114th Legislative Day

April 17, 1996

Speaker Daniels: "The House will come to order. The Members will please be in their chairs. Those not entitled to the Floor will please retire to the gallery. The Chaplain for the day is Pastor Mike Drake of the Elkhart Christian Church in Elkhart, Illinois. Pastor Drake is the guest of Representative John Turner. Guests in the gallery may wish to rise for the invocation. Pastor Drake."

Pastor Mike Drake: "Thank you Father, for each Representative here today. You have given each of them a great responsibility. They do not take the privilege of governing lightly. You've spoken from King David of Israel. 'He who rules over men must be just, ruling in the fear of God.' And through the words of the Apostle Paul, 'Your rulers are God's servants to do you good.' These men and women are our Representatives. Elected by our choice. Sometimes they hear our praise but more often they hear our criticism. We often clamor for our agenda, believing ourselves to be right. But they represent more than just a few of us. They represent all of the people of Illinois. They've been sent here to exercise judgement. May they have the wisdom of Solomon and to rule this great people May they have the integrity of Job to endure wisely. patiently their responsibilities. May they have the compassion of Jesus in leading those whom they serve. And may those of us who elected them, Father, follow Your Commandment given by the Apostle Paul, to pray, intercede and give thanks for all those in authority, that peaceful and quiet lives in all godliness and holiness. This is my prayer in Jesus name. Amen."

Speaker Daniels: "Thank you Pastor Drake. We'll be lead in the Pledge of Allegiance by Representative John Turner."

Turner, J. - et al: "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the

114th Legislative Day

- April 17, 1996
- United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."
- Speaker Daniels: "Roll Call for Attendance. Representative

 Currie is recognized on the Democrat side of the aisle for

 any excused absences."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. Please let the record show that Representative Martinez is excused today."
- Speaker Daniels: "The record will so reflect. Representative

 Cross for excused absences on the Republican side of the
 aisle."
- Cross: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Happy to report we're all here today. Thank you."
- Speaker Daniels: "The record will so reflect. Mr. Clerk take the roll. There are 116 Members answering the roll and a quorum is present and the House will now come to Order. Committee Reports, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk McLennand: "Committee Report from Representative Cowlishaw, Chairman from the Committee on Aging. To which the following Joint Action Motions were referred. Action taken on April 17, 1996. Reported the same back with, 'do approve for consideration'. Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 3238. Committee report offered by Representative Rutherford, Chairman from Committee on Constitutional Officers to which the following Joint Action Motions were referred. Action taken on April 17, 1996. Reported the same back, 'do approve for consideration'. Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 2250. Committee Report offered Representative Cowlishaw, Chairman from Committee on Elementary and Secondary Ed. Committee on Elementary and Secondary Ed. to which the following Joint Action Motions were referred. Action taken on April 17, 1996. Reported

114th Legislative Day

April 17, 1996

the same back, 'do approve for consideration'. Motion to concur in Senate Amendments #1 and Senate Amendment House Bill 226. Committee Report from Representative Maureen Murphy, Chairman from the Committee on Revenue, to which the following Joint Action Motions were referred. action taken on April 17, 1996, reported the same back 'do approve for consideration' Floor Amendment #2, House Bill 17. Representative Tom Cross, Chairman from the Committee on Judiciary for Civil Law, to which the following Joint Action Motions were referred, action taken on April 17, 1996, reported the same back 'do approve for consideration' Floor Amendment #6 to House Bill 346. Correction. The Committee on Aging Report was offered by Representative Lawfer. Representative Balthis, Chairman from the Committee on Cities and Villages, to which the following Joint Action Motions were referred, action taken on April 17, reported the same back 'do approve for consideration'. Conference Committee Report #1 to House Bill 270. Amendment #1 to House Bill 682."

Speaker Daniels: "Announcements, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk McLennand: "Attention Members. Today, Doris Price from Group Insurance is available to meet with you in room 122A. She is available today and tomorrow. From April 1 through May 30th is your insurance benefit choice period. Again, Doris Price from Group Insurance is available to meet today and tomorrow. Also, on May 9th a Representative from the General Assembly Retirement System will be available for meetings. In addition, on your lap, on your desk today was a memo dealing with new software that is available on your laptop computers. If you have any questions there is plenty of staff available from LIS to answer them. Thank you."

