case. The Department of Public Aid

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

attorneys and the attorneys for the Clerk of the Circuit Court of Cook county, differ completely on this issue. I should indicate to you that a...these attorneys have studied the issue. These attorneys believe after their conversations with the appropriate officials in Washington, that this is a good program, this is a program that will not put the State of Illinois out of compliance with federal law."

Wennlund: "Which attorneys are you referring to?"

Lang: "I don't know their names, Representative."

Wennlund: "But I mean, who do they represent?"

Lang: "They're attorneys representing the Clerk of the Circuit Court of Cook County."

Wennlund: "Well, first of all, it is the attorney's for the Department of Public Aid who work very closely with the federal department, are well aware of what the federal regulations are, and what the federal law is, and they have determined that, indeed, it will put the Department of Public Aid out of compliance, and in serious jeopardy of losing federal funding and federal pass-through dollars that are, in fact, distributed by the Department of Public Aid, to recipients of Public Aid. And the Department of Public Aid currently has agreements with the County of Cook, and the State's Attorney's office with respect to the enforcement of these support obligations."

Lang: "Is that a question also?"

Wennlund: "No. It's a statement. To the Bill. Ladies and
Gentlemen of the House, the Department of Public Aid, in
the administration of its programs and the collection of
the support obligations, already has intergovernmental
agreements with the Cook County State's Attorney and the
County of Cook in the collection of these, which are

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

perfectly legitimate. However, these other types of agreements, which provide the collection of these types of support obligations, I am informed by the Department of Public Aid and their attorneys, that indeed they will put them in jeopardy of violating the federal regulations that deal with it, and will, indeed, cost the taxpayers money, because they are going to lose federal dollars. And you're gonna hurt the very people you're trying to help, because you're gonna have less federal dollars, less pass-through dollars, with which to do it. Now, I suggest that the timing is wrong for this Bill and that before you take a step that would jeopardize federal dollars that would go to public aid recipients in Illinois and in Cook county, you ought to take a serious look at this, 'no' vote is a right vote at this time."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Stepan."

Stepan: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I think if you look at the language on this Bill, it does indeed say that the collection program that the Clerk of the Court wants to set up, is in compliance with existing collection programs. This is a Bill that is sorely needed for Cook County. We're having a hard time collecting child support payments. This is something that will facilitate those payments. I urge you all to support this Bill. Thank you."

Speaker McPike: "Shall the House adopt the First Conference Committee Report to House Bill 4078?' All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. 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 Motion, there are 66...67 'ayes', 43 'nos', and the House does adopt the First Conference Committee Report to House Bill 4078, and this Bill, having received a Constitutional

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1988, Representative Cowlishaw. Senate Bill."

Cowlishaw: "Yes, thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The First Conference Committee Report to Senate Bill 1988, includes all of the material that was in this Bill when it left the House that was not controversial. There was one Amendment that controversial, that was removed, and then there is one small item that was added, and that is purely a technical Amendment, that has to do with vacancy on a committee of ten, and how the remaining committee members are authorized to appoint another member to fill the vacancy. That's all the Conference Committee does. I would be glad to answer any questions, and I move for the adoption of the First Conference Committee to Senate 1988."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Davis, on the Motion."

Davis: "First of all, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen, this is more than just a technical Amendment. It'll probably pass out of here with a hundred and something votes. It includes the language in which I spoke before, that stated that the Chicago Public School Children were going to lose instructional time, and someone spoke after I did, stated that it did no such thing. Well, it does. report states that we, the Conference Committee appointed to consider the differences, accept Amendments #1, 2, 3, 7, 9, and 11. Later in this report, where I had an Amendment to pass, that it said students had to be in school at least 4 1/2 hours a day before they could be dismissed early on a consistent basis for staff development for teachers, that they would be losing school time, someone said that's not true. Well, it is true. The school children in Chicago..."

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall...Representative Young,
Anthony Young."

