88th Legislative Day

January 24, 1996

Speaker Churchill: "The House will be in order. The Members will be in their chairs. Representative Churchill in the Chair. The Chaplain for the day is the Reverend George Coates of St. Peter's African Methodist Episcopal Church of Decatur. Reverend Coates is the guest of Representative Julie Curry. Will the guests in the gallery please rise to join us for the invocation. Reverend Coates."

Reverend Coates: "Oh God our Father, the Creator and Sustainer of life, we are grateful for Your grace, mercy, and kindness. You watched over us while we slept and we were able to rise this morning and see a new day, a day that we have never seen before. Bless the gifted and intelligent Members who were elected by the people from various districts to represent them in this legislative Assembly. May the laws you consider here be laws that will protection and security for the citizens of Illinois. the light οf the Divine wisdom, knowledge. and understanding help to guide and assist you in your decisions. Let justice roll down like a river righteousness as a mighty stream so that cities, towns, villages, and all of Illinois will become another Eden. demi-paradise for all citizens. We ask this in the mighty name of our Lord and Savior, Jesus Christ. Amen."

- Speaker Churchill: "We will be led in the Pledge of Allegiance today by Representative Persico."
- Persico 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 Churchill: "Roll Call for Attendance. Representative

 Currie is recognized to report any excused absences on the

 Democratic side of the aisle. Representative Currie."

88th Legislative Day

January 24, 1996

- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. Please let the record show that

 Representative Martinez is excused again today because of
 family commitments."
- Speaker Churchill: "The Journal will so reflect. Representative

 Cross, any absences on the Republican side of the aisle?"

 Cross: "No."
- Speaker Churchill: "You are always a succinct person. I appreciate that very much. Mr. Clerk. Mr. Clerk, take the record. There are 115 Members answering the Roll and a quorum is present. The House will come to order. Mr. Clerk, Committee Reports."
- Clerk McLennand: "Committee Report from Rules Committee offered by Representative Churchill, Chairman from the Committee on Rules, to which the following Joint Action Motions were referred, action taken on January 24, 1996, reported the same back 'do approve for consideration'. Return to the order of Third Reading Senate Bill 775. Committee Report Andrea Moore, Chairman from the from Representative Committee on Elections in State Government, to which following Bills and Resolutions was referred, action taken on January 24, 1996, reported the same back with the following recommendation: 'do pass as amended' Short Debate Senate Bill 454. Committee Report from Representative Stephens, Chairman from the Committee on Executive, to which the following Bill was referred, action taken on January 24, 1996, reported the same back with the following recommendation: 'do pass as amended' Senate Bill 21."

Speaker Churchill: "Introduction of Bills. First Reading."

Clerk McLennand: "Introduction and First Reading of House Bills.

House Bill 2747, offered by Representative Novak, a Bill
for an Act in relation to disposal of fluorescent,
high-intensity discharge lamps. House Bill 2748, offered by

88th Legislative Day

January 24, 1996

- Representative Novak, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Administrative Procedure Act. House Bill 2749, offered by Representative Cross, a Bill for an Act to amend the Code of Civil Procedure. Introduction and First Reading of these House Bills. Introduction of Resolutions. House Resolution #69 offered by Representative Cross."
- Speaker Biggert: "Representative Biggert in the Chair.

 Supplemental Calendar distribution, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk McLennand: "Supplemental Calendar #1 is being distributed."

 Speaker Biggert: "Representative Currie for an announcement."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. We earlier did excused absences but we've just had late word that Representative Blagojevich is also excused today, so I hope the record will reflect that information."
- Speaker Biggert: "Thank you, Representative. The record will so reflect. Mr. Clerk, Senate Bill 775 appears on the Supplemental Calendar. What is the status of that Bill?"
- Clerk McLennand: "Senate Bill #775, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Vehicle Code. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Biggert: "Mr. Clerk, please return the Bill to the Order of Second Reading. Mr. Clerk, Committee Announcements."
- Clerk McLennand: "Committee Announcement. Rules Committee will meet...Rules Committee will meet at 12:20, Speaker's Conference Room. Rules Committee, 12:20, Speaker's Conference Room."
- Speaker Biggert: "Mr. Clerk, are there any Motions to be read?" Clerk McLennand: "Discharge Motions were filed on House Bill 2667
 - for Amendments #1 and Amendment #3 filed by Representative Saltsman and Representative Mautino on the 23rd."
- Speaker Biggert: "The Motions will appear on the next Calendar.

 Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, in the Speaker's Gallery

88th Legislative Day

January 24, 1996

we have a portion of the Junior and Senior class of Newman High School in Sterling, Illinois. Newman High School is rich in academics, in which they placed 2nd three years ago. They were state champions two years ago, and semi-finalists in 1995. They are here with their instructor and Dean of Students, Mr. Jerry Standler and they are the guests of Representative Jerry Mitchell and Representative Ron Lawfer. Please give them a warm welcome. Mr. Clerk, on page 4 of the Calendar appears Senate Joint Resolution #8. Representative John Jones is recognized on Senate Joint Resolution 8."

Jones, John: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Senate Joint Resolution #8 simply petitions the Secretary of the U.S. Department of Interior to delete Illinois from the list of affected states for the purpose of developing a regulatory program for coal bed methane gas. The Department of Mines and Minerals already has that in place and what they're doing is simply petitioning the Secretary of Interior to show them on this list. There are seven states that are affected: West Virginia, Pennsylvania, Kentucky, Ohio, Tennessee, Indiana, and the State of Illinois. The current law, the federal law requires affected states to develop a regulatory program for coal bed methane gas within three years of designation of being an affected state or to petition the Secretary to be deleted from the list. since the office of Mines and Minerals has this already in place, they just simply want to petition the Department of Interior, and you know, quite frankly, they would like to move it very quickly. I would ask for a favorable vote on this issue."

Speaker Biggert: "Thank you, Representative. Is there any discussion? The Representative from Effingham,

88th Legislative Day

January 24, 1996

Representative Hartke. Ladies and Gentlemen. Ladies and Gentlemen, could we have your attention please and break up these conferences that are in the front? Thank you. Proceed, Representative Hartke."

Hartke: "Madam Speaker, I have an inquiry of the Chair, or the Clerk. Has this Resolution been printed and distributed?

I don't seem to find it on my desk at all."

Speaker Biggert: "We're checking with the Clerk, Representative.

Thank you, Representative. I've been advised by the Clerk that it will be ready for distribution in about 15 minutes so we'll take it out of the record. Senate Joint Resolution has now been distributed. Representative Jones has introduced the Resolution. Is there any discussion? The Representative from Effingham, Representative Hartke."

Hartke: "Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. I appreciate, you know, having a copy of the Resolution. And as I scan across it here, a date jumps out at me. What was the cutoff date by the Federal Government for us to pass this petition?"

Speaker Biggert: "Is that question directed at the Sponsor, Representative?"

Hartke: "Yes. Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Biggert: "He indicates he will. Representative Jones."

Jones, John: "October of 1995 Representative."

Speaker Biggert: "Representative Hartke."

Hartke: "Well, if that was the cutoff date, what are we doing doing it now? If we were required to file this petition before that cutoff date, what's the point in the Resolution? Aren't we a day late, a dollar short?"

Speaker Biggert: "Representative Jones."

Jones, John: "It's my understanding, Representative, from Fred Bowman at Mines and Minerals, they can still petition, you

88th Legislative Day

January 24, 1996

know, it's very beneficial to the Department of Mines and
Minerals in the State of Illinois."

Speaker Biggert: "Representative Hartke."

Hartke: "How many states are affected by this legislation? Do you know? Are we the only state that's not in this?"

Speaker Biggert: "Ladies and Gentlemen, it's very difficult for the Sponsor and the Representative to have any dialogue with this noise. Could you please give them your attention? Representative Jones."

Jones, John: "Thank you, Madam Chairman. Representative Hartke,
there are seven states: West Virginia, Pennsylvania,
Kentucky, Ohio, Tennessee, Indiana, and Illinois."

Speaker Biggert: "Representative Hartke."

Hartke: "So how many of these states complied with the request of the Federal Government in the cutoff date and how many did not?"

Speaker Biggert: "Representative Jones."

Jones, John: "I believe the director said yesterday there was two that we know of."

Speaker Biggert: "Representative Hartke."

Hartke: "Two other states? Illinois and which other state?"

Speaker Biggert: "Representative Jones."

Jones, John: "I believe Ohio was the other one, Representative."

Speaker Biggert: "Representative Hartke."

Hartke: "Well, I think he's in error now. I think it's Kentucky and Tennessee and there are two other states. What is the bottom line on this, Representative Jones? Why are we wanting to do this? Is it saving us a ton of money? Is it cutting down on the workload of the Department of Mines and Minerals that is helping them? What, what is the bottom line?"

Speaker Biggert: "Representative Jones."

88th Legislative Day

January 24, 1996

Jones: "It will just save us from needless paperwork, you know, to comply with the Federals when we already have it in place in the Department of Mines and Minerals."

Speaker Biggert: "Representative Hartke."

Hartke: "Well, I would just interject that if this is downsizing our paperwork and so forth, it would seem to me that we would have done this last October or last Summer. How long have we known about this cutoff date and the requirement that we opt out in this program?"

Speaker Biggert: "Representative Jones."

Jones: "The Resolution was tied up in the Senate, and when it got to the House floor, you know, we didn't have the time to move on it. But, you know I would've liked to have moved on it a lot sooner but I believe as a Representative said in the Committee yesterday, was this in the fast track legislation and it was not."

Speaker Biggert: "Representative Hartke."

Hartke: "So you're saying that we, in Illinois, have known about this for about a year. Is that right?"

Speaker Biggert: "Representative Jones."

Jones, John: "Approximately, yes."

Speaker Biggert: "Representative Hartke."

Hartke: "How much is approximately?"

Speaker Biggert: "Representative Jones."

Jones, John: "Oh, you can go anywhere from a month to 10 months."

Speaker Biggert: "Representative Hartke."

Hartke: "Fact of the matter is, the Department of Mines and Minerals has known about this for three years. And I think that in that time frame, tied up in the Senate, it may have been tied up that long, it may not have been. But I think it also would compel the House to introduce the Resolution. We could've done it, moved it over there, and put it in

88th Legislative Day

January 24, 1996

their lap but you're saying now we've got to do this today, and so forth. Is that right?"

Speaker Biggert: "Representative Jones."

Jones, John: "Well I personally would like to do it today and I know Director Bowman and all the people in the Department of Mines and Minerals would love to see it done today so it can get to the Governor's desk and then we can get the petition sent off to the U.S. Department of Interior."

Speaker Biggert: "Representative Hartke."

Hartke: "Well I really think we should too. I support the
Resolution. We ought to put it in airmail or some way.

Maybe we can fax the Resolution to them just as soon as we
get it passed so we can get this monumental piece of
legislation on the way."

Speaker Biggert: "Thank you. The Representative from Washington, Representative Deering."

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

Speaker Biggert: "He indicates he will."

Deering: "Representative, can you tell me in a nutshell, does this allow the State, does this give the State discretion to expand the drilling and production of methane gas? Does it keep us from doing this? Or in a nutshell, what does it do?"

Speaker Biggert: "Representative Jones."

Jones, John: "Representative, it is my understanding it doesn't expand it now, but the Office of Mines and Minerals does have the discretion to change it."

Speaker Biggert: "Representative Deering."

Deering: "You said that Mines and Minerals has a discretion to expand it now if they want? I'm sorry, I didn't hear your answer."

Speaker Biggert: "Representative Jones."

88th Legislative Day

January 24, 1996

Jones, John: "What this does Representative, is it keeps it at the state level instead of at the federal level and you know, that's the purpose of it."

Speaker Biggert: "Representative Deering."

Deering: "I understand that it keeps it at the state level versus the federal level. What does it do? What is it allowing the Department of Natural Resources...Division of Mines and Minerals to do?"

Speaker Biggert: "Representative Jones."

Jones, John: "The only thing this does is just allows us to petition the Department of Interior to take us off the list."

Speaker Biggert: "Representative Deering."

Deering: "So if it takes us off this list, then would that let a company in your district or my district go out into government owned lands, drill into the coal bed, and produce methane gas to be used for consumer consumption or for private business consumption in their industry?"

Speaker Biggert: "Representative Jones."

Jones, John: "Really that would depend on the current rules and regulations of the Department of Mines and Minerals and you know, whether the Department of Mines and Minerals would issue a permit for such activity."

Speaker Biggert: "Representative Deering."

Deering: "Okay, so then this list that this would take us off of, or that we're asking to be taken off of, is this an exemption list or is it a list that says that we're not in compliance so we can't do any production or expansion? I'm somewhat confused here."

Speaker Biggert: "Representative Jones."

Jones, John: "We're on an affected states list. This dilutes regarding coal bed methane ownership, the dispute that

88th Legislative Day

January 24, 1996

impedes coal bed methane development, the regulatory procedures that are not in place to encourage the development of coal bed methane and the extension development of coal bed methane has not taken place."

Speaker Biggert: "Representative Deering."

Deering: "So then, what this Resolution is asking for, is to take us off this affected list which is hampering development in Illinois and then that would allow us to make it easier with Mines and Minerals permitting process to develop methane gas? Is that what we're doing?"

Speaker Biggert: "Representative Jones."

Jones, John: "Yes, Representative Deering."

Speaker Biggert: "Representative Deering."

Deering: "One final question, Madam Speaker. I asked this in Committee yesterday and just for the clarification of getting it on the record in front of the Body...this...by doing this, this will not affect in any way someone who has already tapped into an underground mine, a mine that has been closed utilizing any methane for their own use in private business, is that correct?"

Speaker Biggert: "Representative Jones."

Jones, John: "You are correct."

Speaker Biggert: "The Representative from Kankakee,
Representative Novak."

Novak: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Will the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Biggert: "He indicates he will."

Novak: "I see you over there, John. How are you today?

Representative Jones, I know we've talked a little bit
about this Bill in Committee but I had a few questions
surface in my mind just recently I wanted to ask you. What
are we exempting Illinois for? Are there going to be other
states left on this list besides Illinois? Or will all the

88th Legislative Day

January 24, 1996

states be off the list that are affected?"

Speaker Biggert: "Representative Jones."

Jones, John: "Representative, I believe you said if the other states don't petition will they be off the list? Is that what you said? It's my understanding if you don't petition the Department of Interior you're gonna be left on the list. Only the ones that petition and are relieved or the Department of Interior will be off the list."

Speaker Biggert: "Representative Novak."

Novak: "Well is it not true that Tennessee and Kentucky will remain on the list?"

Speaker Biggert: "Representative Jones."

Jones: "I'm not sure, Representative, you know, they have petitioned. I'm not sure whether their petition has been granted or not."

Speaker Biggert: "Representative Novak."

Novak: "Representative Jones, can you explain for the Body? I know all of us aren't experts about coal and methane gas, but I'm sure someone around here can say a lot of gas might fly out of this Chamber every now and then. But can you explain for the Members of this Body what coal bed methane gas is and how it's produced?"

Speaker Biggert: "Representative Jones."

Jones, John: "You know I really can't answer that,

Representative, but the Gentleman right there beside you
from Washington County might be able to."

Speaker Biggert: "Representative Novak."