114th Legislative Day

- April 17, 1996
- Speaker Daniels: "Order of page two of the Calender, Second Reading is a Bill. House Bill 22. Read the Bill Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 22, a Bill for an Act amending the Illinois Public Aid Code. Second Reading of this House Bill. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments."
- Speaker Daniels: "Third Reading. House Bill 322. Read the Bill Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 322, this Bill's been read a second time previously. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments have been approved for consideration. A Fiscal Note and a Pension Impact Note have been requested on the Bill, as amended and have not been filed."
- Speaker Daniels: "Hold the Bill on Second Reading, Mr. Clerk.

 House Bill 346. Read the Bill Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 346. This Bill has been read a second time previously. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #5, offered by Representative Cross, has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Cross."
- Cross: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In fairness to the question we had yesterday, I'd like to withdraw Floor Amendment #5 and proceed with Floor Amendment #6."
- Speaker Daniels: "With leave of a House Floor Amendment #5 is withdrawn."
- Clerk Rossi: "Floor Amendment #6 is offered, by Representative Cross."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Cross."
- Cross: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Floor Amendment #6 becomes the Bill. It passed out of committee this morning unanimously. It's a Bill that or an Amendment that takes care of a problem, potentially statewide, of designating in every

114th Legislative Day

April 17, 1996

area outside of Cook, a new position of court security officer, for court security people that watch over metal detectors, et cetera at the courthouse. I'd be glad to answer any questions. We've had a good bit of negotiation on it. And as I said it passed out unanimously today."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Granberg."

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

Speaker Daniels: "He indicates he will."

Granberg: "Tom, earlier the Federation of Police was opposed to this Bill before the Amendment. Do you know what their position is now with the Amendment?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Cross."

Cross: "Kurt, there's still some things they don't like about it. They said they're not going to work. They are not in favor of it. They have some opposition of it but they're not going to work it. And they're not going to work to try and kill the Bill. I talked to them this morning. We have spent hours, literally hours with them. I think we've ironed out the bulk, if not all of their oppositions about the Court Security Bill portion. There's a section in here for the Chicago Bar Association, that allows, if you look at part of the Amendment there, it allows for the kind of liberal nature of amending complaints with administrative agencies. They didn't like that portion. We've talked to them and I think that's really where a good bit of their opposition comes from. But other than that I think on the court security part, we've ironed out their differences."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Granberg."

Granberg: "Thanks. Representative Cross, is it your intention to call the Bill on Third today? Or are you just going to put the Amendment on and we can deal with some of these groups or actually talk to them before you call the vote, for a

114th Legislative Day

April 17, 1996

final vote?"

- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Cross."
- Cross: "Kurt, I'll be glad. If you want to talk to the FOP before I call it. I'll be glad to do that. I think maybe, if you can do it fairly soon. I don't want to lose an opportunity to call it. I'll be glad to sit down with them. If you'd like to. Or sit down with you. Let's do that right after this, if you would like to. Let's try to find them."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Granberg."
- Granberg: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We will not request a roll call on the Amendment but I appreciate the Representative's response and his time. We'll get together after the Amendment is adopted. Thank you."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Cross, is it your intention to call this Bill sometime later today?"
- Cross: "I'd like to call it as soon as we can. And that's why
 I'd be glad to talk to Representative Granberg, right after
 the Bill is called."
- Speaker Daniels: "Thank you. Further questions? There being none, Representative Cross moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #6. All those in favor will indicate by saying 'aye'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Amendment #6 is adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Rossi: "No further Amendments have been approved for consideration. The notes that have been requested on the Bill have been filed."
- Speaker Daniels: "Third Reading. Page three of the Calender.