Young: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise to support this Conference Committee. I'm a signator on the Conference Committee, any my signature isn't there, but I just want the Members to know that's not because I don't support it. I've studied long and hard on this issue, and I think that staff development is so important for the teachers in the Chicago School System, and the way the report is drafted, it will only happen if the local school council represents it, and that's why I'm gonna support this report."

Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall the House adopt the First Conference Committee Report to Senate Bill 1988?'

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 Motion, there are 104 'ayes', 3 'nos'. Representative Davis, for what reason do you rise?"

Davis: "My vote, is that still permissible?"

Speaker McPike: "No, it's not. You spoke in debate. No, you can't explain your vote if you spoke in debate. Why not? That's the rules. There are 100...Representative Weller, votes 'aye'. The chair would encourage you to stay by your desks so you can vote. There are 105 'ayes', 3 'nos', and the House does concur in the First Conference Committee Report to Senate Bill 1988. Mr. Edley votes 'aye' and Mr. Saltsman votes 'aye'. Mr. McGuire votes 'aye'. Mr. Schoenberg votes 'aye'. On this Bill, there are 109 'ayes' and 3 'nos', and the House does concur on the First Conference Committee Report to Senate Bill 1988. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

- declared passed. Supplemental Calendar announcement."
- Clerk O'Brien: "Supplemental Calendar #8 has been distributed."
- Speaker McPike: "Mr. Ronan, your Conference Committee Report.

 Does it have any opposition?"
- Ronan: "I a...There's no opposition. I move for the adoption of Conference Committee for House Bill 3707."
- Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall the House adopt the First Conference Committee Report to House Bill 3707?' those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. 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 95, 94 'ayes' and 11 'nos', and the House does adopt the First Conference Committe Report to 3707. This Bill, House Bill having received Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Ryder, are you ready? Mr. Ryder, are you ready? Bill 1783, Representative Weller. Mr. Weller. Mr. Ryder. Mr. Weller."
- Weller: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'd be happy to yield to Representative Ryder."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Ryder."
- Ryder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is the substantive Bill which contains the necessary changes within the substantive law which may effective the cuts which were part of the Governor's budget, and other cuts in the budget that we need. I would be glad to answer any questions. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker McPike: "The question then, 'Shall the House adopt the First Conference Committee Report to Senate Bill 1783?'

 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. Representative White

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

changes from 'aye' to 'no'. On this Motion, there are...on this Motion...Representative Shaw votes 'no'. Representative Flowers votes 'no', and Representative Stern votes 'no'. Representative McGuire votes 'no'. On this Motion, there are 66 'ayes'...66 'ayes', 46 'nos', and the House does adopt the First Conference Committee Report to House...Senate Bill 1783, and this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Representative Flinn, House Bill 3495. Mr. Flinn. Flinn, Flinn.

- Flinn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House...Senate 5...Conference

 Committee Report has been, as far as I'm concerned, has no
 opposition, and I move for the adoption."
- Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall the House adopt the
 First Conference Committee Report to House Bill 3495?' All
 in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted?
 Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have
 all voted who wish? Mr. Black."
- Black: "Yes. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I realize the hour grows late, and the bewitching hour is only half an hour away. But, when somebody gets up and says there's no opposition, and everybody votes 'yes', that's kind of silly. Let's just slow it down, and give a brief explanation, so everybody knows what they're voting on. I think we're going just a little too fast here."
- Speaker McPike: "I think your point is well taken. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this Motion, there are 88 'ayes' and 25 'nos', and the House does adopt the First Conference Committee Report to House Bill 3495, and this Bill, having receiving a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Steczo, Senate Bill 221."

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

Steczo: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I would move that the House adopt the First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill 221. This Bill contains a number of local government provisions, most of which have been through the House, and have been on Consent Calendars and Agreed Lists. They include provisions for the Crystal Lake Civic Center, for the Illinois Council of Forestry Development, for provisions on County Board meetings, and a number of other things, Mr. Speaker. I would...these provisions have been signed off by leaders of both chambers, both sides. I would prefer to to answer any questions that Members might have, and proceed with the the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Matijevich."

