67th Legislative Day

Mag . . '93

Speaker McPike: "The House will come to the The Tour 11 come to order. The Chaplain for large in the ohn Kiefer of Zion Lutheran Church in Roman." "Inois. Reverend Kiefer is the guest of Represent. "The guests in the balcony may wish to rise and join us for the invocation."

Kiefer: "May we bow our heads in prayer to Almighty God. Gracious heavenly Father, God of all creator of the universe that we allow in, we ask Your direction and Your guidance today, for ε^{\pm} of the officials of this great state; to lead this State by Your word, to make wise and intelligent decisions based upon the word of God. As there is no authority except from almighty God, we ask for God's blessings today, and in this great State where Abraham Lincoln led the calle of freedom that we live for. May we be blessed by almighty God. We also certainly ask our blessings today upon all of who labor in this country to serve the government. Be with them in times of stress and trouble, and we also thank You and this God, for Your son Christ, our Lord, who died and rose again for our salvation. We ask for the Holy Spiri bless us and give us Christian patience and understaall that we do. To Christ, we pray. Amen."

Speaker McPike: "We'll be led in the Pledge of Allegiance ...
Representative Pankau."

Pankau - 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...Kubik."

Representative Bernard - Forsen is excused due to illness

67th Legislative Day

May 27, 1993

today."

- Speaker McPike: "Thank you. Representative Currie."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. Let the record reflect that there are no excused absences among House Democrats today."
- Speaker McPike: "Mr. Clerk, take the record. 117 Members answering a Roll Call, a quorum is present. Representative Wennlund, for what reason do you rise?"
- Wennlund: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr Speaker, I move to table the Motion to reconsider the vote by which HJR 9 was adopted, and Mr. Speaker, on this Motion, I request a record vote pursuant to Rule 55. I'm joined by Representative Black, Representative Tenhouse, Representative Hassert, and Representative...Stephens. And that Motion takes precedent, Mr. Speaker, over anv other Motions, and over the Motion to reconsider."
- Speaker McPike: "Thank you, Mr. Wennlund. We're not on that Order of Business at this time."
- Wennlund: "Mr. Speaker..."
- Speaker McPike: "So, your point is not well taken. When we get to that Order, you will be recognized."
- Wennlund: "A Motion can be made at any time...Speaker...Speaker...a Motion can be made at any time to table. That's what the rules provide. It doesn't have to be on Special Order....rules...a Motion can be made at any time, provides..."
- Speaker McPike: "I don't know. I thought you were gonna make a ruling here. The House will stand at ease. Representative Granberg."
- Granberg: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Could I have the attention of the Ladies and Gentlemen on this side of the aisle briefly. Ladies and Gentlemen, we have two young ladies here who brought food for some Representative, and they're not sure

67th Legislative Day

May 27, 1993

who they brought it for. We have ham and swiss on whole wheat, potato salad. Those two ladies right here."

Speaker McPike: "The House will come to order. State Operations, Special Order, Third Reading, Senate Bill 301. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 301, a Bill for an Act amending the River Boat Gambling Act. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Speaker Madigan."

Madigan: "Mr. Speaker, this Amendment was adopted yesterday. Amendment becomes the Bill, and once again, there are two elements in the Bill. One, would be language submitted by the Governor, which would prohibit a board member or an employee of the Illinois Gaming Board from leaving the Board, either as a member or as an employee, and then accepting employment within three years with a licensee or accepting employment representing an application for a license, and then secondly, there's additional language that would provide for an alternative method of considering and granting a license as such that...where there are multiple applications for licensure, those license applications and applicants can be put into competition where they can demonstrate to local communities precisely what they propose to do for the local community that will host the gambling. Those commitments can be reduced contractu...to contracts. There can be contractual arrangements between the license applicant and the community, and then those contractual arrangements can be enforced by the Gaming Board at the time of the renewal of the license. Mr. Speaker, I move for the passage of the Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Speaker Madigan has moved for the passage of Senate Bill 301, and on that, Representative Wennlund."

67th Legislative Day

May 27, 1993

Wennlund: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Before the Chair announced the House was standing in recess, I had a Motion pending, and I think the Chair could show some consideration to the attention of the Motion, which can be made at any time, and dealt with at that time, and must be dealt with before anything else can be considered."

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Wennlund, the Chair told you that we would get back to it, and the Chair will do that."

Wennlund: "I apologize. I did not hear that, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker McPike: "Yes, when we get to that Order, we will... We will get back there."

Wennlund: "Thank you."

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Black, on this Motion."

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

Speaker McPike: "Yes."

Black: "Thank you. Mr. Speaker, this is...all I'd like to do for the record is to have you repeat what you said yesterday. It is your clear intent that Senator Philip sponsor this in the Senate, and then it go for the Governor's desk, hopefully, within a matter of hours, and that this remain a...a very solid proposal for ethics in the river boat gaming industry?"

Madigan: "Mr. Black, I believe that Mr. Tom Dunn is the Senate Sponsor. I'm not positive on that, but I was in a meeting with Senator Philip this morning, and I told him of this Bill, and I...I asked, in front of witnesses, that he concur in the Amendment."

Black: "Thank you very much."

Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 301 pass?'.

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

67th Legislative Day

May 27, 1993

record. On this Motion, there's 112 'ayes' and no 'nays'.

Senate Bill 301, having received the Constitutional

Majority, is hereby declared passed."

- Speaker Madigan: "The Chair recognizes Mr. McPike. Will the Members please give their attention to Mr. McPike?"
- McPike: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise on a Point of Order. I would question whether or not the procedural requirements had...were met yesterday in regards to HJR 9 and SJR 14, and I question whether or not that those two Resolutions were adopted."
- Speaker Madigan: "In response to the Gentleman's inquiry, the ruling of the Chair shall be as follows: The action taken yesterday regarding House Joint Resolution 9 and Senate Joint Resolution 14 was invalid, and were not sufficient to cause the Resolutions to be adopted because the procedural requirements of the statutes and our rules were not met accordingly. Those Resolutions are not adopted, and will be returned to the Calendar Order of Speaker's Table. Chapter 605 states in part, 'Prior to the issuance of bonds for, or the commencement of construction of any new toll highway, however, that particular toll highway shall be authorized Joint Resolution of the General Assembly.' bv Resolution (sic-Rule) 43c provides, 'The following types of Resolutions shall not be subject to the Agreed Resolution procedures, and shall be adopted only on a Record Roll Call Vote by 60 Members; those calling for an expenditure of funds.' I have reviewed the transcript of yesterday's proceedings and it provides, with regard to House Joint Resolution 9, 'Speaker Dunn: The Gentleman moves adoption of House Resolution 9 and Senate Joint 22...excuse me, strike 22 and that shall read 14. On the question, those in favor of the Motion, signify by saying 'aye',

67th Legislative Day

May 27, 1993

those opposed by saying 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and House Joint Resolution 9 and Senate Joint Resolution 14 are adopted.' At a later time, the vote by which Senate Joint Resolution 22 was adopted, strike that again, 14, adopted, was reconsidered. With regard to Senate Joint Resolution 14, the transcript provides, 'Speaker Dunn: Gentleman moves for the adoption of Senate Joint Resolution 14. Those in favor of the Resolution signify by saying 'aye', those opposed by saying 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Resolution is adopted.' It is clear from the transcript that the Resolutions purported to be adopted by a voice vote, and not a Record Roll Call vote by 60 members accordingly. The action taken yesterday when concerning Senate Joint Resolution, did not result in the adoption of the Resolution, and the Resolution shall be returned to the Calendar Order of Speaker's Table, and that shall be ruling of the Chair. Mr. Wennlund."

"Thank you, Wennlund: Mr. Speaker. An inquiry of the Chair. I would ask the Chair...I've read HJR 9 many times. In fact, I was the original Sponsor of it. Where therein, does it call for the expenditure of any funds or for the issuance of any bonds? I think everybody knows that what this does is, converts FAB 341 over to the Toll Highway Authority, and from thereon, the Toll Highway Authority does whatever it wishes with it. This Resolution calls...does not call for the expenditure of any funds whatsoever, nor does it call for, or nor does it mention in there anywhere, it calls for the issuance of bonds. So therefore, it does not fall within the provisions of Rule 43c...and it correctly adopted, by a unanimous vote of this House of Representatives. It was put on the Calendar Democratic Majority. It was called by a Democratic

67th Legislative Day

May 27, 1993

Majority, and it was voted in favor of by the Democratic Majority and the Republican Minority. It was unanimous."