Novak: "Representative Jones, I mean you're the Chief Sponsor of this Senate Joint Resolution and I would suspect that, I mean, you come from coal country down there and gas country and I was just concerned, you know, not too many people, I don't think Representative Feigenholtz knows what coal bed

88th Legislative Day

January 24, 1996

methane gas is. I mean, could you explain this for the edification of the Body? How do we produce coal bed methane gas? I mean, is coal lying in a bed and is it heated up in gas? How do we do this?"

Speaker Biggert: "Representative Jones."

Jones, John: "That's the gas that's produced whenever they mine,
Representative."

Speaker Biggert: "Representative Novak."

Speaker Biggert: "Representative Jones."

Novak: "Well gas is produced from mining, I think that's natural gas. Methane gas, from remembering my eighth grade science books, is a by-product, I think, of coal. It's a compound that comes out of coal, I think, when coal decomposes, and methane gas is a by-product. But can you explain how it's produced? I mean, is this going to benefit the taxpayers in your district as well as the entire State of Illinois?"

Jones, John: "Well, on natural gas, you know, I'm in the oil business myself, have been for almost 40 years, which coal bed methane gas has nothing to do with natural gas. It's two different products altogether. But, you know, I would hope that this piece of legislation or this Senate Joint Resolution would increase coal production, maybe. You know, we'll do anything we can to increase the coal production in the State of Illinois."

Speaker Biggert: "Representative Novak."

Novak: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Representative Jones, when we're talking about coal bed methane gas in Illinois, I mean, the only coal we have in Illinois, unfortunately, is the high sulfur content. Is that not correct?"

Speaker Biggert: "Representative Jones."

Jones, John: "I'm sorry, Representative. I couldn't hear you."

Speaker Biggert: "Representative Novak, would you repeat the

88th Legislative Day

January 24, 1996

question?"

Novak: "Yes, Madam Speaker. Is it not correct, the only coal that I am, I think many of us are aware of in Illinois is the high sulfur content coal. Is that correct? Does this deal with the high sulfur content coal?"

Speaker Biggert: "Representative Jones."

Jones, John: "No, it doesn't."

Speaker Biggert: "Representative Novak."

Novak: "So what you're saying is that we do have certain deposits of lower sulfur content coal within the boundaries of the State of Illinois. Is that correct?"

Speaker Biggert: "Representative Jones."

Jones, John: "We do have some low sulfur coal in the State of Illinois. In fact, the Representative sitting right here in this chair beside me, and myself, we share a county that has probably the lowest sulfur coal in the State of Illinois or even in the Midwest, but we're not being able to produce it right now."

Speaker Biggert: "Representative Novak."

Novak: "Oh, I'm sorry. I see Representative Woolard sitting in a Republican seat. Hi, Representative Woolard. One other question. You know there's a lot of talk going on in Washington about, with this devolution going on with the new Congress and trying to make regulations and standards a little bit more easier for people to understand and live with, whether you are a business person, whether you are an individual citizen. Let's talk specifically about environmental regulations. Will this Resolution have any impact or have any affect on relaxing current environmental standards with respect to the production of coal bed methane gas?"

Speaker Biggert: "Representative Jones."

88th Legislative Day

- January 24, 1996
- Jones, John: "In the sense Representative, that it leaves it with regulatory with the State of Illinois instead of the Federal Government."
- Speaker Biggert: "Representative Novak, your time is just about
 to expire."
- Novak: "Speaker, I could not hear Representative Jones on that last question. What I want to know, is this going to have any impact on relaxing current federal or state environmental relations with respect to the production of this gas?"
- Speaker Biggert: "Representative Jones, yes or no?"
- Jones, John: "No, not that I'm aware of Representative."
- Speaker Biggert: "Thank you. The Representative from Vermilion, Representative Black."
- Black: "Thank you, Madam Speaker. Madam Speaker, I move the previous question."
- Speaker Biggert: "Representative Black has made a Motion to move the previous question. All those in favor say 'aye', all those opposed say 'no'. In the view of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The Motion is carried. Representative Jones to close."
- Jones, John: "Thank you, Madam Chairman. You know, I would simply just ask for an 'aye' vote from every Member in the chamber. You know, this is an important thing for the Office of Mines and Minerals and the Department of Natural Resources so I would just ask for a favorable vote. Thank you."
- Speaker Biggert: "Representative Jones has moved the adoption of Senate Joint Resolution 8. Voting is now open. Those in favor; those opposed. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all the record. On this question, there are 112 voting 'aye',

88th Legislative Day

January 24, 1996

0 voting 'nay', and 3 voting 'present', and the Motion is adopted. Mr. Clerk, Committee Reports."

Clerk Rossi: "Committee Reports. Representative Churchill,
Chairman from the Committee on Rules, to which the
following Joint Action Motions were referred, action taken
on January 24, 1996, reported the same back 'do approve
for consideration' referred to the House floor. Floor
Amendment 5 to Senate Bill 15; Floor Amendment 3 to Senate
Bill 775."

Speaker Biggert: "Mr. Clerk, Committee Announcements."

Clerk Rossi: "Committee Announcements. The House Committee on Executive will meet today at 1:30 p.m. in Room 114 to consider Floor Amendment 5 to Senate Bill 15. Repeating, the House Executive Committee will meet today at 1:30 p.m. in Room 114 to consider Floor Amendment 5 to Senate Bill 15."

Speaker Biggert: "Introduction of Bills, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk Rossi: "Introduction and First Reading of House Bills.

House Bill 2750, offered by Representative Saviano, a Bill for an Act concerning Public Aid. House Bill 2751, offered by Representative Biggins, a Bill for an Act making appropriations to the University of Illinois. House Bill 2752, offered by Representative Wojcik, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Pension Code. House Bill 2753, offered by Representative Cowlishaw, a Bill for an Act to amend the Abused and Neglected Child Reporting Act. House Bill 2754, offered by Representative Brunsvold, a Bill for an Act to amend the Code of Criminal Procedure. House Bill 2755, offered by Representative Cowlishaw, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. House Bill 2756, offered by Representative Erwin, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. House Bill 2757, offered by Representative Deuchler,

88th Legislative Day

January 24, 1996

a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Pension Code. Introduction and First Reading of these House Bills. Introduction and First Reading of House Bills. House Bill offered by Representative Boland, a Bill for an Act to amend the Criminal Code, House Bill 2759, offered by Representative Cowlishaw, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. House Bill 2760, offered by Representative Maureen Murphy, a Bill for an Act to amend the Hotel Operators' Occupation Tax Act. House Bill 2761, offered by Representative Schakowsky, a Bill for an Act in relation to program audits of certain medical practitioners, amending named Acts. House Bill 2762, offered by Representative Brady, a Bill for an Act amending the State Employees Group Insurance Act. House Bill 2763, offered by Representative Brady, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Pension Code. House Bill 2764, offered by Representative Brady, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Pension Code. House Bill 2765, offered by Representative Woolard, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Vehicle Code. First Reading of these House Bills."

Speaker Biggert: "On page 3 of the Calendar, Order of Concurrence appears House Bill 965. The Gentleman from Jersey, Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Thank you, Speaker. Members of the House, this Bill started out as part of the Conservation 2000 and now it contains two Amendments to which I would direct your attention. They were presented yesterday in the Agricultural Committee, and Senate Amendment 3...Speaker, I would ask for a moment for the indulgence of the House."

Speaker Biggert: "Agreed."

Speaker Biggert: "The Representative from St. Clair, Representative Hoffman. For what purpose do you rise?"

88th Legislative Day

January 24, 1996

Hoffman: "Yes. An inquiry of the Clerk, Madam Speaker. Has

Senate Amendment 3 been printed and distributed?"

Speaker Biggert: "Mr. Clerk."

- Speaker Daniels: "Mr. Clerk, the House will come back to order.

 Members will please be in their chairs. Mr. Clerk, what's
 the status of House Bill 965?"
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 965 is on the Order of Concurrence for the House to concur on Senate Amendments 3 and 5."
- Speaker Daniels: "Take that out of the record. The status of Senate Bill 775?"
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 775 has been returned to the Order of Second Reading. Has been read a second time previously.

 Amendments 1 and 2 were adopted in Committee. No Motions have been filed. Floor Amendment 3 has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Moffitt. Ladies and Gentlemen, while we are waiting for Representative Moffitt, announce the plans for the rest of the day. We're going to adopt the Amendment to Senate Bill 775. Then the Democrat side has asked for a caucus which we will honor and the Republicans will go to a caucus. We will then return to the floor and we will be prepared to work on the speed limit Bills until those are completed, after which at such time, if it's the desire of the House, we will complete a few other orders of business, a few other Bills, and then adjourn until February 6th. We hope that we can get you out of here sometime this afternoon or early evening so you can return to your districts if you desire. Those are our plans. If it doesn't work that way, then of course, we'll return tomorrow as well. So, we're on Senate Bill 775, Representative Moffitt."

Moffitt: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would move to adopt Floor

88th Legislative Day

January 24, 1996

Amendment 3."

- Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of Floor Amendment 3. Any discussion? Being no discussion, all in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and Amendment 3 is adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Rossi: "No further Amendments have been approved for consideration."

Speaker Daniels: "Any Motions?"

Clerk Rossi: "No Motions."

- Speaker Daniels: "Third Reading. All right, the Democrats have requested a caucus in Room 118. Republicans will caucus in Room 114 for one hour and we will return at 2:30. Thank you."
- Clerk Rossi: "Announcements. The 1:30 meeting of the Executive

 Committee has been cancelled. Executive Committee will not

 meet at 1:30."
- Clerk McLennand: "Committee notice. Rules Committee will meet at 3:30, Speaker's Conference Room. Rules Committee, 3:30, Speaker's Conference Room."
- Speaker Daniels: "Attention, Members of the House of Representatives. The House will convene in five minutes."
- Speaker Leitch: "The House will come to order, please.

 Representative Leitch in the Chair. All those not entitled
 to the Floor will please remove themselves from the
 chamber. Committee Reports."
- Clerk McLennand: "Committee Report from Representative Churchill,
 Chairman from the Committee on Rules, to which the
 following Joint Action Motions were referred, action taken
 on January 24, 1996, reported the same back 'do approve for
 consideration'. Conference Committee Report 1, to House
 Bill 1462, approved for consideration."

88th Legislative Day

- January 24, 1996
- Speaker Leitch: "Representative Parke, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"
- Parke: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move to recommit House Amendment 5 to Senate Bill 15 to the Rules Committee."
- Speaker Leitch: "You've heard the Motion. Is there any discussion? Hearing none, all those in favor shall say 'aye'; opposed 'nay'. Representative Granberg, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"
- Granberg: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just had a question of the Sponsor. I believe that is the Worker's Compensation Amendment, Representative Parke, is that correct?"
- Speaker Leitch: "Representative Parke."
- Parke: "Representative Granberg, no, that's the Unemployment Insurance Amendment."
- Speaker Leitch: "Representative Granberg."
- Granberg: "So I assume it is your intention, Sir, not to move far with revising the Unemployment Insurance and the Business Tax Break today?"
- Speaker Leitch: "Representative Parke."
- Parke: "Representative Granberg, you have assumed wrong. We are not going to deal with it at this time today, but we will reconsider it when we come back on February 6th."
- Speaker Leitch: "Representative Granberg. No further discussion.

 Any further discussion? Hearing none, all those in favor shall say 'aye', opposed, the same. In the opinion of the Chair, the Motion is adopted. Representative Ryder, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"
- Ryder: "Mr. Speaker, I would stand for the purposes of a Motion to submit Senate Bill 1193 to the Rules Committee and I would so move."
- Speaker Leitch: "You heard the Motion. Is there any discussion?

88th Legislative Day

January 24, 1996

Representative Granberg."

Granberg: "Thank you. Would the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Leitch: "He indicates he will."

Granberg: "Representative Ryder, could you briefly describe what that Senate Bill was for the edification of our Members, please?"

Speaker Leitch: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Certainly, Representative Granberg. It was presented to me by Senator Rea and it would have made a conservancy district which now has appointed Members, elected Members, and a Rules Committee meeting needs to take a further look at it."

Speaker Leitch: "Representative Granberg."

Granberg: "Thank you."

Speaker Leitch: "The Gentleman from Williamson, Representative Woolard, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

Woolard: "Basically, I'd just like to comment that I appreciate
the fact very much that he is moving this Bill back off of
Third Reading, and I think that this is a conservancy
district that's located within my area of the State, and
it's something that's very important to us. And I
appreciate the conciliatory effort that the Representative
is moving this back from Third Reading."

Speaker Leitch: "All right, you've heard the Motion to return

Senate Bill 1193 to Rules. On that matter, seeing no
further discussion, all those in favor shall say 'aye',
opposed the same. In the opinion of the Chair, the Motion
carries and Senate Bill 1193 shall be returned to Rules.
Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Thank you. Mr. Speaker, I would ask to call House Bill 965 for consideration of Amendments 3 and 5 at this time."

Speaker Leitch: "On page 3 of the Calendar, on the Order of

88th Legislative Day

January 24, 1996

Concurrence appears House Bill 965. Representative Ryder, you are recognized, Sir."

Ryder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This would be final action this Bill. The Committee on Conservation and Agriculture has recommended that we approve Senate Amendments 3 and 5, and I therefore, make the Motion to concur on Senate Amendments 3 and 5 to this Bill. The Amendments 3 and 5 become the Bill. Number 3 is a huge Amendment, but it is technical in nature, and the purpose of that Amendment to follow-up, making the technical changes necessary for the consolidation of various agencies under the Department of Natural Resources. Natural Resources consolidation is an issue that we examined and approved during the Session, and was passed by the Governor at that time. is the Legislative Reference Bureau's follow-up with all the technical changes of cross-references to the Bill. is a very large Amendment. After questioning yesterday in Committee, the Committee voted unanimously to approve that I'd be happy to answer any questions on that Amendment. Amendment, but I also wish to talk briefly about Amendment Amendment #5 deals with a situation created by the #5. Federal Government in which they expanded the snow goose hunting season which is primarily Southern Illinois during the next month. However, because that hunting season comes at a time not normally in which hunting is allowed in the Illinois, we had to change a couple of laws for just this circumstance in order to allow hunting to take It deals with the circumstances of the Federal Government allowing us this extra time. It's a sportsman's issue in Southern Illinois but it is an economic development issue as well because hunting in certain counties of the State is one of the foremost industries

88th Legislative Day

- January 24, 1996
- that we have. We'd like to give them an additional opportunity to do that. Mr. Speaker, I'd be happy to answer any questions on this issue."
- Speaker Leitch: "Thank you, Representative Ryder. The Gentleman from Bureau, Representative Mautino."
- Mautino: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
- Speaker Leitch: "Do you have an announcement of personal privilege Representative Mautino having to do with a recent birth?"
- Mautino: "Yes. We're also very proud, and I want to thank all the Members who sent the cards. My wife, Lena and I are very proud to announce the birth of our son, Peter Joseph. And he's doing very fine, he's down at St. Francis. He's 3 pounds 3 ounces, and if he has his father's ability to gain weight, we'll have him home in a week. So he's doing great and thank you much."
- Speaker Leitch: "Congratulations, Representative. You may
 proceed."
- Mautino: "Representative Ryder, the Amendment here...I see that

 we have...are there any changes or increases in the number

 of appointments to boards included in here other than what

 had been approved previously this year?"
- Speaker Leitch "Representative Ryder."
- Ryder: "My personal congratulations to you and your wife, and best wishes to your son, Peter. The answer to your question was asked in the Committee yesterday; I will answer on the floor today. No. Those committees that were in existence, remain in existence, but in some cases we had to change the name of the agency to which they report, or the participation of the agency as part of the committee because of the consolidation of the department. No change in the number of people. No change in the purpose. No

88th Legislative Day

January 24, 1996

additions or eliminations, no changes in the number of gubernatorial appointments. It is purely a straightforward technical change because of the consolidation of the department."