Matijevich: "Will the Gentlemen yield?"

Speaker McPike: "Yes."

Matijevich: "I only have one question. The matter with regards to County Board meetings, what is that? We're getting Bills called and we don't have the analysis yet, and so it makes it difficult. What does that provision?"

Steczo: "It just removes the provision that requires the county boards to meet on the third Monday of December, March, June and September and the second Monday of July."

Matijevich: "All right."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Wojcik, the Sponsor will yield."

Wojcik: "Yes. Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker McPike: "Yes."

Wojcik: "Regarding the Crystal Lake Civic Center, could you explain what that is?"

Steczo: "This provision reduces the corporate limits on the Crystal Lake Civic Center. This provision changes the corporate limits from the corporate limits of school

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

district #47 to the boundaries of the municipality."

Wojcik: "Thank you."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Rice."

Rice: "Inquiry of the Chair."

Speaker McPike: "Yes."

Rice: "Has this been distributed?"

Speaker McPike: "Representative Keane."

Keane: "Question of the Sponsor. Does this Bill have anything to do with having townships offer classes or course work?"

Steczo: "In literacy?"

Keane: "Adult...in literacy."

Steczo: "No, it does not."

Keane: "Thank you."

Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall the House adopt the
First Conference Committee Report to Senate Bill 221?' All
in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. 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 Motion, there are 94 'ayes' and 15 'nos', and the
House does adopt the First Conference Committee Report to
Senate Bill 221, and this Bill, having received a
Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate
Bill 911, Representative Hoffman. Manny Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is a horse racing Bill that was brought up before on OTB's and all it did was change the date, added a few new locations to the Bill itself. I believe its been brought back to from the Senate and I ask for its adoption."

Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall the House adopt the First Conference Committee Report to Senate Bill 911?' All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?

166th Legislative Day

- June 30, 1992
- The Clerk will...The Clerk will take the record. On this Motion, there are...Representative Cowlishaw."
- Cowlishaw: "Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry. I touched the wrong button.

 Would you please change my vote to 'no'?"
- Speaker McPike: "Yes. Representative Cowlishaw changes from 'aye' to 'no'. On this Motion there are 100 'ayes', 8 'nos', and the House does adopt the First Conference Committee Report to Senate Bill 911, and this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative McAfee, Senate Bill 1657."
- McAfee: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to move the adoption of Conference Committee Report #1 to Senate Bill 1567.

 This Bill and conference report contains the Universal Veterans Place, which we passed out of here twice before. It also extends the deadline for delivery of titles from 15 to 20 days. I know of no opposition, and have support of the Secretary of State."
- Speaker McPike: "Mr. Black."
- Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
- Speaker McPike: "Yes."
- Black: "Now, Representative, this has the language that you and I have been working on along with several others for about two years. I'm trying to create a United States Veterans License Plate, is that correct?"
- McAfee: "That is correct."
- Black: "The other language has some things with the Secretary of State that the Secretary and the New Car and Truck Dealers are in total agreement with. Is that right?"
- McAfee: "That is correct."
- Black: "Thank you very much, Representative. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, the new part of this

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

Bill is agreed to by the Secretary of State and the New Car and Truck Dealers, but the most important part, and one that I commend the Sponsor on. We've been working on this for about two and a half years, and I don't know why it keeps dying in the Senate. All we're trying to do is to create a United States Military Veterans plate. Not a plate for every conflict. Just a plate, single design, it's got enough money in it. The Bill makes them pay the money to develop the plate. It's a good idea. I urge your support."

Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall the House adopt the

First Conference Committee Report to Senate Bill 1567?' 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 Motion, there are 112 'ayes', and 1 'no', and the House does adopt the First Conference Committee Report to Senate Bill 1567. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 1769, Representative Steczo." Steczo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would move for the adoption of the First Conference Committee Report on Senate Bill This report contains most of the information that was originally passed in Senate Bill 1769 and adds a number of...a few new provisions. One is agreed language on the Liquor Control Act regarding copies of invoices that have to be kept at the original location. It makes changes the Pharmacy Practice Act which conform to the Federal OGRA provisions. Ιt provides for a window individuals meeting specific criteria to become psychologists. That has the approval of the clinical psychologists. It allows the Department to offer more than one different type of examinations for interior designers,

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

and the others are the provisions, or many of the provisions that passed in the original Bill. Mr. Speaker, I'd answer any questions, but would urge a 'yes' vote on the adoption of the report."

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Black."

Black: "Yes. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I realize that we need to get our business done as quickly as possible, but an inquiry of the chair."

Speaker McPike: "Yes."

Black: "Not so much has this Conference Committee Report been distributed, has it even been printed?"

Speaker McPike: "No."

Black: "Well, perhaps we could take this out of the record until we could get it copied."

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Steczo? This hasn't been printed. Do you think we could take it out of the record until it's printed?"

Steczo: "I think, Mr. Speaker, we could accommodate the Gentleman."

Black: "Thank you very much."

Speaker McPike: "Speaker Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, could we go to the matter of House Bill 2758, which is concerned with the hospital assessment program to support the Medicaid program for the State of Illinois? Mr. Speaker, the Motion to concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 failed earlier, and Mr. Speaker, I would propose that we call that Motion again."

Speaker McPike: "House Bill 2758. The Gentleman moves to concur in...put the Bill up, Mr. Clerk. Supplemental #1, 2758. The Gentleman moves to concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 2758. All in favor of the Gentleman's Motion vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Mr. Lang."

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

Lang: "Mr. Speaker, once again, for the record, I have to declare
 my conflict that explains my 'present' vote."

Speaker McPike: "Thank you. Mr. Black."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. An inquiry of the Chair."

Speaker McPike: "Yes."

Black: "I lost something in the translation. Is the Gentleman
 moving for reconsideration?"

Speaker McPike: "No, he's just moved to concur. He made a Motion to concur."

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

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, I spoke to this issue earlier tonight and I beg your indulgence that I might speak on this matter again. Everyone agrees this is a matter of great importance for the budget of the State of Illinois. This is a \$700 million program. This is the Governor's proposal to provide adequate funding for the Medicaid program in our state. If this Bill does not pass, then there will be a \$700 million hole in the budget for the next fiscal year. We considered this earlier. At that time, there were 38 Members from this side of the aisle who supported this Motion. If there are a significant number of people from the other side of the aisle, and it doesn't have to be terribly significant, there are many over here who will join with you, and provide the needed 60 votes to adopt this Motion. So, Mr. Speaker, I would ask you to give these people every opportunity to vote for their Governor."

Speaker McPike: "Representative McCracken, on behalf of his Governor."

McCracken: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm delighted to speak on

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

behalf of my Governor. You know, I don't know if we all knew this the first time, but I am told now that the nursing home rate of reimbursement will drop 30% tomorrow. Tomorrow, I am told by the Department of Public Aid. it's scare tactics. We don't have time to try to make this thing work at any time between now and the election. going to require 71 votes in another 17 minutes, and it ain't gonna get better. I am told that the nursing home reimbursement rates will drop by 30% tomorrow. I am also told, I understand your position, I am also told by the Department of Public Aid, that the hospital assessments will drop by 30% commencing August 1st. Now. people saying it's not true. I don't mind being corrected. told that that is in fact what's going to happen, that a notice has already been posted by the Department of Public Aid announcing the cuts in the rate of reimbursement nursing homes effective tomorrow. I don't know how else to put it. Seventy one votes in another 17 minutes is not going to be any easier than this is now. I don't think anyone contends we can get away with doing nothing, and I ask for more 'aye' votes."

Speaker McPike: "Speaker Madigan."

Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, I want to thank you for your indulgence and I want to thank all of those who supported this Motion the second time, but I was just on the telephone and there was a message from Garcia, so we can take this matter out of the record. Thank you. Or, take the Roll Call."