 House Bill 1476. Representative Churchill. Read the Bill

 Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1476. This Bill's been read a second time previously. No Committee Amendments. No Floor

114th Legislative Day

- April 17, 1996
- Amendments have been approved for consideration. The State's Mandates Note and the Fiscal Note that were requested on the Bill have been filed."
- Speaker Daniels: "Third Reading. House Bill (sic) 1477,

 Representative Churchill. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1477. This Bill has been read a second time previously. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments."
- Speaker Daniels: "Third Reading. Page four of the Calender appears House Bill 2595. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2595. This Bill has read a second time previously, No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments."
- Speaker Daniels: "Third Reading. House Bill 2859.

 Representative Stephens. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2859. This Bill has been read a second time previously. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments."
- Speaker Daniels: "Third Reading. House Bill 3041.

 Representative Churchill. Read the Bill Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 3041. This Bill has been read a second time previously. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments."
- Speaker Daniels: "Third Reading. Page nine of the Calender, on the Order of Postponed Consideration. House Bill 2655.

 Representative Wennlund. Read the Bill. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2655. This Bill has been read a third time previously and is on the Order of Consideration Postponed."
- Speaker Daniels: "Return that Bill to the Order of Second Reading. House Bill 3271. Representative Myers. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

114th Legislative Day

- April 17, 1996
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 3271, a Bill for an Act amending the Professional Boxing and Wrestling Act. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Daniels: "Return the Bill to the Order of Second Reading.

 On the Order of Third Reading. House Bill 1476. Read the
 Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 1476, a Bill for an Act amending the General Obligation Bond Act. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Churchill."
- Churchill: "Thank you Mr. Speaker. This is solely a Vehicle for GO bonds."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Hannig."
- Hannig: "Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. I would just ask Members on our side of the aisle to oppose this effort to move this Bond Bill. We have had a position on our side of the aisle that the State of Illinois needs to get its house in order. That we don't need to go further and further in debt, even as we continue to string out the payment cycles. So, I would just ask the Members on this side of the aisle and any fiscal conservatives on the other side of the aisle to please vote 'no'."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Churchill, moves for the adoption and passage of House Bill 1476. All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye'; opposed by voting 'no'. The voting is open. This is final action. Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Have all voted who wished? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are...Representative Granberg."
- Granberg: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We would requests a verification of the Roll Call, if it does, in fact, received 60 votes before you announce it into the record."

114th Legislative Day

April 17, 1996

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Granberg request a verification of the Affirmative Roll. There are 60 voting 'aye', 52 voting 'no'. And the Clerk will proceed with the Order of Verification."

Clerk Rossi: "Poll of those voting in the Affirmative. Representative Ackerman. Balthis. Biggert. Biggins. Black. Bost. Brady. Churchill. Ciarlo. Clayton. Cowlishaw. Cross. Deuchler. Doody. Durkin. Goslin. Hughes. Johnson, Tim. Johnson, Tom. Jones, Hassert. John. Klingler. Krause. Kubik. Lawfer. Lindner. Lyons. McAuliffe. Mitchell. Moffitt. Moore, Andrea. Mulligan. Noland. O'Connor. Murphy, Maureen. Mvers. Pankau. Parke. Pedersen. Persico. Poe. Roskam. Rutherford. Ryder. Salvi. Saviano. Skinner. Spangler. Stephens. Tenhouse. Turner, John. Wait. Weaver. Wennlund. Winkel. Winters. Wirsing. Wojcik. Zickus and Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Granberg."

Granberg: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative Klingler?"

Speaker Daniels: "She's in her chair as always."

Granberg: "I'm sorry. I thought that she might be out at the Labor Rally with the AFSCME employees."

Speaker Daniels: "She has already addressed them."

Granberg: "Representative Saviano?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Saviano, he's in the rear of the chamber. Representative Bost asked leave to be verified."

Granberg: "Did Representative Bost go out to meet the AFSCME employees, too?"

Speaker Daniels: "Yes. Representative Persico asks leave to be verified. Representative Biggert? Okay, further questions?"

Granberg: "Representative Leitch?"

114th Legislative Day

- April 17, 1996
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Leitch? Did you check his vote, Sir? Mr. Clerk."
- Granberg: "Mr. Speaker if I didn't see the voting board.