Speaker Leitch: "Representative Mautino."

Mautino: "Just one final question. I know I asked this of the Director of Conservation during the previous hearings. Has there been any change regarding or is there anything addressed in this Amendment towards the macro-sites and the person or persons who will be appointed to oversee macro-sites throughout the State?"

Speaker Leitch: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Representative, there has been no change. Previous law is current law with the exception that changes of names or agency designations because of the consolidation took place, but no substantive change. To the very best of my knowledge, this Amendment is strictly technical. No substantive changes were made. But it's a huge Amendment, and I appreciate the questions you're asking and I'll be happy to answer any others the Gentleman...that Members may have."

Speaker Leitch: "The Gentleman from Kankakee, Representative Novak. For what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

Novak: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. Will the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Leitch: "He indicates he will."

Novak: "Yes, Representative Ryder, what is the length of time for this snow goose season now in Illinois?"

Speaker Leitch: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative, February 10th to March 10th, a 29 day season."

Speaker Leitch: "Representative Novak."

Novak: "Thank you. Twenty-nine day season. Was there a snow

88th Legislative Day

January 24, 1996

goose season at all in the State of Illinois prior to the consideration of this Bill?"

Speaker Leitch: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Representative, yes indeed there is an annual snow geese season in the State of Illinois. We have enjoyed that season. It has expired. The season that we are now discussing is one that was granted by the Federal Government in addition to the season that we previously enjoyed."

Speaker Leitch: "Representative Novak."

Novak: "Thank you, Representative Ryder. One last question. I know this is a pretty thick document here and there's a lot of insignificant changes, I guess, referring to conservation and making changes to natural resources, but for the record, can you tell me are there any exemptions in here for the Retail Rate Law? Are there?"

Speaker Leitch: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Representative, for the record, there are no exemptions for the retail Rate Law to my knowledge."

Speaker Leitch: "Have you concluded your questions,

Representative? Thank you. The Gentleman from Williamson,

Representative Woolard."

Woolard: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to just clear up one thing that was stated incorrectly. The snow goose season is still in until the 31st of this month. So, you know, we are continuing with the regular snow goose season which coincides with the Canada goose season. But this is a special season as was stated by Representative Ryder. Let me just say a couple of things. First off, he indicated that it is an economic boon to certain areas of this state. Goose hunting is a major industry in my area. It's something that we depend on very diligently every fall and

88th Legislative Day

January 24, 1996

this gives us another opportunity to expand that opportunity to bring economic development to Southern Illinois. But let me talk for just a second about the consolidation of agencies. You know. I think that there's a lot of us that have some real concerns when we start talking about mega-agencies, such as we have developed here. But I'm one of those that believes that not have we had a great transition, but I believe that this can continue to be a well run operation because of the people involved, and the management of that department at this time. I also would like to say that I think it's imperative that we find ways to make government more efficient, and I think that each and every one of us have a responsibility to see that this is done in an effective fashion. I commend Representative Ryder again for being the Sponsor of this legislation, for taking this idea, I commend those people expanding upon it. the department that are doing a good job and implementing it. I commend the Governor of this state for giving us the leadership that makes a difference. Let me just say that there are times when it works. I believe this is one that does. I hope in the one that is proposed, that we are just as effective in making it work then as now."

- Speaker Leitch: "Thank you, Representative. The Gentleman from Jo Daviess, Representative Lawfer. For what reason do you rise, Sir?"
- Lawfer: "Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Will the Sponsor yield for a question?"
- Speaker Leitch: "If he can tell a snow goose from another goose, he indicates he can. Representative Ryder."
- Lawfer: "Representative, in Amendment #3, it creates the Office of Water Resources within the Department. This is a

88th Legislative Day

January 24, 1996

transfer from the Department of Transportation, I understand and that also has to do with regulation of water, navigation, flooding. Is this any change, or any enlargement of responsibilities over what they currently have."

Speaker Leitch: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Representative, we made that decision last year when we authorized the consolidation of the Department. When that division came from the Department of Transportation, it brought with it only those responsibilities that we had previously given. They have those same responsibilities under the Department of Natural Resources, and they have not been given additional responsibilities, either by that previous legislation nor are they having additional responsibilities or lesser responsibilities under this legislation."

Speaker Leitch: "Representative Lawfer."

Lawfer: "Thank you very much."

Speaker Leitch: "Representative Hartke, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

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

Speaker Leitch: "He indicates he will."

Hartke: "Representative Ryder, when this concept of consulting the agencies was put together, there was talk that we would be saving millions and millions of dollars. Could you tell me how many millions of dollars we've saved by this consolidation of the agencies?"

Speaker Leitch: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Representative, you may have been quoting your own press release, but I certainly did not indicate to you that that would save millions and millions of dollars. In fact, I don't believe that the best reason for making the

88th Legislative Day

January 24, 1996

consolidation in the previous year was saving money, but rather more efficient government, working smarter with less government. But I do not have the figures. I don't believe the figures are available to show that millions of dollars were saved, or that hundreds of people were laid off. I don't think that happened. But I think that we did get a better agency, a more streamlined agency, one that works better. If someone suggested to you that it was going to save millions and millions of dollars, that person was not me."

Speaker Leitch: "Representative Hartke."

Hartke: "Are we delivering more services now than we did before?

And if so, name one."

Speaker Leitch: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Representative, we are not. We are delivering the same services better."

Speaker Leitch: "Representative Hartke."

Hartke: "Thank you. He didn't want to answer the question, anyway."

Speaker Leitch: "Seeing no further discussion, Representative Ryder to close."

Ryder: "First I want to thank the House for their attention and their questions on this Bill. The technical part is not one of the more glamorous things that we do in this Legislature, but it is one of the more necessary ones. We made a good decision last year when we created the Department of Natural Resources. We now do the everyday work of the technical part. And for those folks who wish to continue hunting snow geese, I apologize that I was not aware of the season extending until today and beyond. But for those folks who wish to hunt, and those folks who receive the economic benefit, I would ask your favorable

88th Legislative Day

January 24, 1996

vote. And finally, I do want to thank all of those folks who were tempted to make jokes about snow geese or goose, and didn't. I certainly appreciate that, and I ask for your favorable vote."

Speaker Leitch: "The Gentleman has moved the question. 'Shall the House concur with Senate Amendments 3 and 5 to House Bill 965?' All those in favor shall signify by voting 'aye', all those opposed shall vote 'no'. The voting is open. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 115 voting 'aye', none voting 'no', and this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, Supplemental Calendar Announcement."

Clerk McLennand: "Supplemental Calendar #2 is being distributed."

Speaker Leitch: "Mr. Clerk, please read Senate Joint Resolution
#74."

Clerk McLennand: "Senate Joint Resolution #74 offered by Representative Churchill, be it resolved by the Senate of the 89th General Assembly of the State of Illinois, the House of Representatives concurring herein that when the Senate adjourns on Wednesday, January 24th, 1996, it stands adjourned until Thursday, January 25th, 1996. And when it adjourns on that day it stands adjourned until Tuesday, February 6th, 1996. And when the House of Representatives adjourns on Wednesday, January 24th, 1996, it stands adjourned until Thursday, February 1st, 1996 in Perfunctory And when it adjourns on that day, it stands Session. adjourned until Tuesday, February 6th, 1996."

Speaker Leitch: "Representative Black, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I rise and ask that

88th Legislative Day

January 24, 1996

the House move to suspend House Rule 3-6a to provide for the immediate consideration of SJR 74."

Speaker Leitch: "The Gentleman has moved to suspend House Rule 3-6a. On that question, all those in favor...

Representative Currie, for what purpose do you rise?"

I don't oppose this Motion but I Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. would suggest to this House that our rules right now provide that any Adjournment Resolution must first be voted upon in the House Rules Committee. I have filed an Amendment to the House Rules that would obviate the need for Motions such as the one Mr. Black is making today, and I would suggest that that has happened for practically every week we've been in Session this Fall and the beginning of this Winter. Since you have in fact, avoided the Rules Committee, it would make far better procedural sense to deal with my proposed Amendment to the Rules Committee, to the Rules with respect to Adjournment Resolutions, than forever to be messing up the Rules that you have provided this House. So, may I suggest to the Chair that, while I will not oppose this Motion today, I think we should all oppose Motions like this in the future since there's a much better way to deal with the problem than the way that Mr. Black proposes that we deal with it this afternoon."

Speaker Leitch: "Thank you, Representative. Hearing no discussion on the question, the Gentleman has moved that House Rule 3-6a be suspended. All those in favor shall say 'aye'; all those opposed shall say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it and House Rule 3-6a is suspended. Representative Black."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I move the passage of Senate Joint Resolution 74."

88th Legislative Day

January 24, 1996

Speaker Leitch: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage of Senate Joint Resolution 74. And on that question, all those in favor shall say 'aye'; all those opposed shall say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it and the Motion passes. On page 3 of the Calendar, under the Conference Committee Reports appears House Bill 1787. Representative Kubik."

Kubik: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of present to you today, the First Conference Committee on House Bill 1787. House Bill 1787 essentially is a corrective measure that would allow the nine Chicago museums and Brookfield Zoo, to sell Capital Improvement Bonds which were previously authorized by the Illinois General Assembly. In 1992, the Legislature authorized the issuing...or authorized the bonding authorization of roughly \$27 million for the Brookfield Zoo. A year they all authorized a \$128 million bond authorization for the Chicago Park District on behalf of its nine museums. The nine museums obviously are those that many of you have attended over the years, the Chicago Historical Society, the Field Museum, the Science and Industry, et cetera. These bonds are being used as part of a capital program to improve these institutions. I'd like to tell you that when I...I know Representative Currie was the Sponsor of the Chicago Park District Bill and I was the Sponsor of the Brookfield Zoo Bill, and the reason that the Legislature authorized these bonds was because the Park District the Forest Preserve District are rather unique entities. There was no real easy was for them to go to referendum and issue bonds. What this Bill does is, essentially allows those two units of government to issue the remaining bonds on a one-time basis. So, in the case of the Chicago

88th Legislative Day

January 24, 1996

Park District for the Chicago museums, they were authorized \$128 million, they have issued \$34 million and this Bill would allow them to issue the additional \$94 million in The Cook County Forest Preserve District issued approximately \$16 million in bonds, this would allow them to issue the additional ll. Let me make one other point, and that is that this Bill, these institutions, not raise money through taxes, property taxes, but they also must match these contributions dollar for dollar by private donations. So what this Bill does is, allows those institutions to sell these bonds, and I know that many of you have heard from a lot of people on this issue. I would be more than happy to respond to any questions that you might have and would urge your support of House Bill...the First Conference Committee Report on House Bill 1787."

Speaker Leitch: "You've heard the Motion, and on this question, is there any discussion? Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Yes. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Leitch: "He indicates he will."

Speaker Leitch: "Representative Kubik."

Kubik: "Yes, it does."

Speaker Leitch: "Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "So this is another exemption to the tax caps legislation that was passed, what, two years ago now? Is that correct?"

Speaker Leitch: "Representative Kubik."

Kubik: "I would say this is a corrective measure. And I think Representative Hoffman, that this particular corrective measure is different than a lot of the other issues that we've seen before us, primarily because these units of

88th Legislative Day

January 24, 1996

government, the Chicago Park District and the Cook County Forest Preserve District came to the General Assembly to get their authorization for the bonds. And we were, in a sense, their referendum, so to speak. And so through an oversight in the tax cap legislation, they are not allowed to sell those bonds so this would correct that oversight."

Speaker Leitch: "Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Did we pass something last Spring regarding exempting forest preserve districts from the tax caps? Is that now law? Or is this that same thing? I genuinely don't know." Speaker Leitch: "Representative Kubik."

Kubik: "This is different for one major reason. The bond that we are authorizing, this does not create a new cap, so to speak. This allows these institutions to sell the remaining bonds. Now, if they, after 20 years want to come back with a capital program, they must come back to us to get additional authorization to sell bonds."

Speaker Leitch: "Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "I guess the only concern that some people may have, and I'm saying this for the edification of everybody on this side of the aisle and on that side of the aisle, is indeed, this is an exemption to the tax cap. So for everybody who heard the hue and cry that we need property tax reductions and everybody who heard the hue and cry that we need to limit property tax caps, well every single time we come into this General Assembly...property taxes, every time we come into this General Assembly, somebody else wants to be let out from under the property tax cap. So if you're a true blue property tax capper, and you want to keep property taxes down, there's no way that you should be supporting this, because this could be and would result, and could result in a property tax increase. If you want

88th Legislative Day

January 24, 1996

to fund the museums, all well and good, but let's not kid each other. Let's be honest about this. If we're going to have property tax reform in this State, continually do it on a piecemeal basis, let's not continue... next we're going to have education in here, then we're going to have local governments in here, and then we're going to have township governments in here, and anybody who has a property tax is going to come and want to be rid of your property tax caps. So I say to you, I'm personally going to vote 'no' against this. I think, in my mind, although I understand why some people would support I in my mind, say you can't have it both ways. You're either for property tax caps, or you're against property tax caps. And if we're going to continue to do things in a hodgepodge piecemeal basis, I don't see how we're ever going to have a consistent tax policy here in the State of Illinois."

Speaker Leitch: "If we could have some more order please? The Lady from Cook, Representative Currie, for what purpose do you rise?"

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker..."

Speaker Leitch: "Excuse me, Representative. Let's get some order here, please. Would you give the Lady your attention, please? Proceed."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker, and Members of the House. I rise in support of the Conference Committee Report to House Bill 1787. Is this an exemption to the property tax cap? Yes it is, but I like to think that had the people who propose the property tax cap in Cook County, had they taken a little time, had they done their homework thoroughly, instead of deciding this was an appropriate topic for the fast track, they would've included this language in the

88th Legislative Day

January 24, 1996

For the point here is first of all, that original Bill. these projects are good projects, as Representative Kubik noted, I was the original Sponsor of the Bill that enabled the museums on park district lands to expand facilities to improve their programs so that we could do a better job of educating youngsters all across the State of But to say that, isn't to say that maybe there's Illinois. better way to accomplish this end and that, from my perspective, would certainly have been an outright repeal. But I would note for my property tax conscious friends that the park district has assured us, each and every one of us, and the good citizens of the City of Chicago and the County of Cook that there will not be an increase in the property tax levy because of passage of House Bill 1787. as Representative Kubik noted, the museums are in the middle of the projects we have already approved. already done 30 odd million dollars of the bonds that we've given them approval to do. They have additional programs and projects on their way to completion. They'll be stuck if we don't approve this at this point, and the park district has assured that there will be a return on the outstanding debt before they permit new debt that will, in fact, increase the property taxes that are paid by any homeowner or property tax owner in Cook County. These were good projects when we offered them, when we authorized them a few short years ago. They're still good projects, while, as I say, there may be a better way to make sure projects can go forward, we would be doing a disservice to the museums, to the private contributors who help support these projects as well, and to all of the citizens of Illinois, were we to stop these projects at this point in their tracks. I strongly urge a 'yes' vote."

