63rd Legislative Day

May 21, 1993

- Speaker McPike: "...come to order. The Chaplain for today is
 Reverend Charles Lyons, of the Armitage Baptist Church in
 Chicago. Reverend Lyons is the guest of Representative
 Santiago. The guests in the balcony may wish to rise and
 join us for the invocation."
- Lyons: "Will you bow with me? Holy God, we acknowledge Your might and mercy, shown to us through Your son, Jesus. God of righteousness and truth, forgive us for abandoning Your absolutes. We have been consumed with political correctness rather than concerned with moral courage. We need You. Illinois needs Your help. May each Member of this Body exercise personal reliance on You for regeneration and wisdom, realizing their individual accountability to You. Lord God, men and women of this Body are husbands and wives, fathers and mothers. May they be sensitive to their families, caring, attentive, meeting the needs of those who support them at home. Lord, moral mushiness seems to be the order of the day. May these men and women be people of character, principal, integrity, and courage. Please give direction in the activities of this day, we pray. Amen."
- Speaker McPike: "We'll be led in the Pledge of Allegiance by Representative Mulligan."
- Mulligan et al: "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."
- Speaker McPike: "Roll Call for Attendance. Representative Currie.

 Miss Currie."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. There are no excused absences among House Democrats."
- Speaker McPike: "Thank you. Representative Kubik. Representative Andrea Moore, you want to vote 'present'. Representative

63rd Legislative Day

May 21, 1993

Wennlund."

- Wennlund: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Let the record reflect that

 Representative Bernard Pedersen is excused."
- Speaker McPike: "Mr...Representative Lawfer, for what reason do you rise?"
- Lawfer: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Point of personal privilege. I would like this group to welcome the...students and staff at Freeport Emmanuel Lutheran Chu...School. They're in the balcony today."
- Speaker McPike: "All right. Once again, that's against the Rules.

 Representative... Mr. Clerk, take the Roll. 117 Members

 answering the Roll Call, a quorum is present. Messages from
 the Senate."
- Clerk Rossi: "A message from the Senate by Mr. Harry, Secretary.

 'Mr. Speaker, I'm directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has concurred with the House of Representatives in the passage of the Bills of the following titles, to wit: together with the attached Amendments thereto and the adoption of which I'm instructed to ask the concurrence of the House, to wit: House Bills 979, passed the Senate as amended May 20, 1993.'"

Speaker McPike: "Agreed Resolutions."

Clerk Rossi: "House Resolution 826, offered by Representative Woolard. House Resolution 827, offered by Representative Ryder; House Resolution 828, offered by Representative Saviano; House Resolution 829, offered by Representative Clayton; House Resolution 830, offered by Representative Leitch; House Resolution 831, offered by Representative Leitch; House Resolution 832, offered by Representative Leitch; House Resolution 833, offered by Representative Black; House Resolution 834, offered by Representative Noland; House Resolution 836, offered by Representative

63rd Legislative Day

May 21, 1993

Balanoff; House Resolution 837, offered by Representative Curran; House Resolution 838, offered by Representative Roskam; House Resolution 839, offered by Representative Stephens; House Resolution 841, offered by Representative Kubik; House Resolution 842, offered by Representative von Bergen-Wessels: House Resolution 843. offered Representative von Bergen-Wessels; House Resolution 844, offered by Representative Krause: House Resolution 845. offered by Representative Mulligan; House Resolution 846, offered by Representative Frederick; House Resolution offered by Representative Hawkins; House Resolution 849, offered by Representative Black; House Resolution 850, offered by Representative Stephens; House Resolution 851, offered by Representative Granberg; House Resolution offered by Representative Granberg; House Resolution 853, offered by Representative Granberg; House Resolution offered by Representative Hannig; House Resolution 855, offered by Representative Parcells; House Resolution 856, offered by Representative Phelps: House Resolution 857, offered by Representative Noland; House Resolution 859. offered by Representative Hicks; House Resolution 860, offered by Representative Kubik; House Resolution 861. offered by Representative Weller; House Resolution 862, offered by Representative Weller; House Resolution offered by Representative Weller; House Resolution 864, offered by Representative Ronen; House Resolution 865, offered by Representative Ronen; House Resolution 866, offered by Representative Giorgi: House Resolution 867. offered by Representative Balanoff; House Joint Resolution 42, offered by Representative Noland: Senate Resolution 52, offered by Representative Hartke; Senate Joint Resolution 63, offered by Representative Kubik; House

63rd Legislative Day

May 21, 1993

Resolution 868. offered by Representative Edley; House Resolution 869, offered by Representative Edley; House Resolution 870, offered by Representative Lawfer; House Resolution 871, offered by Representative Lawfer; House Resolution 872, offered by Representative Capparelli; House Resolution 874, offered by Representative Cross; House Resolution 875, offered by Representative Zickus; House Resolution 877, offered by Representative Tim Johnson; House Resolution 878, offered by Representative Tim Johnson; House Resolution 879, offered by Representative Tim Johnson: House Resolution 882, offered by Representative Sheehy; House Resolution 883, offered Representative Noland; House Resolution 884, offered by Representative Giglio; House Resolution 885, Minority Leader Daniels; House Resolution 887, offered by Representative Steczo; House Resolution 888, offered by Representative Parcells; House Joint Resolution 43, offered by Representative Hawkins."

- Speaker McPike: "Representative Currie moves for the adoption of Agreed Resolutions. All in favor say 'aye'; opposed, 'no'.

 The 'ayes' have it, and the Agreed Resolutions are adopted.

 General Resolutions."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Resolution 835, offered by Representative Weller; House Resolution 840, offered by Representative Hannig; House Resolution 847, offered by Representative Woolard; House Resolution 858, offered by Representative Davis; Senate Joint Resolution 19, offered Representative Biggins; Senate Joint Resolution 20, offered by Representative Currie; Senate Joint Resolution 44, offered by Speaker Madigan; Senate Joint Resolution 51, offered by Representative Schakowsky; Senate Joint Resolution 54, offered by Representative Meyer."

63rd Legislative Day

May 21, 1993

Speaker McPike: "Committee on Assignment. Death Resolutions."

Clerk Rossi: "House Resolution 873, offered by Representative Stephens, with respect to the memory of George A. Donner. House Resolution 876, offered by Representative Tim Johnson, with respect to the memory of Mr. and Mrs. Johnson. House Resolution 880, offered by Representative Novak, with respect to the memory of Lloyd Hartman. House Resolution 881, offered by Representative Stroger, with respect to the memory of Henry L. Collins. House Resolution 886, offered by Representative Cowlishaw, with respect to the memory of Thomas F. Stowell, Jr."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Currie moves the adoption of the Death Resolutions. All in favor say 'aye'; opposed, 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the Death Resolutions are adopted. On page 2 of the Calendar, under Concurrences. Does any Member have a Bill marked for Concurrence that the Member would like to nonconcur in? The Chair has been informed of three of them. Representative Ryder is not here. Representative Brunsvold, Mr. Brunsvold, He's not here. Agriculture and Conservation, Second Reading. 586. Representative Schoenberg. The Bill's been read a second time. Are there any Amendments?"

Clerk Rossi: "Floor Amendment 1, offered by Representative Schoenberg."

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Schoenberg."

Speaker McPike: "Yes, this is only Friday. Sure."

Schoenberg: "Momentarily is literally momentarily."

Speaker McPike: "Yes. Yes. Representative Brunsvold, did you have a nonconcurrence that you would like to call? Or did you..."

63rd Legislative Day

May 21, 1993

Brunsvold: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to nonconcur on..."

Speaker McPike: "1553."

Brunsvold: "1553, yes."

- Speaker McPike: "All right. House Bill 1553, Mr. Clerk. Mr. Brunsvold, your Motion."
- Brunsvold: "The Motion is not to concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2. These is the Orange Cap Bill, and they put some Amendments on there, which were not totally disagreeable...to me. We want to...however, there are some provisions for goose hunting that we need to put in one of these Bills, and this is a good Bill to do it with, and that's why I'm not concurring."
- Speaker McPike: "All right. The Gentleman moves to nonconcur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 1553. All in favor of the Motion, say 'aye'; opposed, 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the House nonconcurs. 579, Mr. Deering. Representative Deering. Do you intend to call this Bill? Mr. Deering, do you...do you want to call this Bill at all, or just...forget it? Representative Cowlishaw, 546. It's been read a second time. Are there any Amendments?"
- Clerk Rossi: "Floor Amendment 1, offered by Representative Stephens."
- Speaker McPike: "Mr. Stephens. Representative Stephens.

 Representative Cowlishaw."
- Cowlishaw: "Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that it is

 Representative Stephen's intent to withdraw this

 Amendment."
- Speaker McPike: "That was my understanding. Mr. Black, would you like to withdraw this Amendment for Mr. Stephens? He informed Representative Cowlishaw that that was his intent.

 Representative Stephens withdraws the Amendment. Further Amendments."

63rd Legislative Day May 21, 1993

Clerk Rossi: "No further Amendments."

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

Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 546, a Bill for an Act amending the Public Community College Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Cowlishaw."

Cowlishaw: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 546 has to do with the...the fact that in November of '91' a community college system foundation was formed, primarily to seek private gifts and grants from corporate and other external sources nationwide and allocate those funds throughout community college system here in Illinois. In order to do that, it is necessary for this enabling legislation to be passed. Certainly, our community college system, which is one of the finest in the nation, needs all of the help that it can get, and to the extent that can...manage to recruit the...the financial support from the private sector, not just in Illinois, but throughout the nation. We certainly ought to endorse any such an...endeavor, and it is that reason, and incidentally, this measure has no opposition whatsoever. I stand in strong support of Senate Bill 546, and move for its approval."

Speaker McPike: "Any discussion? Any discussion? The question is,
'Shall Senate Bill 546 pass?' All those in favor vote
'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted
who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the
record. On this Motion, there are 112 'ayes' and 0 'nays'.

Senate Bill 546, having received a Constitutional Majority,
is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 586. The Bill's on
Second Reading. Are there any Amendments?"

Clerk Rossi: "Floor Amendment 1, offered by Representative Schoenberg."

63rd Legislative Day

May 21, 1993

Speaker McPike: "Representative Schoenberg."

Schoenberg: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment 1...merely deletes a certain provision about...pertains to the appointment of the manager of the State Fair, and deletes a provision in the Bill which deals with the length of the terms. It makes it in conformity with the House version. There's no opposition. I move adoption."

Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment 1 be adopted?'

All in favor say 'aye'; opposed, 'no'. The 'ayes' have it,
and the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments."

Clerk Rossi: "Floor Amendment 2, offered by Representative Woolard."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Woolard."

Woolard: "Table Amendment 2, please."

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

Clerk Rossi: "Floor Amendment 3, offered by Representative Woolard."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Woolard."

Woolard: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. What we're dealing with here is pregnant cows, and we're going to assist them and continue the great record that we have had in the State of Illinois of being humane in every approach."

Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment 3 be adopted?'

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

The Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments."

Clerk Rossi: "No further Amendments."

Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. Representative...Deering, are you
ready on your Bill? Mr. Deering, are you ready? Mr. Clerk,
579, read the Bill."

63rd Legislative Day May 21, 1993

Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 579, a Bill for an Act amending the Motor Vehicle Franchise Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Representative...Deering."

Deering: "Mr. Speaker, I think we have some Amendments."

Speaker McPike: "The Gentleman asks leave to return it to Second Reading. Leave's granted. The Bill's on Second. Mr. Clerk, any Amendments?"

Clerk Rossi: "Floor Amendment 1, offered by Representative Deering."

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Deering."

Deering: "Withdraw the Amendment."

Speaker McPike: "The Gentleman withdraws Amendment 1. Further Amendments."

Clerk Rossi: "Floor Amendment 2, offered by Representative von Bergen Wessels."

Speaker McPike: "Representative von Bergen Wessels."

von Bergen Wessels: "Yes, Speaker. What this Amendment does...return to...a group of trail riders the right to ride their horses... Would like to withdraw this Amendment, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker McPike: "The Lady withdraws the Amendment. Further

Amendments."

Clerk Rossi: "Floor Amendment 3, offered by Representative Hicks and Deering."

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Hicks. Withdraws the Amendment? Further Amendments."

Clerk Rossi: "No further Amendments."

Speaker McPike: "Representative...Deering."

Deering: "Out of the record."

Speaker McPike: "What's your desire here?"

Deering: "Would you take the Bill out of the record, please."

Speaker McPike: "Yes. 798, Representative Daniels' Bill. No. 157,

63rd Legislative Day

- May 21, 1993
- Representative Curran. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 157, a Bill for an Act in relation to state government. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker McPike: "Mr....Mr. Curran."
- Curran: "Mr. Speaker, I need to move this Bill back to Second for two agreed Amendments."
- Speaker McPike: "The Gentleman asks leave to return to Second Reading. Leave is granted. The Bill's on Second. Mr. Clerk, read the Amendments."
- Clerk Rossi: "Floor Amendment 2, offered by Representative Curran."
- Speaker McPike: "Mr. Curran."
- Curran: "This Amendment puts Senate Bill 157 back in the position that it passed the Senate which was Senator Hasara's Bill.

 It's got language in here which...affects the...uniform traffic ordinance numbering system. Be glad to answer any questions. Ask for the adoption of the Amendment."
- Speaker McPike: "The Gentleman asks for the adoption of Amendment

 2. All in favor say 'aye'; opposed, 'no'. The 'ayes' have
 it and the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?."
- Clerk Rossi: "Floor Amendment 3, offered by Representative Black."
- Speaker McPike: "Mr. Black."
- Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Amendment 3 adds provisions to amend the State Employee Indemnification Act, to include the definition of employee, 'individuals who contract with the Department of Military Affairs for youth programs.' That will cover these people that we hope to get started this year in the program for...high school drop outs...that will take place at Chanute Air Force Base sometime in the next fiscal year. We move...move approval of Amendment 3."

63rd Legislative Day May 21, 1993

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Black."

Black: "Yes?"

Speaker McPike: "I'm sorry. You move for the adoption?"

Black: "Yes, I move for the adoption."

Speaker McPike: "I apologize. The Gentleman moves for the adoption of Amendment 3. All in favor say 'aye'; opposed, 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Rossi: "No further Amendments."

Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. 240, Representative Lang.

Representative...Pankau, 764. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 764, a Bill for an Act in relation to the environment. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Pankau."

Pankau: "I ask for your approval of Senate Bill 764. This Bill deals with voluntary clean ups of waste sites. It...if someone is looking at a piece of property, and it has some environmental problems on it, and they go in and they purchase the property, they do all of the clean up the way EPA tells them to do. They follow all the EPA's...EPA's regulations and registrations; they get all the reports done. Everything is fine. What this legislation does, says in the future, EPA cannot come back to them and make them meet a higher standard or make them do it over again, so that they are...once they've done it voluntarily, on their own, they're free and clear. This does not however, any people that might have been...previously...who actually put it there. It also does not take care of any future liability should they sell it again, or the property get redeveloped or whatever. So I ask for your approval. This is...the Amendment now puts it in the form where we have agreement by the Illinois EPA, the Illinois Solid

63rd Legislative Day

May 21, 1993

- Waste Association, the Illinois Trial Lawyers, the Illinois Environmental Council, the Illinois Manufacturers' Association, and the Illinois State Chamber of Commerce. To my knowledge, there is no opposition to this Bill."
- Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 764 pass?'

 All those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed voted 'no'. Have all... Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this Motion, there are 116 'ayes' and 0 'nays'. Senate Bill 764, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 627, has been read a second time previously. Are there any Amendments?"
- Clerk Rossi: "Floor Amendment 1, offered by Representative Shirley Jones."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Jones withdraws Amendment 1.

 Further Amendments."
- Clerk Rossi: "Floor Amendment 2, offered by Representative Shirley Jones."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Shirley Jones withdraws Amendment
 2. Further Amendments."
- Clerk Rossi: "Floor Amendment 3, offered by Representative Shirley Jones."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Shirley Jones on Amendment 3.

 Withdraws Amendment...withdraws Amendment 3. Further

 Amendments."
- Clerk Rossi: "Floor Amendment 4, offered by Representative Edley."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Edley. Withdraws Amendment 4."

 Further Amendments. Mr. Edley. Mr. Edley on Amendment 4."
- Edley: "I withdraw the Amendment."
- Speaker McPike: "Thank you. Further Amendments."
- Clerk Rossi: "Floor Amendment 5, offered by Representative

63rd Legislative Day

May 21, 1993

Edley."

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Edley."

Edley: "I withdraw the Amendment."

Speaker McPike: "Further Amendments."

Clerk Rossi: "No further Amendments."

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

Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 627, a Bill for an Act amending the

Public Utilities Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Lou Jones."

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

Senate Bill 627 requires the utility to refund, with interest, any amount it has overcharged the customer due to an error, either in charging more..."

Speaker McPike: "...Can we have some...a little quiet, please?

It's very difficult to hear the Lady. Thank you."

Jones, Lou: "...in charging more than the published rate or in measuring the quantity or volume of service provided. The refund shall be from the date of overpayment at the legal rate or at a rate established by the Commission. It authorizes repayment without a hearing. Requires a complaint relating to incorrect billing to be filed within two years after the customer first becomes aware of the incorrect billing; and, I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 627 pass?'

The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 627 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this Motion, there is 114 'ayes' and 0 'nays'. Senate Bill 627, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Ackerman had intended to vote 'aye' on that Bill. Appropriations. Senate Bill 319. The Bill is on Second Reading. Are there any Amendments?"

63rd Legislative Day May 21, 1993

Clerk Rossi: "Floor Amendment 8, offered by Representative Hannig."

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Hannig."

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

This is the technical Amendment that Representative Ryder referred to yesterday."

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Ryder."

Hannig: "Doesn't change any numbers, and I move for its adoption."

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Ryder."

Ryder: "I committed yesterday to do this. I stand in support of the Amendment."

Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment 8 be adopted?'

All those in favor say 'aye'; opposed, 'no'. The 'ayes'

have it, and the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Rossi: "No further Amendments."

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

Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 319, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the Department of Public Aid. Third reading of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is the Department of Public Aid budget in exactly the same form and dollars as it passed out of here yesterday, with the exception of a technical Amendment. I would move its adoption."

Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 319 pass?'

All those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted? Representative Shirley Jones votes 'no'. Have all voted? Shirley, just vote..vote. The switch is still open.

Have all voted? Representative Shirley Jones votes 'no'.

Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this Motion, there

63rd Legislative Day

May 21, 1993

are...are 77 'ayes' and 35 'noes'. Senate Bill 319, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Okay. Representative Lang, 240. Representative... Senate Bill 118, Representative Levin. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 118, a Bill for an Act amending the Nursing Home Care Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Levin."

Levin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 118 authorizes physicians to order identification wristlets for...certain patients in nursing homes. It prohibits... No. No. No. ...It... The... It...deals with the situation of the nursing home residents unfortunately, wander off the premises. We've, unfortunately, all known of a relative or a friend in that situation, suffering from Alzheimers or some other disease. This particular Bill had its genesis last fall from a noted situation in the Chicago area, where a patient wandered off and there was no way of identifying him. This is an agreed Bill at this point, with the industry. ... It only applies where the...the doctor has authorized the...wristlet. It does not apply across the board. Is there any questions? happy to answer them; otherwise, I just ask for your support for Senate Bill 118."

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Wennlund."

Wennlund: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. An inquiry of the Chair.

Are...Amendments 1 and 2 on the Bill? Were they adopted?"

Clerk Rossi: "Amendments 1 and 2 are not on the Bill."

Wennlund: "Thank you very much."

Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 118 pass?'

All those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Have all

voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the

63rd Legislative Day

May 21, 1993

record. On this Motion, there are 117 'ayes' and 0 'nays'. Senate Bill 118, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 411, Representative Brunsvold. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 411, a Bill for an Act concerning homeless families. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Brunsvold."

Brunsvold: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 411, Senator Garcia's Bill, sets up a Homeless Family Placement Act. This is an attempt by the Senator to refer homeless families with school-aged children to the shelter closest to the child's school of origin. The Bill sets up definitions dealing with...defining a school of origin, referring agency, homeless family, etc. It...was supported, as it come out of the Senate, by the Legal...Legal Assistance Foundation of Chicago, the Coalition of the Homeless and the Coalition against Domestic Violence. The City of Chicago opposed the Bill...as it came to the House. I think it was Commissioner Alvarez had some concerns. Senate Amend... Excuse me, House Amendment 2 was attached to the Bill, and by Representative Lopez, and that cleaned up the language. Put some concerns in there dealing with domestic violence in the family, family employment status, and the families job training opportunities. It ... It had the state and federal monies that came into this fund. They are to consider some these things before making the placement, and in fact, if no homes are available. then the placements will take place in the...the nearest opportunity...or nearest facility that could shelter this homeless family. So, there are some provisions here to make exceptions. I think the Bill is cleaned up, and right now, I don't know of any opposition

63rd Legislative Day

May 21, 1993

to the Bill, and would ask...answer any questions, and ask for the passage of Senate Bill 411."

Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 411 pass?'

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 115 'ayes' and 0 'nays'.

Senate Bill 411, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 262. I'm sorry, Representative Kaszak."

Kaszak: "Thank you, Speaker. I just want the record to reflect that on Senate Bill 319, I'd like it to reflect I voted 'no' on that Bill."

Speaker McPike: "And the record will so reflect. Mr. Ryder, do want this Bill called. 262?"

Rvder: "Please."

Speaker McPike: "Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 262, a Bill for an Act concerning entities subject to reregulation by the Department of Insurance."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This...Bill has been amended. It is a Department of Insurance financial and regulatory proposal. It does reflect Amendments as were requested, concerning language that was deleted at the request of the Illinois Trial Lawyers Association. It was also amended to include changes for the comprehensive health insurance plan, and...for governmental reciprocals for the purpose of subscriber reporting. I would be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 262 pass?'

All those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the

63rd Legislative Day

May 21, 1993

record. On this Motion, there are 116 'ayes' and 0 'nays'. Senate Bill 262, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 31, Representative Lindner. The Bill has been read a second time. Are there any Amendments? Representative Tom Johnson, for what reason do you rise?"

Johnson, Tom: "I'm going to be withdrawing Amendment 1."

Speaker McPike: "All right. Let's wait until we get to the Amendment. Mr. Clerk, are there any Amendments?"

Clerk Rossi: "Floor Amendment 1, offered by Representative Tom Johnson."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Tom Johnson withdraws Amendment

1. Further Amendments."

Clerk Rossi: "Floor Amendment 2, offered by Representative Wennlund."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Wennlund."

Wennlund: "Withdraw."

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Wennlund withdraws the Amendment. Further
Amendments."

Clerk Rossi: "Floor Amendment 3, offered by Representative Tom Johnson."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Tom Johnson."

Johnson, Tom: "Yes...Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. This

Amendment really becomes the Bill, and
incorporates...Senator Topinka's..."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Steczo in the Chair."

Johnson, Tom: "...Senator Topinka's Bill that provides that the State's attorney shall notify the school principal of a minor found delinquent for Class A misdemeanor in violation for unlawful use of weapons, sale of firearms. This passed the Senate 55-0. Now, in addition to Senate Bill 31, which had that basic provision, the Amendment provides for adding

63rd Legislative Day

May 21, 1993

really the contents of three previous Bills, which have passed the House chambers here by large margins. One House Bill 52, House Bill 53, and House Bill 49. These three Bills dealt with enhancing penalties for aggravated battery and...and for compelling organization or membership gangs and mob action. The provisions of House Bill 49, which are incorporated in this Amendment, provided for where a person who sells or penalties manufactures, purchases or possesses, and carries a machine gun; and, the third one, which we've previously passed out of this House is, House Bill 53 which is really the career criminal Bill that provides that any person who violates armed...armed violence sections of the statute with a firearm when they've been convicted three times previously of...forcible felonies, that they would get an enhanced penalty, 15 to 50 years, as opposed to the current Class X provisions. Bill also previously passed the House by a vote of 109-2. And I would ask this...that this Amendment be adopted."

Speaker Steczo: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment 3 to Senate Bill 31. On that, is there any discussion? The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Clinton, Representative Granberg."

Granberg: "Inquiry of the Chair. Is Amendment 3 germane to the Bill?"

Speaker Steczo: "Mr. Granberg, we are checking."

Granberg: "Thank you."

Speaker Steczo: "Mr. Granberg, the ruling of the Chair is that

the Amendment is not germane, because the...the Bill amends

the Juvenile Court Act, while the Amendment makes

Amendments in the Criminal Code. Mr. Johnson."

Johnson, Tom: "Yes, if I may at least respond to that ruling of the Chair, and ask that they reconsider. This Amendment

63rd Legislative Day

May 21, 1993

incorporates the original Bill, so the whole thing is the Amendment."

Speaker Steczo: "Mr. Johnson, the Chair has ruled that the

Amendment is not germane. Mr. Black. The Chair recognizes

Representative Black."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I...I was looking to see if Representative Homer was on the floor. It was my understanding that this had been worked out. I hesitate to even use the word 'agreed'. I wasn't privy to that, but I thought it had been agreed to."

Speaker Steczo: "The Chair recognizes Representative Homer."

Homer: "Thank you. Since my name was mentioned, I'd like to state position on the Bill. These are...this Amendment incorporates Amendments that are from Bills that passed the House Judiciary II Committee and also passed the House, and so, I had indicated that I would support them as being consistent with what we had done previously. These Bills were carefully heard in Committee, carefully considered and felt by the Committee and the House to be good changes in the law, and therefore, we passed them. I have absolutely no problem with the passage of the Amendment. Now, I never passed judgement on, or was asked to give an opinion about the germaneness issue, and it...it's my understanding the Chair is saying the underlying Bill amends the Juvenile Court Act, whereas these Amendments amend the Criminal Code, and Ι won't interject any opinion on parliamentary ruling."

Speaker Steczo: "Mr. Clerk, are there any further Amendments?" Clerk Rossi: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Steczo: "Third Reading. Representative Lindner, do you wish to call this Bill on Third Reading?"

Lindner: "Yes, Mr. Speaker."

63rd Legislative Day

May 21, 1993

Speaker Steczo: "Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 31, a Bill for an Act amending the Juvenile Court Act of 1987. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Steczo: "The Chair recognizes the Lady from Kane,
Representative Lindner."

Lindner: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is Senator Topinka's Bill, amending the Juvenile Court Act. There is already a provision in the Juvenile Court Act that following an adjudication of delinquency for a crime which would be a felony by an adult that the states attorney has to ascertain whether that minor is enrolled in school, and provide a copy of the dispositional order to the principal or chief administrative officer of the school. This simply amends that and includes some Class A misdemeanors for use of weapons, unlawful sale of firearms, unlawful unlawful possession of firearms or firearm ammunition, defacing identification marks of firearms, and adds that to the list of those crimes which must be reported if a minor is adjudicated a delinquent. I know of no opposition to this, and I would urge passage."

Speaker Steczo: "The Lady has moved for the passage of Senate
Bill 31. On that question, is there any discussion? The
Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Representative
Dart."

Dart: "Will the Sponsor yield, please?"

Speaker Steczo: "She indicates that she will."

Dart: "...What's the present situation now in regards to this reporting? Is there anything that's done?"

Lindner: "Yes. The present situation, and that is found in Section F of the Juvenile Court Act on confidentiality and inspectibility of juvenile records already says that for a crime which would be a felony if committed by an adult,

63rd Legislative Day

May 21, 1993

following an adjudication of delinquency that if the State's attorney ascertains that the minor is in school, that that should be reported, and a dispositional order given to the principal. So this is only to add those four Class A misdemeanors to do with firearms."

Dart: "So... So, actually, what...what you're doing then is...just...in a way, extending the number of offenses that are gonna be reported, so that these weapons offenses by juveniles are also something that they're made aware of?"