 Representative Leitch always votes. He's very consistent."
- Speaker Daniels: "Mr. Clerk, how is Representative Leitch recorded?"
- Granberg: "Representative Mitchell."
- Clerk McLennand: "Representative Leitch is not voting."
- Speaker Daniels: "Okay. Representative Mitchell? He's over here, Sir. He's over there. Further questions?"
- Granberg: "Representative Pedersen."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Bernie Pedersen? Representative Pedersen is in the chambers. Further questions? Representative Granberg."
- Granberg: "Representative Pedersen you're recorded as voting 'aye'. With your ALEC record and fiscal conservatism is that correct?"
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Granberg."
- Pedersen: "This is a decrease."
- Speaker Daniels: "Just for the record, everyone voting against decreasing the GO Bond authorization. Representative Granberg."
- Granberg: "Is Senator Salvi our fiscal conservative here?

 Senator Salvi please? No the real conservative."
- Speaker Daniels: "Remove him from the roll. Further questions?

 Representative Granberg."
- Granberg: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am sure Senator Salvi would want to vote to increase the state's debts. So I am sure this is a better reflection of that vote. Is Representative Zickus here?"
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Zickus is here in the front.

 Representative Granberg."

114th Legislative Day

April 17, 1996

Granberg: "Thank you. Representative Lyons? Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Daniels: "I'm sorry, Sir?"

Granberg: "Representative Lyons."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Lyons? She's not voting. Wait.

She is on the roll call recorded as 'yes'. Where is

Representative Lyons? Representative Noland have leave to
be verified?"

Granberg: "Absolutely."

- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Lyons is in the chambers.

 Further questions? She's right here. Representative

 Granberg, further questions?"
- Granberg: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. For a moment, let me have the pleasure of introducing a guest. Former State Senator, former State Treasurer, my good friend, your good friend Jim Donawald is here with us today."
- Speaker Daniels: "Welcome Treasurer Donawald. Welcome, Sir."

Granberg: "Representative Hughes?"

- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Anne Hughes? Is the Lady in the chambers? She's in the rear of the chambers. Further questions?"
- Granberg: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. No further questions."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Churchill is recognized.

 Representative Churchill."
- Churchill: "I ask for leave to put it on Postponed Consideration."
- Speaker Daniels: "Postponed Consideration. The House will stand at ease for 30 minutes. Supplemental Calender Announcement."
- Clerk McLennand: "Supplemental Calender #1 is being distributed.

 Introduction. First Reading of Senate Bills.
- Clerk McLennand: "Senate Bill 1388, offered by Representative Meyer, a Bill for an Act concerning Public Health and

114th Legislative Day

April 17, 1996

Welfare. Senate Bill 1390, offered by Representative Meyer, a Bill for an Act that amends the Environmental Protection Act. Senate Bill 1504, offered by Representative Meyer, a Bill for an Act to amend the Environmental Protection Act. Senate Bill 1543, offered by Representative Meyer, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Public Aid Code. Senate Bill 1749, offered by Representative Noland, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Farm Development Act. First Reading of these Senate Bills. Refer to the Rules Committee."

- Doorman: "Attention, the House is going to reconvene. All those persons not authorized access to the Floor, please retire to the gallery at this time."
- Clerk McLennand: "Introduction First Reading of Senate Bills.

 Senate Bill 1320, offered by Representative Rutherford, a
 Bill for an Act to amend the Code of Criminal Procedure.

 Senate Bill 1363, offered by Representative Balthis, a Bill
 for an Act to amend the School Code. Senate Bill 1288,

 offered by Representative Kubik, a Bill for an Act to amend
 the Election Code. Introduction First Reading of these
 Senate Bills. Rules Committee."
- Doorman: "Attention. Will all persons not authorized access to the Floor, please retire to the gallery at this time? The House will reconvene for business."
- Clerk McLennand: "Introduction First Reading of Senate Bills.

 Senate Bill 1391, offered by Representative Persico, a Bill for an Act to amend certain Acts in relation to environmental protection. Senate Bill 1578, offered by Representative Persico, a Bill for an Act to amend the Environmental Protection Act. Introduction First Reading of these Senate Bills. Refer to the Rules Committee.