88th Legislative Day

January 24, 1996

Speaker Leitch: "Representative Kubik, do you wish to close?

Representative Kubik."

Kubik: "Mr. Speaker, I would urge all Members to support this proposal. I would like to respond to one of the points that was made by an earlier speaker with respect to the exemption to this cap. The fact of the matter is, one, these institutions, when we were drafting the property tax cap legislation, did not come to us and ask for a change in the law because quite honestly, I don't think they envisioned that this would happen. They did not think because they received their authorization from the State of Illinois, that they would need to have this legislation. So this was something that they did not even know, those institutions did not even know when we passed this legislation. This is a very unique situation because the Legislature is the one who has authorized these bonds, unlike local government and other units of government. So this is a very unique situation. I think that it is one that we should address, and as a strong proponent of tax caps, I think this is a very reasonable and good correction of the initial legislation. So I urge your support of the First Conference Committee on House Bill 1787."

Speaker Leitch: "The Gentleman has moved for the adoption of the First Conference Committee Report to House Bill 1787. All those in favor shall signify by voting 'aye', all those opposed shall signify by voting 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Take the record. And on that question, there are 61 voting 'aye', 44 voting 'no', 9 voting 'present', and the House has adopted First Conference Committee Report to House Bill 1787. On

88th Legislative Day

January 24, 1996

Supplemental Calendar #2 appears House Bill 1462. Representative Moffitt."

Moffitt: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On Conference Committee Report for House Bill 1462, approval of this. concurring on Senate Amendment #1 which we voted on vesterdav. That vote on Senate Amendment 1 yesterday was 71 to 35. I think most of you would remember the provisions of that. That Amendment represented an agreement between the Midwest Truckers Association and the Transportation Association and the Illinois Movers and Warehouseman's Association and Illinois Commerce Commission. And that action was taken yesterday. That was an Agreed Bill. There was no opposition. It was bipartisan proposal, and it had been developed by gubernatorial commission. The Conference Committee Report that we're looking at here, of course incorporates Amendment 1 and also adopts the language for the speed limit on local roads. This Conference Committee Report passed the Senate today by a vote of 56 to nothing, 56 to nothing in the Senate. The language dealing with speed limit, we have heard this in Transportation Committee for two different meetings now for the last two weeks Transportation Committee, and heard lots of testimony in favor of 55 miles an hour on our local roads. In Illinois, at the present time, we have an inconsistency on our speed limits of two lane roads with our state two lanes being at 55, and two lane local roads being at 65, and the intent of this legislation would be to put the two lane local roads at 55 like they have been for the last 20 years. county and township roads in Illinois for the most part were not built to handle speeds of 65 miles per hour. Allowing vehicles to travel at 65 on these roads creates a

88th Legislative Day

January 24, 1996

safety hazard. I think you need to keep in mind two things as we consider this speed limit Bill. First of all, is the issue of safety. In comparing the fatality rate and the injury rate of the three years prior to the 55 miles hour, which was 1971, '72, and '73, and with the three most recent years with 55 miles an hour, the fatality rate decreased 43% in Illinois. The second issue is cost, cost to local government, for them to be able to take, to really keep their roads, their two lane roads, at 55 miles an hour, like they've had them for the last 20 years. Without this legislation, it would represent а significant expenditure on their part just to keep them at the speed limit they've had. Local governments would save estimated \$3,000,000 by not having to post 55 mile an hour signs, since this Bill would automatically cap the limit at 55 on local roads. So we're saving local government that expense. This adoption of this legislation would set the maximum speed limit on state two lane highways, which is currently 55, to match local roads, we would have a uniform 55 mile an hour speed limit on two lane highways throughout the State of Illinois. Be happy to answer any questions that you might have."

- Speaker Leitch: "The Gentleman from Clinton, Representative Granberg. For what purpose do you rise, Sir?"
- Granberg: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Parliamentary inquiry. When was this Conference Committee to House Bill 1462 distributed to the Members?"
- Speaker Leitch: "Representative Black, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"
- Black: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, with the permission of Representative Granberg, who has asked a very cogent question, if he would relinquish the floor to me, I would make a Motion that I

88th Legislative Day

January 24, 1996

think would perhaps answer his question, or at least give the opportunity to answer his question."

Speaker Leitch: "Representative Granberg."

Granberg: "Well, in all due respect to my colleague, I think this is a parliamentary inquiry for the Chair, and I'm sure we will get to Representative Black at the due time. But, according to the House Rules, when the new Majority took over for openness in government, according to House Rule 8-4b, no Conference Committee Report may be considered the House unless it shall have first been reproduced and distributed for one full Session day prior to May 1st. it's my understanding this Conference Committee Report just been distributed and I know the intention of the Majority in the new House Rules is for that openness And that's what we all are about here, and 'I government. concur with the new Majority that we want that openness in government. We want the opportunity to fully debate this, and that's for the public's best interest. So with that, Mr. Speaker, I would ask again when this distributed and if it comes in compliance with the House Rules?"

Speaker Leitch: "I think your point is well taken, Representative. Representative Black, for a Motion."

Black: "Yes, if in order Mr. Speaker, I think my friend and colleague, Representative Granberg, is absolutely correct. I apologize to the Body for failing to seek recognition prior to the opening remarks of this fine Bill's Sponsor. And if in order, Mr. Speaker, what I would like to do at this time is to make a Motion to suspend Rule 8-4b so that we can provide for the immediate consideration of Conference Committee #1 to House Bill 1462."

Speaker Leitch: "The Gentleman has moved to waive House Rule

88th Legislative Day

January 24, 1996

8-4b. All those in favor shall signify by saying 'aye', all those 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the rule is waived. Is there any discussion on the Conference Committee Report? Representative Granberg."

Granberg: "Mr. Speaker, I didn't... obviously you didn't see my light, and I know that was not intentional. But you did not respond to my question as to when the Conference Committee Report was actually distributed. We seemed to jump. Maybe we did not know that. Maybe you did comply with the rules, so I had asked that question, and I'm sure you'd like to answer."

Speaker Leitch: "I'm informed it was distributed this afternoon.

I'm checking to see an exact time but I'll let you know when I have it. Is there any discussion on the Conference Report? The Gentleman from Effingham, Representative Hartke. Representative Hartke, do you wish to discuss the Conference Committee Report, Sir?"

Hartke: "Yes, I have a question. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Leitch: "He indicates he will."

Hartke: "Would you look at the Conference Committee Report on page 4, line 16 through about 25. Would you look at that and explain what you think that means?"

Speaker Leitch: "Representative Moffitt."

Moffitt: "Representative Hartke, would you repeat your question please?"

Speaker Leitch: "Representative Hartke."

Hartke: "Well, I have some concerns about this Conference

Committee Report as it relates here in this paragraph on
page 4 between line 14 and line 25."

Speaker Leitch: "Representative Moffitt."

Moffitt: "Representative, an interstate highway is, there's a

88th Legislative Day

January 24, 1996

clear definition of an interstate highway that's defined
elsewhere in the Act."

Speaker Leitch: "Representative Hartke."

Hartke: "Yes. You would not consider this definition then to be an interstate highway?"

Speaker Leitch: "Representative Moffitt."

Moffitt: "That is correct, Representative."

Speaker Leitch: "Representative Hartke."

Hartke: "Let me reiterate just what you said. This is...this definition is not considered an interstate highway definition."

Speaker Leitch: "Representative Moffitt."

Moffitt: "That's my understanding, Representative."

Speaker Leitch: "Representative Hartke."

Hartke: "Yes. What kind of a road is it that you're trying to
 describe right there?"

Speaker Leitch: "Representative Moffitt."

Moffitt: "Representative, the language I believe that you're referring to is not new language. It's the language that's been in the statute. Correct?"

Speaker Leitch: "Representative Hartke."

Hartke: "I understand that. But I'm trying to understand exactly what that says because we're referring to that in this legislation."

Speaker Leitch: "Representative Moffitt."

Moffitt: "We are not changing any definition there. It's language that's been there and we're not changing any definition that has been in place for a number of years."

Speaker Leitch: "Representative Hartke."

Hartke: "But you are making reference to that type of particular road and I want to be assured that you're not making a reference to an interstate. Because we are talking about

88th Legislative Day

January 24, 1996

county and township roads in this legislation, not referring to interstates."

Speaker Leitch: "Representative Moffitt."

Moffitt: "You are correct. We are not referring to interstate.

That is not our intent."

Speaker Leitch: "Representative Hartke."

Hartke: "Thank you very much, Representative Moffitt."

Speaker Leitch: "The Gentleman from Rock Island, Representative Brunsvold. For what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

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

Speaker Leitch: "He indicates he will."

Brunsvold: "Representative Moffitt, you and I discussed the township and county roads at 55 and I agreed that I thought that was appropriate. That's what this Bill does. What does it do for a state two lane road? What's the speed limit on a state two lane road right now with this Bill?"

Speaker Leitch: "Representative Moffitt."

Moffitt: "Representative, the speed limits on two lane state roads in Illinois are currently 55. The Governor has indicated that by order, and we are...this also actually agrees that they are 55 on the two lane state roads. We're clarifying the actions that the Governor has taken."

Speaker Leitch: "Representative Brunsvold."

Brunsvold: "Did you say the Governor had...what word did you use, Executive Order, 55, what term did you use there?"

Speaker Leitch: "Representative Moffitt."

Moffitt: "It's my understanding that it was by Executive Order of
the Governor that the two lane state roads are 55, and IDOT
has done speed studies to back up his decision. They've
also been, of course, posted at that speed limit."

Speaker Leitch: "Representative Brunsvold."

88th Legislative Day

January 24, 1996

Brunsvold: "So, let me ask you a question then. According to state law that was passed here probably 25 years ago, after the feds took off their requirements, what did the statutes say about the speed limit on a two lane state road? I mean, the Governor has indicated a 55, but what did the state law say?"

Speaker Leitch: "Representative Moffitt."

Moffitt: "Representative, it's my understanding that the state law said that two lanes would be 65 unless an engineering study was conducted and to establish them at a lower speed, and that's what the Governor has done with information studies from IDOT. He's established the two lane roads at 55, a continuation of what it has been for approximately the last 20 years."

Speaker Leitch: "Representative Brunsvold."

Brunsvold: "Representative Moffitt, you know I ..I know you're handling this Bill, but I totally disagree with what the Governor has done. He's taken the authority away from this General Assembly to set the speed limits on the two lanes, two lane roads in this state by an Executive Order of which we have not acted on. The speed limit right now should be 65 according to what you're saying to me and I wouldn't be opposed to lowering it to 60 and raising the interstate limit to 70. I think that's what we ought to do as a Body to do that, and that's what I'd like to do. Just tell me that this Bill right now doesn't affect that situation and all you're addressing is county and township roads."

Moffitt: "Representative, the intent of the...the overriding intent of the legislation is addressing speed limit on local roads, counties, and townships and setting two lane local roads at 55 miles an hour. It does clarify the speed limit on the state roads which it's my understanding with

88th Legislative Day

January 24, 1996

an engineering study that the Governor and posting that the Governor has that authority if it is backed up by an engineering study of IDOT."

Speaker Leitch: "Representative Brunsvold."

Brunsvold: "So you're telling me then that this Bill does affect intestate highway speeds, two lane highways, state highway speeds and also addresses counties and townships. If that's the case, then I'm in conflict with what I told you before that I would support your position on 55 on county and township roads. But I told you then that I was for a 60 an hour speed limit on the two lane...on the state two lanes and 70 on the interstates, so this Bill conflicts with what I told you and I just want to know where I stand. I want to support your 55 for the county and townships but I don't want to support the other part of the Bill because I don't think that is appropriate."

Speaker Leitch: "Representative Moffitt."

Speaker Leitch: "Representative Brunsvold."

Moffitt: "Representative, the overriding intent is dealing with local roads. I think if any speed limits...if the General Assembly addresses the issue of speed limits on interstate or two lanes different from what they are now, that's a separate issue. At the present time the speed limit of course is 65 on four lane roads in Illinois, 55 on two lane state roads in Illinois. That has not changed. There is just some clarification allowing that to remain as it is. If we were to address it as a separate issue, and I think that should be a separate issue, if it were to be changed."

Brunsvold: "Representative Moffitt, on I guess on page four, line
16 'however such limits shall not exceed 65' and has
crossed out 70 miles per hour. So we have changed what it
appears to me to be, an interstate speed limit. Is that

88th Legislative Day

January 24, 1996

right? It's crossed out 70 and put 65. I'm not for that. I'm for the 70 mile an hour on the interstates. And if I have to vote for this Bill, I'm not going to support this Bill because you, I think we've changed speed limits here on the interstate and on state two lane roads without really talking about that. We've talked about county and township and I'm with you on that part of this Bill. But I'm not for changing the speed limit as is on line 16 on page four."

Speaker Leitch: "The Gentleman from Coles, Representative Weaver.

For what reason do you rise, Sir?"

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

Speaker Leitch: "He indicates he will."

Weaver: "Representative, I guess for purposes of clarification on page four, I want to make sure that we're doing nothing but returning the limits as they were prior to the federal change and not intending to change the classes of vehicle that we're altering the speed limit for. Is that your understanding?"

Speaker Leitch: "Representative Moffitt."

Moffitt: "Yes, Representative, that's my understanding."

Speaker Leitch: "Representative Weaver."

Weaver: "So, Representative, your intent is not to prohibit those vehicles that were allowed to...for example, go the maximum speed limit prior to this, to still go to the maximum speed limit whether it is on a state road or a county road, is that correct?"

Speaker Leitch: "Representative Moffitt."

Moffitt: "Yes, Representative, that's our intent."

Speaker Leitch: "Are you finished, Representative Weaver? The Gentleman from Washington, Representative Deering. For what purpose do you rise, Sir?'

88th Legislative Day

January 24, 1996

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

Speaker Leitch: "He indicates he will."

Deering: "Representative, I have a few questions about your prior comments. You stated in your opening remark that 55...that some of these secondary and county and township roads aren't safe at 55 miles per hour. Have all these roads been built after the 55 mile an hour speed limit went into effect?"

Speaker Leitch: "Representative Moffitt."

Moffitt: "Representative, just a clarification on your statement of what I said. It was at 65 that many of them would not be safe. And I believe just now you said that I said 55.

I said 65 or certainly intended to say 65, that that is what we felt was not safe on many of the two lane local roads. Your additional question or your actual question is, have these been built recently? There'd certainly be a wide range but most of the roads would have been in place for many years of course."

Speaker Leitch: "Representative Deering."

Deering: "Representative, do you believe in local control?"

Speaker Leitch: "Representative Moffitt."

Moffitt: "Representative, whenever possible I certainly like as much local input as possible, local control as possible. You'll note that we have pretty much all the lobbies for local government in support of this legislation. Be happy to go over that list with you but those lobbies that represent local government have strongly backed this. They've testified that they are proponents and they feel that this is...would be in their best interest as they indicated that it would save them money and yet provide the continued...what's considered safe speed limit on the local roads. The provisions of this Conference Committee Report

88th Legislative Day

January 24, 1996

will allow local governments to lower the speed limit by a board resolution. A county board, by resolution, could them below the 55 without an engineering study. That's an additional item of local control, new item of local control that's been put in this. So that has actually increased local control over what we've had in the past."