Speaker McPike: "Have all voted? Mr. Wennlund, do you want to speak? Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Picked up one more Republican. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

take the record. On this Motion, there are 46 'ayes' and 70 'nos', and the Motion fails. Senate Bill 2049, Representative Barnes. Representative Barnes. I guess the Lady's not here. Mr. Wennlund."

Wennlund: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As I am a co-Sponsor, I would request permission to handle this Bill for Representative Barnes."

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Wennlund."

Wennlund: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. All this Bill does is cure a problem that exists throughout the state, because counties require subdividers to put in detention bonds, and after they put them in, nobody wants to maintain them. The Homeowners Association doesn't want to maintain them. Nobody wants to maintain them. It merely authorizes townships to go ahead and maintain those detention bonds. I move for its adoption."

Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall the House adopt the
First Conference Committee Report to Senate Bill 2049?'
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 Bill, there are
107 'ayes' and 4 'nos', and the House does adopt the First
Conference Committee Report to Senate Bill 2049. This
Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby
declared passed. Supplemental Calendar announcement."

Clerk O'Brien: "Supplemental Calendar #9 is being distributed."

Speaker McPike: "Matijevich."

Matifievich: "Speaker, I was wondering if...if we could reconsider that vote on which we named the State of Illinois building after Jim Thompson. I think we could use him tonight."

Speaker McPike: "Speaker Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the provisions of Rule

166th Legislative Day

June 30, 1992

79(e) relative to House Bill 2833. The purpose of this Motion would be to permit consideration of this Bill between now and January 13, 1993."

Speaker McPike: "You heard the Gentleman's Motion. Hearing no objections, the Attendance Roll Call will be used, and the Motion carries."

Madigan: "Excuse me?"

Speaker McPike: "The Motion carried, Mr. Speaker. Unanimous consent."

Madigan: "Thank you."

Speaker McPike: "Speaker Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentleman, I'd like to thank all of the Members of the House for the hard work they've put in during a very long day. We did accomplish a great deal today. However, we are not prepared to consider the Appropriation Bills until tomorrow, and for that reason I would now move that the House stand adjourned until 11:00 a.m., tomorrow morning. If all goes well, we'll be able to consider the budget for the next fiscal year, tomorrow. And then, hopefully, we can go home. So, I move to adjourn until 11:00 a.m., tomorrow morning."

Speaker McPike: "You heard the Gentleman's Motion. All in favor...All in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the House stands adjourned until tomorrow at the hour of 11:00 a.m."

92/10/09 10:28:16

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

JUNE 30 . 1992

HB-0180	MOTION	PAGE	7
HB-0180	The state of the s	PAGE	125
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	11
HB-1181		PAGE	3
HB-1181		PAGE	29
H3-1181		PAGE	10
	OUT OF RECORD	PAGE	19
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	78
H3-1495		PAGE	82
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	96
HB-2694		PAGE	106
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	106
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	193
		PAGE	67
	CONFERENCE CONFERENCE	PAGE	134
		PAGE	197
HB-2833			
	CONFERENCE	PAGE	173
HB-3418		PAGE	3
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	7
	CONFERENCE	PAGE	135
	CONFERENCE	PAGE	77
	CONFERENCE	PAGE	84
	OUT OF RECORD	PAGE	77
	CONFERENCE	PAGE	135
	CONFERENCE	PAGE	188
	CONFÉRENCE	PAGE	86
HB-3663		PAGE	105
HB-3692		PAGE	78
	CONFERENCE	PAGE	187
	CONFERENCE	PAGE	144
	CONFERENCE	PAGE	163
HB-4037		PAGE	105
	CONFERENCE	PAGE	174
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	19
	CONFERENCE	PAGE	175
HB-4070		PAGE	24
HB-4078	CONFERENCE	PAGE	181
HB-4079	CONFERENCE	PAGE	40
HB-4119	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	61
HB-4163	CONFERENCE	PAGE	176
HB-4188	CONFERENCE	PAGE	64
SB-0221	NON-CONCURR ENCE	PAGE	64
\$8-0221	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	78
	CONFERENCE	PAGE	189
	CONFERENCE	PAGE	42
	CONFERENCE	PAGE	190
SB-0911	MOTION	PAGE	63
SB-1490	CONFERENCE	PAGE	147
SB-1516	CONFERENCE	PAGE	148
S3-1516	CONFERENCE	PAGE	169
SB-1516	OUT OF RECORD	PAGE	149
\$8-1567	CONFERENCE	PAGE	191
SB-1615	CONFERENCE	PAGE	149
SB-1665	CONFERENCE	PAGE	44
\$8-1667	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	63
SB-1717	CONFERENCE	PAGE	153
SB-1768	CONFERENCE	PAGE	87
SB-1769	CONFERENCE	PAGE	192
	OUT OF RECORD	PAGE	193
SB-1783	CONFERENCE	PAGE	187
SB-1823	CONFERENCE	PAGE	29
SB-1892	RECALLED	PAGE	125
SB-1892	THIRD READING	PAGE	126
SB-1904	CONFERENCE	PAGE	88