Lindner: "That's correct."

Dart: "Thank you."

Speaker Steczo: "Is there any further discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 31 pass?' All those in favor will signify by voting 'ave'; those opposed by voting 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 117 voting 'ves', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', and Senate Bill 31, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. If there are any Members of the House who have Bills on the Order of Concurrence, where their requests will be to nonconcur with the Senate Amendments, please inform the Chair. Representative Ryder in the chamber? Mr. Ryder, do you wish to pursue your nonconcurrence Motions at this time? On... Mr. Ryder, on Senate...House Bill 1852 and House Bill 1915. On the Order of Concurrence appears House Bill 1852. The Chair recognizes Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Mr. Speaker, I would offer an alternate Motion to nonconcur with Senate Amendment 1."

Speaker Steczo: "The Gentleman moves that the House nonconcurs with Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 1852. All those in

63rd Legislative Day

May 21, 1993

favor will signify by saying 'aye'; those opposed by saying 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The House does nonconcur with Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 1852. Mr. Ryder, House Bill 1915."

- Ryder: "I would offer a Motion to nonconcur with Senate Amendment
 1."
- Speaker Steczo: "The Gentleman moves that the House nonconcurs with Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 1915. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye'; those opposed by saying 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the House does nonconcur with Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 1915. On the Special Order of Law, Second Reading, appears Senate Bill 433. Representative Turner. Representative Turner. Out of the Record. Senate Bill 778, Representative Schakowsky. please read the Bill. Representative... Representative Schakowsky, please take that... Could we hold that momentarily? I'm sorry. On the Order of Law, Second Reading, appears Senate Bill 870, Representative Maureen Murphy. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 870. The Bill has been read a second time previously. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments."
- Speaker Steczo: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

 Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 870, a Bill for an Act amending the

 Jury Commission Act. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Steczo: "The Chair recognizes the Lady from Cook, Representative Murphy."
- Murphy, Maureen: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen.

 This Bill assigns Cook County jurors to convenient locations by amending the Jury Commission Act, providing that in counties of 1,000,000 or more, jurors shall be assigned to jury duty as determined by court rules to be

63rd Legislative Day

May 21, 1993

most favorable to an impartial trial and to not to incur unnecessary expense or unduly burden the citizens of any part of this County. I ask for favorable approval."

- Speaker Steczo: "The Lady has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 870. On that question, is there any discussion? There being none, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye'; those opposed by voting 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Please record Representative McGuire as 'aye'. Representative Kaszak wishes to be record... The Lady from Cook, Representative Kaszak, to explain your vote."
- Kaszak: "Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to explain my vote because of my concern about the demographic impact that assigning jurors to courts closest to their homes. I think you would tend not to get the cross section that you would need in order to ensure a diverse jury, and that's why I'm voting against this Bill."
- Speaker Steczo: "Have all voted who wish? The Chair recognizes the Lady from Cook, Representative Davis, one minute to explain your vote."
- Davis: "I just think our...is the person gonna be tried near their home? You know, if a...if you're on trial, is that trial gonna necessarily occur near your home? I think this is a piece of legislation to limit the number of minorities on jury duty."
- Speaker Steczo: "The Chair recognizes the Lady from DuPage, Representative Biggert."
- Biggert: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To explain my vote, I, too, agree with Representative Kaszak. I think it really limits the...the type of jury that you're going to get, and it's my understanding that it's opposed by the Illinois State

63rd Legislative Day

May 21, 1993

Bar Association."

- Speaker Steczo: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 93 voting 'yes', 16 voting 'no', 6 voting 'present', and Senate Bill 870, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of Professional Regulation, Second Reading, appears Senate Bill 290, Representative Krause. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 290. The Bill has been read a second time previously. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment 1, offered by Representative Levin."
- Speaker Steczo: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Levin, on Amendment 1."
- Levin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment 1 is similar to House Bill 2076 this passed earlier year on the Consent Calendar. ...It...simply...removes the restriction on the number of facilities supp...for supportive residences that there may be in the City of Chicago. It does not...expand the ability to have these facilities outside the City of Chicago. simply removes the number limitation within the City of Chicago. This is necessary in order to obtain approximately \$2.5 million in federal...grants. If there's any questions, I'll be happy to answer them. Otherwise, I just ask for your support for Amendment 1."
- Speaker Steczo: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment 1. On that, is there any discussion? The Chair recognizes the Lady from Cook, Representative Krause."
- Krause: "I just merely, Mr. Speaker, that I also join in support
 of Amendment 1."
- Speaker Steczo: "The Gentleman from Will, Representative

63rd Legislative Day

May 21, 1993

Wennlund."

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

Speaker Steczo: "He indicates that he will."

Wennlund: "Didn't we just pass a Bill out of here that did the same thing?"

Levin: "Earlier in the session, we passed House Bill 2076, which is very...which is similar. This does not go as far as 2076. 2076 took off the restriction on the location of these facilities anywhere in the State. This is simply... It maintains..."

Wennlund: "...Senate Bill about a half hour ago."

Levin: "No."

Wennlund: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Steczo: "Is there any further discussion? There being none, all those in favor of the adoption of the Amendment, will signify by saying 'aye'; those opposed by saying 'no'.

The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk, any further Amendments?"

Clerk Rossi: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Steczo: "Third Reading. The Order of Revenue, Second Reading, appears Senate Bill 503, Representative Balthis.

Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 503. The Bill has been read a second time previously. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment 1, offered by Representative Balthis."

Speaker Steczo: "...recognizes the Gentleman from Cook,

Representative Balthis on Amendment 1."

Balthis: "Mr. Speaker, I want to withdraw Amendment 1."

Speaker Steczo: "Amendment 1 is withdrawn. Mr. Clerk, any further Amendments?"

Clerk Rossi: "Floor Amendment 2, offered by Representative Balthis."

63rd Legislative Day

May 21, 1993

Speaker Steczo: "Representative Balthis on Amendment 2."

- Balthis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Amendment 2 is...attempts to clarify the purpose of the Technology Challenge Grant. The language makes explicit as a possible grant purpose the evaluation of commercialization potential of new technology and the dissemination of information and potential user...familarization materials regarding that technology. Currently, a grant pro...purposes are limited to using universities, community colleges, and research institutions, to directly assist firms or consortium firms, with commercialization and their technology development. I would move for the adoption of the Amendment."
- Speaker Steczo: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment 2. On that, is there any discussion? All those in favor of the adoption of the Amendment, will signify by saying 'aye'; those opposed by saying 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Mr. Clerk, any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Rossi: "Floor Amendment 3, offered by Representative Ostenburg."
- Speaker Steczo: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook,
 Representative... Withdraw Amendment 3. Any further
 Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Rossi: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Steczo: "Third Reading. On the Order of Environment and Energy, Third Reading, appears Senate Bill 240, Representative Lang. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 240, a Bil' for an Act amending the Environmental Protection Act. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Steczo: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Lang."
- Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill's been throughly debated

63rd Legislative Day

May 21, 1993

several times on Amendments and the House Bill and the Senate Bill. Everybody knows what it's about. I would ask for green votes."

Speaker Steczo: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 240. On that question, is there any discussion?

The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Will, Representative Wennlund."

Wennlund: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. What you're gonna do, is you're gonna go home, hopefully at the end of next week, and you're gonna get hit over the head by municipalities because this is another mandate. It's a reverse mandate. It's telling them that the State of Illinois will regulate leaf burning and not individual municipalities throughout State. You're also telling them that you're gonna increase their costs by, state-wide, by millions the leaves can't be burned in some of dollars, because these towns in Illinois. Municipalities are, therefore, gonna have to take them to a compost site, pay the cost to pick them up, and ultimately, increase the cost of waste disposal to average home owners. That's what you're doing. You're gonna raise the cost of getting rid of their leaves to the average home owner, because municipalities are gonna charge the home owners to take the leaves to a compost site and have them composted. So, if you restrict the ability of these municipalities to dispose of leaves in the manner and fashion which they desire, and which they can afford, then you'll vote against this Bill. You've got to municipalities the opportunity to...come up with their own creative ideas on how to get rid of leaves or whether to permit burning or not permit burning. Ultimately, you're gonna cost the Illinois citizens money by passing this Bill, because municipalities are gonna pass the costs right

63rd Legislative Day

May 21, 1993

on to the individual. And in the townships, you're gonna have a direct hit, because residents outside incorporated areas, are gonna have to pay to have somebody pick 'em up and take them to a compost site. So, you're gonna hit...the citizens of Illinois in the pocket regardless of which way you do it if you vote 'yes' on this Bill. The correct vote on this Bill is a 'no' vote. Let municipalities and counties and townships decide what's the best method of getting rid of them. Ultimately, if you pass this Bill, there's gonna be a tremendous cost to all Illinois residents just to get rid of leaves. Let the municipalities and the townships and the counties decide what the best way to do it is. And vote 'no'."

- Speaker Steczo: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Coles,
 Representative Weaver."
- "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. Weaver: Before you vote on this Bill, I suggest that you check with your counties and your townships back home. I've got a particular problem that you may also share, and that is, our landfill no longer accepts yard waste. We've got no place to put it, no place to take it, and if this Bill passes into law, we can't do anything with it. I think need to allow the local units of government to establish the option that they can live with without overriding their ability to deal with yard waste and leaves. I think a 'present' or a 'no' vote is the only appropriate vote here."
- Speaker Steczo: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Skinner."
- Skinner: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, there are certainly gonna be costs involved here. I would argue they will be primarily on individuals, and not on municipalities,

63rd Legislative Day

May 21, 1993

however. But against those costs, you have to measure the public health threat that leaf burning has. Now, if you lived in an area that had a young child die of leaf burning, die of leaf burning, as I do...the young girl died in Lake in the Hills a little over a year ago, you might feel differently about this. If this Bill is defeated, some of you will be living in districts were the next young child dies of leaf burning. That's what her doctor said she died of. Now if you want to vote 'no', that's fine. You're putting a price on human life, and everyone has to vote his own conscience on issues like that."

- Speaker Steczo: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Rock Island, Representative Brunsvold."
- Brunsvold: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise to oppose this piece of legislation. We've heard a couple of speakers say this is a mandate, and trulv is a mandate. I've checked with my officials, Rock Island for one, the City....it will cost probably over \$400,000 in...to do...get rid of these leaves, dispose of these leaves in some proper manner. And if you don't...the individual home owner, if they can't get rid of their leaves, they're gonna push them out on the street, they'll go in the sani...or into the storm sewers, plug up the storm sewers, and then the city's got more responsibility in cleaning those out. Let the locals make their own decisions about how to handle this problem. Don't force this large, large expense onto local government. This is a mandate. Vote 'no'."
- Speaker Steczo: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Will, Representative Hassert."
- Hassert: "Mr. Speaker, fellow Members of the General Assembly, I offered a compromise Amendment yesterday which failed. I

63rd Legislative Day

May 21, 1993

think the rest of the speakers said this before. This is a mandate, and I think we have to realize that we are trying to legislate for a small amount of people, and I understand their problems. I feel for them that we cannot...that that should be left up to the local government to decide if their area is in a area that have a problem. It's up to them. I don't think we can just automatically legislate for every problem that we face within the State of Illinois. This is not a good pr...solution. This is a...a terrible way to try to isolate an area, and try to legislate for a isolated problem. This only happens once or twice a year, where we have to burn our leaves. I don't think we should stop local governments from having that input. I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Steczo: "The Chair recognizes the Lady from Lake, Representative Moore."

Moore, Andrea: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. First all, we are not trying to legislate for a small number of people. We are trying to legislate for air quality Illinois, and any counties over a 100,000. This issue has been dealt with very effectively already by many of municipalities, and I've received a number of support phone calls from people in municipalities that say yes. It's awful to be in a municipal area, and then if there's an unincorporated area, you get the air quality issue right next door. This isn't something that can be dealt with without doing it across the board. I think this is a plus. *** also... We already have several really noncompliance problems in the Chicago metropolitan area. This Bill is a good Bill for air quality. Please vote 'aye'."

Speaker Steczo: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from

63rd Legislative Day

May 21, 1993

Kankakee, Representative Novak."

"Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I Novak: support of this legislation. I in think this legislation is reasonable. The Sponsors of the legislation and the advocates that initiated the legislation, worked hard to address all concerns from more populated areas, agriculture from the interests, and from larger communities. We have put these exemptions into the Bill to address those problems. This addresses a very major public health policy concerning air quality. And if you've seen the individuals and children some of that have suffered...dramatically from the affects of smoke...from leaf burning, you will vote in the right manner to protect the health and livelihoods of children and people that live in these areas. So please support this legislation."

Speaker Steczo: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Ostenburg."

Ostenburg: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'm amazed that the argument that's being made by some of the individuals who are opposing this measure, because in some cases, they're the same people who were telling us...in debate a few days ago, that we should not have local control on pesticides. Leaf burning is a pretty universal thing. You either burn the leaves or you don't; and that's all that's involved is leaves. If anything should have a state-wide standard to protect clean air, should be leaf burning. Pesticides, where there's a lot of variables involved, where in fact, local control important so that you can examine those variables, we voted to make it a state-wide law to ban pesticides. There's a little bit of inconsistency in the arguments that are going on here. This measure is an important measure for the clean

63rd Legislative Day

May 21, 1993

air quality of our State. If, indeed, people are concerned about local control, they should revisit the pesticide issue. This isn't one that relates to local control at all. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Steczo: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Macon, Representative Dunn."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Dunn: rise in support of this legislation. Ι, too. legislation, in some regards, may not be an particularly easy thing to do, especially for those of us who have smaller communities and villages and rural areas in our district, which may be located in counties affected by this legislation. The other side of the coin, however, is that there are individuals out there for whom the leaf burning period in the fall is a time of intense agony. They have respiratory problems; both youngsters, middle-aged and senior citizens, and for those who have those problems, and they are serious and are exacerbated by the burning of leaves. Not much else matters to those people during that period of time. If you can't breath, not much else counts. We need to adopt this legislation, enact this legislation on behalf of those people. We're all on this planet and we owe it to them if it is within our power to provide clean air for them to breath year round. vote 'aye'."

Speaker Steczo: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I think the Sponsor of this Bill was right 15 minutes ago. It's been throughly debated and I think we're all ready to vote, and with all due respect to the Sponsor, I'm always amazed at what we do down here. It's perfectly

63rd Legislative Day

May 21, 1993

legal to burn the American flag, but by golly, in a few minutes, we're gonna make it illegal to burn leaves. Makes a lot of sense to me."

Speaker Steczo: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Champaign, Representative Johnson. Mr. Johnson."

Johnson, Tim: "...I don't...okay, 1'11 try. find this...almost...I mean, we've done some pretty dumb things around here, including me probably, but I can't imagine that we have a Bill that would prohibit leaf burning in Bonnville, Illinois, that has 400 people, but the area around Bonnville, Illinois...I mean, it would allow leaf burning in Bonnville, Illinois, with 400 people, but the area around Bonnville, Illinois, just on the periphery that's outside the City, that it's prohibited, unless you're a farmer. I mean, the same arguments that we used before with respect to Springfield telling Champaign County various other municipalities the what to do is...stands, but it's just unbelievably illogical that we're going to allow leaf burning, as we should, in a town of 350 people, and then the people who are right out side, it's prohibited. That doesn't even make sense. All the arguments that we've heard for the last two months on this inane piece of legislation about the smoke not stopping at the city lines and so forth, well, if that's all true, why do we have a ridiculous Bill like this? You know, the Sponsor of this Bill, and the various Sponsors really...continue to say they're good people who normally make a lot of sense. I can't imagine a Bill that's more illogical than this one. And as far as the policy goes, I don't know why, again, we think we know more here in the State Capitol about whether people in Mahomet and St. Joe and the various other areas in counties of over 100,000

63rd Legislative Day

May 21, 1993

people in this State do. Let them make that decision. If they want to ban leaf burning, they can ban leaf burning. people want to do it in those areas, let 'em do it, as we've done historically. But don't come over to Champaign and to St. Joe and Mahomet and people who live in areas outside those areas where there's no municipality. Little area....somebody who happens to buy a place on...on four acres in the country who went there specifically for that reason, and tell them what they can do with their property. That's absolutely ridiculous. It's a classic example of micro-management from this level of government, and it makes no sense at all. I... I've taken a lot of pride for my seventeen years down here, and considering myself an environmentally sensitive Legislator, I've gotten a variety of awards over the years from the Illinois Environmental Council, and I take a lot of pride in having a good relationship with the environmental community, but I don't think saying you're an environmental Legislator requires you to sign on to a piece of legislation that is absolutely ridiculous, and this is truly ridiculous, inconsistent, and it ought to be overwhelmingly defeated."

Speaker Steczo: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Lang, to close."

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. You know, I think we've...this
Bill received about 90 votes in its exact same form the
last time we voted on it, and it's sitting over there in
the Senate, waiting to see what we're going to do with this
Bill. For those that are concerned about telling people
what to do with their property, I don't think there's
anything wrong with that, when what they do with their
property affects our lives. When what they do with their
property affects the air we breath, or in some other cases,

63rd Legislative Day

May 21, 1993

the water we drink. This... This Bill's about the air. It's about poison toxins in the air, and I guarantee you those of you that have spoken against the Bill that if the advocates for this Bill, these ladies that have been around the Capitol talking to you, or at this microphone, they'd give you a close that you would not be able to ignore. They talked about the death of children; they talked about asthmatics that can't breath. This Bill will protect people in their homes and in their properties, and all around the State of Illinois. To those that sav it's illogical to make counties of a 100,000 or more, I would agree. I'd like to pass a Bill that would prohibit burning state-wide, state-wide, but we aren't going to do that. This is the Bill we're going to pass. We've already passed this once. We must protect our air. There are ways to take care of leaves without burning them and ruining the atmosphere. This is an important Bill to protect the environment and it requires an 'aye' vote."

- Speaker Steczo: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 240. and that question... The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye'; those opposed by voting 'no'. The voting is open. Mr. Johnson."
- Johnson, Tim: "...verify this, if it gets the requisite number of votes."
- Speaker Steczo: "The Gentleman has required a verification, should the Bill receive enough votes, or votes to pass.

 Please record Representative McPike as 'no'. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 67 voting 'yes' and 47 voting 'no'. The Chair recognizes Mr. Johnson. Mr. Johnson...for the purposes of a verification. Mr. Johnson."

63rd Legislative Day

- May 21, 1993
- Johnson, Tim: "I'm not going to take the House's time. I think the votes are here. I withdraw my request."
- Speaker Steczo: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from McDonough, Representative Edley."
- Edley: "Vote me 'no'. Change my vote."
- Speaker Steczo: "Please record Mr. Edley as 'no'. On this question, there are 66 voting 'yes', 48 voting 'no', 3 voting 'present'; and Senate Bill 240, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of State Operations, Second Reading, appears Senate Bill 436, Representative Stephens. Mr. Stephens. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 436 has been read a second time previously. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment 1, offered by Representative Stephens."
- Speaker Steczo: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Madison,

 Representative Stephens, on Amendment 1."
- Stephens: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment 1 deletes a provision that would otherwise, have created immunity from liability for the funds, the governing committee, the board of directors and their agents and employees. I move for its adoption."
- Speaker Steczo: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment 1. On that question, is there any discussion? There being none, all those in favor of the adoption of the Amendment, will signify by saying 'aye'; those opposed by saying 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Rossi: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Steczo: "Third Reading. On the Order of State Operations,

 Second Reading, appears Senate Bill 473, Representative

 Levin. Mr. Levin. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

63rd Legislative Day

May 21, 1993

- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 473. The Bill has been read a second time previously. Amendment 1 has been adopted to the Bill.

 No Motions filed. Floor Amendment 2, offered by Representative Kubik."
- Speaker Steczo: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Kubik, on Amendment 2."
- Kubik: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would withdraw Amendment 2."
- Speaker Steczo: "The Gentleman withdraws Amendment 2. Any further Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Rossi: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Steczo: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 473, a Bill for an Act amending the Revenue Act of 1939. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Steczo: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Levin."
- "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Levin: House. Senate Bill 473...was passed out of the House Revenue Committee by unanimous vote and, was in fact, on the Consent Calendar. Ιt contains three separate underlying Bill...provided that take provisions. The notice, in terms of tax buyers, must provide, in terms delinquent property owners, prior to receiving a tax deed, must also be published in a newspaper, and establish new contesting a tax deed. In addition, we for amend...we added in committee, the contents of House Bills 2196 and 2410; neither of which is controversial. 2196 was an initiative of the Cook County Clerk, and supported both the County and the City of Chicago and tax buyers, and provided a means for bringing forward...late charges on...on tax bills. So that everybody know...would know if amounts had not been paid in previous years. It phases it in over a five-year period. And House Bill 2410...dealt

63rd Legislative Day

May 21, 1993

with Long-time Owner/Occupant Property Tax Relief Act, a purely voluntary provision which passed this House, I believe unanaimously...the House Bill. If there any questions, I'd be happy to answer them. I know of no opposition to any provision of this Bill, and simply ask for your support."

Speaker Steczo: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 473. On that question, is there any discussion?

The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Kubik."

Kubik: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in support...for Senate Bill 473. The Sponsor is correct. This Bill was on the Consent Calendar. The provisions in this Bill were all non-controversial, agreed by just about every party I can think of, and since...since this is the only provision of...of the Bill that are not included in a Senate Bill, I think we ought to pass...or a House Bill that's coming over from the Senate, I apologize; the House Bill coming over from the Senate. I think we ought to pass this Bill and I would support the Sponsor's Motion and urge adoption of Senate Bill 473."

Speaker Steczo: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from McHenry,
Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Would the Sponsor tell us how this is different from his last Long time Owner/Occupant Property Tax Relief Act?

Is it different from the House version?"

Levin: "...It's identical."

Skinner: "Thank you."

Speaker Steczo: "There being no further discussion the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye'; those opposed by voting 'no'.

Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted

63rd Legislative Day

May 21, 1993

who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question there are 115 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. Senate Bill 473, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of State Operations, Second Reading, appears Senate Bill 617, Representative Gash. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 617. The Bill has been read a second time previously. Amendment #1 has been adopted to the Bill. No Motions filed. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Gash."

Speaker Steczo: "The Chair recognizes the Lady from Lake, Representative Gash, on Amendment #2."

Gash: "I'd like to withdraw Floor Amendment #2."

Speaker Steczo: "Amendment #2 is withdrawn. Any further Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk Rossi: "Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative Gash."

Speaker Steczo: "Representative Gash, on Amendment #3."

Gash: "I'd like to withdraw Amendment #3."

Speaker Steczo: "Amendment #3 will be withdrawn. Any further Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk Rossi: "Floor Amendment #4, offered by Representative Gash."

Speaker Steczo: "Representative Gash on Amendment #4."

Gash: "This is basically just a technical Amendment. It clarifies that the Secretary of State shall insure that the code and the register are published and made, but is not required to publish them itself in hard copy, and it clarifies that if the Secretary of State does in fact publish the code and register, then the public will be charged a reasonable fee and government entities will be

63rd Legislative Day

May 21, 1993

charged cost."

Speaker Steczo: "The Lady has moved for the adoption of Amendment #4. On that, is there any discussion? The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black."

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

Speaker Steczo: "She indicates that she will."

Black: "Representative, you said this was a technical Amendment, but in fact, the Amendment becomes the Bill, does it not?"

Gash: "Well, no it does not."

Black: "Whoa, we better get our staff people together."

Gash: "Excuse me?"

Black: "We better get our staff people together then. I think if you'll check with all the other Amendments you've withdrawn, Amendment #4 becomes the Bill."

Gash: "From what I understand, this goes to the cost and the availability, but basically the Bill allows that the code and register will be published and be in the public domain. This incorporates Amendment #1, which is all ready adopted."

Black: "What will your plans be with Amendment #5? Is it your intention to withdraw Amendment #5?"

Gash: "Excuse me?"

Black: "Is it your intention to withdraw Floor Amendment #5?"

Gash: "Probably, yes."

Black: "Okay. I don't wanna...I have no opposition to your Bill, but I do think the respective staff people might want to get together, because there are obviously not in agreement as to what form this Bill will be in when you adopt Floor Amendment #4."

Gash: "Okay. Amendment #4 will become the Bill."

63rd Legislative Day

May 21, 1993

Black: "All right. That's...so, your staff is in agreement with ours then; Amendment #4 does become the Bill?"

Gash: "Basically."

Black: "Okay. Basically. Right. Okay, that fine, thank you."

Speaker Steczo: "Is there any further discussion? All those in favor of the adoption of Amendment #4. The Chair recognizes the Lady from DuPage, Representative Biggert."

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

Speaker Steczo: "She indicates that she will."

Biggert: "Representative Gash, in Amendment #4 or...is it included that...is there any reference that these may be published by outside firms, or is all of this done by LIS?"

Gash: "Can you repeat your question?"

Biggert: "In Amendment #4 does it include..."

Gash: "From what I understand...Representative, from what I understand, it puts it in the public domain, which means that it can be done by outside firms."

Biggert: "So, that this is...this applies to outside firms, and then it says that the Secretary of State will publish this also with LIS."

Gash: "Right. Right."

Biggert: "All right. Thank you."

Speaker Steczo: "Is there any further discussion? All those in favor of the adoption of Amendment #4 will signify by saying 'aye', those opposed by saying 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk Rossi: "Floor Amendment #5, offered by Representative
Gash."

Speaker Steczo: "The Lady from Lake, Representative Gash, on Amendment #5."

Gash: "Withdraw Amendment #5."

63rd Legislative Day

May 21, 1993

- Speaker Steczo: "Amendment #5 is withdrawn. Any further Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Rossi: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Steczo: "Third Reading. On the Order of State Operation,

 Second Reading, appears Senate Bill 650, Representative

 Murphy. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 650. The Bill has been read a second time previously. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Maureen Murphy."
- Speaker Steczo: "The Chair recognizes Representative Murphy on Amendment #1."
- Murphy: "I'd like to withdraw Amendment #1."
- Speaker Steczo: "Amendment #1 is withdrawn. Any further Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Rossi: "Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Maureen Murphy."
- Speaker Steczo: "Representative Murphy, on Amendment #2."
- Murphy: "Yes. This Amendment represents an agreement between the mortgage bankers and lawyers, and it makes four changes to the Bill. Definition of occupant clarifies the Act of making lessee a party, deletes the service of process changes and prohibits a holder or purchaser from proceeding against any such occupant until 30 days after the order confirming the sale. Again, this was a technical substantive change, and language that was agreed to by the mortgage bankers and the lawyers. I ask for favorable passage."
- Speaker Steczo: "The Lady has moved for the adoption of Amendment #2. Is there any discussion? All those in favor of the adoption of the Amendment will signify by saying 'aye'; those opposed by saying 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"

63rd Legislative Day

May 21, 1993

Clerk Rossi: "No further Amendments."