- Speaker Madigan: "Mr. Wennlund, with all due respect to your position, Sir. I don't plan to go beyond the statement that I read. I don't wish to be disrespectful to you, and I don't want you to misinterpret my comment, but I think you would understand that I don't plan to go beyond the statement that I read into the record."
- Wennlund: "So...what you're saying is, is that...here comes the heavy hand again...with just a ruling, without any merit whatsoever, because the Resolution can't be much simpler. It can't be much plainer. I can't possibly understand how the Chair could rule that this Resolution calls for the expenditure of funds, or the issuance of bonds, and I'd like that explained."
- Speaker Madigan: "Now, Mr. Wennlund, I...I don't wish to...unduely irritate you, but I think you understand I...I don't plan to go beyond the statement that I read."
- Wennlund: "Well, Mr. Speaker, in that event, I move that the Chair's ruling be overruled, and on that Motion, I request a Roll Call vote, and I am joined by Representative Black, Parke, Stephens..."

Speaker Madigan: "Fifty others."

Wennlund: "...Tenhouse, and...correct."

Speaker Madigan: "All right. On the question...on the question...on the question, 'Shall the Chair be overruled?'

Those in favor of overruling the Chair will vote 'aye', those against overruling the Chair will vote 'no'. The Clerk shall take the record. Tony, record Mr. McPike as 'no'. Mr. Black. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. Mr. Black."

Black: "Yes, thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and

67th Legislative Day

May 27, 1993

Gentlemen of the House. Pursuant to Rule 80, I am joined by Representative Wennlund and others on my side of the aisle to dissent respectfully from any action of the House they consider injurious to any individual or the public, and I would like to have our dissent entered upon the Journal at our request pursuant to Rule 80 because of the ruling of the Chair."

Speaker Madigan: "That shall be so ordered, and on this question, there are 51 'ayes' and 66 'noes', and the Motion fails.

The next matter shall be House Bill 1300, Mr. Parke, a Motion to concur in a Senate Amendment. Mr. Parke."

Parke: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of House. I urge you to support the concurrence of Senate Amendment 3 to House Bill 1300, which is the Parental Notice of Abortion Act. I would like to give a summary of what the Amendment does so the Body has knowledge of what this Amendment does. It adds the option of judicial waiver of notice if a judge finds by clear and convincing evidence that a waiver of notice is in the minor's best interest or that notice is unnecessary because the minor iα sufficiently well-informed and mature to make a decision. In addition, changes the penalty for physicians intentionally violate the Act from a Class A misdemeanor to civil offense of \$1,000 for the first violation and \$5,000 for each subsequent violation. Ι happen to have stacks of letters from physicians all over the state supporting that change in the legislation. It also allows judicial bypass procedures to track language upheld by the U.S. Supreme Court, and I might point out to the that Governor Edgar has indicated upon this agreement shown in this Amendment that he plans on signing this legislation when it gets to his desk."

67th Legislative Day

May 27, 1993

Speaker McPike: "Representative McPike, in the Chair. The Gentleman has moved to concur in Senate Amendment #3 to House Bill 1300, and this will be final action, and on the Gentleman's Motion, the Chair recognizes Representative Homer."

Homer: "Will the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker McPike: "Yes."

Homer: "Representative Parke, in reading your Bill, there's a Section 30 in your Amendment that talks about 'right of intervention', and as I read that section (you correct me if I'm wrong), this Amendment would allow any Illinois State's attorney (and we have 102 of them), to defend the constitutionality of this Act in any other...in any county in the state?"

Parke: "That is correct."

Homer: "So, in other words, just to take an example: If there was a ruling by a Peoria County judge that...that the Act was unconstitutional, then the Sangamon County State's attorney could defend the action even though the Peoria County State's attorney...did not wish to do so?"

Parke: "We're having trouble understanding. Could you just say it one more time, Representative?"

Homer: "All right. There's a...there's a ruling in Peoria County, a Peoria County judge rules the Act unconstitutional; the Peoria County State's attorney agrees and does not intervene or...or else accepts the ruling of the judge. You would allow any of the other State's attorneys, regardless of what county, to come in and defend that...Act...that ruling in the other county?"

Parke: "Thank you, Representative. That is not the intention of this legislation, and it is my understanding from counsel, that they do not have jurisdiction out of their own

67th Legislative Day

May 27, 1993

county."

Homer: "Well...well, Representative Parke, in all due respect to you Sir, I don't think that's the proper reading of that section. It says that, 'any State's attorney in any case in which the ex-constitutionality is challenged', it does not limit it, as does Section 25 to, 'counties in which the State's attorney has jurisdiction.' Clearly in Section 25, there's a limitation as to jurisdiction, in Section 30, there's no such limitation."

Parke: "Representative, in all due respect to you in which you have shown a knowledge of the law. that is an interpretation that you have made. That is not our interpretation of the law, and in addition, you are well aware that the courts will interpret that and that, that is not something that you and I can debate on here. That your opinion. That is not shared by us. You know and I know, that the courts will determine what that means."

Homer: "Well, I don't know how they can determine otherwise the way it so broadly worded. Now, let me ask you another question with regards to the penalties. You want to empower State's attorneys to...to file for civil penalties against physicians who perform an abortion with reckless disregard as to whether the person upon whom the abortion has been performed is a minor or an incompetent person. Let me just ask you, Sir, with regard to incompetent person. Under what circumstance would warrant a finding of reckless disregard with respect to whether a physician is aware of whether a person is incompetent?"

Parke: "Well, it's our intention that it would have to be intentional and that it would be proven in court that it was intentional and that it was reckless. And that again, Sir, is what the courts will determine. As you are well

67th Legislative Day

May 27, 1993

aware, and I will repeat again, that this will be challenged in the courts, and the courts will make these decisions. For you to show your knowledge of the law is impressive, but quite frankly, it does not matter what your impression of the law is. You will have one vote on that. The courts, ultimately, Sir, will determine whether or not that holds water or is not true."

Homer: "Well, Representative Parke, that's a novel argument we here in the Legislature should disregard the language of the Bills upon which we're called upon to act, and that, Sir, I think is a preposterous statement. Mr. Speaker, the Bill...to the Amendment. I am one who supports the concept of parental notification; however, this Amendment that's before us is seriously flawed. It's flawed because imposes on State's attorneys some unwarranted and unwanted responsibilities. It would allow the attorney of any county in this state to defend an action in I know of no precedent in any other county of the state. any other provision of the statutes that would so State's attorneys. That is a serious flaw and one that should not be allowed to pass. In addition, and perhaps more seriously, is the whole question of why in the world we would want to empower State's attorneys and authorize them to go in and enforcing civil penalties against physicians who, in the opinion of the State's attorney, has performed an abortion with a reckless disregard as to whether another individual is incompetent or a minor. Those are...those are medical questions, not something we should leave to the discretion of 102 elected State's attorneys in this state to enforce civil penalties. I would like to know another provision in the statute where State's attorneys are empowered to enforce civil penalties.

67th Legislative Day

May 27, 1993

State's attorneys, Ladies and Gentlemen, are empowered to enforce the criminal laws. They have plenty to do in that regard that we should not be putting them in the position having to try to impose civil penalties physicians, particularly when you have the Medical Disciplinary Board made up of experts in the field of medicine who have the power to impose a \$5,000 penalty the \$1,000 first-offense against physicians, let alone penalty set forth in this statute. If you think that you are trying to create good public policy, I would suggest you would not do that by having...by encouraging those who may now be picketing abortion clinics to turn their picketing to the courthouse steps in order to lobby and pressure elected State's attorneys to jump into this question of parental notification. Clearly it's important matter, but it doesn't belong in the politicized lap of the local courthouse and the State's attorney. do this, you would have 102 different State's attorneys administering different interpretations of the statutes, enforcing this law on a very uneven basis. The sensible thing would be to centralize this authority in the Medical Disciplinary Board where a uniform statewide application of the policy can be implemented and by experts in the field who can make interpretations with regard to these medical decisions. So, however well-intended the Bill, and I think with the addition of the judicial bypass, that that part is certainly an improvement. The Bill remains seriously flawed, and should be sent to Conference. This version clearly should be rejected, and I urge a 'no' vote on this Amendment."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Stephens."