 Committee notice. Rules Committee will meet at 2:15, in

114th Legislative Day

April 17, 1996

- Speaker's Conference Room. Rules Committee 2:15, in Speaker's Conference Room. Introduction of Resolutions. Senate Joint Resolution #89, offered by Representative Madigan and Speaker Daniels. Rules Committee."
- Speaker Daniels: "The House will come to order. Representative Granberg for what purpose do you rise?"
- Granberg: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I know it's against the House Rules but I would like to introduce the parents of the Murray Mental Health Center in my district. The Mental Health Center in Centralia. The Concerned Parents Group is here in the gallery. They're always good friends of ours up here in Springfield, and their kids' at the Murray Mental Health Center. So if you'll welcome."
- Speaker Daniels: "Welcome. Welcome to Springfield. Mr. Clerk on the Order of Consideration Postponed appears House Bill 1476. Read the Bill please."
- Clerk McLennand: "House Bill 1476, a Bill for an Act that amends

 General Obligation Bond Act has been read a third time

 previously. Is on the Order of Consideration Postponed."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Churchill."
- Churchill: "This is a Vehicle for GO bond to say decrease in the bonding authority."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Granberg."
- Granberg: "I assume this is the same Bill we called for a vote an hour and a half ago."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Churchill."
- Churchill: "I don't think it was that long."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Granberg."
- Granberg: "Is our term fiscal conservative, Senator Salvi here
 for this vote that we get..."
- Speaker Daniels: "Further discussion? Representative Granberg?

 Representative Hanniq?"

114th Legislative Day

April 17, 1996

Hannig: "Yes. Thank you Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. This Bill is no better now than it was a half hour ago when we voted on it. This Bill is an effort to spend about \$600 million that the state does not have. It's an effort spend this money, even as we try to figure out how to fund our schools. And even as we try to figure out how to pay our Bills. And we try and figure out how to operate state government. So, if you think that it's important that spend money that we don't have, that we simply borrow and borrow, I suppose that you can be a part of this process of moving this Bill along. But it seems to me, for those of us who think that we ought to pay our bills first, get our house in order, that we ought to see our bond upgraded by the New York people before we start spending more money and borrowing more money. For us I think important vote is to not be a part of this process and to vote 'no'. And I urge all of my colleagues to do so. I'll thank the fiscal conservatives on the other side of the aisle who helped us earlier in the day to defeat this proposal and I hope that they stay with us. Thank you."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Black."

Black: "Yes, thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. To the Bill before us. The same old tired routine from that side of the aisle, that we've heard for the last 14 months. I'm amazed that you would get up and say that with your friends and labor visiting the Capitol today. Because if we're going to adhere to what you want us to do, no bonding means no public construction. No jobs. No prisons. No highways. No school buildings. No nothing. Well, I'm sick and tired of hearing it. You've never met a bond issue you didn't like when you ran this House. If you don't want to put Labor to

114th Legislative Day

April 17, 1996

work then you vote 'no'. But by God, I'm going to vote to put Labor to work in my district and I am going to vote 'ves'."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Schoenberg."

Schoenberg: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Mr. Black's words, I think, ring very true. And perhaps we should be more grateful. There approximately \$600 million worth of projects which will be put on this Bill if the majority has their way. we, in the minority, ought to be grateful that at least we'll have the opportunity to vote up or down on these Because three of the largest capital projects projects. that are on line for this state in this year, in calender year, we won't have the opportunity to vote on them. The Department of Public Aid is online to spend \$19 million, paid out over 20 years turns into \$33 million, for brand new Department of Public Aid building. We won't have a chance to vote on that, even though the vacancy rates in Chicago are 18%. We won't have a chance to do that, because they won't be financed through bonds. will be financed through certificates of participation. The very vehicle, that was used ironically, to build the prisons that didn't get built with the bonding from the last Session. We won't have a chance to spend \$75 million to build a 'Taj Mahal' for the Illinois Environmental Protection Agency in a 20 year lease-to-own arrangement. Because that doesn't require prior legislative approval. We won't be able to buy a building for three times the market rate on Chicago's River North neighborhood, for the Illinois Department for Employment Security. A pay out of over \$33 million dollars over 20 years. We won't have a chance to do that, even though they're selling it, they