- Speaker Steczo: "Third Reading. On the Order of State
 Operations, Second Reading, appears Senate Bill 926,
 Representative Mosley. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 926. The Bill has been read a second time previously. Amendment #1 has been adopted to the Bill. No Motions filed. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Moseley."
- Speaker Steczo: "The Chair recognizes the Lady from Sangamon,

 Representative Moseley, on Amendment #2."
- Moseley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I withdraw Amendment #2."
- Speaker Steczo: "Amendment #2 is withdrawn. Any further Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Rossi: "Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative Moseley."
- Speaker Steczo: "Representative Moseley, on Amendment #3."
- Moseley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I withdraw Amendment #3."
- Speaker Steczo: "Amendment #3 is withdrawn. Any further Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Rossi: "Floor Amendment #4, offered by Representative Moseley."
- Steczo: "Representative Moseley, on Amendment #4."
- Moseley: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. This Amendment is the result of negotiations that have been on going and continue between the securities industry and the Secretary of States' office. This is a agreed to language for the securities industry. We are still working on some language with the Secretary of States' office, but at this point, they have agreed to allow this Bill to forward, so, that we can put it into a Conference Committee and take out their objections as well. I want to point out in the adoption of this language, that we are addressing this at persons, not

63rd Legislative Day

- May 21, 1993
- at employers or corporations, and I ask for your favorable consideration."
- Speaker Steczo: "The Lady has moved for the adoption of Amendment #4. On that, is there any discussion? The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Vermillion, Representative Black."
- Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. To the Amendment. Why I...let me first of all rise to say that I do not want to defeat the Amendment. I think the Sponsor's aware that we have some problems with the Amendment; but, for the record, I would like the record to reflect that the Secretary of State is opposed to this Amendment as it's currently written. There is language that needs to be added, and also the effective date needs to be changed to January 1, 1994. With the understanding of the Secretary of State and all other parties, that this will go to the Senate and those changes We would urge your adoption of Amendment will be made. #4."
- Speaker Steczo: "The Lady has moved for the adoption of Amendment #4. Is there any further discussion? There being none the question is, 'Shall the Amendment be adopted?' All those in favor will signify by saying 'aye'; those opposed by saying 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments, Mr Clerk?"
- Clerk Rossi: "Floor Amendment #5, offered by Representative Moseley."
- Speaker Steczo: "Representative Moseley, on Amendment #5."
- Moseley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Amendment, which is cosponsored by Representative Tenhouse, is to allow the Institute...the Illinois Institute for Entrepreneurship Education, which is located at Northern Illinois

63rd Legislative Day

May 21, 1993

University, to continue operations. They were currently under a sunset. This is a very good institute, which is providing meaningful training for people all over the state, including Quincy, and I urge for your favorable consideration."

- Speaker Steczo: "The Lady has moved for the adoption of Amendment #5. Is there any discussion? All those in favor of the Amendment will signify by saying 'aye'; those opposed by saying 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Rossi "Floor Amendment #6, offered by Representative Moseley."
- Speaker Steczo: "Representative Moseley, on Amendment #6."
- Moseley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Amendment is an Amendment that is agreed to again with a Co-Sponsor of Representative Black. This Amendment allows the University of Illinois to enter into 10 year contracts for the purchases of coal and fuels. It further stipulates that all contracts are subject to termination and cancellation in any year for which the General Assembly fails to make to an appropriation to make payments. I believe this will allow the University flexibility in purchasing coal, and I ask for your favorable support."
- Speaker Steczo: "The Lady has moved for the adoption of Amendment #6. On that, is there any discussion? There being none, all those in favor of the Amendment will signify by saying 'aye'; those opposed by saying 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Rossi: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Steczo: "Third Reading. On the Order of State Operations, Second Reading, appears Senate Bill 1068,

63rd Legislative Day

- May 21, 1993
- Representative Persico. Mr. Persico? Senate Bill 1068. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 1068 has been read a second time previously. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Black."
- Speaker Steczo: "The Chair recognizes Representative Black on Amendment #1."
- Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Please withdraw
 Amendment #1."
- Speaker Steczo: "Amendment #1 is withdrawn. Any further Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Rossi: "Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Wennlund."
- Speaker Steczo: "The Chair recognizes Representative Wennlund on Amendment #2."
- Wennlund: "Please withdraw Amendment #2."
- Speaker Steczo: "Any further Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk Rossi: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Steczo: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 1068, a Bill for an Act amending the Criminal Code of 1961. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Steczo: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from DuPage,
 Representative Persico."
- Persico: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 1068, without the Amendment, is a non-controversial Bill. It amends the Criminal Code to provide for the disposition of confiscated weapons used in a homicide. It is a Bill that passed out of the Senate 55 to 0. It is also a Bill that passed the House last year, but was amendatorily vetoed by the Governor. We have answered those concerns. It is also a Bill that is

63rd Legislative Day

May 21, 1993

supported by the...both the NRA and gun control advocates, and I ask for your support of this Bill."

Speaker Steczo: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 1068. On that, is there any discussion? The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Dart."

Dart: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Steczo: "He indicates that he will."

Dart: "Representative, is there...are there safeguards in this, so to insure that even after the...say in the murder case that individuals have been convicted for...later if there's appeals and questions of...along the Appellate court that may reverse or remand the case back to the trial court? Are there safeguards in here to insure that that gun will still be around if it's needed for evidence later on in a remand type of situation?"

Persico: "Well, basically what it does, is it sets up a system of order of how that gun will be disposed of. From, if it is stolen let's say, it will be returned to its rightful owner. Then it is transferred to the Sheriff's Department for, you know, destruction and so on. So, there are some..."

Dart: "I noticed something here. It says: 'as long as it's no longer needed for evidentiary purposes.' So, I would imagine that means that in different case like remands they've taken that into consideration then, correct?"

Persico: "Yes they do. After it's no longer needed for evidence."

Dart: "Thank you."

Speaker Steczo: "Is there any further discussion? There being none the question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1068 pass?' All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye'; those opposed

63rd Legislative Day

May 21, 1993

by voting 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 113 voting 'yes', 1 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', 1068, having received Bill the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Cowlishaw. Representative On the Order οf Local Government, Third Reading, appears Senate Bill 371. Representative Cowlishaw. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 371 has been read a third time previously and is on consideration postponed."
- Speaker Steczo: "The Chair recognizes the Lady from DuPage, Representative Cowlishaw."
- Cowlishaw: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 371 is an initiative of the Northeastern Illinois Planning Commission, which is currently performing the waste water studies that are required by federal mandate. If they did not do them, the Illinois would State of be required to do them. Consequently, the state is spared the cost of having to do those studies. The studies are actually useful, most particularly to developers, and consequently what this Bill does is to permit 'NIPSY' to pass on to the developers who need these studies the cost that they incur in preparing the studies. That's all the Bill does. There opposition to this Bill whatsoever. All opposition has been removed, even those who previously were in opposition, are now in support and I move for the adoption of Senate Bill 371."
- Speaker Steczo: "The Lady has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 371. On that question is there any discussion? There

63rd Legislative Day

May 21, 1993

being none the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' those in favor will signify by voting 'aye'; those opposed by voting 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question there are 84 voting 'yes', 28 voting 'no', 2 voting 'present' and Bill 371, having received Senate the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Giolitto, do you wish to be recorded as... No. On the Order of Local Government, Third Reading, appears Senate Bill 707, Representative Lang. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill. The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Lang."

- Lang: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. I ask leave of the House to move the Bill back to Second Reading for purposes of an agreed Amendment."
- Speaker Steczo: "The Gentleman asks leave to bring House...Senate
 Bill 707 back to the Order of Second Reading for the
 purposes of an Amendment. Is there objection? There being
 none, Senate Bill 707 now appears on the Order of Second
 Reading. Mr. Clerk, are there any Amendments?"
- Clerk Rossi: "Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Lang."
- Speaker Steczo: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Lang, on Amendment #2."
- Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. With this agreed Amendment, this Bill now includes DuPage and all downstate counties, and I move adoption."
- Speaker Steczo: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #2. On that, is there any discussion? The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Will, Representative Wennlund."

63rd Legislative Day

May 21, 1993

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

Speaker Steczo: "He indicates that he will."

Wennlund: "Representative, you referred to it as an agreed

Amendment. Can you tell me who has agreed?"

Lang: "Well, I'm not exactly sure. It was indicated to me by former State Representative Gene Hoffman, who sat on your side of the aisle. The Amendment was drafted by him, and was intended to include all counties out of Cook; so, that those on your side of the aisle that might feel aggrieved by that, would no longer feel aggrieved."

Wennlund: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Steczo: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #2. Is there any further discussion? There being none, all in favor of the adoption of the Amendment will signify by saying 'aye'; those opposed by saying 'no'.

The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk Rossi: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Steczo: "Third Reading. For what purpose does the Gentleman from Kane, Representative Hoeft, seek recognition?"

Hoeft: "Mr. Speaker, could you please change Senate Bill 1068 my
 vote from 'no' to 'yes' please."

Speaker Steczo: "Mr. Hoeft, the transcript will so reflect."

Hoeft: "Thank you."

Speaker Steczo: "On the Order of Professional Regulation, appears

Senate Bill 290. Representative Krause. Mr. Clerk, please
read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 290, a Bill for an Act concerning the Department of Rehabilitation Services. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Steczo: "The Chair recognizes the Lady from Cook,

63rd Legislative Day

May 21, 1993

Representative Krause."

- Krause: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Very briefly, Senate Bill 190 amends the Disabled Persons Rehabilitation Act, and it makes a number of technical changes merely to bring the state into compliance with the Federal Rehabilitation Act, and in addition makes changes in order to have us comply with the McMillan lawsuit in order to reopen intake for the home services program. I ask for adoption of the Bill."
- Speaker Steczo: "The Lady has moved for the passage of Senate
 Bill 290. On that question, is there any discussion? The
 Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Vermilion,
 Representative Black."
- Black: "I just have an inquiry of the Chair, Mr. Speaker. Has Floor Amendment #1 be adopted to this Bill?"
- Clerk Rossi: "Floor Amendment #1 has been adopted to the Bill."
- Black: "All right. Thank you very much."
- Speaker Steczo: "There being no further discussion, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye'; those opposed by voting 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question there are 116 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present' and Senate Bill 290, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of State Operations, Third Reading, appears Senate Bill 142, Representative Brady. Mr. Brady. Please read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 142. a Bill for an Act amending the Freedom of Information Act. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Steczo: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from McLean, Representative Brady."
 - Brady: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. This

63rd Legislative Day

May 21, 1993

Bill, as amended, addresses an issue raised by a recent court decision involving the Freedom of Information Act. The Bill makes it clear that traffic accident reports are public record, pursuant to the Freedom of Information Act, unless the traffic accident itself is subject to an on going criminal investigation. The Bill is the result of a consensus between the Illinois Municipal League, the Press Association and the automobile insurance carriers. I'd be happy to answer any questions, and I ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker Steczo: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 142. On that question, is there any discussion? The Chair recognizes the Lady from DuPage, Representative Biggert."

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

Speaker Steczo: "He indicates that he will."

Biggert: "What do you as a Sponsor of the Bill, consider an 'on going and criminal investigation' to be?"

Brady: "On going means that while an investigation is not yet final, then such accident traffic reports would be available. For example, until law enforcement determines whether someone is to be charged with a crime and then files such charges, only after that point would traffic accident reports be available. These traffic accident reports would otherwise be subject to the discovery process in a criminal prosecution. So, it makes sense that they could be disallowed under the Freedom of Information Act."

Biggert: "Thank you or think you mentioned, but I couldn't hear you, who wants this Bill? I'm sorry, I couldn't hear your response when you talked about the Bill, but who wants this Bill? Why are you proposing this?"

Brady: "Oh, thank you. The Municipal League, the Press

63rd Legislative Day

- May 21, 1993
- Association and the auto insurance industry."
- Biggert: "Has the Bar Association asked or given any opinion on this?"
- Brady: "Other interested parties such...who...who had some concern, is the City of Chicago and the Bar Association, and they have removed their opposition."
- Biggert: "Thank you. To the Bill, Mr. Speaker. I am in favor of this. Thank you."
- Speaker Steczo: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook,

 Representative Dart."
- Dart: "Thank you. Will the Sponsor yield?"
- Speaker Steczo: "He indicates that he will."
- Dart: "Can you go in a little more indepth about the court case, instead of what exactly was holding?"
- Brady: "It is my understanding in the Fourth Appellate Court, that a judge ruled that there maybe some liability on the part of municipalities in releasing information, and we have a great fear here that if we don't clear up this issue, there will be a lot of changes occurring and the Municipal League will advise its Members not to release any information."
- Dart: "Okay."
- Brady: "But, as far as I know, there was judge and a...a plaintiff, and a very good...I don't know."
- Dart: "I couldn't have put it any better myself. Nothing further."
- Speaker Steczo: "Is there any further discussion? The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from McLean, Representative Brady, to close."
- Brady: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just ask for a favorable vote."
- Speaker Steczo: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 142 pass?'

63rd Legislative Day

May 21, 1993

All those in favor will signify by voting 'ave': those opposed by voting 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 109 voting 'yes', 5 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present' and 142. having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of State Operations. Third Reading, appears Senate Bill Representative McAuliffe. Out of the record. Senate Bill 580, Representative Granberg. Mr. Granberg? Out of the record. Senate Bill 594, Representative Moffitt. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 594, a Bill for an Act amending the School Code. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Steczo: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Knox, Representative Moffitt."
- Moffitt: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. We'd like to take this back to Second Reading for an Amendment."
- Speaker Steczo: "The Gentleman asks... For what purpose does the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Dart, seek recognition?"
- Dart: "We would object to taking this back to Second Reading."
- Speaker Steczo: "Mr. Moffitt, could you take the Bill out of the record and have your staff people contact the staff people on the democratic side to see if there's...if we're on the same wave length?"
- Moffitt: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Sure will."
- Speaker Steczo: "For what purpose does the Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black, seek recognition? He does not seek recognition. On the Order of State Operations, Third Reading, appears Senate Bill 677, Representative

63rd Legislative Day

- May 21, 1993
- Rutherford. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 677, a Bill for an Act concerning nursing homes. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Steczo: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Livingston, Representative Rutherford."
- Rutherford: "Let's leave to move it to Second for purposes of an Amendment please."
- Speaker Steczo: "Gentleman asks leave to move...bring Senate Bill 677 back to the Order of Second Reading for the purposes of an Amendment. Is there any objection? There being none, the Bill is now on Second Reading. Mr. Clerk, any Amendments?"
- Clerk Rossi: "Floor Amendment #5, offered by Representative von Bergen Wessels."
- Speaker Steczo: "The Chair recognizes the Lady from Whiteside,

 Representative von Bergen Wessels, on Amendment #5."
- von Bergen Wessels: "Thank you Speaker. Amendment #5 is House
 Bill 1940, which passed out of this chamber 110 to 0, but
 apparently did not make the posting requirement at the
 Senate. It includes elder adults with disabilities under
 the section of the Domestic Violence Act that will allow an
 order protection to issue to care-givers who are abusive,
 in addition to household members who might be abusive, and
 I would urge its passage."
- Speaker Steczo: "The Lady has moved for the adoption of Amendment #5. On that, is there any discussion? The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Livingston, Representative Rutherford."
- Rutherford: "I stand in favor of this Amendment as well."
- Speaker Steczo: "Is there any further discussion? All those in favor of the Amendment will signify by saying 'aye'; those opposed by saying 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment

63rd Legislative Day

May 21, 1993

is adopted. Any further Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk Rossi: "No further Amendments."

- Speaker Steczo: "Third Reading. The Order of State Operations,

 Third Reading, appears Senate Bill 594, Representative

 Moffitt. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 594 has been read a third time previously."
- Speaker Steczo: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Knox, Representative Moffitt."
- Moffitt: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Senate Bill 594 amends the School Code. House authorizes the school districts to issue life safety bonds or to levy a life safety tax when it's necessary. It's permissive language when it's necessary to do so handicapped accessibility, to comply...to bring the building into compliance. Current law authorizes school districts to use life safety bonds just for fire prevention, safety, energy conservation and school security purposes. This simply adds life safety to that. The Bill does not grant school districts any additional taxing authority. It only expands the purpose for which the taxing authority may be utilized. I would urge your support of this Bill."
- Speaker Steczo: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 594. On that question, is there any discussion? The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black."
- Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor
 yield?"
- Speaker Steczo: "He indicates that he will."
- Black: "Representative, is...is...this the legislation...or excuse me, I don't know that. Is it legislation designed

63rd Legislative Day

May 21, 1993

to address the American with Disabilities Act that many schools are faced with?"

Moffitt: "Yes it is."

Black: "Thank you very much."

Moffitt: "Which is a federal mandate, and we're simply...if the local school board needs this as a tool, it would give them that authority. It's permissive."

Black: "Thank you."

Speaker Steczo: "The Lady from Whiteside, Representative von Bergen Wessels."

Speaker Steczo: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Coles, Representative Weaver."

Weaver: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Just a brief question. Representative, this will not...should this pass into law, this will not have any affect on the tax exempt status of those bonds."

Moffitt: "No. The..."

Weaver: "Would it? I'm not even sure if life safety bonds are tax exempt now. I would assume they are. Would it have any affect on that?"

Moffitt: "It does not change anything as far as life safety bonds whatsoever. They're all ready regulated."

Weaver: "It expands your authority..."

Moffitt: "The usage of them, yeah."

Weaver: "Right."

Moffitt: "...and that has been kind of the problem with the state board in reviewing, as a matter of fact, I've got a case right now, we've got a meeting next week where they're concerned about the installation of an elevator as part of the renovations of the building, not qualifying under the

63rd Legislative Day

- May 21, 1993
- life safety code, because it...it deals with handicapped accessibility."
- Weaver: "But, this would not affect the status of the bonds or the salability of those bonds at all, is that right?"
- Moffitt: "I don't think it would affect the salability. The State Board of Education is a proponent of this legislation."
- Weaver: "Very good. Thank you. Sounds like a good Bill."
- Moffitt: "They are proponents."
- Speaker Steczo: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Skinner."
- Skinner: "Would this allow any school district in the collar counties to sell bonds without a referendum?"
- Moffitt: "It continues the same authority that they have now, Representative."
- Skinner: "Then the answer is 'no', I assume. I mean if this guts the tax cap, I would be somewhat disturbed."
- Moffitt: "I do not see it as gutting the tax cap."
- Moffitt: "I don't see it as doing that. If you do, I think you know you could explain that. But, it's a...we already have life safety bonds that it just expands the use, and it's..."
- Skinner: "Well, actually in the collar counties we don't have life safety bonds anymore; not without a referendum."
- Speaker Steczo: "Mr. Moffitt."
- Moffitt: "Apparently, it depends on whether they're up to the cap or not. If they're not up to the cap they can do it, and if they are up to the cap, they can't without a referendum."
- Moffitt: "The cap would apply to these bonds."

63rd Legislative Day

May 21, 1993

Skinner: "All right. I think the Members of the General Assembly should remember that we passed a \$100 million bond issue.

We authorized \$100 million to retrofit all the state buildings in Illinois that are owned by Illinois. So, this is, I suspect, a significant expansion of the life safety code authority, and if we wish to pass that...the Bill knowing that, that's fine."

Speaker Steczo: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Kane, Representative Hoeft."

Hoeft: "This Body and the State Legislature drew specific guidelines for the use of life safety. Then the federal government came along and increased the demands upon the school district. This simply opens up the ability of the school districts to meet the federal government demands. This is critical legislation to keep healthy schools, and you've got to support it."

Speaker Steczo: "The Chair recognizes the Lady from Cook, Representative Zickus."

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

Speaker Steczo: "He indicates that he will."

Zickus: "Representative, are there realtors still in opposition
 to this, which I think they are?"

Moffitt: "I talked to them this week. They entered a record of appearance as an opponent. I think they're concerned about life safety and complying with this Act; but, they are on record as far as I know, still as an opponent."

Zickus: "They're still opposed."

Moffitt: "That's my understanding."

Zickus: "Thank you."

Speaker Steczo: "The Chair recognizes the Lady from Cook, Representative Erwin."

Erwin: "Thank you, Speaker. I rise on a point of personal

63rd Legislative Day

May 21, 1993

privilege. I would like the Members of the House to join me in welcoming the future leaders of our state, the 6th grade class from St. Clemment's school in Lincoln Park."

- Steczo: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from DuPage,
 Representative Persico."
- Persico: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of this piece of legislation. To answer the concerns of a previous Speaker, life safety bonds would not affect the collar counties unless they exceeded the debt limit. If they exceeded the debt limit, then they would have to go to referendum to increase this debt limit. So, I do think it's a good Bill, and it's a much needed Bill in order to comply with the American Disability Act."
- Speaker Steczo: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Knox,

 Representative Moffitt, to close."
- Moffitt: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think if you'll just reflect back to last fall, there was an advisory referendum in the State of Illinois, where the people said they're very concerned about mandates, and if there's mandate, there should be a way to pay for it. This addresses that problem, where we're giving our local schools one more tool that they can use to come in compliance with the federal mandate that being the Americans With Disability Act, and I think we certainly want our schools to be in compliance, and give them a method to pay. So, I would ask for your support. Thank you."
- Speaker Steczo: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 594. The question is, 'Shall this Fill pass?'

 All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye'; those opposed by voting 'no', the voting is open. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question

63rd Legislative Day

May 21, 1993

- there are 98 voting 'yes', 17 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present' and Senate Bill 594, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of Law, Third Reading, appears Senate Bill 246, Representative Lindner. Representative Lindner? Do you wish to call your Bill? Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk McLennand: "Senate Bill 246, a Bill for an Act concerning children. Third Reading of this Bill."
- Speaker Steczo: "The Chair recognizes the Lady from Kane, Representative Lindner."
- Lindner: "Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would ask to take this back to Second for purposes of an Amendment."
- Speaker Steczo: "The Lady asks leave to move Senate Bill 246 back to the Order of Second Reading for the purpose of an Amendment. Is there leave? There being no objection, leave is granted. The Bill will be on the Order of Second Reading. Mr. Clerk, are there any Amendments?"
- Clerk McLennand: "Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Lindner."
- Speaker Steczo: "The Chair recognizes Representative Lindner, on Amendment #1."
- Lindner: "Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Essentially, the
 Amendment becomes the Bill and it is the result of
 negotiations between Representative Dart, who has the other
 Child Abandonment Bill, and myself and the people that we
 have worked with, and I don't think there is any opposition
 from Mr. Dart on this, and I would ask for passage of this
 Amendment."
- Speaker Steczo: "The Lady has moved for the adoption of Amendment #1. On that, is there any discussion? There being none, all those in favor of the adoption of the Amendment will signify by saying 'aye'; those opposed by saying 'no'. The

63rd Legislative Day

May 21, 1993

'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk McLennand: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Steczo: "Third Reading. The Order of Law, Third Reading, appears Senate Bill 289, Representative Hoffman. Mr. Homer, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"

Homer: "The sponsorship of that Bill was this morning turned over to me. Representative Hoffman signed a form doing so. I'd like to present the Bill."

Speaker Steczo: "Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk McLennand: "Senate Bill 289, a Bill for an Act to amend the Code of Civil Procedure. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Steczo: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Fulton, Representative Homer."

Homer: "Thank you. Mr. Speaker, a point of order."

Speaker Steczo: "State your point."

Homer: "The a...I want to return this Bill to Second and amend it. Today is the deadline. Is there...is it my understanding that we will be given an opportunity later today then to call the Bill on Third Reading?"

Speaker Steczo: "You may."

Homer: "My Amendment is not printed, I'm told. Could the Chair clarify the issue with regard to..."

Speaker Steczo: "Mr. Homer, the suggestion would be if the Amendment is not printed, perhaps we should wait until the Amendment is printed and distributed."

Homer: "Can we take this Bill from the record?"

Speaker Steczo: "The Gentleman requests that the Bill be taken from the record. Mr. Homer, would you care to move Senate Bill 483? Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk McLennand: "Senate Bill 483, a Bill for an Act to amend the Criminal Code of 1961. Third Reading of the Bill."

63rd Legislative Day

May 21, 1993

Speaker Steczo: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Fulton, Representative Homer."

Homer: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. The Bill, as it came over from the Senate, made the offense of prison quard a Class 4 Felony. aggravated assault on a It's currently a...it's currently a Class A Misdemeanor. The Bill also has on it three Amendments. The first Amendment, was an Amendment of Representative Cross', having to do with the uniformed definition of 'organized gang activity'. The second Amendment, created the use immunity provisions borrowed from the federal statute. The...Amendment #3, was offered by Representative Frias, in request of Sheriff Michael Sheehan, of Cook county, for video appearances for inmates, where a personal appearance constitutionally required. I would answer questions, and I would respectfully request the passage of the Bill."

Speaker Steczo: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 483. On that question, is there any discussion. There being none the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye'; those opposed by voting 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish. Have all voted who wish? all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question there are 115 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present' and Senate Bill 483, having received required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of Law, Third Reading, appears Senate Bill 678, Representative Saviano. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk McLennand: "Senate Bill 678, a Bill for an Act concerning Aids. Third reading of this Bill."

63rd Legislative Day

May 21, 1993

Speaker Steczo: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Saviano."

Saviano: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. What this Bill does as amended, the Bill requires that the defendant and a victim upon request, be notified of the results of the test for HIV and will also apply to the testing and notification requirements when a juvenile is adjudicated delinquent for criminal sexual assault, aggravated criminal sexual abuse and criminal sexual abuse. What the purpose of this Bill is to insure we don't lose a potential amount of \$1.7 million of federal funding which funds these AIDS tests. It flew out of the Senate on Agreed Bill list, and I believe we've worked out all our differences here, and I believe the Chairman of the Jud II Committee is also on board, and I'd ask for a 'do pass'."

Speaker Steczo: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 678. On that question. is there any discussion? There being none the question is 'Shall this Bill pass?' All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye'; those opposed by voting 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question there are 117 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present' and Bill 678, having Senate received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Third Reading, appears Senate Bill 869, Order of Law, Representative Schakowsky. Ms. Schakowsky? Mr. please read the Bill."

Clerk McLennand: "Senate Bill 869, a Bill that amends the Criminal Code of 1961. Third Reading of this Bill."

Speaker Steczo: "The Chair recognizes the Lady from Cook, Representative Schakowsky."

63rd Legislative Day

May 21, 1993

Schakowsky: "Thank you, Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 869, among other things, provides that a person commits the offense of disorderly conduct if he uses an emergency service in a fraudulent or fictitious manner. Essentially, this Bill closes a loophole that was asked for by some downstate State's attorneys who felt that their offices were being misused in a frivolous kind of way. We already have an...a disorderly conduct offense for misusing 911. In addition, this has an Amendment to it that would limit the use of certain...hold on a second, model airplanes that make a lot of noise and one that would...and an Amendment that was added that deals with hate crimes that is a non-controversial Amendment, and I urge passage of this Bill."

Speaker Steczo: "The Lady has moved for the passage of Senate
Bill 869. On that, is there any discussion? The Chair
recognizes the Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative
Black."

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

Speaker Steczo: "She indicates that she will."

Black: "Yes, could you please explain the non-controversial

Amendment #3 in greater detail?"

Schakowsky: "I would appreciate it if the...Representative that offered that Amendment might give you that answer, Representative..."

Black: "That would be fine. That would be fine."

Speaker Stergo: "Mr. Black?"

Black: "Yes."

Speaker Steczo: "Have you completed your questioning?"

Black: "Yes. I see the Representative who sponsored the Amendment. Amendment #3 deals with the Criminal Code

63rd Legislative Day

May 21, 1993

section on hate crimes, and I was just wondering if the Sponsor would explain that in a little greater detail?"

Speaker Steczo: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Levin."

Levin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #3 is not intended to make any substantive change in the Hate Crimes Law at all but to address confusion and a trial court ruling in Chicago where a trial court judge held that because a prosecutor did not file a separate action for the underlying offense (in that a battery offense) throughout the hate crimes indictment as well. Ninety-nine times out of a 100, a prosecutor will want to file both the underlying offense and the separate hate crimes, but for tactical reasons on occasion they will not; they will just wanna go with the hate crimes, and this simply gives them the flexibility do that. It makes clear that you cannot throw out the indictment...if you don't separately prosecute for the underlying offense."

Black: "Thank you. Just one last question, and I appreciate your patience. With the adoption of Floor Amendment #3, in your legal expertise, would this have the potential to subject a person to double jeopardy?"