Stephens: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I... I received a letter May

67th Legislative Day

May 27, 1993

8th of 1990, from a 16-year-old girl who contacted me today and asked if I would just read a portion of that letter, and I won't... I won't go on very long but I did wanna read just a couple of sentences from that letter. 'When I was 16, I had an abortion. I regret now and always will what I did to a helpless baby and to my family. My abortion changed my life forever. My parents were the understanding people that I have ever met. The boy, to say the least, he was not...there with me. It was under his pressure that I got the abortion in the first place because it would ruin his life, and yet he didn't even go with me. It was the loneliest day of my life and I will never forget it.' Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen, I guess what we're talking about here today is just simply keeping families together from the very beginning to the very end, and people that I represent tell me no matter where they feel they are in the...on the issue of abortion, they feel strongly that parents should know when drastic measures are taking place involving their children, and that's what this Bill and this concurrence Motion is about. It's a reasonably drafted piece of legislation. I think it addresses a very controversial issue in a common-sense manner, and on behalf of the young lady that wrote me that letter those several years ago, who still has the heartfelt feelings of a would-be young mother, I ask you to rise in support of the Gentleman's Motion."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Tom Cross."

Cross: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker McPike: "Yes."

Cross: "Representative Parke, I, too like Representative Homer, support the idea of judicial or parental notification, but I have some questions...concerns about this particular Bill

67th Legislative Day

May 27, 1993

and Amendment. With respect to Section 15 of the Amendment, the Senate Amendment, there is a reference or a requirement that, 'no person shall perform an abortion upon a minor or upon an incompetent person, unless that person, or his or her agent or referring physician has given at least 48 hours actual notice to one parent or to the legal guardian.' Is there a reason why that language is limited to either a parent or legal guardian?"

Parke: "Well, the concept of the Bill, Sir, is that we think it's important that in a family structure the basis for what has made America strong is that a parent has a moral right and a legal right to be able to make decisions that affect their minor children, and so, therefore, we believe that it is proper that they should be the ones notified, not somebody down the street, not somebody that lives next door, not the girlfriend in her school, but their parents, the ones that have brought them into the world, the ones that have protected them over the years. They are the ones that have the responsibility of being at their sides in the decision-making process, and that's why it's in there."

Cross: "I agree that ideally we would love both parents to have input and notification, but I refer to the Parental Notification Act of 1983, which provided that notification would be justified if you gave notice to any adult person standing in loco parentis and that that would be sufficient. Considering that, as well as the fact that you look at the definition of 'family member' that you refer to in your Amendment that talks about 'parent, grandparent, or child whether by whole blood, half-blood or adoption.' I'm including a step grandparent, stepparent or stepchild. Do you see any problem with including those people or the person standing in loco parentis, considering the climate

67th Legislative Day

May 27, 1993

and the society that we have today in a realistic world? And what I'm referring to, Representative Parke, is in your...in the Amendment under the definition of 'sexual abuse' on page 1 and page 2, there's reference to 'family members' defined in Section 1212 of the Criminal Code, and that's...that's 1212, Section C."

Parke: "Are you asking me a question, Representative?"

Cross: "I'm asking you in the context of todays society and extended families, don't you think that language would be...would also be acceptable as well as a person standing in loco parentis?"

Parke: "With some Supreme Court rulings, the reason why we put in judicial bypass is so that the judge can make a determination of who has the responsibilities for that child, who has the rights, duties and responsibility of that child. So that's why we put parental notification in by virtue of this Amendment so that...we can bypass that in determination of the judge that is the right thing to do. Otherwise, barring that, we believe ultimately that the should have parents the right to have the responsibility of working with and protecting their children. So, I don't understand your point, and because you look at the ruling of 1983 ruling, our Bill will delete that provision and we think that in todays modern era this is more appropriate, and that's our determination, Representative."

Cross: "If a grandmother is raising a child and is not by definition a legal guardian, wouldn't we rather have the grandmother notified instead of going through the judicial bypass provision?"

Parke: "All the child has to do is go to the judge, say that that's what she prefers to have done. The judge can make

67th Legislative Day

May 27, 1993

the determination whether that's appropriate or not, and the judge can then say if it's not appropriate in his opinion that he bypasses all notification. That again, Sir, is why the judicial bypass is in there. We think it's logical. It's common sense, and it protects the children of Illinois."

Cross: "I have a couple of other questions, Representative Parke. Looking at Section 20 of the Bill, under the exceptions to the notice, 'the minor patient declares in writing that she is a victim of sexual abuse, neglect or physical abuse by either of her parents or legal guardian, no notice is required.' Under the Amendment, there's a definition of 'sexual abuse' and it says, 'any sexual conduct or sexual penetration as defined in Section 1212 of the Criminal (and it refers us to 1212), and then I wanna refer you to 'sexual conduct'. 'Sexual conduct', means 'any intentional or knowing touching or fondling by the victim or the accused either directly or through clothing of sex organs, anus, or breasts of the victim or the accused or any part of the body of a child under 13 years of age.' My question is (and the significance there is under 13 years of age), is it possible that in the case of a father raising a child where the mother is no longer around, deceased, and the child is over 14, 15 or 16 years of and is pregnant, if the father has committed the sexual conduct that we speak of, is this notice section then no good or is she absolved of the notice section?; I guess, is the question."

Parke: "That is a question that, again, that if there is a confusion that you have in this legislation, then the courts will define what that means. But it is the intent of this Bill, as it is written in the Bill, the intent is

67th Legislative Day

May 27, 1993

to protect any minor child from any sexual abuse which must be reported to the DCFS offices anonymously that, in fact, there has been abuse, sexual abuse, and that that minor child is to be protected and to make sure that that investigation either clears up that child...that accusation of that parent or it sustains that accusation, and therefore, there are actions taken in the courts."

Cross: "My question, though, is to you. Is it possible though that is the minor child...or does that section absolve the parent in this situation?"

Parke: "It is not the intent of this legislation to absolve anybody of responsibility for sexual abuse, so therefore, it is my intent that this legislation is correct in the way it is written and that we think that if there are any flaws to this legislation, that the court will so deem it and that we will review any part of this legislation now and later to look at anything that you kindly would bring to our attention, but we do not believe this is flawed. It's been reviewed by lawyers, just as you have been counseled by lawyers, and..."

Cross: "I haven't been counseled by lawyers on this, Representative."

Parke: "I'm sorry, but the lady to your left is a lawyer, is she not?"

Cross: "She hasn't talked to me about the Bill."

Parke: "She has not? I don't know...well, it doesn't really
 matter or not..."

Cross: "Sir, if she hasn't counseled me on this Bill..."

Parke: "...it's mute...it's mute...for whoever, yourself or whoever, it is not our intent."

Cross: "Mr. Speaker, to the Bill. I would ideally love to vote for a parental notification Bill, as many of us would in

67th Legislative Day

May 27, 1993

this House. The problem is this Bill, as Representative Homer has said, has serious flaws. And to speak on several that he has not spoken about, I would direct you to Section 15 of the Amendment, that only allows notice to one parent or legal quardian. In a world that we live in with extended families where mothers and fathers are divorced, where they're not around, it is unreasonable to limit us to that particular language. In 1983, this Legislature realized that, and we are going backwards with this current legislation. In 1983, under the Parental Notification Act, we all said that 'notice can be accomplished by giving notice to any adult person standing in loco parentis.' There's no reason why that particular language should not be in this particular Bill, and I would ask you to vote on this particular Bill for that reason, as well as the others highlighted by Representative Homer."