Speaker Leitch: "Representative Deering."

Deering: "Representative, you know this was repealed by federal government and the new Congress, and the new Majority here in Illinois is saying that we want less regulation, less regulation, so Congress deregulated the speed limits and now here we're wanting to regulate the speed limit further. Ιt seems to me like we're adding...let me ask you this. I see in this Bill that local county boards, local control, local governments can reduce the speed if they want to without IDOT approval. Why are we not allowing them to increase the speed above 55 if they go through IDOT or the U.S.. Department of Transportation's 85th percentile study? Why will we not allow them to do that if those locally elected officials feel that they know their highways better than we up here in Springfield and they seem to think they're safer? might add, sure, today those local officials might have been up here lobbying you on behalf of this but tomorrow in an election most of them could be thrown out the window the people out there apparently want less regulations so, I don't think we can use that argument but why do we limit local governments' ability to set their own speed limits when we do not do it today?"

Speaker Leitch: "Representative Moffitt."

Moffitt: "Representative, there are a number of reasons that I think we need to take into consideration here. First of

88th Legislative Day

January 24, 1996

all, that local government has been in strong support of this legislation. Secondly, we are not lowering the speed limit on local roads. This is a continuation...adoption of this legislation would be a continuation of what they have had for the last...approximately twenty years. So we're not lowering it, we're just saying it would continue on. A lot of local government would not have the finance or the expertise in-house expertise to do the engineering study. So it...by letting these... by the state establishing that based on experience from IDOT that 55 is the most practical, would be in the best interest of the citizens of the State of Illinois to keep it at 55. That's based on actual studies, the expertise that we have at IDOT."

Speaker Leitch: "Representative Deering."

Deering: "Representative in your lengthy, windy, answer, you pretty well agreed with my argument that if we have a consultant come in at the local level and do the 85th percentile study and they think the roads are safe, then we should have an opportunity to increase them. That's the that's IDOT's regulations now and I haven't decided what I'm going to do here but I clearly see this as more a regulation from the state level."

Speaker Leitch: "The Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black. For what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

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

Speaker Leitch: "He indicates he will."

Black: "Representative, as to the issue of local control. Have you talked to local officials in the counties that you represent as to their stand on this particular piece of legislation?"

Speaker Leitch: "Representative Moffitt."

88th Legislative Day

January 24, 1996

Moffitt: "Yes, Representative, I have talked to many local officials and all that I have talked to have been in support of it."

Speaker Leitch: "Representative Black."

Black: "I think that point should be well taken by the Members of this Body. Perhaps someone in this chamber has been asked to let the issue of the maximum speed limit revert to local control but I don't think many of us have heard that. In fact, on the contrary, Logan County Sheriff, Mr. Patterson, said that most county and township roads, some of them are gravel, some of them are oil and chip, some of them are 120 feet wide. In my district some are 10 feet wide. A concrete slab with gravel shoulders. They were built in the 1920s. They're not built for 65 miles an hour. I called the local officials in my district, the Sheriff, the County Highway Superintendent, the Chairman of the County Board, and they made it very clear that they favor the continuation of the 55 mile an hour limit that currently exists on county and township roads. I think that issue has been addressed by your legislation but Representative, I'd like to ask you some questions for the record about some of the things that came out in the Senate Amendment Senate Amendment #1, that deals with the fee structure on the movers and warehousemen in the State of Illinois. That fee increase was negotiated with the industry, is that your understanding?"

Speaker Leitch: "Representative Moffitt."

Moffitt: "Yes, Representative, that's my understanding. It was negotiated with the industry. It was bipartisan and there was no opposition."

Speaker Leitch: "Representative Black."

Black: "And is it further your understanding that what we passed

88th Legislative Day

January 24, 1996

yesterday in Senate Amendment #1 is not an automatic increase in the permit fee from 25 to \$50, but simply authorizes the Commerce Commission to proceed with that fee increase if they do so through the rule making procedures? Is that your understanding?"

Speaker Leitch: "Representative Moffitt."

Moffitt: "Yes, Representative, that's my understanding and I trust you will also mention part of the provision there was to lowering would be lowering another fee. I assume you perhaps, you are going to address that or I would like to comment on it if you don't."

Speaker Leitch: "Representative Black."

Black: "That, that's correct and that was my next question. In fact, the greatest number of trucking firms in this state would have a general commodity permit and that permit fee, in fact, is reduced is it not?"

Speaker Leitch: "Representative Moffitt."

Moffitt: "Yes, that is correct."

Speaker Leitch: "Representative Black."

Black: "For purposes of legislative intent, these permit fees that we are talking about are not new, is that to your understanding?"

Speaker Leitch: "Representative Moffitt."

Moffitt: "The actual fees have existed in the past, it's just changing what the limits could be."

Speaker Leitch: "Representative Black."

Black: "It is your understanding that these fees are yearly in nature, not by trip, but they are a yearly fee on the vehicle per year, not per trip?"

Speaker Leitch: "Representative Moffitt."

Moffitt: "Yes, Representative, that is my understanding."

Speaker Leitch: "Representative Black."

88th Legislative Day

January 24, 1996

Black: "And is it further your understanding that in the .. no matter how anybody wants to spin this particular Amendment, there is no way that the Commerce Commission would ever have the authority under this Bill to go to the rent-a-truck business, the U-haul, the Ryders, that many of us have used to move our furniture? Those people will not pay this fee and therefore, we the consumer will not have to bear the cost of that permit i s that true?"

Speaker Leitch: "Representative Moffitt."

Moffitt: "Yes, Representative, that is my understanding."

Speaker Leitch: "Representative Black."

Black: "Thank you very much, Representative and Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. To the Bill. There are certainly some contentious issues whenever one wants to set speed limits. There are those in this chamber, I dare say, that would like absolutely no limit except the common sense of the driver. And I would submit to you that perhaps many of us should look at the speedometer on our way home this evening and see what we drive. It wasn't very long ago that a television station took some very interesting pictures of the General Assembly on their way home. All of them, as I recall, all of them well within the legal speed limits of the State of Illinois. So let us not be too hypocritical in what we're about to do. The issue is one of inherent safety on roads that do not have shoulders, may not have any illumination or center line. Many of these county and township roads do not, in fact, have shoulders and at harvest time and planting time they may very well be clogged with implements of agricultural husbandry such as rather large tractors. This is a item of safety. If you want to revisit it later on, we can do so, but I would urge an 'aye' vote on the Bill before us

88th Legislative Day

January 24, 1996

today."

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

For what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have an inquiry of the Clerk."

Speaker Leitch: "Go ahead and state your inquiry."

Lang: "Thank you. The digest on page 1415, indicates for House Bill 1462, that the Sponsors are Kubik, Churchill, Deering, and Hartke. The board indicated when it first went up, the names of Kubik, Churchill, Deering, and Hartke. And during the debate, Sir, the names changed to Moffitt, Lawfer, Ackerman, Jones J., and Myers. We have not any information as to how this happened. Does the Clerk have the appropriate slip? And, if so, when was it filed?"

Clerk McLennand: "It was filed as the Bill was called off."

Speaker Leitch: "Representative Lang."

Lang: "The answer was, it was filed while the Bill was being debated?"

Clerk MCLennand: "No, when the Bill was called up. That's when the slip was filed."

Speaker Leitch: "Representative Lang."

Lang: "Does the Clerk or does the Speaker or does the Sponsor have any idea how Representative Hartke's name would have been removed from the Bill without his permission?"

Speaker Leitch: "Mr. Clerk."

Clerk McLennand: "It's the Representative who is the lead Sponsor determines the Sponsorship, the hyphened Sponsors on a Bill."

Speaker Leitch: "Mr. Clerk, has the appropriate slip been filed?" Clerk McLennand: "Yes."

Speaker Leitch: "Thank you. Further inquiries, Mr. Lang? Representative Lang."

Lang: "Well, when you say that the lead Sponsor removed Mr.

88th Legislative Day

January 24, 1996

Hartke, would that have been Mr. Kubik, the first lead Sponsor, or Mr. Moffitt, the current lead Sponsor or whoever will be the next lead Sponsor if Mr. Moffitt fails in his efforts to pass this Bill?"

Clerk McLennand: "The appropriate Sponsor signed the slip."

Speaker Leitch: "Representative Lang."

Lang: "Speaker, that's not much of an answer, not saying the appropriate Sponsor. Who was the appropriate Sponsor? Would that be that be Mr. Kubik or would that be Mr. Moffitt? Perhaps the Parliamentarian should tell us. He seems to be not doing much now."

Speaker Leitch: "It is the ruling of the Chair that the Sponsorship is appropriate. Do you wish to appeal the ruling of the Chair?"

Lang: "I do."

Speaker Leitch: "Representative Lang."

Lang: "Thank you. Rule 5-1 states very clearly, 'provided the principle Sponsor is in agreement.' I don't know who the principle Sponsor of this Bill is anymore, maybe somebody does. By Motion, the Sponsorship of a Bill may be changed to that of another Representative or Representatives as the case may be. I don't know that any such Motion has been filed. Just simply filing a new Sponsor slip doesn't get it done according to the rule, so I would ask the Parliamentarian to rule on this and I think the rule is quite clear, Sir."

Speaker Leitch: "The ruling of the Chair is that the Sponsorship is appropriate. Do you wish to appeal the ruling of the Chair, Sir?"

Lang: "Before I make that request, Sir, I would like you to respond to my inquiry relative to House Rule 5-1. It clearly says a Motion must be filed. Perhaps we could ask

88th Legislative Day

January 24, 1996

the Clerk whether such a Motion has been filed."

Speaker Leitch: "Do you wish to overrule the Chair, Sir? Representative Lang."

Lang: "I'm entitled to an answer to my parliamentary inquiry. I
am not referring yet to your previous ruling. I will make
a Motion to appeal momentarily. I'm now making a new
parliamentary inquiry. I'm entitled to an answer to my
question as to whether the Sponsor, whoever that person may
be, of this Bill has complied with Rule 5-1 or rule that
your side of the aisle pass, Sir. It's not our rule, it's
your rule."

Speaker Leitch: "We believe that an appropriate slip was filed by Representative Kubik which conforms and satisfies with the rule that you just cited, Sir. If you wish to appeal the ruling of the Chair, you may do so, otherwise we shall proceed. Representative Lang."

Lang: "I will make that Motion momentarily, Sir, however we are now not talking about the slip. Now you're telling me Representative Kubik filed that. I'm glad to know who finally filed that slip. You still have not responded to my inquiry about the Motion that is required by your Rule 5-1. The rules of this House require that a Motion be filed to change the Sponsorship. That is what the rule says, that is what the Body should demand of you, Sir, as Speaker. Now can I have an answer to that inquiry?"

Speaker Leitch: "Yes, it is the ruling of the Chair that Rule 5-1 has been complied with. If you wish to overrule, Sir, you're welcome to do so. Representative Lang."

Lang: "Is...can the Clerk hold up the Motions so we can at least see it? If Rule 5-1 can only be complied with by written Motion, Sir, that is what the rule says so if you're going to rule that it's been complied with, obviously, you have

88th Legislative Day

- January 24, 1996
- the Motion before you. The Parliamentarian can't answer that question. You either have the written Motion before you or you do not. Surely I've delayed this process long enough so someone on your side of the aisle can prepare the Motion."
- Speaker Leitch: "Do you have a Motion, Sir? I've offered the ruling if you wish to appeal, please do so, if not then we shall proceed. Representative Lang."
- Lang: "I have two Motions, Sir. I'm going to appeal both of your rulings. One ruling that indicated that the Sponsorship was properly changed; one ruling that Rule 5-1 was complied with. I move to appeal your ruling on both and would ask for a Roll Call vote on both, and a divided issue, Sir."
- Speaker Leitch: "The Gentleman has moved to appeal the ruling of the Chair. The question is, 'Shall the...your Motion included two of them. Well you did not make that clear to the Chair, Sir. Alright, we will divide them. Which one do you choose to proceed with first, Sir? Representative Lang."
- Lang: "You choose, Sir, you pick. Either order is fine as long as I get Roll Call votes on both of these."
- Speaker Leitch: "The Gentleman has moved to appeal the ruling of the Chair with respect to Rule 5-1. The question is, 'Shall the ruling of the Chair be sustained?' All those in favor shall vote 'aye'; all those opposed shall vote 'no'. The voting is open. Mr. Clerk, on this Motion there are 62 voting 'aye'; 53 voting 'no'. Take the Record. On this question there are 62 voting 'aye'; 53 voting 'no'. Representative Lang."
- Lang: "I would ask to verify this vote."
- Speaker Leitch: "The Gentleman has asked for a verification. Mr. Clerk, poll the absentees."

88th Legislative Day

January 24, 1996

- Clerk McLennand: "No Members are not voting. Those Members voting in the affirmative to sustain the Chair: Ackerman.

 Balthis. Biggert. Biggins. Black. Bost. Brady. Churchill. Ciarlo. Clayton. Cowlishaw. Cross. Deuchler.

 Doody. Durkin. Hassert. Hoeft. Hughes. Johnson, Tim."
- Speaker Leitch: "Hold it a minute, Mr. Clerk. The Gentleman from Champaign, Representative Johnson, for what reason do you rise, Sir?"
- Johnson, Tim: "Have leave to be verified so that I can visit with a constituent."
- Speaker Leitch: "The Gentleman has leave to be verified.

 Representative Johnson, Tim Johnson. Right there.

 Proceed, Sir."
- Clerk McLennand: "Representatives Johnson, Tom. Jones, John. Klingler. Krause. Kubik. Lachner. Lawfer. Leitch. Lindner. McAuliffe. Meyer. Mitchell. Lyons. Moffitt. Moore, Andrea. Mulligan. Murphy, Maureen. Mvers. Noland. O'Connor. Pankau. Pedersen. Persico. Poe. Rutherford. Roskam. Ryder. Salvi. Saviano. Skinner. Spangler. Stephens. Tenhouse. Turner, John. Wait. Weaver. Wennlund. Winkel. Winters. Wirsing. Wojcik. Zickus, and Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Leitch: "Mr. Lang, do you have any verifications?"

Lang: "Representative McAuliffe."

Speaker Leitch: "Representative McAuliffe is on the Democratic side, Sir."

Lang: "Representative Salvi."

Speaker Leitch: "Is Representative Salvi in the chamber?

Representative Salvi. Representative Salvi. Is the

Gentleman in the chamber? Remove his name."

Lang: "Representative Klingler. Oh, she is here, sorry."

Speaker Leitch: "Representative Klingler is here."

88th Legislative Day

January 24, 1996

Lang: "Representative Cross."

Speaker Leitch: "Representative Cross. Representative Cross.

Where is he? He's standing in the back of the chamber. Do
you see him, Representative Lang?"

Lang: "Representative Spangler."

Speaker Leitch: "Representative Spangler. Representative Black asked leave to be verified. Leave was verified. Representative Spangler. The Gentleman's in the chamber, Sir. Does Representative Winters have leave to be verified?"

Lang: "Of course, of course. Representative Wennlund."

Speaker Leitch: "The Gentleman is near the...in his seat on the phone."

Lang: "Representative Myers."

Speaker Leitch: "Representative Myers. The Gentleman is standing in the back."