Levin: "No, because the...in terms of your hate crimes, the elements you have to meet include objectively all the elements of the underlying offense plus the intention...of committing the battery or whatever else it is, you know, for...based on the individuals' race or whatever the purpose here is. This is not intended - I'd like to make this very clear - this is not intended to change the law in any way. This is, in fact, the interpretation that the State's Attorney's Office in Cook County, the Chicago

63rd Legislative Day

May 21, 1993

Police Department and every prosecutor and attorney I've talked to believes is, in fact, the law at the present time. We just wanted to add a sentence to make it doubly clear. So, this is not intended to in any way to change the law, to change any of the elements or to do anything that is different from what the law is now. It just...we got this one bad decision, and we want to clarify for that particular judge and anybody else that has confusion that you can...the prosecutor does have the flexibility here."

- Black: "All right. Thank you very much, Representative and thank you, Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker Steczo: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Dart."
- Dart: "Representative Levin, I...I was gonna ask you a couple quick questions on this as well. Is the Bar Association taking any position on this?"
- Levin: "I don't believe they have. I have talked to both the Chicago Police Department, the Anti-Defamation League and the State's Attorney's Office of Cook County, as well as the Senate Sponsor, the Republican Sponsor, of the underlying Bill regarding this matter."
- Dart: "As far as this Amendment, is...is this...is this been something that came up in committee and was debated at all?"
- Levin: "It is not something that's come up in committee. It's something that was discussed about three or four months ago initially with Representative Homer. It was not acted on while we had Bills in the House, and it was something that was subsequently developed and, I think, run by everybody. So, the intent is it does not, in the view of the State's Attorney's Office in Cook County, in terms of the Chicago Police, in terms of the others, it does not change the law

63rd Legislative Day

May 21, 1993

in any way because right now the view is that the law is that you don't have to separately plead the underlying offense. You don't have to charge the individual with the battery and the..."

Dart: "I...I understand that. How many problems have we had with this that requires us to do this in statute?"

Levin: "The reason this comes up is; one, because of the trial court decision that occurred; and, secondly, it has come up in the Advisory Committee on Hate Crimes of the Chicago Police Department; it's come up in the discussions. The Advisory Committee..."

Dart: "My...my only concern...my only concern about this is the way it's actually worded and drafted. Is the way it's been worded and drafted, have the different bar associations had a chance to look at it and say it's fine, because I'm just concerned when you start saying they do not have to be convicted of the underlying offense or even prosecuted on it, the underlying offense is a element of it though, however, correct?"

Levin: "That's correct. You..."

Dart: "I...I just don't want there to be any confusion with the fact that you're saying that the...the offense itself has different elements to it. Those, obviously, all have to be proven still, but the other offenses don't have to be charged separately."

Levin: "That's correct. That's the only...that's the sole intent of adding this line to the statute is so that you do not have to separately charge the person with the underlying offense..."

Dart: "Which...which is already the present law."

Levin: "Pardon?"

Dart: "Which is already the present law."

63rd Legislative Day

May 21, 1993

Levin: "That's correct."

Dart: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Steczo: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Fulton, Representative Homer."

Homer: "Thank you. Will the Gentleman yield, that is Representative Levin?"

Speaker Steczo: "He indicates that he will."

Homer: "Representative Levin, you and I have had a discussion about this issue, and I'm mainly asking you these questions for purpose of legislative intent, and the concern that I had was not in the application of this provision to the hate crime offense because, obviously your Bill as you've stated, is doing nothing more than stating what is already the law. Correct?"

Levin: "Correct."

Homer: "The concern that I had was that we have a number of other offenses in the statutes where there is an underlying offense of a similar nature. For example: Battery and aggravated battery, assault, aggravated assault, stalking, aggravated stalking. And what I wanted to make sure this Bill did not do was give grounds for a challenge to convictions for those offenses under the theory that since we did not specifically state in the legislation that it is not necessary to charge and convict for the underlying offense that somehow we intended that that be the law, and I want to make sure that, for example, where there's a prosecution for aggravated battery, that where there was no charge brought for battery that it is not your intention, is it, that there be some defense created by this statute whereby there could be a dismissal of the aggravated battery conviction or reversal of it since the charge of battery was not proven independently? Is that correct?"

63rd Legislative Day

May 21, 1993

Levin: "I completely agree with you. We have discussed this matter, and I think what I told you in our conversations was that the intention here is not to set any precedence for any other acts. We're responding here simply to the fact that we had one trial court judge that misunderstood the statute and we want to clarify this statute, but this should not have any effect on any other statute and the interpretation of any other statute."

Homer: "Thank you, and briefly then to the Bill. I would like to just state that the concern again is that sometimes where we create where we pass provision that instructs the court with respect to a specific crime but we fail to give the same instructions with regard to some other crime, that the defense then uses the fact that we were silent on the other crime as some sort of legislative intent that we intended to create some defense that did not previously exist. And so I understand the Gentleman. That is not his intent here and that his purpose is solely to educate the trial courts with respect to the issue of prosecution of hate crime offenses; and, on that basis, I would support the Bill."

Speaker Steczo: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, strangely enough I don't want to ask a question about the same Amendment. I am interested in Amendment #2, which would seem to ban model airplanes within a, let's see, within a mile of the corporate limits of any municipality without the municipalities' village board or city council approving it by a three-fifths vote. Now, my county is eligible because the language of the Amendment says that it's gonna affect every county under...under 300,000 people. This...Amendment has been sponsored by the Representative from Peoria County, and I

63rd Legislative Day

May 21, 1993

would hope that...this Amendment could be narrowed through a conference committee so that it would apply to counties of, let's say, 250,000 to 300,000, because I certainly have received no complaints in McHenry County and, indeed, the location which model airplane people used to use in the Crystal Lake area was within the village...within the City of Crystal Lake's city limits. But the city didn't have to give permission, just the park district had to give permission because it was on park district property. I'm gonna have to vote 'present' because of the language...the population language limits. Thank you."

Speaker Steczo: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Frias."

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

Speaker Steczo: "He indicates that he will."

Frias: "This is for the...to the original Bill. I have a question for Representative Schakowsky. I'm a little confused as to what this Bill does. Could you explain that to me, please?"

Schakowsky: "I'd be happy to respond to that. It was...let me give you an example of what initiated this legislation. Most recently...this is from the State's attorney in Shelby County. Most recently, someone from southern Effingham County called our sheriff and asked them to deliver an emergency message to an estranged husband in Tower Hill serious illness of their mutual child. concerning a deputy was dispatched immediately to take the message. turned out that this was a sham and was simply an attempt to harass an estranged husband living in Tower Hill. So, Penny...Representative...Senator Severns introduced this legislation because the State's attorney was saying this is not an infrequent use of their office, not this particular

63rd Legislative Day

May 21, 1993

problem but others like it."

Frias: "Okay, let me ask you a question. Would this apply to, let's say, an individual who pulls the fire alarm in school?"

Schakowsky: "I'm sorry..."

Frias: "Would this apply to an individual, a child or a teen-ager or a youngster who pulls the fire alarm in school?"

Schakowsky: "Fire..."

Frias: "Fire alarm for a...or let me ask you another question.

If...if...would this...does this apply to Chicago? Is that

correct?"

Schakowsky: "I still can't hear you."

Frias: "Does this apply to Chicago?"

Schakowsky: "Yes."

Frias: "Okay. It says here in the analysis that if convicted of this offense, they would have to reimburse the municipality for the expense. Is that correct?"

Schakowsky: "Yes. With..."

Frias: "Do you have any idea..."

Schakowsky: "The expenses associated with the response would be covered by the person convicted of the violation."

Frias: "Do you have any idea what that expense might be for, let's say, for a false police response or a false fire..."

Schakowsky: "I'm...I'm certain that it...I'm certain that it would vary, and my understanding is that misuse of fire alarms that...this is a disorderly conduct charge now.

That's what we're talking about..."

Frias: "Right. What concerns me...what it savs here is the expense associated with the response, so would that individual be billed for, let's say, five squad cars responding or for one or two fire engines? Is that how that's worded? And would you have any idea what that cost

63rd Legislative Day

May 21, 1993

might be?"

Schakowsky: "No, I don't."

Frias: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Steczo: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from St. Clair, Representative Flinn."

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

Speaker Steczo: "The Gentleman has moved the previous question.

The question is, 'Shall the main question be put?' All
those in favor will signify by saying 'aye'; those opposed
by saying 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The previous question
has been moved. The Lady from Cook, Representative
Schakowsky, on Senate Bill 869, to close. Representative
Schakowsky."

Schakowsky: "Thank you, Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The...original Bill which dealt with misuse of emergency services and was intended really to close a loophole in the law by adding the penalty of disorderly conduct to misuse passed the Senate by a vote of 54 to nothing. It is really just viewed as some way to make sure that...abuses do not occur beyond what is already in the law. The...other two Amendments that have been added on protect communities from the inordinate noise of model airplanes and a piece of legislation, again, that really just clarifies the law on hate crimes. I urge passage of this legislation."

Speaker Steczo: "The Lady has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 869. The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye'; those opposed by voting 'no'. The voting is open. The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Johnson, one minute to explain your vote."

Johnson, Tim: "Yes, to explain my vote. I am very concerned

63rd Legislative Day

May 21, 1993

about this Amendment #3 that Representative Levin has proposed here, and I believe that it is...it's really deficient in that as it reads it appears as though somebody could be charged and prosecuted with an underlying offense, found not guilty, and then subsequently, charged with a hate crime. And I think that just the wording of this has made it very deficient; and, therefore, I'm gonna have to vote 'present' on this."

- Speaker Steczo: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question, there are 72 voting 'yes', 20 voting 'no', 25 voting 'present', and Senate Bill 869, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of Health Care and Human Services, Third Reading, appears Senate Bill 712, Representative Balanoff. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk McLennand: "Senate Bill 712, a Bill for an Act that amends the Public Aid Code. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Steczo: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Balanoff."
- Balanoff: "What we're trying to do is get this over to the Senate, so we can have a Conference Committee to try to work out with the Department of Public Aid, their concerns and their problems and with that agreement, we understand that they're on board."
- Speaker Steczo: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 712. On that question, is there any discussion? The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black. Mr. Black."
- Black: "Thank you very much, thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

 An inquiry of the Chair. Amendment #1 and 2 are on the
 Bill. Can you tell me the status of Amendment #3 and 4?"

63rd Legislative Day

May 21, 1993

- Speaker Steczo: "Mr. Clerk, what's the status of Amendments #3 and 4?"
- Clerk McLennand: "Amendment #3 was withdrawn. Amendments #1, 2 and 4 were adopted."
- Black: "I'm sorry, would the Clerk repeat that?"
- Speaker Steczo: "Mr. Black, Amendment #3 is withdrawn. Number 4
 is adopted."
- Black: "All right. Thank you. So, it's a...will the Sponsor yield, Mr. Speaker?"
- Speaker Steczo: "He indicates that he will."
- Black: "It's your intent to put this in a Conference Committee report?"
- Balanoff: "Yes it is."
- Black: "And it's my understanding that the agency's in agreement with that. So, I intend to vote 'aye'."
- Speaker Steczo: "Is there any further discussion? There being none the question is 'Shall Senate Bill 712 pass? All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', those opposed The voting is open. Have all voted who by voting 'no'. wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question there are 117 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present' and 712. having received Senate the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of Revenue, Third Reading, appears Senate Bill 387, Representative Kubik. On the Order of Revenue, Reading appears Senate Bill 940, Representative McPike. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk McLennand: "Senate Bill 940, a Bill for an Act in relation to forest preserve districts. Third Reading of this Bill."
- Speaker Steczo: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Madison, Representative McPike."

63rd Legislative Day

May 21, 1993

- McPike: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Bill was introduced by Senator Pate Philip for his forest reserve district in DuPage county. It says that you cannot assess property taxes on the landfill located within the forest preserve districts in DuPage county. We added an Amendment that would allow the forest preserve districts in Lake and Cook counties to sell bonds. That is Amendment #3, I believe. So, those are two provisions of the Bill, and I move for the passage of the Bill."
- Speaker Steczo: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 940. On that question, is there any discussion? There being none the question is 'Shall Bill pass?' All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye'; those opposed by voting 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. this question there are 77 voting 'yes', 39 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present', and Senate Bill 940, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr....Representative Wirsing wishes to be recorded as voting 'no'. On the Order of Labor, Third Reading, appears Senate Bill 498, Representative McPike. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk McLennand: "Senate Bill 498, a Bill for an Act that amends the Unemployment Insurance Act. Third Reading of this Bill."
- Speaker Steczo: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Madison, Representative McPike."
 - McPike: "Thank you. This has to be returned to Second Reading for an Amendment."
 - Speaker Steczo: "The Gentleman has moved that Senate Bill 498 be moved to the Order of Second Reading for the purpose of an

63rd Legislative Day

- May 21, 1993
- Amendment. Is there any discussion? Any objection? There being none, Senate Bill 498 is on the Order of Second Reading. Mr. Clerk, any Amendments?"
- Clerk McLennand: "Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative Gash."
- Speaker Steczo: "The Chair recognizes Representative Gash, on Amendment #3."
- Gash: "I'd like to withdraw Amendment #3."
- Speaker Steczo: "Amendment #3 is withdrawn. Any further Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk McLennand: "Floor Amendment #4, offered by Representative Gash."
- Speaker Steczo: "Amendment #4, Representative Gash."
- Gash: "Amendment #4 amends the Metropolitan Transit...okay, I'm sorry. I would like to withdraw 4."
- Speaker Steczo: "Amendment #4 is withdrawn. Any further Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk McLennand: "Floor Amendment #5, offered by Representative
 Gash."
- Speaker Steczo: "Representative Gash, on Amendment #5."
- Gash: "Amendment #5 amends the Metropolitan Transit Authority

 Act. The Bill applies only to managerial employees of the

 CTA, and does not affect members of collective bargaining

 units. It is printed."
- Speaker Steczo: "For what purpose does the Gentleman from Cook,

 Representative Parke, seek recognition?"
- Parke: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentleman of the House. I have an inquiry of the chair. Can you ask the Clerk to check and see..."
- Speaker Steczo: "Please state your inquiry."
- Parke: "...If #5, Amendment #5 has been printed and distributed?"
- Speaker Steczo: "Mr. Clerk, has Amendment #5 been printed and

63rd Legislative Day

May 21, 1993

distributed?"

Clerk McLennand: "Amendment #5 has not been distributed."

Speaker Steczo: "Amendment #5 evidently has not been distributed."

Parke: "Well, could we have... Could this be taken out of the record, so our staff can look at Amendment #5? Cause we do not have it."

Speaker Steczo: "Mr. Parke, I...Representative McPike."

McPike: "Mr. Parke, it's my understanding that this was given to us from labor and management that's the RTA/CTA, and they've both signed off on it."

Parke: "I can appreciate Representative McPike, that there is...but...but, we'd like a look at it. Could we do that? Would you accommodate us?"

McPike: "Yes."

Parke: "Thank you very much."

McPike: "Why don't you take this out of the record for...and let him read the Amendment."

Speaker Steczo: "Senate Bill 498 will be taken from the record.

The Chair wishes to go back to a few Bills that were amended earlier today, and the first one is...appears on the Order of State Operations, and that is Senate Bill 436, Representative Stephens. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

Clerk McLennand: "Senate Bill 436, a Bill for an Act that amends the Illinois Insurance Code. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Steczo: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Madison, Representative Stephens."

Staphens: "This is Third Reading, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Steczo: "Yes, Mr. Stephens."

Stephens: "Thank you. I just wanted to correct the book. This is a mine subsidence Bill. It was amended earlier today to take out some objectionable language about immunity of the

63rd Legislative Day

May 21, 1993

board and the governing committee and the board of directors and the agency and employees of the mine subsidence group, and I move its adoption."

- Speaker Steczo: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage 436. Bill On that question, is there any Senate discussion? There being none the question is, ' Shall this Bill pass?' All those in favor will signify voting 'aye'; those opposed by voting 'no'. The voting is open. all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take the record. On this question there are 116 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', none voting 'present' and Senate Bill 436, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared On the Order of Revenue appears Senate Bill 503, Representative Balthis. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk McLennand: "Senate Bill 503, a Bill for an Act that amends the Illinois ...the Build Illinois Act. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Steczo: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Balthis."
- Balthis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 503 amends the public infrastructure loan and grant program article of the Build Illinois Act. It authorizes the Department of Commerce and Community Affairs to make loans and grants to local entities, including medical facilities and public health clinics, to assist in the financing of public infrastructure for health, safety and economic development; and Amendment #2 clarifies the technology challenge grant program, and I would move for its adoption."
- Speaker Steczo: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 503. On that question, is there any

63rd Legislative Day

May 21, 1993

discussion? There being none the question is, 'Shall All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye'; those opposed by voting 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk, please take the record. On this question there are 116 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present' and Senate Bill 503, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of Agriculture and Conservation, appears Senate Bill 586, Representative Schoenberg. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."

- Clerk McLennand: "Senate Bill 586, a Bill for an Act in relation to the Department of Agriculture and administrative procedures. Third Reading of this Bill."
- Speaker Steczo: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Schoenberg."
- Schoenberg: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 586 is the parallel version of House Bill 581. In enables us to privatize the state fair, take an agency which had an operating deficit of \$700 million and make it a profit enterprise. I would urge its adoption."
- Speaker Steczo: "Gentleman has moved for the passage of Senate
 Bill 586. On that question, is there any discussion? The
 Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Will, Representative
 Wennlund."

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

Speaker Steczo: "He indicates that he will."

Wennlund: "Representative, you referred to a \$700 million deficit?"

Schoenberg: "Seven hundred thousand, I apologize."

Wennlund: "Ah, \$700 thousand deficit, and when..."

63rd Legislative Day

May 21, 1993

Schoenberg: "...and when Everett Dirksen used to say: 'A few million here, a few million there'; so, we won't talk about real money."

Wennlund: "Yeah, right, I hear ya. Okay, but I thought I did hear \$700 million was the figure."

Schoenberg: "I'm sorry, it's \$700,000."

Wennlund: "How is this Bill going to remove that deficit?"

Schoenberg: "Well, what it will enable us to do is, it makes some statutory changes that enables us to privatize the...privatize the grandstand. It also makes a provision for the appointments of a...dealing with the appointments of the managers for the respective state fairs. As I indicated in my opening remarks, this is really parallel to the version...to House Bill 581, that Representative Black graciously invited me to the first ride down the slide on, and the overwhelming support for this measure from your side."

Wennlund: "Well, okay. There are some questions in it, and since

Representative Black is more familiar with it, I yield my

time to Representative Black."

Speaker Steczo: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. To the Sponsor. It's my understanding, if you check with staff, all of the provisions relating to the state fair have now been removed from this Bill, and this Bill, in fact, addresses some laboratory testing, bovine, brucellosis, swine tuberculosis, hog jowls and black eyed peas, and stuff like farmer Hartke knows, right?"

Schoenberg: "That's correct."

Black: "So, there's nothing in this Bill about the state fair?"

Schoenberg: "That's what I've been advised, yes."

63rd Legislative Day

May 21, 1993

Black: "Okay."

Schoenberg: "I apologize for the misunderstanding."

Black: "All right. Well, so you and I are gonna go down the slide. That was on the House Bill we all ready passed."

Schoenberg: "That's correct. That's on the Governor's desk."

Black: "This is a very technical agriculture Bill, crafted by farmer Noland, farmer Hartke, and farmer Schoenberg."

Schoenberg: "Well, I've been gardening very actively these last few weekends, and if that's what my downstate colleagues want, I'm happy to oblige them."

Black: "I also understand there's a farmer McPike Amendment to it. So, but that's agreed to. It's our understanding..."

Schoenberg: "Sorry about the misunderstanding."

Black: "Outstanding Bill."

Speaker Steczo: "Is there any further discussion? The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Logan, Representative Olson."

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

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

Olson: "Representative Schoenberg, and all those farmers previously mentioned, I just need assurance that Floor Amendment #l is not on the Bill."

Schoenberg: "No, it's not on the Bill, because Floor Amendment #3 has the effect of deleting Floor Amendment #1."

Olson: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Steczo: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Williamson, Representative Woolard. He does not seek recognition. Mr. Woolard."

Woolard: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was just going to help Jeff...
with the answer to that question. I think that Floor
Amendment #3 was the one that distorted everybody's
thinking on this Bill. We took care of the pregnant cows,
and eliminated the fair from this Bill. Thank you."

63rd Legislative Day

May 21, 1993

- Speaker Steczo: "Representative Schoenberg has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 586. The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye'; those opposed by voting 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk, please take the record. On this question there are 114 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', Senate Bill 586, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of State Operations, appears Senate Bill 650, Representative Maureen Murphy. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk McLennand: "Senate Bill 650, a Bill for an Act that amends the Code of Civil Procedure. Third Reading of this Bill."
- Speaker Steczo: "The Chair recognizes the Lady from Cook, Representative Murphy."
- Murphy: "This is technical language amending the Civil Procedure Code that was agreed to by the lawyers and the mortgage bankers. Basically, it just says clarifying language and better defines occupants as the person in physical possession of mortgage real estate. Clarifies the Act. Deletes the service of process changes, and 4, prohibits the holder purchaser from proceeding against any such occupant. It has to do with technical procedures with regard to foreclosure."
- Speaker Steczo: "The Lady has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 650. On that question, is there any discussion? There being none the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye'; those opposed by voting 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Please record Representative Giorgi as 'aye'. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, please take

63rd Legislative Day

May 21, 1993

- the record. On this question there are 117 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present' and Senate Bill 615, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of State Operations, Third Reading appears Senate Bill 830, Representative Hicks. Mr. Clerk, please read the Bill."
- Clerk McLennand: "Senate Bill 830, a Bill for an Act concerning insurance. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker Steczo: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Jefferson, Representative Hicks."
- Hicks: "I believe, Mr. Speaker, there's some Amendments for 830."
- Clerk McLennand: "The Bill has been read a second time previously. Floor Amendment #4, offered by Representative Hicks."
- Speaker Steczo: "The Chair recognizes Representative Hicks, on

 Amendment #4. Mr. Clerk...the Chair recognizes

 Representative Hicks. Mr. Hicks?"
- Hicks: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I apologize for the delay. Amendment #4 makes a change in...of...the Bill whereby the director now shall prescribe by rule the insurance claim forms and billing forms that will be acceptable. It is a technical change to the original aspect of the Bill which is a...a insurance form claim change. I'd ask for its adoption."
- Speaker Steczo: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #4 and on that question, the Gentleman from Will, Representative Wennlund."
- Wennlund: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Speaker yield?"
- Speaker Steczo: "He indicates that he will."
- Wennlund: "Representative Hicks, that was a good mumble. I'm sorry I wasn't able to understand exactly what Amendment #4 does."

63rd Legislative Day

May 21, 1993

Hicks: "Thank you, Mr. Wennlund. I'm sorry if you couldn't understand me. The Amendment makes a technical change in order to include the Bill's uniform claims provisions of Article (9) of the Insurance Code, which applies to all insurance companies rather than Article 20 which applies only to accidents in a health insurance company, so this claim form then would be used...utilized for all insurance code forms."

Wennlund: "Thank you very much."

- Speaker Steczo: "Is there any further discussion? There being none, the question is, 'All those in favor of the adoption of the Amendment will signify by saying 'aye'; those opposed by saying 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk McLennand: "Floor Amendment #5, offered by Representative Hicks."
- Speaker Steczo: "Withdraw Amendment #5."
- Clerk McLennand: "Floor Amendment #6, offered by Representative Granberg."
- Speaker Steczo: "The Chair recognizes Representative Granberg on
 Amendment #6. Mr. Granberg, Amendment #6, Senate Bill 830.
 Mr. Granberg?"
- Granberg: "I'd like to withdraw Amendment #6."
- Speaker Steczo: "Amendment #6 is withdrawn. Any further Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk McLennand: "Floor Amendment #7 offered by Representative Hicks."
- Speaker Steczo: "Representative Hicks on Amendment #7."
- Hicks: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #7 is the Golden Rule Amendment which simply redefines preexisting conditions in the original Bill, as a condition that manifests itself within 12 months

63rd Legislative Day

May 21, 1993

rather than six months; also makes a second point in the Bill dealing with the dates of coverage for preexisting conditions for 12 months. I'd ask for its adoption."

Speaker Steczo: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Amendment #7. On that is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Will, Representative Wennlund."

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

Speaker Steczo: "He indicates that he will."

Wennlund: "Representative, I...I understand that Amendment #7 is a clarification of Amendment #5, but my staff tells me that Amendment #3 needs to be tabled, otherwise, it creates a big hole in the Bill."

Hicks: "I guess an inquiry of the Chair. Was Amendment #3
 adopted?"

Speaker Steczo: "Mr. Clerk, was Amendment #3 adopted?"

Clerk McLennand: "Amendment #3 was adopted."

Hicks: "Mr. Wennlund, I would certainly agree with you and I'd be happy to move to have Amendment #3 withdrawn as the original Sponsor of that Amendment."

Wennlund: "Yes, we'll have to table it. Thank you."

Speaker Steczo: "Representative Hicks moves to table Amendment #3. All those in favor will signify by saying 'aye'; those opposed by saying 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the Amendment is tabled. Go back to Amendment #7. Representative Wennlund have you completed your questioning on Amendment #7? Mr. Wennlund. are you through Amendment #7? Is there any further discussion on Amendment There being none, all those in favor of the adoption #7? of the Amendment will signify by saying 'aye'; those opposed by saying 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the Amendment is adopted. Any further Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk McLennand: "No further Amendments."

63rd Legislative Day

May 21, 1993

Speaker Steczo: "Third Reading. Representative Currie in the Chair."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Hicks, that Bill will be reviewed and we'll get back to it quite shortly. Continuing with the list of Bills that were amended earlier today and are now ready for votes on final passage, Senate Bill 707 on the Order of Local Government, Representative Lang."

Lang: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Senate Bill 707 as amended..."

Speaker Currie: "Wait just a minute. Has the Bill been read a third time? Clerk?"

Clerk McLennand: "Senate Bill 707, a Bill for an Act concerning the validation of appropriation of tax levy ordinances.

Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Lang."

Lang: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. As I understand it now, there is little objection to this Bill. It covers Cook County and downstate and this will keep us after two years from having to go through this exercise every year, and I move for passage."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Lang moves to pass on Senate Bill 707 and on that Motion being no discussion the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this...Representative Kubik votes 'aye'. On this Motion 60 voting 'aye', 51 'no', and this Bill having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared the next Bill on that same Order; the Bills amended earlier today now ready for votes on Third Reading, appears on State Operations, Senate Bill 926, Representative Moseley. Clerk, read the Bill."

63rd Legislative Day

May 21, 1993

Clerk McLennand: "Senate Bill 926, a Bill for an Act amending the Higher Education Student Assistance Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Moseley."

"Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the Assembly. Moseley: know, for the past several years, the Illinois Student Assistance Commission has been the guarantee agency for the Illinois Student Loan Program. This Bill simply allows this agency to get the license of the persons who default on quaranteed student loans, if they are a stock There are many steps that will be taken to insure repayment arrangements; this is a last resort. In addition to this, we have been working closely with the securities agency, industry, and with the Secretary of State's Office. At this point we believe we are very close to an agreement and we would like this Bill to move forward so that we could go to conference and satisfy everyone. I promise that we will have everyone satisfied before this Bill to the Governor. In addition, we have some language for Northern and for the University of Illinois. I ask for your favorable consideration."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Moseley moves to pass on Senate
Bill 926. Is there any discussion? Representative
Wennlund?"

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

Speaker Currie: "She will."

Moseley: "Yes."

Wennlund: "It's my understanding, that the Secretary of State has some serious objections with respect to various Amendments that have been adopted to this Bill and that the Bill will not move until those objections have been worked out."

Moseley: "As I stated, Representative Wennlund, that is

63rd Legislative Day

May 21, 1993

absolutely correct. The Bill will not move further until we have everyone comfortable with the language."