Speaker McPike: "The...the Chair is willing to do whatever the There are 20 Members wish. lights blinking. We can explain our votes, or we can continue to talk for approximately two more hours. Representative Monroe Flinn moves the previous question. All in favor...the question is, 'Shall the previous question be put?' All in favor say 'aye', opposed, 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Representative to close, and then...the Chair will recognize everyone to explain their votes."

Parke: "Thank you, Representative, Speaker McPike, I appreciate that. It is important not to lose sight of the reasons why parents and children of the State of Illinois virtually need this legislation. Illinois law demands that parents take responsibility for the care of their children. How can a parent properly advise a doctor on potential medical problems or give appropriate follow-up medical care and

67th Legislative Day

May 27, 1993

emotional support if their right to know about the surgery is stripped away. Requiring that a parent be notified of abortion surgery is good medical practice and common sense. This law is virtually needed by minor girls in Illinois. are naturally uncomfortable and awkward approaching their parents with a difficult situation, it's actually just those situations for which teens need the guidance of a parent who will put their childs' interest first, unlike a boyfriend or a clinic operator who may be pressing her in this crisis. House Bill 1300 has exceptions for dysfunctional families, in addition to a judicial procedure for those minors who do not wish to notify their parents. This law is virtually needed by doctors in Illinois, most of whom would agree that it's better to have a parent or guardian involved in a surgical procedure performed on a minor. This law will help them, give them a legal justification for doing what is in the best interest of their parents, notifying and involving a parent. The civil penalties will only affect those who fragrantly violate the notification provisions, and it is more lenient than most of the 38 other states which have enacted parental involvement laws. I have here stacks of faxes that are coming in right now from all over this state from doctors in your area saying that they agree that these penalties are proper and if they break the law, they should be fined for these. I ask you to join with me and the more than 75% of the American public which supports parental Mr. Speaker, I wish this Bill could solve all the notice. problems and have all the answers, but it can't. The Gentlemen have tried to talk about what they see as flaws. I do not see those as flaws. I see those as things that we can work with to protect our daughters and work with, but

67th Legislative Day

May 27, 1993

this is the best compromise we can come up with. This Bill allows the majority of our families to work together to come up with a decision that will affect our minor daughters the rest of their lives. This is common-sense legislation, which allows parents the knowledge and ability to protect their minor daughters. My friends, voters will be looking at this vote before your next election. 'yes' vote, I will point out to you, listen to me, please, only a 'yes' vote will count; a 'no', a 'present', 'present' vote, a 'not voting' vote is a vote against this Bill. I will tell you, I give you my word, I give you word, I hope you are listening, this is it, this is it. can compromise no further on this Bill. If you wish to make a difference in the lives of our daughters, this will I will not call for concurrence...for noncurrence. This is one vote...this is the one that will be recorded. I will not speak to this legislation then. Let me tell you as a father, as a father, I'm outraged that my 15 year old daughter and my 12 year old daughter could have a surgical operation, namely an abortion, without my knowledge. Sometimes we have to stand up for what is right. special interests, please, I beg. On behalf of myself and my family and the hundreds of thousands of other parents, the right to protect and counsel our minor daughters count on this vote, and I would ask you to vote 'yes' on concurrence Motion of House Bill 1300."

Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #3 to House Bill 1300?' All those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Representative Flowers, to explain her vote."

Flowers: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. You're talking about deception, deception, deception. This ceased

67th Legislative Day

May 27, 1993

to be a parental notification Bill; this now becomes a witch hunt for doctors. We're making criminals out of doctors. I urge you to please defeat this Bill. Thank you very much."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Clayton."

Clayton: "Thank you. As a mother and a grandmother, I am very much in favor of parental notification, and I just wish that this were a Bill that I could support. I'm thinking of the one-third of the girls who find themselves pregnant who, for some reason, cannot go to their parents (either they cannot or they will not). Either they have abusive parents, they don't want to disappoint their parents, or they are runaways or throwaways. It is these girls that I am concerned about and I feel that they should be able to go to a caring adult who loves them and will have their best interest in mind in helping her to make the very difficult decision that she will be faced with, in mind, I will have to vote 'present' on the Bill, which would state that I favor parental notification, but I cannot vote for this Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Wennlund."

Wennlund: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I've always supported the concept of parental notification in this House and have voted for it on numerous times. But now we come back with an Amendment that adds an additional sanction to doctors. It says on top of the malpractice suit, that the parents may give if they don't get their notice in 48 hours (and we all know the U.S. Post Office delivers everything in 48 hours), but in addition to the malpractice, in addition to the disciplinary board, in addition to a civil action against the doctors, now we're gonna allow the State's attorneys to

67th Legislative Day

May 27, 1993

sue them. This is horrible. What kind of burden are you gonna be putting on the doctors? I support the concept of parental notification but not the concept of driving doctors out of business when they're absolutely necessary to the delivery of health care in Illinois. That's why I'm gonna vote 'no'."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Kubik."

Kubik: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm sorry we didn't have more time to talk about this Bill, but I have always supported the issue of parental notification, and I still do. the bottom line in my mind is that this Bill, if it passes, goes to the Governor and this will probably be the first parental notification Bill that really has an opportunity to be...come into law. So, to argue that it doesn't matter what the Bill says, just what we mean, is not good enough in this case. We ought to have a Bill we can vote for. I can support a parental notification Bill. I cannot support a Bill that allows State's attorneys, which allows in only one procedure, one medical procedure (that being abortion) they have the ability to go out and sue doctors. know it's been easy to kick around doctors in the last couple of days, but in no other instance does this occur. I think that's wrong. I think if the Sponsor would remove that provision, you'd get an 'aye' vote on this side."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Ostenburg."

Ostenburg: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. To explain my vote. The American Medical Association, since 1972, has been opposed to parental notification. In a report that was prepared by the Council on Ethical and Judicial Affairs of the AMA, it pointed out that in Massachusetts where there was a parental notification law, a study showed that the impact of the

67th Legislative Day

May 27, 1993

parental consent law was that...it reduced the number of minors undergoing abortions in Massachusetts by half but at time the same the reduction was explained by corresponding increase in minor residents of the state traveling the neighboring states for their abortions. think all we're doing by a provision like this is creating a situation that causes complications the young people who are seeking medical attention for a problem that they have. Parental notification is a good concept. It sounds like a good concept but, in fact, it causes severe complications for the health and safety of young women. I oppose this Motion."

Speaker McPike: "Representative von Bergen Wessels."

von Bergen Wessels: "Thank you, Speaker. I am concerned that the Sponsor does not want to do any further work, that it's a take-it or leave-it situation right now. the...legal problems that two other Representatives brought have an additional question in my mind. several phone calls to find out who would pay for guardian ad-litem, who would pay for the counsel that could be appointed by the courts, and to date, I have not found any other answer than the county. So this would just be another unfunded mandate from the information that I could get from guardianship and advocacy. So I think there are problems in...in this Amendment, and I think it needs to go back to a conference committee. I'm sorry that the Sponsor doesn't want to do that, but I'm not going to...vote in favor of it."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Mulligan."

Mulligan: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think it's important not to lose sight of the fact that this...the maker of this Bill is not particularly concerned with young children or them

67th Legislative Day

May 27, 1993

notifying their parents. What they're concerned with is criminalizing doctors; and, although he claims to have a stack from around the state, why is the Medical Society, why are the trial lawyers definitely against this Bill? We offered Amendment would an that have allowed a compassionate other relative, someone that was concerned with the young person, to be involved with decision, because many of us feel that parents should be involved in this decision. This is not a notification Bill. This is let's discourage doctors, let's criminalize them Bill. I would urge a 'no' vote, and I would request a verification of the vote at the end of this. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "The Lady from Sangamon, Representative Moseley.

Representative Turner, in the Chair."

Moseley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just want to remind people that are standing here, that to accuse someone that they're not taking the best interest of people at heart, and especially children, is rather harsh words. that parental notification, if nothing else, is one where the majority of Americans are on the side of the parents. Too often in this Body we stand up and we make laws for the very few parents that abuse the privilege of having children and abuse those children, and very seldom do we stand up and try to do something to create the family that are necessary. I think that this helps to foster some communication, and I'm sorry to see so many red votes because I'm afraid this issue will come back to you, and this cannot be considered a parental notification support. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "The Lady from DuPage, Representative Biggert, one minute to explain your vote."