114th Legislative Day

April 17, 1996

want to sell to us over three times the market value. Because it doesn't require any bonding. These largest capital projects online for the State of Illinois to execute this year. We won't have a chance to vote on them because they can they can be done without us. guess we should be grateful that we have this before Because the big three ticket items can all be done without us. And what are the implications for that? many. There's a lot of money that is going to get spent unnecessarily. There is a lot of money that is going to get spent without any legislative oversight, from our side of the aisle or from your side of the aisle. regardless of who's in power, I don't know that that's how we want to do business. And the other thing that's regrettable about this is, as I said before, these very instruments, the certificates of participation were used earlier to initiate prison construction. We would be use certificates of participation for construction and not need a single Democratic vote or a single Republican vote to build more prisons, which I know many of us feel are necessary. And the reason we can't do that, is because we're building or buying buildings that we don't need. So, I guess thanks are in order that we at least have an opportunity to vote on this because over a \$175 million worth of capital projects are going to get done with out us issuing a single Roll Call Vote. Thank you."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Would the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Daniels: "He indicates he will."

Skinner: "We get another vote on this right? It has to come back from the Senate, right?"

114th Legislative Day

April 17, 1996

Churchill: "From this point it's a Vehicle Bill, so, if the Senate were to decide to nothing with it, it will never come back because it will never have anything on it. In the event that the Senate wants to add something to it, then obviously it has to come back here for votes. So, you'll get to see what the final package is and you'll get to vote it up or down."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Well, that seems obvious to me but it doesn't seem obvious to the prior speaker. I was just curious as to why? And you can answer...I understand that. He did however raise some very cogent questions about certificates of participation. I mean real. questions. I would much rather have the Legislature be able to say, 'yes' or 'no', to new facilities and have the Executive Branch just proceed a pace without asking our permission. I hope those projects are in this Bill, that we can either vote 'yes' or 'no' when it comes back. Thank you."

Speaker Daniels: "Further discussion? Representative Deering."

Deering: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Some of the rhetoric coming from the other side of the aisle seems a little surprising, especially when it was mentioned that the unions were here today and how we're going to vote against public works, do a lot of things, that's not in the best interest of Labor. It's ironic that it's the other side of the aisle that wants repeal prevailing wage, that's voted against working men and women for the last year. It seems that there has been some talk even by the Sponsor of the Bill, that this is a decrease, A decrease, is the key word. And one of the prior speakers said that this is going to stop projects. Well, apparently, if this is a decrease, maybe they want

114th Legislative Day

April 17, 1996

those union men and women to work for work minimum wage. Maybe that's the message we ought to be sending. And also as far as bonding and what we're going to do, you know this state is not in the best fiscal shape. We all were a part of dumping on the Governor's lap and he signed into law the third largest bond default in the history of the country. The first intentional. Our bond rating is shot to hell. We couldn't even sell a \$50 million bond proposal on Wall Street, a few weeks ago or month ago. Nobody would even bid on it. Maybe it's not the Democrat side of the aisle that's blocking some of these projects. Maybe it's just the fiscal integrity of the state, that we as taxpayers all have to deal with."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Churchill, now moves for the passage of House Bill 1476. All those in favor signify saying, voting 'aye'; opposed by voting 'no'. The voting is open. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question, there are 63 'aye'; 49 'no'. This Bill having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Page six of the Calender appears House Bill 2593. Representative Black. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk MCLennand: "House Bill 2593, a Bill for an Act that amends the Workers Compensation Act. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Black."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is another one of those Republican Bills, that's bad for working men and women that I've been trying to get passed for four years. Two of those years I wasn't in the Majority. Let's try again. Amendment #1 to