Wennlund: "Thank you."

"The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in Speaker Currie: favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this Bill, 111 voting 'aye', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill having received the required Constitutional Majority...Representative Shirley Jones. 'ave'. Representative Harold Murphy 'aye', Representative Bugielski 'aye', Representative Parcells 'aye'. On this Motion, 115 voting 'aye', 0 voting 'no'. This Bill having received the required Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. On State Operations, Senate Bill 935, Representative Walsh. Clerk, what is the status of the Bill?"

Clerk McLennand: "The Bill's on Second Reading, having been read
 previously a second time."

Speaker Currie: "Are there any Amendments filed?"

Clerk McLennand: "Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative Leitch."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Leitch. Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I would like to table

Amendment 1 and Amendment 2 that were put on in committee."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Walsh moves to table Amendment 1 and 2 that were adopted in committee. On the Motion is there any discussion? Hearing none, all in favor of the Motion vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Motion succeeds and those two Amendments are tabled.

That brings us to Amendment 3 by Representative Leitch."

Walsh: "I believe he would like to table Amendment 3."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Walsh moves to table Amendment 3.

63rd Legislative Day

May 21, 1993

On that Motion there is no discussion. All in favor say 'aye'; opposed, 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Motion succeeds and the Amendment is tabled. Are there further Amendments?"

Clerk McLennand: "Floor Amendment #4, offered by Representative Walsh."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "I'd like to table Amendment #4."

Speaker Currie: "Or withdraw...Representative Walsh withdraws

Amendment 4. Further Amendments?"

Clerk McLennand: "Floor Amendment #5, offered by Representative Walsh."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "Floor Amendment #5 changes the effective date from...changes it to January 3, 1994."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Walsh moves to adopt on Amendment 5 to Senate Bill 935. All in favor say 'aye'; opposed, 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Are there further Amendments?"

Clerk McLennand: "Floor Amendment #6, offered by Representative Walsh."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "Thank you Madam Speaker. I'd like to table Floor Amendment #6."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Walsh withdraws Amendment #6.

Further Amendments?"

Clerk McLennand: "Floor Amendment #7, offered by Representative Walsh."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "Floor Amendment #7 makes some technical changes to the Bill, and I'd move its passage."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Walsh moves 'do adopt' on

63rd Legislative Day

May 21, 1993

Amendment 7 to Senate Bill 935. All in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed, 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Are there further Amendments?"

Clerk McLennand: "Floor Amendment #8, offered by Representative Walsh."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Walsh, Amendment #8."

Walsh: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'd like to withdraw Floor Amendment #8."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Walsh withdraws Amendment 8. Are there further Amendments?"

Clerk McLennand: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Currie: "Third Reading."

Walsh: "Thank you."

Speaker Currie: "Clerk, perhaps you would announce the Amendments that remain on the Bill?"

Clerk McLennand: "Floor Amendments #5 and 7 have been adopted."

Speaker Currie: "On the Order of Law, Second Reading. On the Order of Law, I'm not sure it's Second Reading, appears Senate Bill 25, Representative Dart. Representative Dart. This Bill is on Third Reading. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk McLennand: "Senate Bill #25, a Bill for an Act that amends the Code of Civil Procedure. Third Reading of this Bill."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Dart."

Dart: "Thank you, Speaker. This Bill would provide a notice of impending drivers license suspension. Shall state that a person may obtain a photostatic copy of the original ticket by sending a self addressed envelope. I know of no opposition and I move for passage."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Dart moves 'do pass' on Senate
Bill 25, and on that Motion, is there any discussion? The
Representative from Vermilion, Representative Black."

Black: "Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. An inquiry of the

63rd Legislative Day

May 21, 1993

Chair."

Speaker Currie: "State your inquiry."

Black: "Yes. What Floor Amendments, if any, are on this Bill?"

Speaker Currie: "Clerk, could you advise us of the Amendments that are on this Bill?"

Clerk McLennand: "Amendment #1 was adopted. Amendment #1 was the only Amendment."

Black: "Was Amendment #1 a Committee Amendment or Floor Amendment, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk McLennand: "Committee Amendment."

Speaker Currie: "He indicates he will."

Black: "Representative, how would you answer the question that some people have posed that should this Bill become law, it will simply promote the appeal of parking tickets and further crowd the Circuit Court docket."

Dart: "Well...I would argue that...that's not going to occur for numerous reasons and one of them is that this is in permissive language and that the person may obtain this photostatic copy and all this is doing is allowing a person to obtain additional information, which I think most of...people...constituents would like to get that information. It was an effort by the City, particularly the City of Chicago, to appease a lot of people who have tickets from downstate who get them."

Black: "Okay. That's the point that I wanted to get to and you're absolutely correct. I do have a number of constituents who seem to accumulate parking tickets in the City of Chicago. If I understand Committee Amendment #1, this would then let my constituents demand a photostatic copy of the original ticket?"

63rd Legislative Day

May 21, 1993

Dart: "Correct."

Black: "Is that at any point in the process, or only when the City is taking action to suspend their drivers license?"

Dart: "This would be at the point when they are sending the notice out to them that they do it. Representative Deuchler has a similar Bill that went over. It was a House Bill. It went over to the Senate and there was negotiations going on with the City, and I believe we're still in the process of negotiating at some point."

Black: "All right. Thank you very much. Thank you Madam Speaker."

Speaker Currie: "Further discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this Motion, lll voting 'aye', 4 voting 'no'. This Bill having received the required Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Next Bill on the Local Government Order of Call, Senate Bill 47, Representative Blagojevich. Clerk, read the Bill. Oh, I'm sorry, tell us the status of the Bill."

Clerk McLennand: "Senate Bill 47 has been read a second time previously. Floor Amendment...Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Blagojevich."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Blagojevich."

Blagojevich: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Floor Amendment #2 changes the body of the Bill to say the following; it inserts in line 18 the phrase, 'or held in a facility that has a seating capacity in excess of 15,000 persons in the city with a population in excess of two million people.' This Amendment, what it does, in effect, is it excludes large auditoriums and large stadiums

63rd Legislative Day

May 21, 1993

from operation under the heart of the...what this Bill is intended to do."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Blagojevich moves 'do pass' on
Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 47; and, on that Motion,
Representative Granberg."

Granberg: "Will the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Currie: "He indicates he will."

Granberg: "Representative, can you tell me what facilities are exempted by your Amendment, and what application this would then have with those exempted facilities?"

Blagojevich: "The facilities that are exempted would be the Chicago Stadium because they have a capacity...seating capacity of over 15,000, White Sox Park, Wrigley Field, Soldier Field, the Rosemont Horizon; perhaps other places throughout this state that have a seating capacity of over 15.000."

Granberg: "Why are we exempting facilities such as those?"

Blagojevich: "It's not my choice, Representative Granberg. The reality of the matter is, if we didn't exempt those, particular Bill would not be on the floor for a consideration. So, we have to make a compromise this...in this art of compromise, in this compromise, and we exempted those particular places for that reason. My feeling is that the Bill would be better if those places were in it, but then I have to ask the question, 'Is this a better world if some promoters and some events of this sort are encompassed in this Bill and others aren't.' Right now, nobody is covered by this Bill. At least to have some makes it better than none."

Granberg: "Representative, you said that 'in the spirit of compromise'. Whom did they negotiate with to exempt those facilities and have the provisions apply to smaller

63rd Legislative Day

May 21, 1993

facilities? Did anyone agree to this?"

Blagojevich: "Those negotiations, Representative, were not involving me. It's my understanding that the representative of the White Sox was able to have...came to me with this Amendment and...it was made clear to me that it was the only hope to get the Bill passed, so I agreed to file the Amendment."

Granberg: "Okay. Thank you, Representative. To the Amendment..."

Speaker Currie: "To the Amendment."

Granberg: "...Madam Speaker. I...I respect the Representative, but I rise in opposition to the Amendment. I don't why facilities such as those mentioned (White Sox, Wrigley Field, the Stadium and others) should be exempted and other facilities would not be exempted. If we're gonna have a provision such as this and we're gonna protect the citizenry, then we should protect all of them, and I would rise against the Amendment."

Speaker Currie: "Further discussion? Representative Black."

Black: "Yes, thank you very much, Madam Speaker. I rise in opposition to Amendment 2. For example, as Representative Granberg has already stated...Chicago Stadium would be under this Amendment, exempt from any injury reporting requirement put forth in the underlying Bill. Well, I've been to Chicago Stadium. I went there one night to see a fight and a hockey game broke out. And I'm gonna tell you, I think there were injuries. Now, that doesn't make any sense to me that you're gonna exempt the large venues of the State of Illinois from having to comply with an Injury Reporting Act, and yet subject those small venues (mainly downstate small venues) to an Act. If it's a good idea, it's certainly a good idea for Chicago Stadium in the year

63rd Legislative Day

May 21, 1993

or two that it has left to exist and it's certainly a good idea for Cominsky Park and Wrigley Field and Airy Crown Theatre and other venues in Chicago. So, I would urge my colleagues to vote 'no' on Amendment #2. And, Madam Speaker, I arise with the appropriate number of people under 55(c) to request a Roll Call Vote on Amendment #2."

Speaker Currie: "You do have the appropriate number of people.

Further discussion? Representative Weaver."

Weaver: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Just a brief question. Does this Amendment have any effect on the exemption of the state-owned properties?"

Speaker Currie: "Representative Blagojevich."

Blagojevich: "Yes, it does. Can I address Representative Black's comments?"

Speaker Currie: "No. Representative Weaver."

Weaver: "Follow-up question: Does this mean then that you are no longer exempting state-owned properties or they remain exempt?"

Blagojevich: "They remain exempt, I'm sorry."

Blagojevich: "That's correct."

Weaver: "What exactly is left that we're including if this Amendment goes on?"

Blagojevich: "Any event that has a capacity of less than 15,000 people and more than 50 people, rock concerts, things of that sort."

Weaver: "Any privately owned facility or any municipality owned facility."

Blagojevich: "Correct."

Weaver: "But it does exempt the City of Chicago?"

Blagojevich: "Well, no. It only exempts those places that have a

63rd Legislative Day

May 21, 1993

seating capacity of over 15,000 and those, incidentally, would also be included in other parts of the state, so it's not just...just related to Chicago."

Weaver: "So, any event in the City of Chicago at a facility owned by the City of Chicago that seats fewer than 15,000 people, would be required to report under this Bill?"

Blagojevich: "Unless Chicago has a home...has a rule that would be different because home rule is not preempted here."

Weaver: "Okay. So, in effect then, Chicago is exempt?"

Blagojevich: "Depends upon..."

Weaver: "Because they have home rule power."

Blagojevich: "Well yeah, I guess you're right."

Weaver: "So...so, essentially what you're telling me is we're exempting everybody except private and municipal operations downstate?"

Blagojevich: "Would include everybody except those home rule areas that have the right to...to decide at their local level."

Weaver: "I...I see. Don't you believe that if's a really a good idea, it ought to be a good idea for everybody?"

Blagojevich: "I couldn't agree with you more, Representative, and
I wish we could have Chicago included. Again, the powers
that be..."

Weaver: "I'll tell you what..."

Blagojevich: "...yet would not let this Bill be called but for this particular Amendment. So, half a loaf is better than no loaf. And really the question is, in my view, are we better off having a reporting requirement for at least some promoters than no promoters? That, to me, is the issue."

Weaver: "Well, thank you. Madam Speaker, to...to the Amendment.

I don't necessarily agree that half a loaf is better than
no loaf, particularly when downstate is a part that's not

63rd Legislative Day

May 21, 1993

getting any part of the loaf. I think if...if the Gentleman is sincere that this is a good idea, let him take care of the City of Chicago and we'll take care of downstate."

Speaker Currie: "Further discussion? Representative Biggert."

Biggert: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Currie: "He indicates he will."

Biggert: "Representative, what about civic centers? Are they exempt or are they included in this?"

Blagojevich: "They're...they're included in this if they hold less than 15,000."

Biggert: "Okay. A civic center being...if they're owned by the local government or if they're privately owned?"

Blagojevich: "It's my understanding that in both cases they would be included in this Bill, if the seating capacity was less than 15,000."

Biggert: "Thank you."

Speaker Currie: "Further discussion? Representative Olson."

Olson: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. A question of the Sponsor."

Speaker Currie: "He will yield."

Olson: "Representative, in the exemption in this Amendment or any other Amendment that might be forthcoming, is there anything, like say, a downstate county fair in here?"

Blagojevich: "Your... What is your question? What about the county fair?"

Olson: "Is there an exemption for such an event as a downstate county fair?"

Blagojevich: "No."

Olson: "Is there an exemption say a Member of this General
Assembly would have a fund-raiser at a downstate county
fairgrounds or a...or a municipal park in a downstate
city?"

63rd Legislative Day

May 21, 1993

Blagojevich: "If a fund-raiser is defined as a commercial event, then a fund-raiser would be included, but a fund-raiser is not a commercial event. This only involves commercial events, so..."

Olson: "A fund-raiser is not a commercial event."

Blagojevich: "I don't believe a fund-raiser is considered a commercial..."

Olson: "If you charge a fee, sell a ticket..."

Blagojevich: "If it's for a business purpose, I would think that would be a commercial event, but to raise money for a political campaign or for some charity, because not-for-profit organizations are exempt from this. So, I don't believe a fund-raiser would be included here."

Olson: "Thank you. Ladies and Gentlemen."

Speaker Currie: "To the Amendment."

Olson: "To the Amendment. If you're downstate or even in some of these smaller outlying areas of...Cook or the collar counties, I think this is very...open-ended here. There's not enough definition of what is or is not included. I would be very careful with your vote. Thank you."

Speaker Currie: "Further discussion? Representative Frias."

Frias: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Just to address a concern that Representative Granberg and, I believe, Representative Black brought out about exempting Chicago. To a certain extent, exempting them really wouldn't matter in this case because if somebody's transported to an emergency facility such as a hospital, with an injury report, the hospital is required to notify the police at which time a proper police report is filled out. So, to a certain extent, if there are injuries at the stadiums or White Sox Park, or any facility to that extent, they are reported once they're taken to the hospital. I support the Amendment."

63rd Legislative Day

May 21, 1993

Speaker Currie: "Further discussion? Representative Shirley Jones."

Jones, S: "Yes. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Currie: "He indicates he will."

Jones, S: "Could you tell me if this excludes the Chicago park district facilities?"

Speaker Currie: "Representative Blagojevich."

Blagojevich: "Representative Jones, Chicago is, because of the preemption rule, it would exclude Chicago. If Chicago had its own rule, that would rule."

Jones, S: "No, I mean the park district facilities affairs, not just Chicago park district facilities."

Blagojevich: "Excluded."

Jones, S: "Is excluded? Okay."

Speaker Currie: "Further discussion? Representative Steczo."

Steczo: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Currie: "Indicates he will."

Steczo: "Representative Blagojevich, I'm just curious as to who now is exempt and who is not. So, we know that the Cubs and the Sox and the Bulls and everybody else are exempt from this Bill and the City of Chicago is exempt, correct?"

Blagojevich: "Correct."

Steczo: "And according to Representative Jones' question, the Soldier Field is evidently exempt, correct?"

Blagojevich: "It's exempt...it's exempt because of home rule but it's also exempt because it holds more than 15,000 people."

Steczo: "So, outside of the City of Chicago, any home rule...any facility located in a home rule area outside of the City of Chicago is exempt? Is that what you said before?"

Blagojevich: "Yes. If there...if there's..it does not preempt home rules, so if there's a local municipality that has home rule powers, then this would not govern in that area.

63rd Legislative Day

May 21, 1993

But if it's absent...absent home rule, this would then be the law."

Steczo: "So, let's say there's a concert venue in Hoffman Estates or in Tinley Park when they are home rule communities, then this Bill would not apply to them?"

Blagojevich: "It would not apply."

Steczo: "So, who does it apply to? Mr...Mr. Blagojevich, would this Bill apply to the World Music Theatre in Tinley Park?"

Blagojevich: "I'm sorry, Representative, I didn't hear you."

Steczo: "Would this...would the provisions now apply to the World Music Theatre in Tinley Park?"

Blagojevich: "I don't...is Tinley Park home rule or not?"

Steczo: "I believe they are home rule."

Blagojevich: "So, it would not apply to Tinley Park."

Steczo: "Would it apply to Poplar Creek and Hoffman Estates?"

Blagojevich: "The whole issue there is..."

Steczo: "Would be home rule again."

Blagojevich: "And do they hold over 15,000 people."

Steczo: "So, the question then would be in cases such as this, 'Are you home rule, are you not home rule? Do you have over 15,000; do you have under 15,000?' So, you are exempting part of the...part of the city or the City of Chicago. You're exempting all the home rule communities which probably have these types of venues anyway. So, actually venues under 15,000 and nonhome rule areas are the ones that...that are being affected by this Bill?"

Blagojevich: "Yes."

Steczo: "Mr. Blagojevich, I... Madam Speaker and Members of the House, to address the Bill."

Speaker Currie: "To the Amendment."

Steczo: "To the Amendment, rather, I'm sorry. It seems to me that if there's gonna be a problem and a problem with

63rd Legislative Day

May 21, 1993

injuries and injuries created by...by certain situations occurring, those...those injuries occur in places where you have large numbers of people. The Chicago Bears, for instance, who...who draw 65,000 or 66,000 people on a given...on a given Sunday or in situations where there are large numbers of people; for instance, at the Wrigley Field or the Sox Park for 80 games a year, it is not those small venues of 15,000 and less in nonhome rule areas that create the problem. So...so, Amendment #2, I feel, goes in exactly the wrong direction in...and, although I highly respect the Sponsor, would encourage opposition by Members of this Body to Amendment #2."

Speaker Currie: "Further discussion? Representative Wennlund." Wennlund: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Wait a minute. Wait just a minute. Let me tell what this Amendment is designed to do. To limit the application of the Bill to the World Music Theatre, which is in my district, and let me tell you why. When the Grateful Dead come and when the Butthole Surfers come and all of their followers come, people are getting stabbed over there and there's not even a police report filed because they have a private security firm. No... they'll haul 'em off to the hospitals, no police reports, no witnesses; people are getting stabbed over there when these Grateful Dead come. That's what this Amendment is limit it to the World Music Theatre, nothing about. to else. Ιt ought to be adopted. Forget all misinformation you've heard. This Amendment is designed to limit to the World Music Theatre, and I ask for its adoption."

Speaker Currie: "Further discussion? Representative Levin."

Levin: "I...I, too, rise in support of Amendment #2. I have across the street from my legislative office the Oratorium

63rd Legislative Day

May 21, 1993

Theatre, where a lot of these groups play, particularly on weekends, and the suburban kids line up on a Friday night. What this legislation... What this Amendment does and what the Bill itself does is to guarantee the parents of these kids that the theaters are safe. They wanna know that. They wanna know if there are safety problems, if there are other problems in these theaters where they're sending their kids, and that's what this does. I think it's a good Amendment."

- Speaker Currie: "Representative Blagojevich, to close. Now is your opportunity to respond to Representative Black. Since he hadn't asked you a question, you couldn't respond then but you may tell it the way you feel it now."
- Blagojevich: "Well, I would simply say, Rep...I would refer Representative Black to what Representative Wennlund so passionately and articulately said. I would, also, really this is simple. Can we have reporting requirements for some promoters, preferably we'd have 'em for all. But since we can't have 'em for all, life being what it is, we're a lot better off narrowing this and having some kind of accountability and some kind of responsibility for people who put on events where other people are hurt. All we're asking for is a police so that we can, to sum up what Sergeant Joe Friday said in nothing but the Dragnet, 'Get the facts, Ma'am, facts.' That's all this is about really. It's not about a particular discrimination at one part of the state or the other. It's just fact-finding. It's having a It's finding out what happened when somebody gets hurt, and this Amendment also points out that you cannot...cannot...this does not kick in this Bill unless an ambulance transports somebody to a medical facility. So,

63rd Legislative Day

May 21, 1993

it's involved for serious injuries, and I would ask for a 'yes' vote on this Amendment. And this is a Bill that we all can go home and tell the mothers in our districts that we're watching out for their teen-age kids when they go to rock concerts and things. So, I'm grateful for Representative Wennlund's remarks, and I hope that this Amendment is not gratefully...ungratefully dead. Thank you."

- Speaker Currie: "Representative Blagojevich moves 'do adopt' on Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 47. All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this Motion, there are...Representative Saviano votes 'aye'. There's 47 voting 'aye', 65 voting 'no', and the Motion fails. Are there further Amendments? Representative Granberg, for what reason do you rise?"
- Granberg: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise on a point of personal privilege. Representative Wennlund talked about the Grateful Dead. Well, I'm a fan of the Grateful Dead, and I haven't stabbed anybody in years, and I took offense to that."
- Speaker Currie: "Congratulations, Representative Granberg. We're pleased to know it. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk McLennand: "Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative Levin."
- Speaker Currie: "Amendment 3, Representative Levin. Could we have a little order in the chamber, please! Representative Levin."

Levin: "Withdraw."

- Speaker Currie: "Representative Levin withdraws Amendment 3.

 Further Amendments?"
- Clerk McLennand: "Floor Amendment #4, offered by Representative

63rd Legislative Day

May 21, 1993

Blagojevich."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Blagojevich, on Amendment 4."

- Blagojevich: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Amendment very simply makes it a little bit easier on the promoters. Certain concerns were mentioned to me about what if a promoters doesn't know or an organizer doesn't know that somebody was hurt, so this would just say that it would have to a willful failure on the part of a promoter or an organizer to have a police report made."
- Speaker Currie: "Representative Blagojevich moves 'do adopt' on
 Amendment 4 to Senate Bill 47, and on that Motion,
 Representative Black."
- Black: "Thank you very much, Madam Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in opposition to Amendment #4 to Senate Bill 47. I'm joined by the requisite number of people on my side of the aisle in seeking a Roll Call Vote pursuant to 55(c) on this Amendment. The failure of this Amendment does nothing to make this Amendment any better than the one you've already killed, and the underlying Bill is worse. And I apologize for straying from the Amendment. Vote 'no' on Amendment #4."

Speaker Currie: "Further discussion? Representative Biggert."
Biggert: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
Speaker Currie: "He indicates he will."

- Biggert: "To Amendment 4. This doesn't change the reporting the promoter and the owner...are they still all required to report? And what if one of them is willfully and knowingly fails?"
- Blagojevich: "Representative, the intent of this is that either the organizer, the promoter or the owner of the facility has an obligation to report an injury that would require an

63rd Legislative Day

May 21, 1993

ambulance to take someone to a medical facility. This Amendment would say that that organizer or promoter would not be guilty of a petty offense which is the criminal aspect to it if the failure was..."

Biggert: "Okay. All right."

Blagojevich: "...just negligent or didn't know."

Biggert: "Thank you."

Speaker Currie: "Further discussion? Representative Wennlund."

Wennlund: "Thank you. Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. This Amendment is a very simple Amendment that merely says that it would have to a willful violation. If the owner of the World Music Theatre didn't know about a stabbing or an incident, then he's not in violation of it. It's as simple as that. Now, to kill this Amendment, JAM productions, JAM productions who put on all these rock concerts at the World Music Theatre has hired two lobbyists to kill it. It's safe...simply a method so that we know what's going on at these rock concerts and know who the witnesses are to a stabbing. It's as simple as that, and I ask for a 'yes' vote on this Amendment."

Speaker Currie: "No further discussion. Representative Blagojevich, to close."

Blagojevich: "Well, again I would echo Representative Wennlund's remarks. Think about it. We're all Legislators here. We were all elected by different districts in this state. And, as the Representative said, two lobbyists were hired by JAM productions to jam this Bill. Why don't we send a message to these lobbyists. What are we here, notted plants? We're Legislators, duly elected. If nothing else, if you can't handle the merits of this, send a message to these lobbyists that, 'Hey, we control this House and that our votes and our voice counts.' Vote 'yes' on this

63rd Legislative Day

May 21, 1993

Amendment. It's an Amendment to tighten the Bill for those who had problems with the requirements of a promoter."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Blagojevich moves 'do adopt' on Amendment 4 to Senate Bill 47. All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this Motion, there are 46 voting 'aye', 65 voting 'no', and the Amendment fails. Are there further Amendments?"

Clerk McLennand: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Currie: "Third Reading. Representative Blagojevich, your Bill is unamended. Would you like to hear it on Third Reading at this time? Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk McLennand: "Floor Amendment...Senate Bill 47, a Bill for an Act concerning governmental regulations. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Blagojevich."

Blagojevich: "Well, this is the un...unabridged, unadulterated version of the Bill as it first came to me. This is a Bill that, frankly, I like in its purest form. Those of you who thought that Chicago ought to be included should jump on this Bill since Amendment #2's been beaten. So, welcome aboard; we're happy to have you. Those of you...those of you who think the promoter ought to be a little bit more responsible, then come along, because that Amendment was You'll like this Bill, too. And those of also defeated. you who think that we ought to have long-term contracts with the University of Illinois for fuel and it ought to be ten years in duration rather than seven, come join us because that's an Amendment that was passed out of the Senate and that's on this Bill, too. So, we'd love to have you. I'm cautiously optimistic that maybe we might pick up

63rd Legislative Day

May 21, 1993

a couple more votes. Thank you."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Blagojevich moves 'do pass' on Senate Bill 47, and on that Motion, Representative Black."

Black: "Yes, thank you very much, Madam Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. To the Bill. I don't believe this Bill now except the Organized Event anything is on Injury Reporting Act. Let me repeat that: This Bill would become the Organized Event Injury Reporting Act. It would require that any activity attended by more than 50 people and the owner of said facility or premises or grounds were such an event attracting more than 50 people would be held, they must notify the local law enforcement agency of any physical injury of any kind, of any kind, that requires transportation of the person by ambulance for medical treatment. Now, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, you all have lots of police officers and lots of court officials and lots of hospitals in some parts of the state. I submit to you in other parts of the state we aren't as fortunate. This covers county fairs, it covers your volunteer fire department pancake breakfast, it covers the turtle races, it covers all the hoe-downs, the country and western dances. Holy toledo, we don't need this. This is an outrage. Vote 'no'. I don't know what the Grateful Dead have to do with an event at my county fairgrounds that 50 reasonable people to square dance to Lawrence And if one of them...if one them, God forbid. sit...would happen to fall off the stage and break their ankle, I'm gonna have to see to it that the police are notified, an ambulance is called and some kind of paperwork filled out; all for a square dance. Vote 'no'."

Speaker Currie: "Further discussion? Further discussion? Representative Steczo."

63rd Legislative Day

May 21, 1993

Steczo: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Members of the House. The...the supporters of this legislation would have one believe that there are...there are just serious physical injuries which require the promoter or the venue or whatever, to contact an ambulance and have a...have a patient taken to the hospital. The Bill, I believe, says, 'Physical injury of any kind', and that's a wide, range, as Representative Black, I believe, eluded to. in...in conjunction with his remarks, it's not only the person that falls off the stage and has to have...has to have an ambulance called. This could be an attack of the hives that a person has to have an ambulance called and be taken to a hospital. It doesn't necessarily mean that this doesn't specify serious physical infirmity So, what happens? You have your police officers, you have everybody else who's there trying to do crowd control or trying to protect the rest of the neighborhood; no, they've got to be out filling out accident reports for somebody who has an attack of the hives. It just doesn't make any sense; and, on top of everything else, we have in this...in this state for the last number of years have tried to limit mandates. And one of the more serious things that our local police officials do is police our local communities. Why do we need to mandate them to waste their time filling out these reports. This Bill may be well-intentioned but it certainly doesn't make any sense, and it probably will be more of a headache (which we may have to call an ambulance for) than anything else, so I would encourage 'no' votes on behalf of the Members of this Body."