67th Legislative Day

May 27, 1993

Biggert: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To explain my vote. If
Representative Parke really believed that this was a parent
notification Bill, I think he would...he would allow it to
go to conference committee. I think that we are all
concerned about this issue, that we are all concerned about
parental notification, but we have tried and tried to work
out a compromise and not have been...been listened to at
all. I think that other than that, legally there are
severe questions as Representative Homer and Representative
Cross have brought up, and I would urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker Turner: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Jones."

Jones, L: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. like one of the other speakers, I am a mother and also a grandmother, and I support parental notification. it's very important. I don't think this particular Bill...I think it needs some work on it, and I think it should go into a conference report because I don't think it answers all the questions. But the main concern that I have is, that we're all colleagues, and I think it's very unprofessional for any Member in this House to get up threaten another Member with a forthcoming election because they do not vote like they vote. We all have different constituencies, and most of the time we vote the voice of our constituency, and I think it's very unprofessional for another Representative to say that in explaining his vote. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Roskam."

Roskam: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is a Bill which has gotten the approval in lengthy negotiations from a Governor who is endorsed by the National Abortion Rights Action League. This is a Bill

67th Legislative Day

May 27, 1993

that has gone through tremendous negotiations. The notion that this criminalizes physicians is erroneous. There's no criminal penalties here. I come from a family physicians, and quite frankly, with all due respect, I've spoken to any number of doctors, and they have been surprised that there are people here who are arguing that they should somehow be exempted from flying in the face of a law that the General Assembly puts forth and not have to...come up with any penalties as a result of that. not criminalizing physicians. What we're doing is setting in motion a procedure. We've offered judicial bypass, which Representative ... "

Speaker Turner: "Bring your remarks to a close. The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Salvi."

Salvi: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Let's please be honest here. We're not being honest. This issue before us is very This Bill has been tested in other courts, in simple Bill, other states. It's a very a very simple question before us. Do you support parental notice or don't you? Don't tell us State's attorneys don't have the right anywhere else in any other cases not to impose civil fines. Tell someone who got a ticket from a state trooper Don't tell us in loco parentis is the reason you're not voting for this. In loco parentis is not needed when you have judicial bypass. It's an absurdity to have that. Don't tell us civil liability is added. There's immunity This is a carefully drafted document. in this. question is, go home and ask your voters, and the reason you're hiding is because you know what the voters are going Ask your voters, 'Should a parent be notified or shouldn't they be notified?' That's the question before us."

67th Legislative Day

May 27, 1993

Speaker Turner: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Davis, one minute to explain your vote."

Davis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would just like to let...I think people know that I passed the parental notification for students or children who test positive for AIDS, certainly do support parental notification. It is now law. However, in that legislation we did not penalize or criminalize the doctor. I think it's important that we don't add additional criminal penalties to people who are trying to serve. I believe that parents can be given a notice but without this attachment on that Bill which really destroys the legislation. Many people here would be voting for that Bill, but because of that criminal penalty and the fact that you're trying to make doctors responsible in a way in which it won't be a productive opportunity for the patient or the doctor; therefore, I have to vote 'no' on this legislation."

- Speaker Turner: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Frederick. I should say the Lady from Lake."
- Frederick: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To answer the Gentleman that spoke earlier, my stepson is a physician. He says this is punitive legislation and it should be defeated."
- Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Will, Representative Meyer, one minute to explain your vote."
- Meyer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I look at the board today and it looks a little bit different than the last time this subject was visited, but not a whole lot different because it's still a pretty even vote. Some undecided, and also some that are voting 'present', but to me it's an extremely simple question. You either believe in parental notification or you don't. There can be all sorts of excuses to find why you don't vote against any one

67th Legislative Day

May 27, 1993

particular Bill, and I just ask you to consider, before the final vote is taken, your own conscience. Are you voting the way that you feel that your constituents really feel on parental notification, and are you being true to yourself with your last vote that you took in terms of reasoning through this decision? Because I'm looking at a couple names up there and I'm not gonna..."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Coles, Representative Weaver, one minute to explain your vote."

Weaver: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen, why, why do we wonder about the moral decay and the decline of family values in Illinois when the public sees this kind of hypocrisy? Today a minor cannot even get a drivers license, buy cigarettes or have a root canal without parental notification. It amazes me that we, the government, would permit major surgery without at least telling the parents. You know, Representative Salvi was entirely correct. A green vote means you favor parental notification, a red vote means you do not favor parental notification, and yellow votes are useless because you won't make anybody happy. Green votes are the only possible vote for the parents and the kids of this state."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Schoenberg."

Schoenberg: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'd like to speak on behalf of my constituents. I think it's a fair statement to say that my district probably has more physicians on Chicago's north shore than any other district, and I don't think any of those physicians want something as onerous, a triple jeopardy, that this parental notification Amendment can provide. You know, several weeks ago I asked many of you in a one-on-one

67th Legislative Day

May 27, 1993

discussion before we had a vote, if you could vote for something which would bring an end to the violence that occurs at medical facilities, and I didn't do it in a way that said, 'This is your compromise, take it or leave it.' I reached out and some of you reached back and we left the interest groups on the sidelines and that measure received 79 votes. That's how public policy's made. This isn't good public policy. This isn't a compromise. This is a car bomb designed to explode in the lives of many people."

- Speaker Turner: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative Pugh, one minute to explain your vote."
- Pugh: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is one of the toughest Bills as a freshman Legislator that I've had to deal with. But there comes a time when you have to vote according to who you are, and as a parent, I personally feel that I would like to know if my daughter's gonna have an abortion. I'd like to be there to tell her that I'm gonna support you if you have this baby or if you have the abortion. As a parent, as a dad, I'd like to know."
- Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Logan, Representative Olson, one minute to explain your vote."
- Olson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. When we had this Bill, the underlying Bill in here, it passed out. What has changed? Yes, there's been an Amendment. It technically makes some changes, but this is still parental notification, and in 80% and 90% of the cases I think that that's who the girl that has the problem will turn to. Are criminalizing...are we criminalizing doctors? Heavens no. Do we criminalize people who drive cars when we pass limit laws? All we're doing is setting up an opportunity for a doctor to criminalize himself. We're not punishing

67th Legislative Day

May 27, 1993

doctors here. We're not punishing doctors here. If I speed going home tonight and get caught, I criminalize myself. Remember what your thoughts were when we had this Bill in here before. I really see no reason to change. Is this Bill technically flawed, legally flawed? I don't believe so. Someone said it's been tested in other states. Let it be tested here. Put a green vote up there."

Speaker Turner: "Gentleman from Cook, Representative McAfee, one minute to explain your vote."

McAfee: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To explain my vote. This is one of those votes that we make that you can be 100% right and 100% wrong. And to Terry: I'm a father, too, of a teenage daughter and I can assure you that if and whenever decisions have to be made of this type I would love to be there. But I'll tell you something, I know of no law that can prohibit, that can stand up and force a young lady to come and talk to her father. I think the real issue here is the family unit and how you achieve that. So when I look at this vote and the issue becomes, 'am I trying to do something for families and parents', I'm not so sure, but my real concern here is what's in the best interest of the woman."

Speaker Turner: "The Lady from Kane, Representative Lindner, one minute to explain your vote."

Lindner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To explain my vote. I would like to have a parental notification Bill that I could vote for, but this is not the one. Having a doctor notify parents or having a judge make the decision does not serve the purpose of parental notification. The purpose should be to encourage family unity, to encourage responsible social conduct, and to save lives. We seem to be looking at this from the standpoint of the parents rather than the

67th Legislative Day

May 27, 1993

standpoint of the minors, and that is the focus that we should be looking at, from the minors. Pro-choice does not mean you are pro-abortion. It means that this should be a private decision and we are involving more and more people in this. Now, I can foresee that in elections for State's attorneys and for judges that this is, also, gonna be a question if this Amendment is passed. I urge 'no'."