. 75

REPORT: TIFLDAY PAGE: 002

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

92/10/09 10:28:16

JUNE 30, 1992

SB-1909	CONFERENCE		PAG	E 160
SB-1939	NON-CONCURR	RENCE	PAG	E 64
\$3-1988	CONFERENCE		PAG	E 185
SB-2048	CONFERENCE		PAG	E 82
SB-2049	CONFERENCE		PAG	E 196
SB-2057	CONFERENCE		PAG	E 91
SB-2068	CONFERENCE		PAG	E 47
SB-2075	CONFERENCE		PAG	E 92
SB-2138	CONFERENCE		PAG	SE 55
SB-2176	CONFERENCE		PAG	E 166
SB-3594	CONFERENCE		PAG	SE 89
HR-2284	MOTION		PAG	E 33
SJR-0113	ADOPTED		PAG	E 29
SJR-0113	RESOLUTION	OFFERED	PAG	SE 25
SJR-0141	MOTION		PAG	E 66
SJR-0141	ADOPTED		PAG	E 66
SJR-0141	ADOPTED		PAG	E 67
SJR-0141	RESOLUTION	OFFERED	PAG	E 66
SJR-0159	HOTION		PAG	E 161
SJR-0159	ADOPTED		PAG	E 163
SJR-0159	RESOLUTION	OFFERED	PAG	E 163
SJR-0180	MOTION		PAG	SE 58
SJR-0180	ADOPTED		PAG	6E 61
SJR-0180	RESOLUTION	OFFERED	PAG	SE 59
SJR-0181	MOTION		PAG	E 170
SJR-0181	ADOPTED		PAG	SE 172
SJR-0181	RESOLUTION	OFFERED	PAG	SE 170

SUBJECT MATTER

HOUSE TO ORDER - REPRESENTATIVE GIORGI	PAGE	1
PRAYER - CHAPLAIN RICHARD EIDENT	PAGE	1
PRAYER - REVEREND DENNIS BEATTY	PAGE	2
PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE	PAGE	2
ROLL CALL FOR ATTENDANCE	PAGE	2
INTRODUCTION - MIKE MILLS	PAGE	5
REPRESENTATIVE LAURING IN CHAIR	PAGE	15
REPRESENTATIVE ANTHONY YOUNG IN CHAIR	PAGE	67
REPUBLICAN/DEMOCRAT CAUCUS (RECESS)	PAGE	85
REPRESENTATIVE GIGLIO IN CHAIR	PAGE	85
HOUSE RECONVENES	PAGE	86
REPRESENTATIVE MCPIKE IN CHAIR	PAGE	86
COMMITTEE REPORTS	PAGE	134
REPRESENTATIVE LAURING IN CHAIR	PAGĒ	144
REPRESENTATIVE KEANE IN CHAIR	PAGE	170
REPRESENTATIVE MCPIKE IN CHAIR	PAGE	173
ADJOURNMENT	PAGE	197