Speaker Currie: "Further discussion? Representative Wennlund."
Wennlund: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. The Bill is now in the form

63rd Legislative Day

May 21, 1993

in which you all wanted it. It's now in the form that Mr. Black wanted it. Fine, you want it to apply to all those and that's all I heard, that's all I heard from Mr. apply to everybody; fine, that's what it you want it to also, in this Bill, it permits the But, University of Illinois to make a multi-year contract to buy so that it can get out from underneath Presidents' BTU tax, if and when it passes (and it looks like it probably will). So, you're gonna be voting against the...the U of I, if you go to vote against this Bill and voting against permitting them to enter into multi-year fuel contracts to save money for the taxpayers of This Bill arose out of several incidents at the World Theatre where young teen-agers were getting stabbed. There was no police report because they have a private security firm and no knowledge of any witnesses because there was no police report and nobody was prosecuted as a result of the stabbings. If that's the kind of activity you want to see, then fine, vote 'no'. But this is a good Bill and it ought to be passed."

Speaker Currie: "Further discussion? Representative Tim

Johnson, Tim: "You know, a lot of times we have adjoining districts, they're all part of the Senate districts and there's a little rivalry here and there. I think people ought to look at the board here and just see what a example of the ongoing cooperation that Representative had with each other Prussing and I in representing Champaign County and the University of Illinois. This is a good Bill. We're both for it, and we're up front and working with each other as we do on virtually everything on behalf of the University of Illinois and good government."

63rd Legislative Day

May 21, 1993

Speaker Currie: "Further discussion? Representative Flowers."

Flowers: "Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I rise in support of the Gentleman's Bill. I look at this piece of legislation as being a parental notification piece of legislation. It merely let's the parents know what happened to their child at that particular event. Now, we do support parental notification; am I correct? If so, let us please support this Gentleman's Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Currie: "Further discussion? Representative Moseley."

Moseley: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I just wanted to clarify a point. Anyone that is concerned about some Amendment to this Bill dealing with contracts at the University of Illinois, that Amendment has previously passed out of this House 114 to zero on legislation that I passed. So, please feel free to free up your conscience to vote however you want to on the rest of this language because the University of Illinois has already been taken care of. Thank you."

Speaker Currie: "Further discussion? Representative Granberg."

Granberg: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. I, too, rise in opposition.

As Representative Steczo mentioned, this Bill provides if a person receives a physical injury of any kind, any kind.

This would apply to the Girl Scouts, Boy Scouts, whatever group has one of these functions; they would be obligated under this Act to comply with the legislation. I'm not sure about Representative Black's hoe-downs, but this would apply to everyone. Unfortunately, it does go too far. The Sponsor's well-intentioned, but I would ask for a 'no' vote."

Speaker Currie: "Representative Black, for what reason do you rise?"

Black: "Yes, thank you very much, Madam Speaker. My esteemed colleague and fellow floor leader used my name in debate,

63rd Legislative Day

May 21, 1993

and I must rise to protect what little integrity is left after this Session. I...I just want my colleague to know that I don't want this Bill passed in any form. I don't care whether it applies to everybody or the City of Chicago or not the City of Chicago, this is a bad idea. The University of Illinois Amendment, as Representative Moseley has just indicated, has already passed out of here on, I believe, Senate Bill 926. If you want to go through the hassles of reporting a sprained ankle or a cut thumb or a burnt widget from a neighborhood barbecue held in the city park, then vote for this; otherwise, in all due respect to my colleague, this idea really has not been well thought out, and I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Currie: "Further discussion? Representative Homer."

Homer: "Will the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Currie: "He indicates he will."

Homer: "Representative Blagojevich, you have...a definition of organized event to include or you say does not include events held on property owned by the State of Illinois or a unit of local government or school district. Now, is Cominsky Park exempt from the Bill?"

Blagojevich: "I'm sorry, Representative Homer, I could barely hear you."

Homer: "Exempt from your Bill...exempt from coverage of your Bill, even without the Amendment, are facilities owned by the State of Illinois. Is Cominsky Park exempt from your Bill?"

Blagojevich: "No. not any more."

Homer: "How is it not exempt?"

Blagojevich: "It's not...it's not exempt because this Bill preempts home rule powers. The Bill in its original form now preempts home rule powers."

63rd Legislative Day

May 21, 1993

Homer: "What's it got to do with home rule powers?"

Blagojevich: "No, I'm sorry, forget that. Your question is, 'Why is Cominsky Park not exempt?"

Homer: "I asked if Cominsky Park was exempt."

Blagojevich: "Okay, it's not exempt any longer because Amendment #2 was defeated."

Homer: "But isn't Cominsky Park owned by the authority that's quasi-state agency or governmental unit?"

Blagojevich: "I don't know that, Representative. I know that the reason that we had Amendment #2 was to assuage the concerns of the White Sox, and that's why they had the requirement of 15,000 seating capacity as the limit."

Homer: "So, Amendment #2 is on the Bill?"

Blagoievich: "But, you know. I see what you're saving. Representative and that could verv well interpretation of what...of exempting Cominsky Park. Ιt could be because it's owned by the state and the original Bill does say that the State of Illinois is exempt, property...if the event is held on property owned by the State of Illinois, then it's exempt."

Homer: "What did Amendment 2 do?"

Blagojevich: "Amendment 2 said that it would not include any facility that holds over 15,000 people."

Homer: "So, any facility over 15,000 is exempt?"

Blagojevich: "That was exempt, but that's no longer relevant now."

Homer: "So, let me understand..."

Speaker McPike: "How 'bout to the Bill, Mr. Homer, okay?"

Homer: "Well, I...I'm not sure I got the answer to my question,

Mr. Speaker. But, as I understand it, the Bill now would

exempt Cominsky Park but would not exempt Wrigley Field,

and for those of us who are Cub fans, we question why you

63rd Legislative Day

May 21, 1993

would want to pick on Wrigley Field and the Cubs as opposed to the White Sox, and I think this is definitely a north-sider, south-sider issue that we're dealing with here. But beyond that, in all seriousness Representative, I think your Bill's well-intended but I think it's...it's misquided, and I'll be very brief. The problem, as I see with the Bill is that it is not consistently applied. It's either a good idea to have reporting or it's not a good idea and to single out one ball park in Chicago and not the other makes no sense. Also, the Bill...I would have a hard time going back to Peoria and explaining why the Peoria Civic Center is within your Bill, whereas, other state-owned and publicly owned facilities are not. not a consistently worded Bill. Number two is, it requires the police to get involved even when there's no hint or allegation of a crime. We historically don't get police involved unless there's some allegation of criminal wrongdoing. If somebody sprains an ankle or accidentally hurts themselves, what's the public policy requirement in getting the police involved in filing reports? They have enough to do to fight crime. We shouldn't get them involved in a lot more of a paper chase than involvement in situations that don't involve allegations of criminal conduct. Further, this Bill would require duplication or triplication because it applies not only to the owner but also to the promoter and to...the organizer, which may three separate entities. So, each of them under this Bill would be required to file this report. And, police would be required to act as the paper shuffler for each of the three reports filed by those three different entities. So, while the Bill may be well-intended, clearly the form in which we find it is flawed, and we ought to

63rd Legislative Day

May 21, 1993

defeat the Bill."

- Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 47 pass?'

 All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Erwin. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this Motion, there are 24 'ayes', 89 'noes'. Senate Bill 47, having failed to receive the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared lost. We spent 45 minutes on a Bill that got 24 votes. Representative McPike in the Chair. Senate Bill 252. The Bill's on second reading. It's been read a second time previously. Are there any Amendments?"
- Clerk Rossi: "Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative
 Churchill."
- Speaker McPike: "Rules will meet at 2 p.m. At 2:13 p.m.

 Representative Churchill withdraws the Amendment. Further

 Amendments?"
- Clerk Rossi: "Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Steczo."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Steczo."
- Steczo: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 252 adds language related to Illinois landscape architects and language that was inadvertently left out of their practice Act with relation to disciplinary proceedings and adds language with regard to the Collection Agency Act which is clean up on their part, and it also adds language to the Illinois Vehicle Code regarding registration lists. This is an Agreed Amendment and I would ask for its adoption."
- Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #2 be adopted?' All in favor say 'aye'; opposed, 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Further

63rd Legislative Day

May 21, 1993

- Amendments?"
- Clerk Rossi: "Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative Steczo."
- Speaker McPike: "Mr. Steczo."
- Steczo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Amendment #3 exempts from the Act, people licensed under the Illinois Public Accounting Act. This is an Agreed Amendment. I'd move for its adoption."
- Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #3 be adopted?' All in favor say 'aye'; opposed, 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Rossi: "Floor Amendment #4, offered by Representative Steczo."
- Speaker McPike: "Mr. Steczo."
- Steczo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Amendment #4 is a technical Amendment that replaces the...the words 'response or with the words response and'. I'd move for its adoption."
- Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #4 be adopted?' All in favor say 'aye'; opposed, 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments."
- Clerk Rossi: "Floor Amendment #5, offered by Representative Wennlund."
- Speaker McPike: "Mr. Wennlund withdraws the Amendment. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Rossi: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 383. It's on third reading. Mr. Lang? Mr. Lang? Mr. Lang? Mr. Churchill? Senate Bill 498. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 498."
- Speaker McPike: "The Bill's on Second Reading. Further

63rd Legislative Day

May 21, 1993

Amendments?"

Clerk Rossi: "Floor Amendment #5, offered by Representative Gash."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Gash."

"Floor Amendment #5 amends the Metropolitan Authority Act. It is an Agreed...applies only to managerial employees of the CTA. This is an Agreed Amendment. This does not affect members of collective bargaining units. It states that seniority at the CTA is to be determined on a company wide rather than a job classification basis. A court decision that came down last week held that seniority was to be determined on a job classification basis. That means that a manager who was promote...that means that a manager who was promoted will lose his senor...or her seniority rate. The Amendment will quarantee that a manager who is promoted will retain his or her seniority rates and their is no opposition to Amendment at all."

Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall the Amendment be adopted?' All..."

Gash: "Nothing..."

Speaker McPike: "Nothing. Representative Murphy do you rise on this Amendment?"

Murphy, M: "A question of the Chair? Has this Amendment been printed and distributed?"

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

Clerk Rossi: 'No further Amendments."

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

Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 498, a Bill for an Act amending the

63rd Legislative Day

May 21, 1993

- Unemployment Insurance Act. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker McPike: "Let the record reflect that Representative Gash is now the Chief Sponsor to this Bill. Representative Gash."
- Gash: "Okay, this Bill is just now that last Amendment, and another Amendment that requires that no later than December 31st, 1993, the Director of Employment Security shall make rules that simplifies forms for small businesses."
- Speaker McPike: "Mr. Black, on the 'do pass' Motion. There are two Amendments on this Bill."
- Black: "Yes, thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. To the Bill. It sounds like a good Bill and it sounds like two good Amendments, and I'd love to vote for it if I had a copy of either Amendment, but since I don't, I intend to vote 'present' because, don't take it personally, Representative, but before I vote on anything, I like to have a copy. We don't have a copy. Nobody on our side of the aisle has a copy, and I don't intend to vote for this Bill until I have a copy. Thank you."
- "Let's...let's get a copy over there. This Bill Speaker McPike: was taken out of the record an hour ago, so that Mr. could read the Amendment. Mr. Parke read the Amendment and told me that it was acceptable, so maybe Mr. Parke would give Mr. Black a copy of the Amendment that Mr. approved of, of which he approved. The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 498 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the wish? record. On this Motion, there are 100 'ayes' and 4 'noes'. Senate Bill 498, having received the Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 558. It's

63rd Legislative Day

May 21, 1993

on Second Reading. Are there any Amendments?"

Clerk Rossi: "Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Currie."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker, these are technical changes that our cracker jack technical review staff discovered were necessary in the Bill and have been approved by the drafters of this Property Tax Recodification Act. I move for its adoption."

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

Kubik: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My understanding of the Amendment; I haven't seen it, but the staff indicates to me that it corrects a few misspellings and it's technical in nature and we would be in favor of the Amendment."

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Ryder. The question is, 'Shall the Amendment be adopt...Mr. Skinner. The question is, 'Shall the Amendment #2 be adopted?' All in favor say 'aye'; opposed, 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Rossi: "No further Amendments."

Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 778. It's on Second Reading. Are there any Amendments?"

Clerk Rossi: "Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Schakowsky."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Schakowsky."

Schakowsky: "Thank you, Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. (Senate Bill) 778 a very germane Amendment is Amendment #2, which...which is a Bill that is supported by the Cook County Bar Association, applies only to Cook County and would generate additional money for legal assistance, legal aid agencies. It raises about \$216,000 in...by additional court filing fees. This is a Bill that

63rd Legislative Day

May 21, 1993

is supported by the Clerk of the Circuit Court of Cook County and the Chicago Bar Association would then be able to distribute those funds, to help the indigent have more opportunity to access legal services. This is a Bill that passed the House with bipartisan support and I urge the adoption of Amendment #2, which does become the Bill."

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

Biggert: "Mr. Speaker, an inquiry of the Chair? Is this germane?"

Speaker McPike: "We'll look it up. Representative Skinner, is that why you rise also?"

Skinner: "No. I rise for sensitive reasons. This is obviously a fee increase. I'm sure all the targets will want to vote for it."

Speaker McPike: "The Amendment is germane. The Amendment is germane. The question is, 'Shall...Representative Dart."

Dart: "Will the Sponsor yield, please?"

Speaker McPike: "Yes."

Dart: "This is going to be...raise money for what purpose again now?"

Schakowsky: "This is to raise funds that will be deposited in the Cook County Civil Legal Services for the indigent funds, which is for legal aid foundation and agencies."

Dart: "Who's going to be getting this money then? I mean, what...who's going to be eligible for going after these funds? What type of legal programs?"

Schakowsky: "Eligible clients will mean indigent persons who have been found eligible for civil legal services by civil legal service providers and those are people who are..."

Dart: "Are any particular providers going to be getting this money?"

Schakowsky: "It will be used solely for grants to the Chicago Bar

63rd Legislative Day

- May 21, 1993
- Foundation for distribution to qualified civil legal service providers."
- Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall the Amendment be adopted?' All in favor say 'aye'; opposed, 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted? Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Rossi: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 828. It's on Third Reading. Mr. Novak. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk. Do you want this called? Read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 828, a Bill for an Act relating to disclosure by the seller of residential real property.

 Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker McPike: "Mr. Novak."
- Novak: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 828 is exactly the same except for one word change of the other Bill that I sponsored that past out of here overwhelmingly. It deals with the major initiative of the Illinois Realtors Association concerning Residential Real Property Disclosure Act. It requires the disclosure of material defects of which the seller has actual knowledge, but requires no specific disclosures that are not deemed...but requires no specific investigation by the seller. It provides that the disclosures are not deemed warranties, but also provides..."
- Speaker McPike: "There appears that there is no opposition to this Bill. The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 828 pass?'

 All in favor vote 'ave': corosed 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 108 'ayes' and 2 'noes'. Senate Bill 828, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed.

63rd Legislative Day

May 21, 1993

Senate Bill 345. The Bill's on Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill, Mr. Steczo's Bill."

- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 345, a Bill for an Act amending the Metropolitan Pier and Exposition Authority Act. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Steczo. Representative Dart,
 would you handle this Bill? Representative Hughes, for
 what reason do you rise?"

Hughes: "Mr. Speaker, I'd like to be recorded as a 'no' vote on
that past Roll Call please."

Speaker McPike: "On 828?"

Hughes: "Yes."

Speaker McPike: "Yes, the..."

Hughes: "Thank you."

- Speaker McPike: "Representative Hughes intended to vote 'no' on Senate Bill 828. The record will so reflect. Out of the record. Senate Bill...Senate Bill 91. It's on Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 91, a Bill for an Act amending the Downstate Forest Preserve District Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Wirsing, do you want this Bill returned to Second Reading?"

Wirsing: "Yes."

Speaker McPike: "The Bill's...no objections, the Bill's on Second Reading. Are there any Amendments?"

Clerk Rossi: "Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative Novak."

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Novak."

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

This Amendment simply changes the population restriction from 100,000 to counties of 90,000 and above. It's done

- 63rd Legislative Day May 21, 1993 specifically to address the concerns of my home county,

 Kankakee County..."
- Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #3 be adopted?' All in favor say 'aye'; opposed, 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Rossi: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 664. The Bill's on Second Reading. Are there any Amendments?"
- Clerk Rossi: "Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Levin."
- Speaker McPike: "Mr. Levin."
- Levin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #2 is the bipartisan Amendment establishing voluntary income tax check-offs for next year. It will provide..."
- Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #2 be adopted?' All in favor say 'aye'; opposed, 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Rossi: "Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative Levin."
- Speaker McPike: "Mr. Levin."
- Levin: "Amendment #3 is simply a technical Amendment to correct some problems in Amendment #2."
- Speaker McPike: "Would you repeat that?"
- Levin: "Amendment #3 is simply a technical Amendment to correct some defects in Amen..."
- Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #3 be adopted?' All in favor say 'aye'; opposed, 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"

63rd Legislative Day

May 21, 1993

- Clerk Rossi: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. Representative Steczo on 345.

 The Bill's on Third Reading. What's your desire?"
- Steczo: "Speaker, I ask leave to bring this Bill back to the Order of Second Reading."
- Speaker McPike: "The Gentleman wants leave to return to Second Reading. Leave is granted. The Bill's on Second. Mr. Clerk, any Amendments?"
- Clerk Rossi: "Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative
 Currie."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Currie."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker, Members of the House. This Amendment includes a Bill that passed the House and for procedural reasons did not get an adequate hearing in the Senate, but what it provides is that the commitment to offer pedestrian access in perpetuity from the west side of the New McCormick Place Building to the Lake Front Land and Park on the East, shall be a statutory obligation. This Bill passed unanimously, and be happy to answer your questions."
- Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #1 be adopted?' All in favor say 'aye'; opposed, 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Rossi: "Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Steczo."
- Speaker McPike: "Mr. Steczo."
- Steczo: "Mr Speaker, withdraw Amendment #2."
- Speaker McPike: "The Gentleman withdraws it. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Rossi: "Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative
 Turner."

63rd Legislative Day May 21, 1993

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Turner, Amendment #3."

Turner: "Withdraw #3."

Speaker McPike: "Withdraws the Amendment. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Rossi: "Floor Amendment #4, offered by Representative
Turner."

Speaker McPike: "This...Amendment #3 was withdrawn. Further

Amendments? Who's the Sponsor of 4?"

Clerk Rossi: "Floor Amendment #4, offered by Representative
Turner."

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Turner, please put his name on the board.

Mr. Turner."

Turner: "Come on...come on. Yes, Sir. Amendment #4 provides for the filling of appointments for the McCormick Place Advisory Board and it requires that whenever, whoever is appointed, that the existing Member must appoint a replacement to the Board immediately, and I move for the favorable adoption of House Amendment #4 to Senate Bill 345."

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Wennlund on the Amendment."

Wennlund: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Can I ask a question of the Sponsor please?"

Speaker McPike: "Yes."

Wennlund: "It's my understanding that...Amendment #4 was identical to 3, but it's technically incorrect if 2 was withdrawn and it was."

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Turner?"

Turner: "We're checking now."

Speaker McPike: "Let's take this out of the record and we'll get back to it. We're having Third Reading, Mr...all right, Representative Deering on 579. It's not here. All right, Representative Deering has returned on...on 579. Any Amendments, Mr. Clerk?"

63rd Legislative Day

May 21, 1993

Clerk Rossi: "Floor Amendment #4, offered by Representative Hicks."

Speaker McPike: "It's not printed. Mr. Ryder."

Ryder: "I have a question on the Amendment and the..."

Speaker McPike: "It's not printed."

Ryder: "In the event you find someone to present it."

Speaker McPike: "It's not printed."
Ryder: "Then my question is moot."

Speaker McPike: "Your board is incorrect. Let's go back to Mr.

Turner's Amendment on Senate Bill 345, which is technically correct, Mr. Wennlund. Mr. Turner, present your Amendment."

Turner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, we'd like to withdraw Amendment #4, but I...before that I'd like to read...I'd like to deal with Amendment #3. The confusion is we want to adopt Amendment #3 and withdraw Amendment #4. These are just technical changes."

Speaker McPike: "All right. The Gentleman withdrew Amendment #3.

The Gentleman would like leave of the Body not to withdraw the Amendment and he has leave, so Amendment #3..."

Turner: "Is adopted."

Speaker McPike: "Present the Amendment."

Turner: "Amendment #3 currently...the law requires that there be created a McCormick Place Advisory Board and those appointments be made by the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House and when a Member leaves the Board, the law requires that whoever is appointed, the existing Member must appoint a replacement to the Board, and I move for the adoption of Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 345."

Speaker McPike: "On Amendment #3, Mr. Ryder."

Ryder: "Thank you. Would the Sponsor yield, please?"

Speaker McPike: "Yes. Yes. Yes."

63rd Legislative Day

- May 21, 1993
- Ryder: "Thank you. Representative, I don't understand the need for this. Is there currently a situation on the Board for which this is relevant?"
- Turner: "...Yes there is...the Board is meeting right now, but there has been for the last year, vacancies on the Advisory Board, so what we would like to do is..."
- Ryder: "This is the Advisory Board or the Board for the Department?"
- Turner: "This is the Advisory Board, and what we'd like to happen is, in the case where there is a vacancy and it has not been filled by the President or the Speaker of the House, that the Authority will have the ability to make those appointments when there is a vacancy or if one is not filled within a four month time period."
- Ryder: "Can you tell me the vacancy that is currently on the Board? Who has not made that appointment?"
- Turner: "I don't...I just know that there's vacancies. I'm not sure exactly..."
- Ryder: "I think if you'd ask staff right next to you that he could tell you."
- Turner: "Let me ask my staff. The vacancy that is currently on the McCormick Place Advisory Board is a vacancy that the Illinois Legislative Black Caucus had some...or provides some input into that particular vacancy. It has not been...there had not been an agreement reached as to who would serve in that particular Advisory position, and so, at this point, it still exists."
- Ryder: "You haven't convinced the Speaker who should have the position? Is that what you're telling me?"
- Turner: "You sound like you understand why that vacancy is there, and what we're trying to do is allow everyone to move forward..."

63rd Legislative Day

- May 21, 1993
- Ryder: "I certainly wouldn't want to interfere with the Black Caucus and the Speaker on this particular issue."
- Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment 3 be adopted?'

 All in favor say 'aye'; opposed, 'no'. The 'ayes' have it,
 the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Rossi: "Floor Amendment #4, offered by Representative
 Turner."
- Speaker McPike: "Mr. Turner, you with...#4 is withdrawn. Further
 Amendments?"
- Clerk Rossi: "Floor Amendment #5, offered by Representative Steczo."
- Speaker McPike: "Mr. Steczo."
- Steczo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Amendment #5 amends the Rural Bond Bank Act by including the counties of Lake, Kane, McHenry and Will. It allows the Lieutenant Governor and State Treasurer to send Representatives to meetings of the Commissioners and to cast votes for those officers. It allows the Commissioner to attend meetings via telephone if that Commissioner is unable to attend a meeting in person; and it raises the debt ceiling for the Rural Bond Bank from \$100,000,000 to \$200,000,000. I'd move for its adoption."
- Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #5 be adopted?' All in favor say 'aye'; opposed, 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Rossi: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. Representative Granberg moves to extend the deadline on Senate Bill 591 and on Senate Bill 606 until November 1, 1993, waiving the appropriate rules to do so, and on that Motion, hearing no opposition, use of the Attendance Roll Call would be used and the Motion

- 63rd Legislative Day May 21, 1993
 carries. (Senate Bill) 383, Mr. Lang. Read the Bill, Mr.
 Clerk."
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 383, a Bill for an Act amending the Security Deposit Interest Act. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker McPike: "Mr. Lang."
- Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to bring the Bill back to Second Reading for purposes of an Amendment."
- Speaker McPike: "The Gentleman asks leave to return it to Second.

 Leave's granted. Mr. Clerk, any Amendments?"
- Clerk Rossi: "Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Lang."
- Speaker McPike: "Mr. Lang."
- Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Amendment #1 is an Agreed
 Amendment between large real estate developers and the
 Realtors Association regarding finders fees. They've been
 negotiating this for some time. It's agreed..."
- Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #1 be adopted?' All in favor say 'aye'; opposed, 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Rossi: "Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Currie."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Currie. Withdraws the Amendment.

 Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Rossi: "Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative Lang."
- Speaker McPike: "Mr. Lang."
- Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Amendment #3 amends the original portion of the Bill regarding interest on security deposit.

 This is an Agreed Amendment between legal services and the realtors."
- Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #3 be

63rd Legislative Day

- May 21, 1993
- adopted?' All in favor say 'aye'; opposed, 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Rossi: "Floor Amendment #4, offered by Representative Santiago."
- Speaker McPike: "Mr. Santiago. Withdraws the Amendment. Further

 Amendments?"
- Clerk Rossi: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. (Senate Bill) 664. Mr. Kubik.

 Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 664, a Bill for an Act in relation to meals for the elderly. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker McPike: "Let's take this out of the record for a few minutes. Thank you. (Senate Bill) 433. Mr. Turner, the Bill's on Second Reading. Do you want this called? Can I just scratch it off? Do you want this called today or... No. (Senate Bill) 778, Representative Schakowsky. It's on...take it out of the record. Does anyone have a concurrence on the Calendar that they would like to nonconcur in? (Senate Bill) 91. The Bill's on Third Reading. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 91, a Bill for an Act amending the Downstate Forest Preserve District Act. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Wirsing."
- Wirsing: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. What Senate Bill 91 does is, that we have a particular situation in my district with a township forest preserve and the people in Byron have the desire to move that Members of that Board from the appointed positions to elected positions and that's the sole purpose of this Bill. It came from the people involved..."

63rd Legislative Day

May 21, 1993

Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 91 pass?'

All those in favor vote 'aye'. Representative Granberg."

Granberg: "Representative Wirsing, can you advise me what Amendments are on the Bill, if any?"

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Clerk, what Amendments are on this Bill?"

Clerk Rossi: "Amendments #1 and 3 have been adopted to the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "One and Three."

Granberg: "Representative, that removed the objections to this Bill?"

Wirsing: "Yes it did."

Granberg: "All right. Thank you."

Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 91 pass?'

All those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Have all

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

The Clerk will take the record. On this Motion there's 113

'ayes', 1 'no'. Senate Bill 91, having received the

Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate

Bill 157. Third Reading. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 157, a Bill for an Act in relation to state government. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Curran."

Curran: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill now requires the Secretary of State to study the feasibility of adopting a uniform traffic ordinance, and as Amendment #3, the Department of Military Affairs requests this Amendment for this legislation to provide legal representation and identification for the 80 new Lincoln Challenge employees to be hired in FY 94. I don't think there's any controversy; ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 157 pass?

All those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the

63rd Legislative Day

May 21, 1993

record. On this Motion, there's 114 'ayes' and 0 'nays'.

Senate Bill 157, having received the Constitutional

Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 246.

It's on Third Reading. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 246, a Bill for an Act concerning children. Third Reading of the Bill."

Clerk McPike: "Representative Lindner."

Lindner: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. As I said this morning when I presented this Amendment, the Amendment becomes the Bill and it is the result of negotiations between the people working with Representative Dart and myself, and we would ask that this be passed."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Granberg."

Granberg: "Representative, is it your intention that this Bill go to a Conference?"

Lindner: "Yes it is."

Granberg: "Fine, thank you."

Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 246 pass?'
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's 117 'ayes'; 0 'nays'.
Senate Bill 246, having received the Constitutional
Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 617.
Second Reading. Are there any Amendments? (Senate Bill)
617 is on Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 617, a Bill for an Act amending the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Gash."