- Speaker Turner: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Murphy, one minute to explain your vote."
- Murphy, M: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The last time we debated this, it was late at night and we gave it due consideration. After it was passed, it was reported that this could not be fine without judicial bypass. now contains judicial bypass. When people talk about making doctors responsible, there is no responsible doctor would fix...a...have an appendectomy on someone without talking to the parents. So to suggest that there are no laws requiring the interaction of parents in serious life-threatening surgeries, is erroneous. Parental notification is on the side of all parents. This is not an abortion question. It is not a choice question. parental responsibility question. With the spray with graffiti, with damage done by children, we constantly put the onus back on the parents. The parents want to be informed, and if doctors are irrationally and irrespective of their duty, move forward with an abortion they should..."
- Speaker Turner: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Parcells, one minute to explain your vote."
- Parcells: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I certainly hope you're not intimidated by the Sponsor of this Bill. I think that was a bad thing for him

67th Legislative Day

May 27, 1993

to do to be threatening and I think you're... I hope you're not intimidated by those who yell the loudest on this It is outrageous to say they won't compromise. Representative Schoenberg pointed out, that's what the name of the game is down here. We do this on many, many Bills, and it's the only thing to do when children's lives are at stake, and to say that we're not for parental notification we vote 'no' or 'present' is outrageous. We had a wonderful parental notification Amendment for this very Bill, which almost passed here. That was acceptable to many of us. We are for parental notification. I would like to bring up one thing. Besides the trouble damages for doctors, the Sponsor said, 'All the child has to do is go to the judge.' Ladies and Gentlemen, that is absurd. Here we are, 14-year-old scared to death, frantic, they're just gonna find themselves to the right courtroom. Of course, they're not gonna find the right courtroom, they're gonna end up in the alleys getting an illegal abortion..."

Speaker Turner: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Moore, Andrea Moore, one minute to explain your vote."

Moore, A: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, but it's Lake. Lake County. This is not just a simple question, and I certainly respect the many people that say it's a simple question of parental notification, and, as a parent, I support parental notification like most of the parents that are out here. Who is going to be against parental notification? But we sit on the floor today and we are Legislators, we are not just parents. My district supports parental notification, but it also supports a Legislator that puts Bills in place, puts laws in place that really work. This law will not work, and that's why my vote is 'no', so that it will go to

67th Legislative Day

May 27, 1993

Conference, and Terry, I would urge you, please, there can be a compromise that will, in fact, in the Conference Committee bring out a parental notification Bill that we all can support, that we all can deliver to our constituencies because many, many of us do support the notification. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Lang, one minute to explain your vote."

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm not particularly a fan of parental notification, but let me just tell the Body this is not a parental notification Bill; this is an anti-abortion Bill, plain and simple. That's all the Bill is. It sets up penalties for doctors who are trying to do their best to take care of the health care of women. T+ sets up road blocks and legal technicalities, a morass of the court system for young women to...to hurdle before they can get these court orders. The Bill itself talks what a medical emergency is and it refers only to the medical health of a woman, it doesn't refer psychological health, their emotional health, their outlook on life, their future, their condition. This is not a good Bill. This is not a good idea. This is an idea that's intended to...to prohibit abortion; and one more comment, the idea that because the National Abortion Rights League endorsed Governor Edgar at one point, does not mean that they're gonna endorse Governor Edgar if he signs a Bill like this. It's an outrage to think that they would."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Parke, one minute to explain your vote."

Parke: "Mr. Speaker, a point of personal privilege. My name was used in debate. I would just like to point out and clear up that there's a presumption that we have not compromised.

67th Legislative Day

May 27, 1993

That couldn't be further from the truth. Many of the...of a group of people who signed on to the Amendment to the first Bill met with Governor Edgar. They had a long discussion with him, brought up many points that they they were concerned about. The Governor gave them the courtesy of listening and incorporating in the compromise of this Amendment, some of those concerns that were brought up by the very women who are saying, 'No, that we have not given compromise.' That is not true, and they know it not true, and in fact, all I have said is that we can go no further. We have compromised as much as we can compromise, and so I just felt that the Body should know that we have done lots of compromising and to presume that we haven't, most of us know that that cannot be possible with this kind legislation. Ultimately, we think you can put all the smoke screens on this that you want..."

Speaker Turner: "Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this...on this question, there are 53 'yes', 50 'noes', 14 voting 'present', and the House refuses to concur in Senate Amendment #3 to House Bill 1300. The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Biggins, for what reason do you rise?"

Biggins: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to advise the Members of the General Assembly of the medical condition of a friend of this Body, that is Nicholas Sabatino, of Northlake. The young Gentleman received a Resolution from this Body about three or four weeks ago, and has undergone...deep medical activity, operations on his body, since. He is continuing a very difficult struggle, a very painful struggle that kept him up and his mother up all last night, fearing the loss of one of his legs. I'd ask

67th Legislative Day

May 27, 1993

you to continue to ask me about his condition and I will tell you. I ask for your prayers for young Nick as he continues his daily painful struggle to get through this ordeal. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "On the Order of Concurrences, we have House Bill 1305, Representative Lopez. Out of the record. House Bill 1374, Representative Levin. Out of the record. House Bill 1854, Representative Ryder. Out of the record. House Bill 1374, Representative Levin."

Levin: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I would move that the House...accept...concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1374. Senate Amendment 1 changed the title the Act...and amended the Environmental Protection Act to change references to hospital wastes. It also amended the Illinois Nuclear Safety Preparedness Act to increase the amount of compensation to local governments from Department of Nuclear Safety for implementation maintenance of nuclear accident plants. mγ understanding that this Amendment is identical to legislation that has passed this House, and there is no opposition."

Speaker Turner: "Are there any questions on this Bill? The Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black."

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

Speaker Turner: "He indicates he will."

Black: "Representative...to the best of my memory, a...a Bill similar to this was vetoed last year because of...some bonded...bonded authority that created a mandate on local units of government. Do you see...can you assure me that it is not still in this Bill as amended by the Senate?"

Levin: "Very honest...I think I would need some staff to be able

67th Legislative Day

May 27, 1993

to answer your question, if...I can get somebody here...because I am really not conversant with this Amendment. I understood that it had passed...in a couple of different forms."

Black: "I...I'd be grateful if you could ask staff because I think it has something to do with volume based studies and...that...on solid waste and I think that..."

Levin: "Oh, the underlying Bill."

Black: "Yes. Create some..."

Levin: "Okay."

Black: "...mandate on local units of government."

Levin: "No. The underlying Bill is simply a pilot program, which has been agreed to...by the Department of Energy and Natural Resources. It came out of the House. I believe it was either unanimous or on the Consent Calendar, and they support it. They have the money for the pilot program, and there is absolutely no opposition to it. It is not a mandate."

Black: "There would be no...appropriation required then, correct?"

Levin: "No additional appropriation. This is something that the Department supports, and they have the money for it."

Black: "Okay, and do we know the location of the pilot project, by any chance, or is that yet to be determined?"

Levin: "I believe that it yet to be determined."

Black: "All right. Thank you very much. I appreciate your patience, Representative."

Johnson, Tom: "Yes. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Turner: "He indicates he will."

Johnson, Tom: "Representative, as I'm reading my notes, this

67th Legislative Day

May 27, 1993

really enables the amount of funds that can be used to compensate local government for expenses incurred in federally mandated implementation and maintenance plans, dealing with nuclear accidents, right?"

Levin: "Yes."

Johnson, Tom: "Do you know whether or not that compensation or what that compensation is for? Is that for medical things?

Or for..."

Levin: "I believe it's for the implementation and maintenance of nuclear accident plans."

Levin: "Correct."

Johnson, Tom: "Okay, and what, like legal fees incurred in that, and any other ancillary type fees?"

Levin: "I believe that it could not exceed \$250,000 in any year, through 1993; \$275,000 through Fiscal Year 94; and \$300,000 for Fiscal Year 96, and thereafter."

Johnson, Tom: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Dart."

Dart: "...Representative Levin, what's the affect of changing the definition for 'potentially infectious medical waste' to 'hazardous hospital waste'?"

Levin: "I don't know."

Dart: "...Do you know why...is...you want to take it out of the record real quick?"

Speaker Turner: "Representative Dart, are you...through or did
 you get your question answered?"