Lang: "Representative Wirsing."

Speaker Leitch: "Representative Wirsing. He is standing in the front, Sir."

Lang: "Representative Parke. Oh wait, Representative Parke is voting 'no'. Representative Cowlishaw. No she's also here, she's in the aisle. I think you've got us on this one, Mr. Speaker. No further."

Speaker Leitch: "Thank you, Representative Lang. On this question, 'Shall the Chair be sustained', there are 61 voting 'aye'; 53 voting 'nay', and on that question the Chair has been sustained. Representative Lang, do you wish to restate your second appeal to the Chair?"

Lang: "Well, Mr. Speaker, as you will recall, I questioned the method in which the Sponsorship was changed. I said it was done improperly, particularly in the case of removing Representative Hartke, who I might add is the only Member

88th Legislative Day

January 24, 1996

whose name was on the board who actually signed the Conference Committee Report. The current Sponsor did not sign the Conference Committee Report. At any rate, I don't think the Sponsorship was changed properly. You have said it is and I appeal your ruling, Sir. I would ask for a Roll Call vote and a verification."

- Speaker Leitch: "The Gentleman has asked that the ruling of the Chair be appealed and so the question is, 'Shall the ruling of the Chair be sustained?' All those in favor of sustaining the Chair shall vote 'aye'; all those opposed shall vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? And on this Motion there are 62 voting 'aye'; 52 voting 'nay', and the Motion has passed. Mr. Lang on your question of your verification, do you wish to pursue it, Sir? Mr. Clerk please read the affirmative. Mr. Clerk, will you proceed please, Sir?"
- Clerk McLennand: "Those Members voting in the affirmative:
 Ackerman. Balthis. Biggert. Biggins. Black. Bost.
 Brady. Churchill. Ciarlo. Clayton. Cowlishaw. Cross.
 Deuchler. Doody. Durkin. Hassert. Hoeft. Hughes."
- Speaker Leitch: "Excuse me. Representative Lang, will you verify Representative Ryder, please Sir? Thank you."
- Clerk McLennand: "Johnson, Tom. Jones, John. Klingler. Krause. Kubik. Lachner. Lawfer. Leitch. Lindner. Lyons. McAuliffe. Meyer. Mitchell. Moffitt. Moore, Andrea. Mulligan. Murphy, Maureen. Myers. Noland. O'Connor. Pankau. Parke. Pedersen. Persico. Poe. Roskam. Rutherford. Ryder. Saviano. Skinner. Spangler. Stephens. Tenhouse. Turner, John. Wait. Weaver. Wennlund. Winkel. Winters. Wirsing. Wojcik. Zickus, and Mr. Speaker."

88th Legislative Day

January 24, 1996

Speaker Leitch: "Representative Lang. Do you wish to challenge any of these names, Sir?"

Lang: "Yes, and I do want to compliment the Clerk. He read those names much more quickly the second time than the first time. Many of those names did sound familiar to me. It was familiar although just for the record, I noted that Mr. Parke voted green this time but that Mr. Salvi did not vote. So those were the changes. We want you to know that we've noticed the changes as we go through this process. Representative Brady."

Speaker Leitch: "Representative Brady is in his chair, Sir."

Lang: "Representative Saviano."

Speaker Leitch: "Representative Saviano. Is the Gentleman in the chamber? Yes he is, he's standing in the back, Sir."

Lang: "Representative Klingler. Oh, she's in her chair.

Representative Wennlund. He's in the aisle."

Speaker Leitch: "Do you have others, Sir?"

Lang: "Representative Wirsing."

Speaker Leitch: "Representative Wirsing."

Lang: "You see he keeps moving around on me, Speaker, he's up in the front, now he's in the back. I see him back there. Representative Krause."

Speaker Leitch: "Representative Krause is in her seat, Sir."

Lang: "Representative Tim Johnson."

Speaker Leitch: "Representative Tim Johnson is standing in front here, Sir."

Lang: "Representative McAuliffe."

Speaker Leitch: "Representative McAuliffe is on the..."

Lang: "On the Democratic side where he rightfully belongs, Sir.

One moment, Sir. None further, Sir."

Speaker Leitch: "On this question there are 62 voting 'aye'; 52 voting 'no', and the Chair has been sustained. The

88th Legislative Day

January 24, 1996

Gentleman from Jersey, Representative Ryder. For what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

Ryder: "Sir, first I rise in a parliamentary inquiry during the time that we've taken with the verifications. Have any Motions been filed with the Chair and the Clerk?"

Speaker Leitch: "Mr. Clerk, have any Motions been filed?"

Clerk McLennand: "Motion has been filed by the principle Sponsor,

Representative Moffitt to change the hyphened Sponsor or

and add cosponsors. Adding in a new chief cosponsor change

of request adds Representative Hartke as a hyphened

Sponsor."

Speaker Leitch: "With leave of the House, the Motion is adopted.

Can you correct the board Mr. Clerk? I am assured that
that will be taken care of in due time. Okay, shall we
proceed? Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. I stand in support of this issue and I hope that I'm joined by others at this point and I do it for safety reasons and I do it because the Legislature needs to act on this issue. I have concerns like many others have concerns about the content of the issues and about those items that are contained therein. But I believe that the overriding safety of the people of the State of Illinois, the overriding safety of those who travel, the non-state highways in this state are more important than the concerns that I have about the technical portions of this Bill. As a result, I wish and I would ask that this Legislature would support with their affirmative votes House Bill 1462, and I think we are ready to vote at this time. Thank you."

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

Hartke: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I too stand in

88th Legislative Day

January 24, 1996

support in this piece of legislation. I think we could have probably been finished with this about a half hour ago had some games not being played around here. I stand in full support and ask my colleagues to support as well."

Speaker Leitch: "Thank you, your point is very well taken.

Representative Cross, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

Cross: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, will Sponsor yield for some
 questions?"

Speaker Leitch: "He indicates he will."

Cross: "Representative Moffitt, it got a little confusing in here with the parliamentary inquiries we had so if I could go over a couple of questions I'm not sure about, that might clear some things up. Could you tell us how many miles of local roads we have in the State of Illinois, roughly?"

Speaker Leitch: "Representative Moffitt."

Moffitt: "Representative, were you implying that the local roads are rough? Is that the...or just the miles of road? Both rough and smooth. Okay, the total roads it's my understanding from IDOT is that as far as county roads in Illinois, we have 16,495 miles of county road. We have township roads in Illinois, we have 73,430 miles of township roads in Illinois."

Speaker Leitch: "Representative Cross."

Cross: "Representative Moffitt, thank you and does anyone have a cost estimate on the cost of posting signs in terms of labor, materials, time, et cetera throughout the State of Illinois? And making the changes in terms of speed limit signs as well as no passing signs, restriping, et cetera, what we're talking about in terms of cost?"

Speaker Leitch: "Representative Moffitt."

Moffitt: "Representative, as I've said, this has been presented, the discussion had been presented twice in Transportation

88th Legislative Day

January 24, 1996

Committee and that figure came up. The most recent estimate that I have from IDOT is that it would cost local government \$3 millions, three million to post local roads. Those thousands and thousands of miles that I just indicated we have in Illinois, so it would be a significant cost. In addition to that, there's the cost of an engineering study the local government had to do it. But it would be...so we know it would exceed three million."

Speaker Leitch: "Representative Cross."

Cross: "My understanding, Representative, is all of this cost would be at the expense of local government none of it would be paid for by the state. Is that correct?"

Speaker Leitch: "Representative Moffitt."

Moffitt: "Representative, yes that would be correct that it would be...the cost would be bore by local government. Without passage of this legislation, we're really putting a mandate on those local governments and not just a mandate, we're putting an unfunded mandate on local government. Those that want to maintain their 55 mile an hour speed limit. So we're trying to avoid that unfunded mandate that would be thrown on local government."

Speaker Leitch: "Representative Cross."

Cross: "Just a couple of other questions. Representative. I know from my own particular county, one of the counties I represent, the county board has been in favor of this resolution...idea as well as the sheriff's office and the county engineer. Are you aware of any opposition or was there any opposition in the committee hearing from any groups like the sheriff's office, Sheriffs Association, or the county engineers or the metro-counties groups at all? Have you heard of any?"

Speaker Leitch: "Representative Moffitt."

88th Legislative Day

January 24, 1996

Moffitt: "Representative, an excellent question, and one that was And certainly I sounded out extremely important to me. local government, the lobbies supporting local government, representing local government before I agreed to Sponsor this legislation that was originally of course individual Bill. I am not aware of any organized opposition. I'm not aware of any group that is opposing Of all the groups that have signed on, have been in support of it. Names like you have specifically asked, the Illinois Sheriffs Association of course is in strong support of it. The United Counties Council of Illinois, the Metro-counties Association of Illinois. I'd like to mention all of them, but I won't right now, for the sake of time, but we have strong support. I would also like to just tell you that I held a town meeting recently in my A town meeting out in one of communities that I represent and it was just a meeting where the question could be anything that any constituent The very first comment at that town meeting, a concerned resident stood up and said, one of the most serious problems facing you as a General Assembly is to have to put in place the 55 mile per hour speed limit on local roads. He was very concerned. It was the very first comment at that town meeting."

Speaker Leitch: "Representative Cross."

Cross: "Representative Moffitt, I...since this is such an important Bill, and I know there are some Members on this side of the aisle that are curious, can you list for us those groups that you mentioned that are in support of this?"

Speaker Leitch: "Representative Moffitt."

Moffitt: "Representative, the organizations, the proponents that

88th Legislative Day

January 24, 1996

I am aware of and probably some others, but the ones that I am aware of in support of this are Midwest Truckers, the Illinois Transportation Association, the Illinois Farm Bureau, the County Engineers Association of Illinois, the Township Officials of Illinois. the Metro-counties Association, the Triple AAA Motor Club, and as I indicated earlier, the Illinois Sheriffs Association. Those are the proponents, the organizations, the lobbies that I am aware of that have registered in support of this legislation. Also in committee, there were a number of insurance companies that signed in as proponents, so it was across the board, a wide range of lobbies that are in support of this. And there are some others...I know there were some others on the proponent slip that I don't have that total list right now, but I know there were some others, too. Some that I was very pleased to have."

Speaker Leitch: "Representative Cross."

Cross: "Well, Representative Moffitt, thank you for your time and leadership on this Bill. I am extremely supportive of it and I hope it passes. Thank you very much."

Speaker Leitch: "The Gentleman from Livingston, Representative Rutherford. For what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

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

Speaker Leitch: "He indicates he will."

Rutherford: "Representative Moffitt, could you for the sake of clarification, give me a little bit of a history and background that brought us to have to deal with all of this today?"

Speaker Leitch: "Representative Moffitt."

Moffitt: "Representative, it was the repeal of the federal speed limit that, of course, had applied to the roads in Illinois. Once that was repealed, the ...we were left with

88th Legislative Day

January 24, 1996

the situation where our two lane state roads had been 55 for the last approximate 20 years and will continue to be. Our four lane interstates part are 65 for the...or have been for the last 20 years and will continue to be. because of the way the law was written adopting that federal speed limit, once it was repealed, then the local roads reverted to 65. As soon as that came out in the open, as soon as we started reading about it in the press, when I started receiving calls. Individuals. organizations, local officials, expressing concern their roads would now be going to 65. They were concerned with the safety. They were concerned with the cost. they said we have been satisfied with the 55 for the last 20 years. We are not asking you to change anything, we would simply like to continue on."

Speaker Leitch: "Representative Rutherford."

Rutherford: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative, from the standpoint of the history on the federal side of it, could you go back and explain perhaps the years and what drove us to that point and what's caused this shift now by Congress?"

Speaker Leitch: "Representative Moffitt."

Moffitt: "Representative, when the federal speed limit first went into effect, we were...there were a couple issues, one was of course, the federal...the oil embargo because of the action in Arab countries. Speed limits were put on as an attempt to conserve the consumption of fuel in the United States. It was soon recognized and realized that an added benefit of proper speed limits in this country, proper for the particular area, was the additional reduction in fatalities, traffic fatalities. So it was, both of those things that probably the oil embargo lead to the speed

88th Legislative Day

January 24, 1996

limits and then it was soon realized the added benefit of proper speeds that...reduction in fatalities. With the...and once people were accustomed to that and realized the benefits then of course that is why we heard from local government saying we'd like to continue with that same speed limit."

Speaker Leitch: "Representative Rutherford."

Rutherford: "I appreciate that, Representative, I think that's good to have on the record here. The...I know that Representative Cross had asked a question in regards to the number of miles of roads and so forth. Do you have a distinction between our state highway system and perhaps the mileage available on the township roads, some kind of percentage of those available in our state?"

Speaker Leitch: "Representative Moffitt."

Moffitt: "Representative, the miles like two lane state or four lane state, I don't have those figures, I'd certainly be happy to get those, but I don't have them readily available."

Speaker Leitch: "Representative Rutherford."

Rutherford: "That's fine, Representative, I'm sure I can obtain them the department. I guess another question would be, are you familiar with perhaps the miles of township roads? Do you have any rough estimate the miles of township roads that exist in our state?"

Speaker Leitch: "Representative Moffitt."

Moffitt: "Excellent question, Representative. Township roads in Illinois are 73,430 miles. That's of township roads. As I indicated earlier, of county roads, it's 16,495 miles of county roads in Illinois."

Speaker Leitch: "Representative Rutherford."

Rutherford: "Excellent answer, Representative. Representative,

88th Legislative Day

January 24, 1996

would you have a chance...is there such a thing as a Township Road Commissioners Association? Are you familiar with them?"

Speaker Leitch: "Representative Moffitt."

Moffitt: "Representative, there's an organization for Township Officials of Illinois and they are in full support of this legislation. I believe they have town...the commissioners in manv counties meet as a separate organization. In addition to...in some areas the township supervisors meet. In some areas all the township officials meet. Of the counties I represent, I know one of them has a meeting where the road commissioners meet on regular basis and that's the township road commissioners have a regular monthly meeting. In another county it's all township officials. It might be the supervisors, it might be the clerks, and the trustees. Road commissioners all come together and have a regular meeting."

Speaker Leitch: "Representative Rutherford."

Rutherford: "Thank you, Representative. Recognizing the townships are obviously going to be very involved with this...what we're going to be passing here, potentially. Do you have any estimation how many townships we have in our state? I mean, and again just a rough estimate of the number of townships, particularly, the number of township road commissioners we may have in our state?"

Speaker Leitch: "Representative Moffitt."

Moffitt: "Representative, I do not have that figure readily available and like my home county, of course, there happen to be twenty townships. There would be twenty township road commissioners. You multiply...the counties are of varying size but of course there would be a significant number of road commissioners throughout the state. In most

88th Legislative Day

January 24, 1996

counties there would be...there would be quite a few throughout the state."

Speaker Leitch: "Representative Rutherford."

Rutherford: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative, realizing that there is a lot of township road commissioners out there, do you have any estimate of anyone polling perhaps that has been done to get some sense of the number that may be proponents or the number that would be opponents of such legislation like this? I mean, is there any...is there any statistical analysis or quantitative results that could come in to tell us whether township road commissioners would be supportive or not?"

Speaker Leitch: "Representative Moffitt."

Rutherford: "I"m sorry, Representative Moffitt, that was a question."

Speaker Leitch: "I said Representative Moffitt."