Gash: "This a Bill to amend the Illinois Administrative Procedure

Act. It places the citation system of the Illinois

Administrative Code into the public domain. It passed out

63rd Legislative Day

May 21, 1993

of the Senate Committee 8 to 0. It passed on Third Reading out of the Senate 55 to 0, and I would appreciate your 'ave' vote."

- Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 617 pass?'

 All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this Motion, there's 113 'ayes' and 0 'nays'.

 Senate Bill 617, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 778. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 778, a Bill for an Act amending the Code of Civil Procedure. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Schakowsky."
- Schakowsky: "Thank you, Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Bill was talked about as the Amendment that was added to 778. Essentially, what it does I'll just repeat briefly one more time, is create a fund of about \$216,000 additional dollars for low income people in Cook county to have access to legal services. This is done only in Cook county through an increase in court filing fees. It's supported by the Cook County Bar Association. It passed out of this chamber with bipartisan support, and I urge your support for Senate Bill 778."
- Speaker McPike: "All right, and on the Ladies 'do pass' Motion, Representative Ryder."
- Ryder: "Thank you. I would ask the Sponsor to yield for a question please? Representative, please tell me how much the fee increase is in the Cock county courts?"
- Schakowsky: "For filing a civil action, if the amount in controversy is under \$250, the fee is \$2. If the amount in controversy is between \$250 and \$1000, it's \$3. If the amount is between \$1000 and \$2500, it's \$4. Twenty five

63rd Legislative Day

May 21, 1993

is lawful for a bank organized under the Illinois Savings Association Bank Act, to act as a community development bank for the economically depressed communities. This is suggested by the League of Savings Institutions and supported by the Commissioner of Savings and Residential Finance, and I'd ask for its passage and I don't know of any opposition."

Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 935 pass?'

All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this Motion, there's 114 'ayes', 0 'nays'. Senate Bill 935, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 830. Is this on Second Reading? It's on Second Reading. Are there any Amendments?"

Clerk Rossi: "No Amendments."

Speaker McPike: "Is it on Second or Third? Is this Bill on Second Reading or Third Reading?"

Clerk Rossi: "Third Reading."

Speaker McPike: "The Bill is on Third Reading. Read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 830, a Bill for an Act concerning insurance. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Hicks."

Hicks: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Bill, Senate Bill 830, deals with the Uniform Claim Act. It's something that's been worked on by several Members of the Insurance Committee, and those Members will be familiar with the Bill. This simply sets forth a standardized claim form for insurance claims to be used by all companies so that we can speed up billing and that type of thing. Be happy to answer any kind of question."

Speaker McPike: "And on this Motion, Representative Ryder."

63rd Legislative Day

May 21, 1993

hundred and \$5000, \$6, and if the amount is between \$5,000 and \$15,000, \$9."

Ryder: "And if it's over \$15,000?"

Schakowsky: "I think that's the... I think the top fee is \$12,000...it's \$12, twelve dollars."

Ryder: "And the numbers that you just read to me are increases, is that correct? This establishes a new fee; therefore...."

Schakowsky: "Yes that's an additional fee. Yes it is."

Ryder: "That's what I needed to know. Thank you."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Well, this is that Bill that all of us targets ought to look at. It's a fee increase, especially if you're in Cook County, you certainly wouldn't want this on a little hit piece coming the last week of the campaign, it would be real difficult to rebut."

Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 778 pass?'

All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'.

Representative Biggert."

Biggert: "Mr. Speaker, I meant to vote 'yes' on 617."

Speaker McPike: "And the record will so reflect. Have all voted?

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

Clerk will take the record. On this Motion, there are 40

'ayes' and 73 'noes'. Senate Bill 778, having failed to

receive the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared

lost. Senate Bill 935. It's on Third Reading. Mr. Clerk,

read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 935, a Bill for an Act amending the Illinois Savings Association Banking Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Walsh."

Walsh: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Bill 935 provides that it

63rd Legislative Day May 21, 1993

Ryder: "Will the Sponsor yield please?"

Speaker McPike: "Yes he will. Representative Hicks (sic - Ryder)."

Ryder: "Representative, the underlying Bill is excellent, I'd like to support it. Please tell me if you will, what Amendments were adopted?"

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Clerk, what Amendments are adopted?"

Clerk Rossi: "Amendment #2, 3, 4 and 7 have been adopted to the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Two, three, four, seven. Representative Olson."

Olson: "Yes, will the Sponsor yield, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker McPike: "Yes, yes Sir."

Olson: "Representative Hicks, I believe I'm correct, but

Amendment #6 dealt with car rental, and that has been
withdrawn?"

Hicks: "Mr. Olson, Amendment #6 as I understood, dealt with the Illinois Vehicle Code, and that Amendment was withdrawn."

Olson: "Do any of the Amendments have anything to do with car rental, and any of the..."

Hicks: "Yes, Amendment #6 dealt with that, and it was withdrawn."

Olson: "Okay, thank you very much."

Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 830 pass?'

All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this Motion, there's 115 'ayes', 0 'nays'. Senate Bill 830, having received a Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Representative Parcells interded to vote 'aye' on Senate Bill 830. Senate Bill 560. Representative Mautino."

Mautino: "Mr. Speaker, I ask that this be brought back to Second for purpose of an Amendment."

Speaker McPike: "All right. The Gentleman asks leave to return

63rd Legislative Day

May 21, 1993

the Bill to Second Reading. Leave is granted. Are there any Amendments?"

Clerk Rossi: "Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative Hoffman."

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Hoffman."

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

This Amendment is something that we passed out with a little bit of change, and it went over to the Senate, and now we want to put it on this Bill. It indicates that attorneys fees and court costs can be added to Mechanics liens. I ask for a favorable vote."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Granberg, on the Amendment."

Granberg: "Thank you. Representative Walsh, this Amendment #3,

have you spoke with the Trial Lawyers Association on this

Amendment?"

Walsh: "Yes."

Granberg: "And a..."

Walsh: "They're fine. They're fine."

Granberg: "They're in favor of it. Thank you."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Biggert."

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

Speaker McPike: "Yes."

Biggert: "Representative, what does the Amendment do?"

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Hoffman, what does the Amendment do?"

Hoffman: "The Amendment indicates if you are a subcontractor and you have a Mechanics lien, that you could also put the amount of attorneys fees on that Mechanics lien that would not exceed 50% of the lien amount."

Biggert: "Well, I think that a...to the Bill, Mr...or to the Amendment, Mr. Speaker. Including attorneys fees in the Mechanics Lien Act is something very new, and I would really stand in opposition to this Amendment and ask for a

63rd Legislative Day

May 21, 1993

Roll Call Vote."

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Levin."

Levin: "Will the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker McPike: "Yes."

Levin: "Representative, this Bill was called once and failed in part because of the opposition of the title companies and the mortgage bankers."

Hoffman: "Representative, this is an Amendment, it has nothing to do with the original Bill that was called and failed."

Hoffman: "This Bill...passed."

Levin: "Excuse me."

Speaker McPike: "Ask you question again, Ellis."

Levin: "All right. Does this do anything to eliminate the problems that the title companies and the mortgage bankers had with the underlying Bill?"

Hoffman: "No."

Levin: "Thank you."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Biggert, did you ask for a Roll Call? Did you ask for a Roll Call? The question is, 'Shall Amendment #3 be adopted?' All in favor, vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this Motion, there are 45 'ayes', 63 'noes', and the Amendment is defeated. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Rossi: "No further Amendments."

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

Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 560, a Bill for an Act in relation to construction contracts. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Mautino."

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

63rd Legislative Day

May 21, 1993

Bill has two provisions. First provision would say that contractors cannot require subcontractors to sign a Waiver of Lien against a construction bond. Second portion of the Bill, states that the a...any cases resulting in this will be settled in accordance with Illinois law. I ask for a favorable Roll Call."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Wennlund, on the 'do pass'
Motion."

Wennlund: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This Bill was defeated one time prior, because what does is it upset the whole mechanics lien structure in Illinois law; and, in addition to that, the Illinois Land Title Association, all the title companies are opposed to it, because before, they could pay out on an escrow when you build a house or any other building, they would have to contact each subcontractor, and know who they are to begin with, and assure themselves that each subcontractor had been paid before they could ever close out the escrow. It's a bad idea to tinker with Illinois law relating to mechanics liens, and in this particular instance, Chicago Title is opposed to it and I understand why. It will throw the entire home building industry, the entire construction industry into chaos and ultimate delay, and the Bill ought to be defeated for a second time."

Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 560 pass?'

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 41 'ayes', 66 'noes'. Senate Bill 560, having failed to receive a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared lost. Senate Bill 227's on Second Reading. Are there any Amendments?"

63rd Legislative Day

- May 21, 1993
- Clerk Rossi: "Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Novak."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Hicks, for what reason do you rise?"
- Hicks: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Simply for clarification, a while ago on House (sic Senate) Bill 830, in your question to the Chair, he said that Amendment #3 was adopted. Amendment #3 was tabled on Second Reading. So, Amendment #3 to House Bill 830 or Senate Bill 830 was actually tabled. So, that Amendment had not been adopted."
- Speaker McPike: "All right Mr. Clerk, let's correct the record.

 You indicated to me that four Amendments were adopted. I
 believe it was 2, 3, 4 and 7."
- Clerk Rossi: "Amendments 2, 3, 4 and 7 had been adopted to the Bill. Representative Hicks did move previously to table #3."
- Speaker McPike: "So, #3 wasn't on the Bill; was not on the Bill.

 All right. (Amendments) 2, 4 and 7 were on the Bill. Mr.

 Hicks, thank you. (Senate Bill) 227. Are there any

 Amendments?"
- Clerk Rossi: "Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Novak."
- Speaker McPike: "Mr. Novak."
- Novak: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House.

 Senate Bill 227, Amendment #2 is the...is the consequence of negotiations with the waste management industry, the Woodford County Farm Bureau and all the other interested parties. What it deals with is the proposed expansion of a landfill that is...that is merely adjacent to the Village of Minonk in Woodford County. The Woodford County Farm Bureau and a bunch of other citizens are very concerned

63rd Legislative Day

May 21, 1993

about the possible expansion of this landfill because the number of acres of property have been purchased; and, as a result, if the landfill is expanded, it will be directly coterminous to the border of the Village of Minonk. They wish that the village residents...the village board and the citizens would like to have the authority to make the decision with respect to the expansion of that landfill."

Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #2 be adopted?' All in favor say 'aye'; opposed, 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Rossi: "No further Amendments."

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

Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 227, a Bill for an Act amending the Environmental Protection Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Novak."

Novak: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The negotiations make this site specific. It only applies to the Woodford County situation with respect to the Village of Minonk and the landfill that is adjacent to it, and I ask for your affirmative support."

Speaker McPike: "Question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 227 pass?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this Motion, there are 116 'ayes', 1 'no'. Senate Bill 227, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 990. It's on Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 990, a Bill for an Act amending the Fire Protection District Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Mr. McAuliffe. Roger McAuliffe. Mr. McGuire will handle the Bill. The Bill's been read a third time.

63rd Legislative Day

May 21, 1993

Mr. McGuire."

McGuire: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill, Senate Bill 990,
has several Amendments on it, but we'd like to strip some
of the Amendments. What I'd like to do is leave
Amendment..."

Speaker McPike: "Return the Bill to Second Reading. Leave's granted. The Bill's on Second Reading. Mr. McGuire, what Motions do you have?"

McGuire: "I'd like to strip Amendment #1."

Speaker McPike: "The Gentleman moves to table Amendment #1. Is there any discussion? The question is, 'Shall Amendment #1 be tabled? All in favor say 'aye'; opposed, 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and Amendment #1 is tabled. Further Motions?"

McGuire: "Strip Amendment #2."

Speaker McPike: "The Gentleman moves to table Amendment #2. All in favor say 'aye'; opposed, 'no'. The 'ayes' have it.

Amendment #2 is tabled. Further Amendments?"

McGuire: "Is there an Amendment #4 on there, Sir? I'd like to leave #3. Is there a #4 or 5?"

Speaker McPike: "Just a minute. Just a minute. Just a minute, please. Amendment #2 was never adopted, so the Gentleman withdrew Amendment #2. Mr. Clerk, are there further Amendments?"

Clerk Rossi: "Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative McGuire."

Speaker McPike: "Mr. McGuire."

McGuire: "I want to leave Amendment #3."

Speaker McPike: "You'd like to offer to adopt it?"

McGuire: "Yes."

Speaker McPike: "Could you explain it?"

McGuire: "Yes. Amendment #3 is a the Civic Center Bill that was

63rd Legislative Day

- May 21, 1993
- passed out of this House a month or so ago with an overwhelming vote but; unfortunately, didn't get any where in the Senate."
- Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #3 be adopted?
 All in favor say 'aye'; opposed, 'no'. The 'ayes' have it
 and the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Rossi: "Floor Amendment #4, offered by Representative
 McAuliffe."
- Speaker McPike: "Mr. McAuliffe. Mr. McGuire, would you handle that Amendment for Mr. McAuliffe."
- McGuire: "Table Amendment #4."
- Speaker McPike: "Yes. The a...Mr. Black would like to withdraw the Amendment for Mr. McAuliffe, and the Amendment is withdrawn. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Rossi: "Floor Amendment #5, offered by Representative

 McAuliffe."
- Speaker McPike: "Mr. Black, what is your desire on that? Mr. Black wants to withdraw that Amendment. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Rossi: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. (Senate Bill) 552. Senate Bill 552 is on Second Reading, is that correct? Are there any Amendments?"
- Clerk Rossi: "Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Dunn."
- Speaker McPike: "Mr. Dunn. Mr. Dunn."
- Dunn: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House.

 I move for adoption of Floor Amendment #2 to Senate Bill

 552. This is an Amendment which would provide that if an assessment is lowered on farm land it will not be raised again until the next quadrennial year. I move for the adoption of the Amendment."

63rd Legislative Day

May 21, 1993

Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #2 be adopted?' And on that Motion, Mr. Kubik."

Kubik: "Yes. Would the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker McPike: "Yes."

Kubik: "I'm sorry, Representative, you said what? What does this Amendment do?"

Dunn: "What the Amendment provides, Representative, is that when a Board of Review reduces an assessment, the legislation provides that the assessment shall remain at that reduced level for the balance of the four years involved with the quadrennial assessment. And this Amendment indicates that when a reduction is made in farm land, the assessed evaluation shall remain at the lower or reduced level for the remaining years in the quadrennial, until the next quadrennial assessment, then it can be raised or lowered or whatever."

Kubik: "So, this includes both farm land and residents?"

Dunn: "Yes it does, both."

Kubik: "How about commercial?"

Dunn: "No."

Kubik: "This does not provide for commercial."

Dunn: "That is correct. It does not provide for commercial."

Kubik: "And when the Bill came over from the Senate, commercial was in it, was that not correct?"

Dunn: "I think commercial was in it and it was taken out, that's correct."

Kubik: "And so what we're doin is restoring farm land and residents and sending it back to the Senate without commercial."

Dunn: "That is correct. With this Amendment."

Kubik: "All right."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Stephens."

63rd Legislative Day

May 21, 1993

Stephens: "Well, on a point of personal privilege. It's getting later in the day and it occurs to me that no one has mentioned the athletic endeavors of last evening, and I want to salute Representative Deering, who with two outs, two strikes, three runs behind, the last gasp we had, and he plugged the gap, and I want to tell ya they don't call him 'Speedy' for nothing. He was around those bases in a flash."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Deering."

Deering: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just bein's my name was spoken here, I'd just like to say I couldn't done it, I couldn't done it without the help of all my friends and teammates on the team there at third base, makin that wind helped me go faster to home."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Currie."

Currie: "Thank you Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker McPike: "Yes. Yes."

Currie: "Representative Dunn, your Amendment says that farm land assessments may not be changed from one quadrennial to another if there's been a successful appeal. The local assessor can't go back to the level of assessment before the appeal. But, my understanding is that farm land is assessed annually, is that right?"

Dunn: "Yes."

Currie: "So, you would say that when farm land has been assessed, and the owner has successfully appealed the new assessment, that will now...that the appealed assessment will stand for four years. Is that what this Amendment does?"

Dunn: "No, no, no. If...if first of all, if reduced on the appeal, and secondly, the appeal of course would come at some time during a quadrennial and if there is a reduction,

63rd Legislative Day

May 21, 1993

the reduction would remain in effect for the balance of the quadrennial which maybe one year, maybe two years, maybe three years."

Currie: "But, if farm land is assessed annually, then it seems to
me the effect of your Amendment is to say if there's been a
successful appeal, and the value has been reduced, then we
won't be reassessing it next year, we'll only reassess it
three years or two years, whatever, whatever the next
quadrennial will be."

Dunn: "You understand the Amendment."

Currie: "It seems to me you're giving a major, a major break to this particular kind of business that's not available to any other kind in the State of Illinois, and I would be surprised that the farmers would even be asking for something that is as expansive as what you've just described."

Dunn: "The treatment, under this Amendment, for farm land in effect, would be the same as the treatment for residential. If the property tax payer feels that the assessment is to high and they appeal and are successful and there is a reduction, the reduction instead of being in effect for just one year would remain in effect until the quadrennial, the existing quadrennial, is over. So, that may be one, two or three years. Very seldom three years, because you'd be in the middle of a quadrennial year by the time you got through the appeal process, you'd probably be at least half way through the quadrennial. So, I would say that if a reduction takes place here, a couple of years at the most would be the impact."

Currie: "Well to the Amendment, Speaker. It's my understanding that farm is reassessed annually. So, I don't understand why for annual reassessments you want to set a new standard

63rd Legislative Day

May 21, 1993

for when the assessment can change if there was an erroneous assessment in one year, why we assume that the next assessment the next year will be erroneous too doesn't make a lot of sense to me. Homeowners, you widely point out, have this opportunity, but at least in the area where I live in Cook County, homes indeed are assessed once every three or once every four years, not annually. But. reference the quadrennial assessment for farm land for farm businesses, looks to me as if you're going to lock in an assessment without any rhyme or reason over a longer period than would be in effect the way the property tax assessment program operates on farm properties. If it is annual, this Amendment does nothing unless the affect of the Amendment is to freeze a reduced appealed assessment for longer than that reduction would have effect under current law. think it's a bad Amendment."

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Skinner."

Skinner: "As astounding as this may sound, I think I may agree with Representative Currie. Would the Sponsor of the Amendment please tell me whether we talking about only the residence which is on the farm land, or are we talking about the farm land itself?"

Dunn: "We're talking about the entire tract. Everything but the residence actually."

Skinner: "Everything but the residence? Because if residence all ready... If the appeal... If the residence is appealed, if the residence is assessed by the township assessor, the rest of the tract is assessed by the supervisor of assessments and if the residence...if the resident wins an appeal on the house, it would all ready be locked into a four.... Well, for the rest of the quadrennial, right?"

Dunn: "Yes. That's correct."

63rd Legislative Day

May 21, 1993

Skinner: "Okav. Well, you folks who represent downstate areas that have homeowners in your small towns who have their taxes go up in relationship to the taxes paid by the farm land around you, ought to to be real cautious about and the reason is that the... I think the reason for the Amendment is that farm land is increasing in value, and as it increases in value, each year the real estate and that probably means that assessment goes up the proportion of total real estate taxes on tax districts that overlap city boundaries into the rural areas. proportion paid by the town folks are going down, while the proportion paid by the farmers are going up. This should be. It's as it should be because the AG Assessment Bill only allows farms to be assessed at 10% market value. So, when the market value goes up, let's say a \$100, the assessed evaluation will go up \$10. Now on top is a formula I do not understand, but which has that something to do with productivity. What the Gentleman seems to be trying to do is to freeze the market value part of the assessment. If it's not frozen for homeowners, it doesn't seem to me it should be frozen for farm owners."

Dunn: "The answer to your..."

Skinner: "That wasn't a question."

Dunn: "Well, here comes the answer anyhow. Farm land is assessed on the basis of productivity, and as productivity goes up, the farm land assessment may increase, as it goes down, it may not. There are some farm land market values which have rises in central Illinois, not many in downstate Illinois. So, to move this Bill along, I move for adoption of the Amendment, Mr. Speaker, and would ask that we proceed with the Motion."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Biggins."

63rd Legislative Day

May 21, 1993

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

Speaker McPike: "Yes. But, I don't know, from that last comment, maybe the answer is 'no'. Representative Dunn, will you yield?"

Dunn: "Yes, I'll... Of course I'll yield."

Speaker McPike: "All right. He'll yield."

Biggins: "Thank you. A few questions. What if the assessment is increased by an action of the Property Tax Appeal Board instead of decreased? Is that addressed in the legislation?"

Dunn: "No."

Biggins: "The Property Tax Appeal Board has the authority to increase any assessment or any evaluation that comes before it. So, what would happen if the assessment is increased by the action of the Property Tax Appeal Board. Would the owner then be precluded from seeking relief?"

Dunn: "Then I think that would scare the daylights out of other farmers from trying to take advantage of the legislation proposed here."

Biggins: "Well, but the fact is, the...would the farm owner in this case have the opportunity to appeal the assessment the following year to the local assessor?"

Dunn: "If the assessment goes up, this Amendment doesn't relate to that situation. So, whatever the current statute is would apply."

Biggins: "So, there would be no relief then for the homeowner.

Does this legislation address single family residences,
non-farm classified?"

Dunn: "Yes."

Biggins: "What if there's a two flat, is that possible to be part...included in this assessment relief."

Dunn: "I don't have the statute book in front of me, I don't know

63rd Legislative Day

May 21, 1993

whether a two flat is included or not. It's not."

Biggins: "Would a rented single family residence be covered?"

Dunn: "Well, well the Bill, itself, I think relates to residential and may include a two flat. The Amendment we're discussing here, only relates to the farm land and nothing to do with residential."

Skinner: "Okay. But, what if I own...if somebody owns a single family residence, they rent it out they appeal the assessment, and it gets reduced..."

Speaker McPike: "This is farm land only. Representative..."

Dunn: "Well..."

Speaker McPike: "Representative."

Dunn: "There is a current... Statute is currently in effect to address that situation. This Bill was not designed to address that situation."

Skinner: "What if the assessment is appealed in a nonreassessment year? For instance, let's say that the homeowner is happy with the assessment as reassessed, but the next year decides that the value is incorrect? Can they appeal it even though it's not a reassessment year?"

Dunn: "Mr. Speaker, these questions would address the underlying
Bill. They have nothing to do with this Amendment. This
Amendment addresses farm land only."

Speaker McPike: "I think you're right. Mr. Black."

Black: "Yes. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I agree with Representative Dunn, and to the Amendment. I favor his Amendment. Farmland assessment is handled completely different than any other type of property, by action of this Body some years ago. Market value does not enter into the equation on how farm land is assessed. I would furthermore indicate in all due respect to my colleague from the collar counties, if farmland going up in value, I

63rd Legislative Day

May 21, 1993

don't know where that is. It sure isn't in may area, but that's beside the point. To Amendment #2. It's a very reasonable Amendment, and I think that Representative Dunn should be commended for taking out the commercial property aspect, that a lot of people had trouble with, and the Amendment as it's before us is worthy of your support. I would urge your affirmative vote; and, Mr. Speaker, I am joined by the appropriate number of people on my side of the aisle pursuant to Rule 55(c), we'd like a Roll Call Vote on this Amendment."

- Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #2 be adopted.' 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 66 'ayes', 47 'noes'. The Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Rossi: "Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative Steczo."
- Speaker McPike: "Mr. Steczo. Withdraws the Amendment. Further
 Amendments?"
- Clerk Rossi: "Floor Amendment #4, offered by Representative Steczo."
- Speaker McPike: "Mr. Steczo."
- Steczo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Amendment #4 is the Bill which had overwhelming support in the House, which would freeze senior citizen assessments upon reaching the age of 65, for those senior citizens that are in an income bracket of \$35,000 or below. I'd move for its adoption."
- Speaker McPike: "And on that Motion, Representative Biggins."
- Biggins: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I speak in support of that Amendment. I think..."
- Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall the Amendment be adopted?' All in favor say 'aye'; opposed, 'no'. The

63rd Legislative Day

May 21, 1993

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

Clerk Rossi: "Floor Amendment #5, offered by Representative Weaver."

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Weaver."

Weaver: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Amendment was brought to me by the Property Tax Appeal Board, and it basically addresses the property tax appeals that are based solely on local multipliers. If an appeal is based upon a local multiplier, then it must be filed with the local Property Tax Appeal Board before the state Property Tax Appeal Board can hear the appeal. I would be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #5 be adopted?' All in favor say 'aye'; opposed, 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Rossi: "Floor Amendment #6, offered by Representative Weaver."

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Weaver."

This Amendment also was brought Weaver: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. to me by the Property Tax Appeal Board. It's a little bit more intricate, but for the state Property Tax Appeal Board to have jurisdiction over an appeal, it one; must it must two; present the evidence that was part of the appeal at the local property board appeal, three; it establishes some fees. Twenty five dollars per parcel of residential or residential and farm and commercial property where the reduction is from \$100,000 to \$300,000 or \$50 per parcel if the commercial industry property EAV change is for more than \$300,000. I would be happy to answer any questions."

63rd Legislative Day

May 21, 1993

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Dunn."

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

As Sponsor of legislation, I rise in opposition to the Amendment. This is a major fee increase in the area of farmland assessment, and it is not the subject of legislation which was introduced in January, February, March, April or May. It is legislation which surfaced by this Amendment, which is filed yesterday. So, this is a major, major increase in fees. It affects a lot of people, and I think we should defeat this Amendment. So, I hope that..."

Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #6 be adopted?' All in favor say 'aye'; opposed, 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the Amendment's adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Rossi: "No further Amendments?"

Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. Senate Bill 571. The Bill's on Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 571, a Bill for an Act amending the Civil Administrative Code of Illinois. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Cross."

Cross: "Speaker, can I move this back to Second?"

Speaker McPike: "Yes. The Gentleman asks leave to return it to Second Reading. Leave is granted. The Bill's on Second.

Any Amendments?"

Clerk RossI: "Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Cross."

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Cross."

Cross: "I'd like to withdraw Floor Amendment #2 as well as Floor
Amendment #3."

Speaker McPike: "The Gentleman withdraws Amendments #2 and

63rd Legislative Day

May 21, 1993

Amendment #3. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Rossi: "Floor Amendment #4, offered by Representative Cross."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Cross."

Cross: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Floor Amendment #4 is an effort between management and labor. It's an approved Amendment between labor and management that amends the industrial training program. It removes the limitation of assisting only manufacturers and now includes all employers, adds labor organizations as agencies or organizations that are eligible for grants, and adds a grant monitoring requirement. I don't know of any opposition to this Amendment, and I'd ask that it be passed."

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

Clerk Rossi: "No further Amendments."

Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. (Senate Bill) 579. Bill's on Second Reading. Bill's on Third Reading. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk. The Gentleman asks leave to return to Second Reading. Mr. Mautino, is that correct? I'm sorry, it's Deering's Bill. Mr. Deering's Bill. Leave is granted. The Bill's on Second Reading. Any Amendments?"

Clerk Rossi: "Floor Amendment #4, offered by Representative Hicks."

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Hicks."

Hicks: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #4 to this Bill, is the Bill that provides for fair treatment for distributors...for liquor distributors in Illinois. This Bill sets forth a number of

63rd Legislative Day

May 21, 1993

things that deal with the Spirits Act, wine is out of this Bill, it's no longer in this Bill as originally it was a problem that we had. We started working on this Bill about a year ago for everybody's clarification. Earlier on in the year we had meetings on this, attempting to get to some agreements. We were unable to do so. One of the problems was wine, as I believe Representative Wojcik has a problem with. That's no longer in the Bill. I'd be happy to try to answer any question anyone may have."

Speaker McPike: "And on that Motion, Representative Hartke."