Levin: "Okay, Mr. Speaker, until...until we can get an answer to the Gentleman's question, can we temporarily take this out of the record, so we can get an answer for him?"

Speaker Turner: "Take the Bill out of the record, Mr. Clerk.

67th Legislative Day

May 27, 1993

House Bill 1374, under the Order of Concurrences.
Representative Levin."

- Levin: "I apologize to the Body. We've got the answer to Representative Dart's question, and that is that all that it does do, is put in a cross reference. Two years ago, the term 'infectious medical waste' was amended in a number of places in various Acts, and one cross reference was missed. That's all this does."
- Speaker Turner: "Are there any further questions? Seeing none, the guestion is, 'Shall the House concur in Amendment #1 to House Bill 1374?' All those in favor should vote 'ave', all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are 117 voting 'yes', no 'noes', no 'presents', and House Bill...the House does concur Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1374, and this Bill is hereby...this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The House would like to welcome Senate President 'Pate' Philips to the Chamber, and we hear he's here taking an opinion as to what time you want to leave. You should voice your opinion now before he leaves. On the Order of State Operations, Second Reading, we have House Bill 402, Representative Balthis. Read Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 402. 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 Balthis."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative...the Gentleman from Cook,

 Representative Balthis."
- Balthis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the

67th Legislative Day

May 27, 1993

House. Mr. Speaker, I would like to move to table House

Amendment 1. I'd like to withdraw House Amendment 2."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman asks leave to withdraw House Amendment #2. All those in favor say 'aye', opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. Leave is given. Leave is granted. The Gentleman asks leave to table Amendment #1. All...all those in favor say 'aye', all opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and leave is granted to table Amendment #1 to House...Senate Bill 402. Are there any further Amendments?"

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

Speaker Turner: "Representative Balthis."

Balthis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate... House Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 402 becomes the Bill, and it amends the tax increment financing district section to the Municipal Code. Creates the Industrial Jobs Recovery Law, to authorize any municipality to establish redevelopment project areas defined economically and environmentally distressed areas, to acquire land in those areas, and to rebuild infrastructure, and to develop those areas for industrial use. Increases in the property tax base in areas that are be used to provide for property tax rebates industrial property owners and to pay off development costs. And the statute has been changed to protect the EAV of school districts so as not to adversely affect their income out of the state aid formula. I'd be happy to answer any questions. I move for its adoption."

Speaker Turner: "Are there any questions? Seeing none, the question is, 'Shall Amendment #3 be adopted to Senate Bill 402?' All those in favor should vote 'aye', all those

67th Legislative Day

May 27, 1993

opposed should vote 'no'. The voting is now open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record. On this question, there are a 115 voting 'yes', 1 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present', and Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 402 is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk Rossi: "No further Amendments."

Speaker Turner: "Third Reading. Under the Order of State
Operations, Third Reading, we have House (sic-Senate) Bill
553, Representative Kubik. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 553, a Bill for an Act in relation to taxation. Third Reading of the Bill."

Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Kubik."

Kubik: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. 550... Senate Bill 553 basically has two components. The underlying Bill deals...is a Department of Revenue initiative which deals with tax enforcement, and it is a...a product of the...a task force in the Department of Revenue that produced this document. There is a House Amendment also, that has been added to this Bill, which would codify the international motor fuel tax agreements, and...and that's the second portion of the Bill. Mr. Speaker, if I could...ask you that...that I need to read some...information into the record as a request of the task force so that the legislative intent on the underlying Bill is established. So, if you would bear with me, I'd like to read that into the record."

Speaker Turner: "Proceed, Representative."

Kubik: "Part of Senate Bill 553 incorporates changes to the tax code intended to clarify the application of those taxes to limited liability companies created under Illinois and comparable foreign state law. Limited liability companies were authorized last year in Senate Bill 2163 to operate in

67th Legislative Day

May 27, 1993

Illinois beginning on...January 1st, 1994. These changes are a result of a joint undertaking by the Department of Revenue and representatives of private sector tax practitioners, accounting firms, tax law firms, and a member of the Secretary of State's corporate advisory committee who drafted the limited liabilities company authorizing law. My comments here are intended to be reflective of legislative intent. The primary legislative intention behind the changes to the Illinois Income Tax Act is to articulate the principal that the federal income tax characterization of a limited liability company is controlling the purposes of the Illinois Income Tax Act. In this regard, the federal income tax characterization of a limited liability company of a partnership for income tax purposes, is intended to result in the limited liability company being treated as a partnership purposes of the Illinois Income Tax Act. federal income tax characterization of a limited liability company as a corporation for federal income tax purposes is an intended...is intended to result in the limited liability company being treated as a corporation for purposes of the Illinois Act. The primary legislative intent behind the changes to the Illinois Retailer Occupation Tax, Use Tax, Service Occupation Service Use Tax Acts; except where otherwise provided by this legislation to the contrary, is to provide the and protection to the limited liability companies under these Acts, as those that are imposed afforded similiarly...afforded to similarly to situated...situated corporations, societies, associations, foundations, institutions, and partnerships. Likewise, the primary legislative intent behind the changes to the

67th Legislative Day

May 27, 1993

Illinois Retailers Occupation Tax, Use Tax. Service Occupation Tax, and Service Use Tax Acts, except where otherwise provided by this legislation to the contrary, to provide the same obligations and protections to members, employees, and agents of limited liability companies as those that are posed and afforded to similarly situated partners, employees, officers, directors, of agents corporations, societies, associations. foundations. institutions, and partnerships. And Speaker, I would appreciate support of Senate Bill 553 Third Reading. I do not know of any opposition. Both of these Bills passed this Chamber overwhelmingly, and we'd like to pass it to the Senate for concurrence, and on to the Governor's desk. I'd be happy to respond to questions, and I appreciate your support."

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

Levin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would join with the Gentleman in urging passage of Senate Bill 553, as amended. He is correct. The underlying Bill is recommended by the Department of Revenue, and is purely technical, and the Amendment is one that we need...in order to be able to avoid the loss of federal funding. If we do not come into compliance with the international fuel tax agreement by September 30 of 1996, we stand to lose federal money. So I urge the passage of Senate Bill 553."

Speaker Turner: "...No further questions. The Gentleman...moves for the passage of Senate Bill 553. The Gentleman from Will, Representative Wennlund."

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

Speaker Turner: "He indicates he will."

67th Legislative Day

May 27, 1993

Wennlund: "Is the federal mandate Representative Kubik, is the federal mandate in preparation for the imposition of the BTU tax? Is that why this tracking mechanism is being put into place?"

Kubik: "It has nothing to do with that...that provision."

Wennlund: "Thank you very...oh, how much federal money are they threatening us with the loss of?"

Kubik: "Surface transportation funds."

Wennlund: "No amount? We don't know?"

Kubik: "Whatever it is in that year."

Wennlund: "Just another federal threat. Thank you."

Speaker Turner: "Seeing no further questions, the question is,
 'Shall Senate Bill 553 pass?' All those in favor should
 vote 'aye', all those opposed vote 'no'. The voting is now
 open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?
 Have all voted who wish? The Clerk shall take the record.
 On this question, there are 109 voting 'yes', 6 voting
 'no', 1 voting 'present', and the House...the House does
 adopt Senate Bill 553, and this Bill, having received the
 Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Senate
 Bill 406, Representative Deering. Read the Bill, Mr.
 Clerk."

- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 406. The Bill has been read a second time previously. Amendment #1 has been adopted to the Bill.

 Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative Deering."
- Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman moves to withdraw Amendment #3.

 Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Rossi: "Floor Amendment #4, offered by Representative Phelps."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Deering on Amendment #4.

 Representative Phelps, I'm sorry, on Amendment #4."
- Phelps: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the

67th Legislative Day

May 27, 1993

House. This Amendment reflects...the same...content that we passed out of here in House Bill 1146, and was never assigned to a committee just by a mistake over in the Senate, and it increases the State's authority to issue bonds for the purposes of coal energy development/research. It increases the bond to 35 million. Appreciate your support."