Moffitt: "Representative, I have just an informal poll as far as my own township officials, my road commissioners, all that I have come in contact with and visited with were in support of this. In addition to that, the fact that the township officials of Illinois are in strong support of this. I know they have had contact with their members and so based on the fact that they are speaking for township officials and the township officials that I have talked with, I find strong support for this legislation."

Speaker Leitch: "Representative Rutherford."

Rutherford: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative there's 102 counties in the State of Illinois. Do you know if each one of those have a county highway commissioner or a county road commissioner? Of the 102, are you familiar with that?"

Speaker Leitch: "Representative Moffitt."

88th Legislative Day

January 24, 1996

Moffitt: "Representative, in the counties of course we have county engineers for the highway department and each county I believe has a highway engineer that has to be certified by the State of Illinois."

Speaker Leitch: "Representative Rutherford."

Rutherford: "I'm sorry, Representative, I was distracted. Could you repeat that please?"

Speaker Leitch: "Representative Moffitt."

Moffitt: "Representative, each county in the State of Illinois has a county highway engineer and those have to be certified by the state."

Speaker Leitch: "Representative Rutherford."

Rutherford: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative, of the 102 county engineers, do you have any polling or statistical analysis or even perhaps a hunch as to how many may be supportive or not of this particular piece of legislation?

Quantitatively, can you give me a percentage of the 102, perhaps?"

Speaker Leitch: "Representative Moffitt."

Moffitt: "Representative, not by actual vote that I have taken, I have felt strongly as I do on a lot of pieces of legislation down here every time legislation comes up, that the organizations that represent the individuals that we are talking about or the organizations can speak for those members. Yesterday in Transportation Committee I did have the county engineer from one of the counties I represent here and he indicated that he thought that pretty much all the county engineers supported the legislation. I don't mean to be indicating that that was by an actual ballot or anything but he felt strong support from the county engineer that was here. Also had the county sheriff from my district and there was a county sheriff from some other

88th Legislative Day

January 24, 1996

districts here also. So I think it's overwhelming support by the local officials both expressed by the ones I have talked to and by their organizations which are speaking for them."

Speaker Leitch: "Do you want to bring your questioning to a close, Representative Rutherford."

Rutherford: "Actually I will be in about nine...eighteen seconds.

I just want to say that I commend you Representative
Moffitt, on the work you've done on this Conference
Committee Report. There's been a great deal of effort put
into it. Obviously, you've done a good deal of research
towards it and I commend you and I look forward to a
positive 'aye' vote on this Conference Committee Report."

Speaker Leitch: "Mr. Clerk, Supplemental Calendar Announcement please."

Clerk Rossi: "Supplemental Calendar #3 is being distributed."

Speaker Leitch: "The Gentleman from McLean, Representative Brady.

For what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

Brady: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Leitch: "He indicates he will."

Brady: "Representative on page 2, line 23, you indicate that you want to discuss 55 miles per hour and on line 18, you wish to indicate 65 or there is 65 miles per hour, is that correct?"

Speaker Leitch: "Representative Moffitt."

Moffitt: "Representative, the lines that you refer to, if I got the numbers correctly, that you indicated, the 60...I believe you said line 18, didn't you? It was 65 miles per hour for highways under the jurisdiction of the Illinois State Toll Highway Authority. Then you mentioned line 23, it's 50 miles per hour for all other highways and this would be all other highways other than interstate and the

88th Legislative Day

January 24, 1996

tollway."

Speaker Leitch: "Representative Brady."

Brady: "Thank you. Also, on lines 11 and 12, they refer to 15 and 30 miles in reverse order. Could you tell me for our purposes what the metric conversion would be to each of those?"

Speaker Leitch: "Representative Moffitt, on the metric conversion."

Moffitt: "Representative, you certainly pose an excellent question and one that I'm just real anxious to find the answer to. Perhaps if you would give me leave to call my 11 year old daughter, we could get an answer for that real quick."

Speaker Leitch: "Representative Brady."

Brady: "Representative, on page 3, line 10, your legislation refers to a bus. Could you define a bus for me?"

Speaker Leitch: "Representative Moffitt."

Moffitt: "Representative, the definition of a bus is defined in the Vehicle Code. We are not changing anything there. To me, a bus would mean a vehicle that carries...could carry multiple passengers, certainly larger than we think of as a van for family use. Generally, a school bus, a charter bus, a commercial bus, a bus used in a commercial bus line. So it would carry a large number of passengers but we would continue to use the definition in Illinois Vehicle Code. We're not changing anything there. The definition of a bus that was in place before this legislation continues to be there. No change."

Speaker Leitch: "Representative Brady."

Brady: "Does this legislation in any way change the color of buses throughout the State of Illinois?"

Speaker Leitch: "Representative Moffitt."

88th Legislative Day

January 24, 1996

Moffitt: "Representative, there's certainly no intent to do that.

Whatever color the bus owners want their bus to be, they
will continue to be that. No change on the color."

Speaker Leitch: "Representative Brady."

Brady: "Does that mean that the intent of this legislation is to continue to advocate buses for school purposes to be painted yellow or orange or whatever that color is?"

Speaker Leitch: "Representative Moffitt."

Moffitt: "You're correct that they would continue to be the same colors as they have. We're not doing anything to change the colors of the buses in Illinois."

Speaker Leitch: "Representative Brady."

Brady: "Representative, on subsequent pages of this legislation...is there any reason this is printed in pink?

Were you thinking about pink buses?"

Speaker Leitch: "Representative Moffitt."

Moffitt: "Representative, I believe the color of this is consistent with Conference Committee Reports and I had no input into the selection of the color of the paper used for printing this legislation."

Speaker Leitch: "Do you want to bring your questions to a close, Representative."

Brady: "Representative, you indicated earlier that certain highway superintendents of each county supported this legislation. Is that correct?"

Speaker Leitch: "Representative Moffitt."

Moffitt: "Would you repeat your question, please?"

Speaker Leitch: "Do you want to answer this question Representative Moffitt? Representative Brady, would you care to restate this, please?"

Brady: "Yes, 'I asked if Representative Moffitt would list by name those highway superintendents in each county who support

88th Legislative Day

January 24, 1996

this legislation?"

Speaker Leitch: "Representative Moffitt."

Moffitt: "I would like to tell you that Frances Griffin from Knox County came down and testified yesterday in support of it and indicated he had been in communication with a number of other county engineers and that they were in support of this legislation. We also had the county engineer from Henry County down here but additional names I don't have with me. Perhaps Frances Griffin would be the one you'd want to keep in mind."

Speaker Leitch: "The Lady from DuPage, Representative Biggert.

For what purpose do you rise?"

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

Speaker Leitch: "He indicates he will."

Biggert: "Representative Moffitt, if there were no state law to regulate the speed limit on the county and township roads and it was local control, and how many counties do we have?

Is it 102?"

Speaker Leitch: "Representative Moffitt."

Moffitt: "Yes, Representative, 102 individual counties."

Speaker Leitch: "Representative Biggert."

Biggert: "Or with the townships, and let's assume that the townships or the counties that were contiguous to each other decided to have different speed limits. It's my recollection when we go through from state to state there is always a posting of the speed limit and quite dramatic signs to show that there is a change in speed limits between the states? Wouldn't these counties or the townships have to post the speed limit at the beginning of the county line to assure that motorists traveling through would know what the speed limit was?"

Speaker Leitch: "Representative Moffitt."

88th Legislative Day

January 24, 1996

Moffitt: "Representative, if the speed limit was other than that which was set for the state, which at the present time is 65 on those roads then this legislation would mean 55. anything other than that, yes, it would have to be posted. It does not have to be posted if it's the speed limit is set for the local roads. Of course the real problem that that creates is the inconsistency as you travel jurisdiction to jurisdiction that if each one was setting a different speed limit, you'd have to be constantly watching for a changing speed sign even though road conditions, you didn't change from urban to rural but just by changing jurisdictions, which there might not be any evidence of, if it was local authority potentially that could be changing as you drove down a stretch of road leading to confusion. This legislation, part of the intent, is that we have consistency. That we have uniformity so that motorists in Illinois know what the speed limits, that they will be there on the roads that they're traveling."

Speaker Leitch: "Representative Biggert."

Biggert: "I have another question. Not being on the Transportation Committee, I'm not familiar really with what these speed studies are that a county would do or a local government and the cost of those and how that really is performed. Could you explain that to me?"

Speaker Leitch: "Representative Moffitt"

Moffitt: "Representative, it's my understanding that the most significant cost would be the cost of purchasing the speed limit signs and posting the speed limit signs. The estimate of course was three million. The engineering studies, and I would expect that if an engineering study was done by local government, that it would be done by different sources. Some might use a private engineering

88th Legislative Day

January 24, 1996

firm, which I guess they're allowed to do. Some might use their county engineer if time permitted, so there wouldn't be necessarily just one way that the engineering studies would be done. But we know the three million for the signs, perhaps a little less for the engineering study, and we'd have to add that to the \$3 million cost."

Speaker Leitch: "Representative Biggert."

Biggert: "Representative Moffitt, I think what I was concerned about is what does this study consist of. Does it consist of putting a wire across the road to check how many cars are on that road, how many accidents have there been in the past year or exactly what does it entail?"

Speaker Leitch: "Representative Moffitt."

Moffitt: "Representative, the traffic study would include a number of things probably not limited to but would include such things as a study of the history of that road. Have there been accidents on that particular stretch of road? They would also monitor the traffic that is flowing on that road at the present time so current flow of traffic, the current speed of traffic if you will, would be a part of that study. They would take into account such things as just the topography, or the lay of the land. What are the conditions? Are there curves? Is it level? Are there hills blocking the view? What are the side roads coming on or leaving that road? So all those conditions, situations would have to be taken into account on that study. That's the type of item that would be included but not necessarily limited just to that."

Speaker Leitch: "Representative Biggert."

Biggert: "Thank you, Representative. I appreciate the answers to the questions and I stand in support of your Bill."

Speaker Leitch: "The Lady from McHenry, Representative Hughes.

88th Legislative Day

January 24, 1996

For what purpose do you rise, Ma'am?"

Hughes: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would...would the Sponsor
yield for questions?"

Speaker Leitch: "He indicates he will."

Hughes: "I've been asked to inquire as to whether this Bill addresses the issue of the fact that there are road signs for cattle crossings, road signs for deer crossings. Does this permit road signs for ratite crossings?"

Speaker Leitch: "Representative Moffitt."

Moffitt: "Representative, certainly an important inquiry, but it does not include any provisions for signing for ratites."

Speaker Leitch: "Representative Hughes."

Hughes: "To the...there are no ratite crossings? During some of this discussion it has been a little bit noisy and we've had at least three different versions of a Bill before us. Could you please clarify a couple of things relative to the ability of local jurisdictions to address what they deem to be appropriate relative to changing speeds? These are township roads, municipal roads, or county roads. Currently, as I understand, in order to lower the speed limit on a road, a local jurisdiction has to conduct an engineering study and supply that to IDOT for approval. Could you explain how this Bill would change those provisions in detail, please?"

Speaker Leitch: "Representative Moffitt."

Moffitt: "Representative, I certainly will and again an important question. I want to make sure everyone understands that under the present law, for a local to change the speed limit to lower it, they can do that but it would involve the cost of an engineering study which could be a significant cost to them and a time delay. The provisions in this legislation will empower local government so that

88th Legislative Day

January 24, 1996

the unit of local government such as the county board could by resolution lower the speed limit from the 55 miles per hour, so we are empowering local government with that aspect. We're saving them money and yet they can change it...they can lower it to 55. So that's adding to the authority or the power that they have increasing over what they have now."

Speaker Leitch: "Representative Hughes."

Hughes: "What are the perimeters under which limits can be lowered? In other words, could the limit be lowered from 55 miles to 15 miles?"

Speaker Leitch: "Representative Moffitt."

Moffitt: "Representative, that would make a difference whether you were in an urban district or a rural district and I believe the statute already addresses that issue on how much it could be changed."

Speaker Leitch: "Representative Hughes."

Hughes: "So, the Bill before us would not change the limitations under which limits could be lowered? Is that correct?"

Speaker Leitch: "Representative Moffitt."

Moffitt: "Representative, I believe that authority would be limited. The locals could decrease the limit within an urban district but not to less than 20 miles per hour."

Speaker Leitch: "Representative Hughes."

Hughes: "One additional question. Since this Bill provides that there no longer will be required an engineering study to lower traffic limits. What would happen in the case where a local jurisdiction lowered those traffic limits and then for whatever reason made a determination that they should then be raised? Would they have to do an engineering study to do that?"

Speaker Leitch: "Representative Moffitt."

88th Legislative Day

January 24, 1996

Moffitt: "Representative, to raise it back up, to increase it, it's my understanding that they would then have to do the engineering study. They can lower it by, lower it by board resolution but it would take the engineering study to raise it back up."

Speaker Leitch: "Representative Hughes."

Hughes: "I don't..so there would be, if this is correct, then there would ...it would be prudent of a local jurisdiction to assess carefully the merits of lowering traffic limits because they...if they did so capriciously or too frequently without considerable deliberation they would then incur the cost of engineering to raise them back to a higher limit even though that higher limit was within the states statutory allowance?"

Speaker Leitch: "Representative Moffitt."

Moffitt: "Representative Hughes, I'm sorry I need to ask you to repeat that question."

Speaker Leitch: "Representative Hughes."

Hughes: "If I understand correctly, it would be prudent, would it not, for local jurisdictions to give careful deliberation to lowering speed limits? To not do so capriciously or excessively because they would then face the cost of engineering studies to return them to a higher limit even though that higher limit was within those allowed under state statute."

Speaker Leitch: "Representative Moffitt."

Moffitt: "Yes Representative, you're correct. It certainly is a very serious question of lowering it. Local government would want to take into account, should they ever decide to raise it, then they would have to have the engineering study represent a cost. So yes, a very very serious decision one that should take into account all factors."

88th Legislative Day

January 24, 1996

Speaker Leitch: "Representative Hughes."

Hughes: "Thank you. To the Bill, we have to do something to address those roads that are under local jurisdiction. I think this is a good solution and I stand in support of the Bill, thank you."

Speaker Leitch: "The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Churchill. For what purpose do you rise, Sir?"

Churchill: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker Leitch: "He indicates he will. Speaker Daniels in the Chair."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Moffitt has some questions to ask about legislative intent. Would you be prepared to answer those questions? Representative Moffitt."

Moffitt: "Representative, I would like to yield to Representative Black."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Black. Okay, Representative Churchill."

Churchill: "Representative Black, under this Bill is it your intent to allow Class B which are 8,000 pounds or less trucks to go 65 miles per hour?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Black."

Black: "On interstate highways, the answer is yes."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Churchill."

Churchill: "Representative Black, is it your intent to allow trucks 8,001 pounds or more to go 55 miles per hour?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Black."

Black: "In accordance with current law, the answer is yes."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Churchill"

Churchill: "Is it your intent on local roads that they can go 55 miles per hour?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Black."

Black: "The answer is, yes."

88th Legislative Day

January 24, 1996

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Churchill."

Churchill: "Is it your intent to come back at some time to adapt this to the Fee Code which creates a distinction between 8000 pounds and 8001 pounds?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Black.'

Black: "Yes."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Churchill."