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

Speaker McPike: "Yes."

Hartke: "Representative Hicks, does this set up a sort of territories, like we have in the beer distribution business now?"

Hicks: "No Sir, it doesn't necessarily set up territories. It simply sets up a relationship in which businesses that have been in business for generations here in Illinois would have a basis by which a fair market value might be set for their product."

Hartke: "Does this set up franchise areas?"

Hicks: "No Sir, it does not."

Hartke: "You're sure, Representative Hicks."

Hicks: "Yes Sir, I am."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Tom Johnson."

Johnson, Tom: "Yes, a question to the Chair. Is this Amendment germane? I noticed that this deals with the motor vehicle franchise."

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Parliamentarian, is this Amendment germane?

Yes, proceed. The question is 'Shall Amendment #4 be
adopted?' All in favor say 'aye'; opposed, 'no'. The
'ayes' have it. The question is 'Shall Amendment #4 be

63rd Legislative Day

May 21, 1993

adopted?' All in favor say 'aye'; opposed, 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Listen, no one asked for a Roll Call on that. No, a lot of people out here screaming, but no one asked for a Roll Call on that, and there's a lot a people screaming at the Chair, maybe we should call the nurses station to get her over here. All right. Representative Dart."

Dart: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. I'd ask if the Parliamentarian to rule under 36(d) if this Bill would go back to Second Reading, First Legislative Day, because it changes the title."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Dart."

Dart: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I withdraw that request, and yes
I object to this being heard on Third today."

Speaker McPike: "All right. The Gentleman is within his right, the Bill was moved from Third to Second. The Gentleman objects to it being heard on Third Reading today and in order to waive that rule requires 71 votes. Are there any more Amendments filed, Mr. Clerk?"

Clerk Rossi: "No further Amendments."

Speaker McPike: "All right, Third Reading. Now it requires 71 votes to overturn Representative Dart's request. Does anyone make that Motion? Mr. Deering."

Deering: "Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend Rule 36(d), and ask that that Bill be heard today."

Speaker McPike: "The Gentleman moves to suspend Rule 36(d) which requires 71 votes. No, that's not 36(d). Let's find the rule for you. That's 37(d). The Gentleman moves to suspend rule 37(d) which requires 71 votes, and on that, Mr. Ryder."

Ryder: "Inquiry of the Chair?"

Speaker McPike: "Yes."

63rd Legislative Day

May 21, 1993

Ryder: "I heard the Speaker indicate that it'd been moved to Third Reading."

Speaker McPike: "Yes."

- Ryder: "Then please interpret for me the Motion about...on which we are about to vote, for those of us who wish for it to stay on Second Reading."
- Speaker McPike: "No, it's on Third Reading. But, the objection was...the rules says that if it goes from Third to Second and back to Third after being amended, that it requires 71 votes to be heard, and Mr. Dart reminded us of that rule, and Mr. Deering has moved to suspend that rule. So, if you want the Bill heard now, you vote with Mr. Deering. It requires 71 votes. If you won't want the Bill to be heard today, you vote against Mr. Deering's Motion."

Ryder: "Thank you, that was the explanation I needed."

- Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall Representative Deering prevail?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'.

 Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Now, I have some people wishing to speak on this. This Motion's got 28 votes, and it needs 71. Representative Mautino."
- Mautino: "I'd like to see some more green votes on there for this reason, there are businesses throughout the State of Illinois from Chicago down to southern Illinois that are losing jobs, and what's happening right now in the industry is consolidations. What happens with this Bill is final..."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Mautino, I think you're addressing the Bill and not the Motion. So, you're allowed to address the Motion. The Motion is to suspend Rule 37(d)."
- Mautino: "On this Motion, this deserves to be heard today and is vital to people throughout your districts, and I would

63rd Legislative Day

May 21, 1993

appreciate seeing more green votes up there, for Deering's home run."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Black."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in support of Representative Deering's Motion. There were four people in the back of the chambers yesterday, none of these people will be business if this Bill isn't heard today, because this is deadline. If you want your businesses owned by a rather large aggressive individual from Indianapolis, continue to vote 'no'. If you want Illinois businesses to have a fair shot at staying in business, paying taxes and employing your people, then I suggest you vote 'yes'."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Hicks."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of Hicks: the House. Motion. Τo the Ι agree absolutely Representative Black, in the fact that this is a difference between those people in your home towns who own businesses and those people have foreign ownership that come in here and tell us how we're going to do business in Illinois. If you want to keep jobs in Illinois, and I mean that very sincerely, you'll vote for this to have this Bill heard, so we can debate it properly. If you don't do that, then you're voting for those businesses that come into Illinois only other states but from other lands whether that be Canada or whether it be from Britain, and I urge your consideration to hear full debate on this Bill today."

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 39 'ayes' and 72 'noes', and Representative Deering's Motion fails. Bill 252. Is it on

63rd Legislative Day

May 21, 1993

Second Reading or Third? It's on Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 252, a Bill for an Act to create the Private Detective, Private Alarm and Private Security Act of 1993. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Steczo."

Steczo: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Senate Bill 252 is the rewrite of the Private Detective and Security Act, and it was amended earlier today to include language on the disciplinary provisions of the Illinois Landscape Architecture Act and some technical cleanup of the Collection Agency Act. The fees and other items that are in this Bill, have been agreed to by the security alarm people and by the Department of Professional Regulation. I would answer any questions and now would ask for an 'aye' vote on Senate Bill 252."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Pankau."

Pankau: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker McPike: "Yes."

Pankau: "Representative, I have had several phone calls from some locksmiths in my district, and they were telling me that, and bear with me, because I'm not exactly up to speed on this. But, often times in the back of stores they have these exit doors, and they have a thing that will flash if you go out the exit door and they have a sign there that says, 'don't...don't use this door, an alarm will sound if you go out this door'. Their understanding is that they could not they presently are able to install that sort of system in with other locks and things that they do. My understanding from them is that they would not be able to install that and the price would rise dramatically because now a security system would have...a security firm would

63rd Legislative Day

May 21, 1993

have to come in and install that, and then it would have to be monitored. So, if someone accidentally went out the door even though it was marked then they would call the security firm and then it would be added to the businesses bill. Is that correct or not?"

Steczo: "Representative, let me answer your question in two ways.

We noticed this week that there was a technical error in the drafting of the original Bill. Amendment #4 made a change in the law that changed an 'or' with an 'and'. We feel that what that does is narrows the definition to exclude a lot of the locksmiths that have had problems. Should that not completely do it, there is an agreement between the people, the private detectives and security people and the Department of Professional Regulation, that the rules will be implemented to make certain that no locksmith in the State of Illinois is placed in jeopardy. The intention of this Act is not to put locksmiths out of business. Whatever we need to do to guarantee that and to clarify that, will be done."

Pankau: "Okay, I don't think they were concerned about being placed out of business, I think they were..."

Steczo: "Yeah, but that's what they told us."

Pankau: "I think they were concerned about having a portion of their market taken away from them and put over to just the security firms."

Steczo: "The intention is not to inhibit what they do currently.

So, if this language is not doing, although we feel it

does then the department will provide for the rules and
regulations necessary to be able to protect them."

Pankau: "Do I have your commitment on that?"

Steczo: "Absolutely, and I've given that to the locksmiths already myself."

63rd Legislative Day

May 21, 1993

Pankau: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Inquiry of the Clerk. Please tell us what Amendments have been adopted."

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Rossi: "Amendments #2, 3 and 4."

Ryder: "I'm sorry, I didn't hear that."

Speaker McPike: "Amendments #2, 3 and 4 have been adopted."

Ryder: "Thank you."

Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 252 pass?'

All those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?

The Clerk will take the record. On this Motion, there's 107 'ayes', 3 'noes'. Senate Bill 252, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 345. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 345, a Bill for an Act amending the Metropolitan Pier and Exposition Authority Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Steczo."

Steczo: "Thank you Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. λs amended, Senate Bill 345 makes some changes to the Rural Bond Bank Act, which provides additional counties that will the services provided by that. eligible for Makes...increases the debt ceiling from \$100 million that was offered by language million. Adds Representative Currie on access to McCormick Place, and also language that was offered by Representative Turner, which provides for appointments to the Advisory Board of McCormick Place if a...a substitution provision where, if appointments are not made at a given time, then the board will provide those appointments. So, the bond bank and

63rd Legislative Day

May 21, 1993

those couple of Amendments relating to McCormick Place are what is in the Bill. Mr. Speaker, I would answer any question Members might have. If not, would ask for an affirmative vote on the passage of Senate Bill 345."

- Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 345 pass?'
 All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all
 voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the
 record. On this Motion, there's 107 'ayes', 1 'no'.
 Senate Bill 345, having received a Constitutional...
 Representative Giorgi. Senate Bill 345, having received a
 Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr.
 Giorgi."
- Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, so that Representative Deering can proceed with Senate Bill 579, we, we...he would like me to reconsider the vote by which Amendment..."
- Speaker McPike: "Senate Bill 579. Mr. Clerk, put the Bill on the board. All right. This Bill is on Third Reading. Representative Deering asks for leave to return to Second Reading. Leave is granted. The Bill's on Second Reading. Mr. Giorgi."
- Giorgi: "Mr. Speaker, he's gonna move to a table..."
- Speaker McPike: "No, you are. You voted on the prevailing side.

 Mr. Deering, either one can move. Mr. Deering voted on the prevailing side of Amendment #4. Mr. Clerk, Amendment #4?

 Amendment #4 was adopted. Mr. Deering voted on the prevailing side. He'd like to reconsider the vote by which Amendment #4 was adopted. All in favor of the Gentleman's Motion, which in affect tables the Amendment. All those in favor of the Gentleman's Motion say 'aye'; opposed, 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the Motion carries. Amendment #4 is tabled. No. Amendment #4, the vote on that by which it was adopted is reconsidered. Now the Gentleman moves to

63rd Legislative Day

May 21, 1993

withdraw Amendment #4. Amendment #4 is withdrawn. On the Motion to reconsider the vote, on the Motion to reconsider the vote, on Amendment #4, hearing no objections the Attendance Roll Call will be used. Hearing no objections, the Attendance Roll Call will be used and the Motion carries. The Gentleman... The vote is reconsidered. The Gentleman now withdraws Amendment #4. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Rossi: "No further Amendments?"

Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, what Amendments are on this Bill?"

Clerk Rossi: "No Amendments have been adopted to the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Senate Bill 383. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 383, a Bill for an Act amending the Security Deposit Interest Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Lang."

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move passage of Senate Bill 383 as it is now. It's an agreement between the realtors and large apartment buildings, relative to payment of finders fees to tenants. It's also an agreement with tenant associations as to how a security deposit will be calculated and paid to tenants. I believe it's an agreed Bill. I move passage."

Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 383 pass?'
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's 116 'ayes' and 'no' nays. Senate Bill 383, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 558. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 558, a Bill for an Act in relation to taxation. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Levin."

63rd Legislative Day

May 21, 1993

Levin: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Bill 558 is the recodification of the Revenue Code. It's the result of two years of efforts under the auspices of the Department of Revenue, involving virtually everybody who has ever had any interest in property taxes. It makes no substantive changes in the Act. It simply rewrites things to put them in English. It is the first phase of the review of the Revenue Code. There will, hopefully, be a second phase where we will look at the substantive things. There were two Amendments that were put on in the House, both of which are purely technical in nature. There is no opposition that we know of to any provision of this Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, on Senate Amendment #3, I wonder if the Gentleman could tell us why we are passing legislation to authorize park districts to issue general obligation bonds without direct referendum?"

Speaker McPike: "Representative Levin."

Levin: "It's my understanding that that language got dropped from the earlier version of the Bill, and it was put back in by that Amendment in the Senate."

Skinner: "Well, that certainly does make this non-controversial."

Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 558.

Representative Kubik."

Kubik: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. I would...I realize the objection of the previous speaker that it's all ready in the Code, so we are not making any changes with respect to the substance of the Code. That particular provision as I recall was dropped as a...because it was of a drafting error. So, we're not making any substantive changes in the Code. This is simply a recodification. I know of no opposition. I

63rd Legislative Day

May 21, 1993

would urge the Membership to support this Bill."

- Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 558 pass.

 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's 110 'ayes', 4 'noes'. Senate Bill 558, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 579. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 579, a Bill for an Act amending the
 Motor Vehicle Franchise Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

 Speaker McPike: "Representative Deering."
- Deering: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. What this Bill now does is it amends the Vehicle Franchise Act. It provides that a motorcycle dealer has a security interest in repurchase inventory, to secure payment to the dealer of the repurchase amount. I ask for a favorable Roll Call."
- Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 579 pass?'
 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's 115 'ayes', 0 'nays'.
 Senate Bill 579, having received a Constitutional Majority,
 is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 664. Mr. Clerk,
 read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 664, a Bill for an Act in relation to meals for the elderly. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Kubik."

Rubik: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill is the Check-Off Bill which has Representative Levin's Amendment, which includes the following check-offs. The breast and cervical cancer research fund, the Illinois Special Olympics fund, The Ryan White pediatrics and adult Aids fund, and an alternative

63rd Legislative Day

May 21, 1993

check-off which will...may be added if one of the others falls off, and that's the Meals on Wheels fund. My understanding is this a bipartisan agreement, and would move its adoption."

Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 664 pass?'
All those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Have all
voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the
record. This Motion there are 117 'ayes'; 1 'no'. Senate
Bill 664, having received a Constitutional Majority, is
hereby declared passed. (Senate Bill) 798, Representative
Daniels Bill. Do you want that called today? No. (Senate
Bill) 433, Mr. Turner. Mr. Turner here? (Senate Bill)
289, Mr. Homer. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 289, a Bill for an Act amending the Code of Civil Procedure. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Homer."

Homer: "I'd ask leave to return the Bill to Second Reading."

Speaker McPike: "The Gentleman asks leave to return to Second Reading. Leave is granted. The Bill's on Second Reading.

Any Amendments?"

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

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Homer."

Homer: "The House Amendment #1 is a product of a request from the Credit Union League and also from the Legal Services Support Center of Illinois having to do with the time limits within which wage garnishment and nonwage garnishment certified notices can be filed, and ⁷ would move its adoption."

Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #1 be adopted?' All in favor say 'aye'; opposed, 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the Amendment is adopted. Further

63rd Legislative Day

May 21, 1993

Amendments?"

Clerk Rossi: "No further Amendments."

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

Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 289, a Bill for an Act amending the Code of Civil Procedure. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Homer."

Homer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill provides that in counties other than Cook, that for the purpose of serving a summons for a garnishment or wage deduction, that it be may be done by registered or certified mail in lieu of service by a sheriff, and I would answer questions. The purpose of the Bill is to streamline the process and to reduce the costs involved for both the plaintiff and the judgement debtor, and um..."

Speaker McPike: "It appears like there's no opposition to this Bill. The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' 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's 112 'ayes', 1 'no'. Senate Bill 289, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 706, Mr. Capparelli. Is Capparelli here? Let the record reflect on Senate Bill 289, Representative Woolard intended to vote 'aye'. Senate Bill 387, Mr. Kubik. Senate Bill 522, Representative Daniels. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 522, a Bill for an Act in relation to fuels. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Kubik. Mr. Clerk, are there Amendment adopted on this?"

Clerk Rossi: "Amendment #1 has been adopted to the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Kubik."

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

63rd Legislative Day

May 21, 1993

House. This is a shell Bill. We'd like to send it back to the Senate to continue discussions with Senator Philip on this issue. So,..."

Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 522 pass?'

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's 65 'ayes', 39 'noes'. Senate Bill 522, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative Moseley."

Mosley: "I wish to be recorded as a 'no' vote on that last one."

Speaker McPike: "Let the record reflect that Representative

Moseley intended to vote 'no' on Senate Bill 522. (Senate

Bill) 798. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill. This Bill's been read a second time all ready. Are there any Amendments?"

Clerk Rossi: "No Floor Amendments."

Speaker McPike: "No Floor Amendments. Are there any Committee Amendments on the Bill?"

Clerk Rossi: "Amendment #1 has been adopted to the Bill."

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

Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 798, a Bill for an Act to change the dates of the general primary election and certain board of education elections. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill is now a vehicle. It does not contain substance for the purposes of discussion and continuing any negotiations that might occur on this issue. I would ask that we move the Bill back to the Senate. It does contain the Committee Amendment which stripped out the contents and creates a vehicle."

Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 798 pass?'

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

63rd Legislative Day

May 21, 1993

- voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this Motion, there are 92 'ayes', 12 'noes'. Senate Bill 798, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 990. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 990, a Bill for an Act amending the Fire Protection District Act. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative McGuire."
- McGuire: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We talked to this Bill a little while ago, and the Bill 990 has to do with the volunteer fireman, and there were some Amendments that were dropped off and I think that the Bill... Thank you."
- Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall this Bill pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this Motion, there are 112 'ayes', 0 'nays'. Senate Bill 990, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 571. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 571, a Bill for an Act amending the Civil Administrative Code of Illinois. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker McPike: "Mr. Clerk, have you read the Bill?

 Representative Cross."
- Cross: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm not aware of any opposition to this Bill. It's an...all three components of this Bill are agreed upon by labor and management. The first portion of this Bill reinstates funding for six local labor management committees that are currently funded by DECCA. The second portion of this Bill creates the State Export Promotion Coordinating Act on an Amendment provided by Representative DeJaegher, and the third, Amendment #4 that

63rd Legislative Day

May 21, 1993

I talked about a few moments ago, amends the industrial training program Amendment or Act and if you have any questions, I'd be glad to try to answer them."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Granberg."

Granberg: "Representative, is this the...does this contain the

Amendments that DECCA talked about, there is an agreement
between labor and management on this?"

Cross: "Amendment #4 is the agreement between labor and management."

Granberg: "I didn't see that Gentleman behind you. So,.."

Cross: "I'm sorry."

Granberg: "Will the Senate Sponsor concur with the Amendments?"

Cross: "As far as I know. Yes."

Granberg: "Thank you."

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Granberg, are you satisfied? The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 571 pass? All those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this Motion, there's 112 'ayes' and 0 'nays'. Senate Bill 571, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate Bill 677. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 677, a Bill for an Act concerning nursing homes. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Rutherford."

Rutherford: "Ask leave of the Body to move it to Second please."

Speaker McPike: "The Gentleman asks leave to return it to Second Reading. Leave is granted. The Bill's on Second Reading. What is your pleasure, Sir?"

Rutherford: "To table Amendment #5."

Speaker McPike: "Representative von Bergen Wessels, that's your Amendment?"

63rd Legislative Day

- May 21, 1993
- von Bergen Wessels: "Yes it is, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to table
 it."
- Speaker McPike: "The Lady moves to table Amendment #5. All in favor say 'aye'; opposed, 'no'. The 'ayes' have it.

 Amendment #5 is tabled. Further Motions? Mr. Rutherford."
- Rutherford: "Ask leave to move to Third for immediate consideration."
- Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 677, a Bill for an Act concerning nursing homes. Third Reading of the Bill."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Rutherford."
- Rutherford: "Thank you. Senate Bill 677, the one sentence that's my part of the Bill, basically says that a long term care provider shall no longer be able to appose administrative charges of any kind on an individual account because of any type of an assessment. There are two other Amendments that are still on it. Representative Wojcik's, in regards to osteoporosis and education, and Representative DeJaegher's in regards to pharmaceutical product rebates. I'd ask for a favorable consideration."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Ryder, on the Motion."
- Ryder: "Does this Senate Bill 677 prevent a long term care provider from including on a residents bill the \$6.30 per resident per day tax imposed by the General Assembly last July?"
- Rutherford: "It does not prevent them from putting the tax on, but it does prevent them from passing on any type of administrative charges to implement that program."
- Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 677 pass?'

 All those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Have all

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

 The Clerk will take the record. On this Motion, there's

63rd Legislative Day

May 21, 1993

117 'ayes', 0 'nays'. Senate Bill 677. On this Motion. there are 117 'ayes', 0 'nays'. Senate Bill 677, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared Allowing Clerk passed. the perfunctory time, Representative Granberg now moves that the House stands adjourned until next Monday...until next Monday at the hour 3:00 p.m. Three, 3:00 p.m. All those in favor of the Motion say 'aye'; opposed, 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and except for perfunctory time, the House now stands adjourned."

"Messages from the Senate by Clerk McLennand: Mr. Harry, Secretary. 'Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House Representatives that the Senate has concurred with the House of Representatives in the passage of the Bills of the following title to wit; together with the Amendments thereto, in the adoption of which I'm instructed ask the concurrence of the House, to wit; House Bills 1816, 1821, 1854, 1886, 2053, 2062, 2123, 2152, passed the Senate as amended May 21, 1993. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has concurred with the House of Representatives in the passage the following Bills of the following title, together with the attached Amendments thereto, adoption of which I'm instructed to ask the concurrence of the House, to wit; House Bills 917, 1243, 1244, 1245, 1246, 1247, 1489, 1507, 1525, 1693, 1721, 1746, 1787, 1885, 2203, passed the Senate as amended May 21, 1993. Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has concurred with the House of Representatives in the passage of the Bills of the following title, to wit; together with the attached Amendments thereto, and the adoption of which I'm instructed to ask the concurrence of

63rd Legislative Day

May 21, 1993

the House, to wit; House Bills 1092, 1126, 1163, 1203, 1235, 1256, 1300, 1313, 1316, passed the Senate as amended May 21, 1993. Committee Report. Committee report on Rules has met, and pursuant to Rule 14(a)6, Bills referred pursuant to Rule 79. The Rules Committee recommends consideration in the Bills referred to the order of Concurrence: House Bills 45, 184, 299, 328, 462, 554, 641, 819, 967, 980, 1261, 1374, 1392, 1411, 1427, 1498, 1575, 1637, 1642, 1739, 1778, 2163, 2242, 2375. Committee Report is offered by Chairman of Rules, Frank Giglio. Being no further business, the House Perfunctory Session stands adjourned, and the House will reconvene on Monday, May 24, at the hour of 3:00 p.m."

RT: TIFLDAY

STATE OF ILLINOIS 88TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES DAILY TRANSCRIPTION OF DEBATE INDEX

93/10/07 09:49:44

MAY 21, 1993

H3-1553 MOTION	PAGE	6
HB-1852 MOTION	PAGE	22
SB-0025 THIRD READING	PAGE	92
SA-0031 SECOND READING	PAGE	18
SB-0031 THIRD READING	PAGE	21
SE-0047 SECOND READING	PAGE	94
SB-0047 THIRD READING	PAGE	108
SB-0091 RECALLED	PAGE	123
S3-0091 THIRD READING	PAGE	131
SB-0118 THIRD READING	PAGE	15
SB-0142 THIRD READING	PAGE	52
SU-0157 RECALLED	PAGE	10
SB-0157 THIRD READING	PAGE	132
SB-0227 SECOND READING	PAGE	141
S3-0227 THIRD READING	PAGE	142
SB-0240 THIRD READING	PAGE	27
SB-0246 HELD ON SECOND	PAGE	62
SE-0246 THIRD READING	PAGE	133
SB-0252 SECOND READING	PAGE	116
S3-0252 THIRD READING	PAGE	160
SB-0262 THIRD READING SB-0289 RECALLED	PAGE	17
S3-0289 THIRD READING	PAGE	167
SB-0290 SECOND READING	PAGE Page	168
SB-0290 THIRD READING	PAGE	25 51
S3-0319 SECOND READING	PAGE	13
SB-0319 THIRD READING	PAGE	14
SB-0345 HELD ON SECOND	PAGE	125
SB-0345 THIRD READING	PAGE	162
S8-0345 OUT OF RECORD	PAGE	126
S3-0371 THIRD READING	PAGE	49
SB-0383 HELD ON SECOND	PAGE	130
SB-0383 THIRD READING	PAGE	164
SB-0411 THIRD READING	PAGE	16
SB-0436 SECOND READING	PAGE	37
SB-0436 THIRD READING	PAGE	79
SJ-0473 SECOND READING	PAGE	38
SB-0473 THIRD READING	PAGE	38
SB-0483 THIRD READING	PAGE	63
SE-0498 SECOND READING	PAGE	117
SB-0498 THIRD READING	PAGE	119
SB-0503 SECOND READING	PAGE	26
SB-0503 THIRD READING	PAGE	80
SB-0522 THIRD READING	PAGE	168
S3-0546 SECOND READING	PAGE	6
SB-0546 THIRD READING	PAGE	7
SB-0552 SECOND READING	PAGE	144
SB-0558 SECOND READING	PAGE	150119
SB-0558 THIRD READING	PAGE	165
SD-0560 RECALLED	PAGE	138
SB-0560 THIRD READING	PAGE	140
SB-0571 RECALLED	PAGE	154
SB-0571 THIRD READING SB-0579 RECALLED	PAGE PAGE	170 155
SB-0579 THIRD READING SB-0586 SECOND READING	PAGE Page	166 7
SB-0586 THIRD READING	PAGE	81
SB-0591 MOTION	PAGE	129
SB-0594 THIRD READING	PAGE	57
SB-0606 MOTION	PAGE	129
SH-0617 SECOND READING	PAGE	40
SB-0617 THIRD READING	PAGE	133
SB-0627 SECOND READING	PAGE	12
SB-0627 THIRD READING	PAGE	13

T: TIFLDAY E: 002

STATE OF ILLINOIS 88TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES DAILY TRANSCRIPTION OF DEBATE INDEX

93/10/07 09:49:44

MAY 21, 1993

SB-0650	SECOND READING	PAGE	43
SB-0650	THIRD READING	PAGE	84
SB-0664	SECOND READING	PAGE	124
SB-0664	THIRD READING	PAGE	166
SB-0677	RECALLED	PAGE	56
SB-0677	RECALLED	PAGE	171
\$8-0677	THIRD READING	PAGE	172
S3-0678	THIRD READING	PAGE	64
SB-0707	RECALLED	PAGE	50
SB-0707	THIRD READING	PAGE	88
S3-0712	THIRD READING	PAGE	75
SB-0764	THIRD READING	PAGE	11
SB-0778	SECOND READING	PAGE	120
SB-0778	THIRD READING	PAGE	134
SB-0798	SECOND READING	PAGE	169
SB-0798	THIRD READING	PAGE	169
SB-0828	THIRD READING	PAGE	122
SB-0830	SECOND READING	PAGE	85
S3-0830	THIRD READING	PAGE	136
58-0830	DISCUSSED	PAGE	141
SB-0869	THIRD READING	PAGE	65
Su-0870	SECOND READING	PAGE	23
\$8-0870	THIRD READING	PAGE	23
SB-0926	SECOND READING	PAGE	44
S3-0926	THIRD READING	PAGE	89
SB-0935	SECOND READING	PAGE	90
SB-0935	THIRD READING	PAGE	135
SB-0940	THIRD READING	PAGE	76
SB-0990	RECALLED	PAGE	143
	THIRD READING	PAGE	170
	SECOND READING	PAGE	47
SB-1068	THIRD READING	PAGE	47

SUBJECT MATTER

HOUSE TO ORDER - SPEAKER MCPIKE PAGE	1
PRAYER - REVEREND CHARLES LYONS PAGE	1
PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE PAGE	1
ROLL CALL FOR ATTENDANCE PAGE	1
MESSAGES FROM SENATE PAGE	2
AGREED RESOLUTIONS PAGE	2
GENERAL RESOLUTIONS PAGE	4
DEATH RESOLUTIONS PAGE	5
REPRESENTATIVE STECZO IN CHAIR PAGE	19
REPRESENTATIVE CURRIE IN CHAIR PAGE	88
REPRESENTATIVE MCPIKE IN CHAIR PAGE	114
ADJOURNMENT PAGE	173
PERFUNCTORY SESSION PAGE	173
PERFUNCTORY SESSION ADJOURNMENT PAGE	174