- Speaker Turner: "Are there any questions? Seeing none, the question is, 'Shall Amendment #4 be adopted to 406?' All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. Amendment #4 is adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Rossi: "Floor Amendment 5, offered by Representative Deering."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Deering, the Gentleman from Washington."
- "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of Deering: the Amendment #5 to Senate Bill 406 deletes sec...certain sections of the Coal Mining Act which pertain to the Department of Mines and Minerals employment requirements for mine rescue station superintendents and mine rescue station assistants. It's а Department Amendment. I'd like to answer any questions."
- Speaker Turner: "Seeing no questions, the question is, 'Shall Amendment #5 be adopted to Senate Bill 406?' All those in favor should say 'aye', all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. Amendment #5 is adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Rossi: "Floor Amendment 6, offered by Representative Hawkins."
- Speaker Turner: "Representative Faulkner...Hawkins."
- Hawkins: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This

67th Legislative Day

May 27, 1993

Amendment allows certain conservancy districts located in areas of extremely high unemployment to enter into a lease agreement with a private developer for the development of single or multiple family dwellings and tourism related developments. I'll be glad to answer any questions."

- Speaker Turner: "The Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black."
- Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I have an inquiry of the Chair. Scratch that. Rather...rather than take a chance on damaging the Gentleman's Amendment, the underlying Bill and Amendments are very important, and I don't want to do anything to endanger this Bill, but in all due respect to the Gentleman, we have had this Amendment for less than two minutes. Our staff has not seen it. We don't have an analysis, and if he would be kind enough to take it out of the record for a few minutes, we'd at least like to look it over."
- Speaker Turner: "Mr. Clerk, take Senate Bill 406 out of the record."
- Speaker Currie: "Representative Currie in the Chair. On Special Order of Concurrences to accept, is House Bill 1037, Representative Turner."
- "Thank you, Madam Chair. I move to concur with Senate Turner: Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 1037. and Amendments do the following things. They add new provision to the Public Aid Code which requires Department of Public Aid to implement а three-year demonstration program of preventative physical examinations for recipients of AFDC. It requires the Department of Public Aid to establish the nature and scope of the exam by rules, and the services must at least include pressure reading, complete blood tests. and other

67th Legislative Day

May 27, 1993

appropriate factors...risk factors. The Agency may limit the exams to one per participant. Pregnant women under the age of 21 are not eligible because they are eligible for coverage under a another program. The Department may enter into agreement with medical clinics and hospitals or local health departments and other providers of medical service to carry out this program. And the Department must study the cost benefits of providing preventative examinations to a targetted group of recipients. Amendment 2 is the provisions of House Bill 1717, and it requires the Department of Public Aid to conduct an on-going long study of the Agency's JOBS program operated under Family Support Act and the Social Security Act. The Agency must collect data on a statistical valid random sample of cases. Other state agencies must collect and forward date to Department pertinent to this study, and the Department must consult with the Social Services Advisory Council arriving at the specific elements of the study. Department must develop a participants profile database and make this information available to the public upon request, and a report must be submitted to the General Assembly by January (sic-1997), and every year thereafter, 1977 including recommendations for changes in the JOBS program, and I move for the adoption of these two Amendments. I move that we concur on these two Amendments on House Bill 1037." Speaker Currie: "Representative Turner moves that the House do concur on Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill Seeing no discussion, the question is, 'Shall the House concur?'. Those in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 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, 116 voting 'no'...voting

67th Legislative Day

May 27, 1993

none voting 'no', and the House does concur on Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 1037, and this Bill, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. We'll return to Senate Bill, Second Reading, Senate Bill 406. Clerk, what is the status of the Bill?"

- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 406 has been read a second time previously. Floor Amendment #6, offered by Representative Hawkins."
- Speaker Currie: "Representative Hawkins."
- Hawkins: "...Gentlemen of the House, I have already explained this Amendment just a few minutes ago, so I ask for a favorable Motion."
- Speaker Currie: "Representative Hawkins moves 'do adopt' on
 Amendment #6 to Senate Bill 406, and on that Motion, any
 discussion? Representative Black."
- Black: "Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. We appreciate the Gentleman's courtesey in letting staff review this. They have had a chance to do so. We have had a chance to do so. They have no opposition to the Amendment. We join him in his Motion to support the Amendment."
- Speaker Currie: "The question is, 'Shall the House adopt
 Amendment #6 to Senate Bill 406?' All in favor say 'aye',
 opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted.
 Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Rossi: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Currie: "Third Reading. Introduction and First Reading."
- Clerk McLennand: "Introduction First Reading of House Bills.

 House Bill #2449, offered by Representative Prussing, a

 Bill for an Act to amend the State Pension Funds Continuing

 Appropriation Act. First Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Currie: "And House Bill 508, on the Concurrence Calendar,

67th Legislative Day

May 27, 1993

page 4 of the Calendar, Representative Brunsvold for a Motion."

Brunsvold: "Thank you, Madam Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would like to move to not concur in Senate Amendment #1, which removed...some language dealing with reg...religious beliefs. Also a section there dealing with life safety taxes and bonds for the Chicago school district, and also a section in there dealing with the...an annual statement to the State Board; and Amendment #2, which was an Amendment that Representative Bugielski had dealing with criminal offenses and ineligibility to serve on a local school council; and Amendment #3, which was provided enrollment of a youth education program sponsored by Illinois National Guard. So I move not to concur in Senate Amendments 1, 2, and 3 to House Bill 508."

"Representative Brunsvold moves that the House not concur in Senate Amendments 1, 2, and 3, to House Bill 508. On that Motion, is there any discussion? If not, all those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. have it, and the Motion is adopted. Representative Giglio...would like to make an announcement about a caucus in Room 114 for the Democrats, and for immediately Republicans, Representative Kubik announces... Representative Leitch announces а caucus in Room 118...is...upon the adjournment, and Representative Granberg now moves that the House stand adjourned until the hour of 11:00 a.m. tomorrow...Friday, May 28th, allowing perfunctory time for the Clerk to accept messages from the Senate. The House will stand adjourned. All in favor...the 'ayes' have it, and the House stands adjourned. Caucus' immediately in Rooms 114 and 118."

Clerk Pam: "Message from the Senate by Mr. Jim Harry, Secretary.

67th Legislative Day

May 27, 1993

- 'Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has refused to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendments to the Bills of the following titles, to wit; Senate Bill 186 and Senate Bill 207. Action taken by the Senate May 27, 1993.'"
- Clerk McLennand: "Perfunctory Session will be at ease until the hour of 5:00."
- Clerk Rossi: "Being no further business, the Perfunctory Session
 will stand adjourned until tomorrow, May 28th, at the hour
 of 11:00 a.m."

REPORT: TIFLDAY PAGE: 001

STATE OF ILLINOIS 88TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES DAILY TRANSCRIPTION OF DEBATE INDEX

93/09/28 15:05:09

MAY 27, 1993

HB-0508	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	48
H3-1037	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	45
HB-1300	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	8
HB-1374	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	35
HB-2449	FIRST READING	PAGE	47
SB-0301	THIRD READING	PAGE	3
SB-0402	SECOND READING	PAGE	38
Sb-0406	SECOND READING	PAGE	43
SB-0406	SECOND READING	PAGE	47
SB-0406	OUT OF RECORD	PAGE	45
\$3-0553	SECOND READING	PAGE	40
HJR-0009	MOTION	PAGE	2
HJR-0009	MOTION	PAGE	5
HJR-0014	MOTION	PAGE	5

SUJJECT MATTER

HOUSE TO ORDER - SPEAKER MCPIKE PAGE	1
PRAYER - REVEREND JOHN KIEFER PAGE	1
PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE PAGE	1
ROLL CALL ATTENDANCE PAGE	1
SPEAKER MADIGAN IN CHAIR PAGE	5
REPRESENTATIVE MCPIKE IN CHAIR PAGE	9
REPRESENTATIVE TURNER IN CHAIR PAGE	24
REPRESENTATIVE CURRIE IN CHAIR PAGE	45
ADJOURNMENT PAGE	48
PERFUNCTORY SESSION PAGE	48
MESSAGE FROM SENATE PAGE	48
PERFUNCTORY SESSION ADJOURNMENT PAGE	49