Churchill: "As it currently stands, is the Farm Bureau now in favor of this legislation?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Black."

Black: "Yes."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Churchill."

Churchill: "As it currently stands, has the Illinois Department of Transportation, the Secretary of State signed off on this legislation?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Black."

Black: "Yes."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Churchill."

Churchill: "Representative Black, is it under these conditions of legislative intent that this Bill would move forward?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Black."

Black: "Yes."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Churchill."

Churchill: "Nothing further, Mr. Speaker. I think this is a fine Bill and we ought to pass it."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Murphy."

Murphy: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question."

Speaker Daniels: "Question, 'Shall the main question be put?' All those in favor say 'aye'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Representative Moffitt to close."

Moffitt: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The issue that we're...that we have before us is one of safety. That's the issue that

88th Legislative Day

January 24, 1996

we're facing, safety on our highways in Illinois, our lane local roads. Passage of this also removes unfunded mandate that's been put on local government that's on them for them to keep the 55 miles an hour speed limit that they've indicated that they'd like to have. Ιt also provides the uniform consistent speed limits throughout the State of Illinois. The figures that we presented indicated that when Illinois went to 55, fatalities were decreased by 43% verses when it was 65 on the studies that were presented in committee. I don't remember any other legislation with that large of decrease in fatalities. We've given you list of a long proponents. Local government supports this legislation. I would ask for your favorable votes."

Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman has moved for the passage of Conference Committee Report #1, to House Bill 1462. question is, 'Shall the House adopt Conference Committee Report #1, to House Bill #1462?' All those in by voting 'aye'; opposed by voting 'no'. voting is open. This is final action. Have all voted who Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the Record, Mr. Clerk. On this question, there are 89 'aye'; 22 'no'; 2 voting 'present'. This Bill having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed and the House does adopt Conference Committee Report #1, to House Bill #1462. Senate Bills, Second Reading, Senate Bill #21. Read the Bill Mr. Clerk."

Clerk McLennand: "On Supplemental Calendar #3 appears Senate Bill
#21, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Public Labor
Relations Act. Second Reading of this Senate Bill.
Amendment #1 was adopted in Committee. Fiscal note,
Judicial note have been filed on the Bill as amended."

88th Legislative Day

January 24, 1996

Speaker Daniels: "Third Reading. Any announcements?"

Clerk McLennand: "Rules Committee will meet in the Speaker's

Conference Room immediately upon adjournment. Rules

Committee, immediately upon adjournment."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Churchill now moves that the House stand adjourned until Tuesday, February 6, 1996, at the hour of 12:00 noon. Leaving time for Perfunctory Session on January 25, 1996, at the hour of 9:00 a.m., and February 1, 1996, at the hour of 9:00 a.m. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it and the House does now stand adjourned until Tuesday, February 6, 1996, at the hour of 12:00 noon."

Clerk Rossi: "The House Perfunctory Session will come to order. Introduction and First Reading of Resolutions. House Joint Resolution #70, offered by Representative Howard. Rules. Introduction and First Reading of House Bills. 2746, offered by Representative Black, a Bill for an Act to amend the Veterinary Medicine and Surgery Practice Act. House Bill 2766, offered by Representative Turner, for an Act to amend the Juvenile Court Act. House Bill 2767, offered by Representative Gash, a Bill for an Act amend the Election Code. House Bill 2769, offered by Representative Gash, a Bill for an Act to amend Illinois Vehicle Code. House Bill 2770, offered by Representative Deuchler, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Savings and Loan Act. House Bill 2771, offered by Representative Gash, a Bill for an Act to amend Court Act. House Bill 2772. offered by Representative Saviano, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Pension Code. House Bill 2773, offered by Representative Biggert, a Bill for an Act to amend Illinois Vehicle Code. House Bill 2774, offered by

88th Legislative Day

January 24, 1996

Representative Scott, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. House Bill 2775, offered by Representative Spangler, a Bill for an Act making an appropriation to the State Board of Education for a grant to Wilmington School District 209-U. House Bill 2776, offered by Representative Krause, a Bill for an Act to amend the Criminal Code. House Bill 2777, offered by Representative Winkel, a Bill for an concerning disclosure of employment Act Introduction and First Reading of these House Introduction and First Reading of House Bills. House Bill 2778, offered by Representative Clayton, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Underground Utility Facility Damage Prevention Act. First Reading of this House Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "House Perfunctory Session will be in order. Rules
Committee Report offered by Representative Churchill,
Chairman from the Committee on Rules to which the following
Joint Action Motions were referred, action taken on January
24, 1996, reported the same back 'do approve for
consideration' to the floor on the Order of Second Reading,
Senate Bill #1154. To the floor on the Order of Third
Reading, Senate Bill 182, Senate Bill 1122, House Bill 546,
and House Bill 2456. There being no further business, the
House Perfunctory Session stands adjourned. The House will
reconvene in Perfunctory Session on Thursday, January 25,
at the hour of 9:00 a.m."

88th Leg. Day 89th J.a. STATE OF ILLINOIS HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES TRANSCRIPTION LOG DATE: 1-24-96 **SPEAKER** DESCRIPTION PAGE TIME House to Order 12:00 Poates Pledge Persico Roll Call attendan martinez (Rep.) all present Il. M. Lennard Committe Reports Introduction 1st Reading Mennand Supl Cal #/ Sp. Biggert excused for the Dalf Rep. Blagojevich

January 24, 1996

The Chaplain for the day is Reverend George Coates of St. Peter's AME Church of Decatur. Reverend Coates is the guest of Representative Julie Curry.

Guests in the Gallery may wish to rise for the invocation.

Rev. George Coates St. Peter's AME Church 515 S. Church Decatur, IL 62522 SS#353-52-0077

TRANSCRIPTION LOG

DATE: 1-24-96

(2)

PAGE	TIME	SPEAKER	DESCRIPTION
		0	
	12:16	Sp. Biggerl	
		0 68	
		Cl Mc Lennone	h
		Cx 14 germani	
		Sp. Biggert	R/2 ml
		Jan of	170
		U. M. Lennand	Rules/12:20
			/
		Sp. Biggert	
	ļ	O. McLennac	HB26 A#12 Motions
			1
	ļ	Sp. Biggert	garda neman Ligh School
		John Jones	SJR8-to open
	1	John Jones	337
		Sp Biggert	
		and the second	
		Horthe	Ing. of Clerk
		•	II
		So. Biggert_	Take it OR -SJR8
			5JR8 - passed out
		Hartke	/
		Sp.B	Cyclel - SJR8
	1	John Jones) .
		Sp. Biggert	
		' 00	
		Deering	·
		Jo.D	
	l	John Jones	
	11	" 7" / J	<u> </u>

STATE OF ILLINOIS HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES TRANSCRIPTION LOG

DATE: 1-24-96

SJR8 DESCRIPTION PAGE TIME **SPEAKER** Movak_ Black M.P.Q. Sp. Biggert John Jones Sp. Biggert Cl. Rosse Committee Keports Sp. Biggert Ex-1:30-Rm 114 Sp. Biggert Cl. Bossi Introduction 1st Keading Sp. Biggert 11.13965 CCR#1 5A#3 Gyder_ 6. Beggut

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TRANSCRIPTION LOG

DATE: 1-24-96

4

	11	1	
PAGE	TIME	SPEAKER	DESCRIPTION
	1:14	7	Ing of Clerk
		Sp. Biggert	0 0
		Sp. Daniels	
		'	HB965 concur TOR
		Sp. Daniels	5B775 A#3
		Cl Rossi	
		Sp. Daniels	
		Moffitt	fl 4#3
		So Daniels	i //
		Sp. Daniels	Third Return at Cancers - 2:30
		Cl. Rossi	ex-will not meet
	3:50		
		Bollmer.	Comm. Report
		Spheitch	,
		Sp Leitch Parke	
		So Leiteh	

STATE OF ILLINOIS HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES TRANSCRIPTION LOG

DATE: 1-24-96

3

PAGE	TIME	SPEAKER	DESCRIPTION
	1		
	3:51	La Franker	Cyclel
		La Leitet	7 8
		100 h	
		Parse -	
		l die	motion adopted
		og. June	714 au., acc p = 3
		Q. Man	
	 	Gydar	
		J. D	
	ļļ	Sp. Zeitch	
		<u>`</u>)
		granbercy	S yeld
		Sp.	
		Reder	
		A	
		S. Leich	
	_	Sp. neutch	,
		'	
		00.	, ,
		So Leiteh	56/193 R/Rule motion carries
		0	motion carries
		Ruder	
		T CONTROL OF THE PARTY OF THE P	
E		La Leitel	148965 5
	1		74070
1		Ryser	to open
		II V	
		Sp. Reitch	
		Mautino	Geter Joesph "Dew Bal

TRANSCRIPTION LOG

DATE: 1-24-96

SPEAKER PAGE TIME Sp. Reitch

STATE OF ILLINOIS HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES TRANSCRIPTION LOG

DATE: 1-24-96

HB 965 DESCRIPTION **PAGE** TIME **SPEAKER** Sp. Leitch 4:07 upl. Cal. 42 Sp. Leitch SJRH Sp. Leitch Black Cowlishan Currie motion passes 181787 CCR#1

STATE OF ILLINOIS HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES TRANSCRIPTION LOG

DATE: 1-24-96 HB1787 C PAGE TIME **SPEAKER** DESCRIPTION So. Leitch Kulik to Close alexters (61-44-9) Sp. Leitel Miffett HB1462 CCR Granberg Sp. Leiteh Black Sp. Leitch Granberg H8-4(6) Jo. Leitch motion passe This afternoon maffitt

TRANSCRIPTION LOG

DATE: 1-24-96 1462 DESCRIPTION PAGE TIME **SPEAKER**

TRANSCRIPTION LOG

DATE: 1-24-96
HB 1462
HB 1181

			HB HB	
PAGE	TIME	SPEAKER	DESCRIPTION	
	5:1a	Sp. Leitch	rule 5-1 of chair	
		Sang	Verification of Roll Call	
		Sp Lietch	Poll affirmative	
		Johnson, Te		
		a. mcf.		
		Sp. Leitch	Chair sulestan	
		Sang		
		Sp. Leitch	ruling of Chair	
		Lang	Puling of Chair 62-52 - Ball of the Affirmative	
		Clerk		
		Sp. Seitch	Chair Substamel	
		Ryder	Barl Ing.	
		Sp. Leitch	0	
		' '		
		Cl: M. Sennon Sp: Leitch Rydler		
		Ryder		

TRANSCRIPTION LOG

DATE: 1-24-96

			HB1462
PAGE	TIME	SPEAKER	DESCRIPTION
	5:27	Sp. Leitch	
		Hartke	
		Sp. Leilch	
		Cross	
		Sp.L.	Typelif
		Moffitt	
		Sp. Leitch	
		Butherford So. L.	Cyclo
		so. L. Moffitt	
		Sp. Leitch	
		Clark Rossi	Supp Cel #3
		Brady -	quela
		moffite -	
		Sigget Bigget So. S.	
		Biggert	linela
		So. S. Mollitt.	

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TRANSCRIPTION LOG

DATE: 1-24-96

LLR 1111-2

			HB1462	
PAGE	TIME	SPEAKER	DESCRIPTION	
	(e:00			
		Hughes	Leveld	
		Moffiel		
		So. Lietch		
		Churchill	yield.	
		Churchill Sp Lietal. Black		
		Sp. Daniels		
		murphys	n. Mg.	
		Laniels	, and the second	
		moffett	to Close TAPEB	
		Sp. Danielo	1462 CCR#1 3 89-22-2	
		Cl. McLennaud		
		Laniels	3 ul	
		Cl. M. Lennaud	Rules	
	6:15		Adjourn Tue Feb 6th Berf. Jan 25 Feb 21 9:00	
			4:00	

12

STATE OF ILLINOIS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TRANSCRIPTION LOG

DATE: 1-24-96

 $\overline{(13)}$

	سد)	Roll.	
PAGE	TIME	Perf.	DESCRIPTION
	1	Cl. Rossi Cl. McL	Introdution HJR70 1st Reading Comm. Report
		Cl. Meg	Comm. Report
	6:45	И	adjourned
			, and the second
		·	

REPORT: TIFLDAY PAGE: 001

STATE OF ILLINOIS .

89TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
DAILY TRANSCRIPTION OF DEBATE INDEX

97/03/12 15:03:43

JANUARY 24, 1996

	011NONN1 24, 1990		
HB-0965	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	21
HB-0965	OUT OF RECORD	PAGE	16
HB-1462	CONFERENCE	PAGE	36
	CONFERENCE	PAGE	30
	FIRST READING	PAGE	81
	FIRST READING	PAGE	2
	FIRST READING	PAGE	2
	FIRST READING	PAGE	3
	FIRST READING		15
	FIRST READING	PAGE	15
	FIRST READING	PAGE	15
		PAGE	15
	FIRST READING	PAGE	15
	FIRST READING	PAGE	15
	FIRST READING	PAGE	15
	FIRST READING	PAGE	15
HB-2757	FIRST READING	PAGE	15
HB-2758	FIRST READING	PAGE	16
	FIRST READING	PAGE	16
	FIRST READING	PAGE	16
	FIRST READING	PAGE	16
	FIRST READING	PAGE	16
	FIRST READING	PAGE	16
	FIRST READING	PAGE	16
	FIRST READING	PAGE	16
HB-2766	FIRST READING	PAGE	81
	FIRST READING	PAGE	81
	FIRST READING	PAGE	81
HB-2770	FIRST READING	PAGE	81
HB-2771	FIRST READING	PAGE	81
HB-2772	FIRST READING	PAGE	81
HB-2773	FIRST READING	PAGE	81
HB-2774	FIRST READING	PAGE	81
HB-2775	FIRST READING	PAGE	82
HB-2776	FIRST READING	PAGE	82
	FIRST READING	PAGE	82
HB-2778	FIRST READING	PAGE	82
SB-0015		PAGE	19
SB-0021	SECOND READING	PAGE	80
SB-0775	SECOND READING	PAGE	17
	THIRD READING	PAGE	3
SB-1193		PAGE	19
HR-0069		PAGE	3
HJR-0070		PAGE	81
SJR-0008		PAGE	4
	RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	4
SJR-0074		PAGE	30
	RESOLUTION OFFERED	PAGE	28
	OIT ENED	1 HOD	20
	SUBJECT MATTER		
BUEB		DACE	4

HOUSE TO ORDER	PAGE	1
REPRESENTATIVE CHURCHILL IN THE CHAIR	PAGE	1
PRAYER - REVEREND COATES	PAGE	1
PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE - PERSICO	PAGE	1
ROLL CALL FOR ATTENDANCE	PAGE	1
SUPPLEMENTAL CALENDAR #1	PAGE	3
NEWMAN HIGH SCHOOL'S JUNIOR & SENIOR CLASS	PAGE	3
REPRESENTATIVE BIGGERT IN THE CHAIR	PAGE	3
REPRESENTATIVE LEITCH IN THE CHAIR	PAGE	18
SUPPLEMENTAL CALENDAR #2	PAGE	28
SPEAKER DANIELS IN THE CHAIR	PAGE	78
HOUSE ADJOURNED	PAGE	81
HOUSE PERFUNCTORY SESSION	PAGE	81
HOUSE PERFUNCTORY SESSION ADJOURNED	PAGE	82