114th Legislative Day

April 17, 1996

House Bill 2593 amends the Workers Compensation Act to increase the contribution rates of employers to the Rate Adjustment Fund. From five tenths or a half of percent to three quarters of a percent of indemnity payments made in a previous six month period. That further increases the General Revenue Borrowing Authority from two and a half million to five million dollars and it increases the repayment cycle from 90 days to 270 days. It provides an administrative cost for the collection of the assessment will be payed out of the fund. It requires an actuarial audit to be conducted on the fund. For those of you who are not familiar with the Rate Adjustment Fund, it was created in the rewrite of 1975. It cost, it pays a cost of living adjustment to the spouses and dependents of workers who are either killed on the job or are permanently and totally disabled. These quarterly payments to beneficiaries are due on January 15, April 15, July 15 and October 15 of each year. Biannual employer assessments are due to the Industrial Commission on March 15 and September 15, of each year. Since 1987 the Rate Adjustment Fund has been chronically insolvent. The population of recipients has grown by about 70 to 100 people per year.

While 30 are removed from the rolls because of death, remarriage or disqualification. Generally these new recipients receive benefits for 20 years or more. What it is is an award equal to sixty six and two-thirds percent of workers average weekly wage, for a maximum of 20 years or \$250 thousand, whichever is reached first. I happen to have five of these people who reside in my district. They are not getting their checks in a timely fashion. I've tried to do everything I could do in the last four years to correct this inequity and I should say, in respect to both sides

114th Legislative Day

April 17, 1996

of the aisle, we have done some things. We've increased the borrowing ability. But that's a short-term solution. Then out of the next assessment you have to pay back your authority, your borrowing, the amount that you've borrowed. So the next quarterly payment to the recipients will not be made in a timely fashion. I would close my introduction to this Bill by simply reading to you a letter from one of my constituents. The letter regarding House Bill 2593. As a current recipient of the Rate Adjustment Fund, am very interested in the outcome of this Bill. My children and I received benefits from this fund. The last two or three years the payments have been very irregular. Before that time they were always prompt and in full. This payment helps to offset expenses and costs incurred supporting my children and myself. Diana's husband, who was a management employee of a firm, was killed in an industrial accident in my district. I'm not interested in blame. I'm not interested in why it can't pay it's bills. I'm not interested in what we should and shouldn't do. I'm interested in seeing Diana and others like her, get the money we promised them. Anything for that reason that I'd ask you to support this Bill. I'd be glad to answer any questions you have."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Hanniq."

Hannig: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Daniels: "He indicates he will."

Hannig: "Representative Black, I applaud your efforts to address this much needed, this problem that needs to be addressed.

But let me ask you a few questions to make sure that I understand what it is we're trying to do. And it's my understanding that the problem that we have with the system is that we just have an imbalance between the revenues that come in and the obligations that the fund has, and that we've tried to address it from time to time by borrowing.

Could you tell us if this takes a different approach? Is

114th Legislative Day

April 17, 1996

there a new mechanism or some way we will raise money through this procedure to try to address that imbalance?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Black."

Black: "I think the most fundamental change in what I have presented to you today is to increase the assessment on the employer, that is the only way through the year 2006, when it has to be revisited. That we're going to be able to work out of this problem. It does allow for some additional short-term borrowing, so that we can meet our obligations. I think that is the fundamental change."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Hannig."

Hannig: "Yes, thank you, Representative and I think you are right on the mark with that. Just let me ask you one last question. And I'm not sure you are aware of this. But I just saw an article in the paper today where the Auditor General says that this agency has failed to collect as much as \$241 thousand in penalties that have been assessed against businesses. Are you aware of that? And does this Bill do anything to address that situation?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Black."

Black: "I'm very much aware of that. And as I said in my remarks a few minutes ago, I'm not concerned anymore with who's fault it is and what they do or don't do, I concur with that article, I haven't seen today's article. But I have, over the last four years, several articles and letters that relate to the issue at hand. I would submit to you that the Industrial Commission and I have told the Executive Director to his face, could do a better job than what they have done of tracking these assessments. They settled, for example, they've settled some back claims on various entities in the County of Cook, for what I believe to be pennies on the dollar. Because we do not have an adequate

114th Legislative Day

April 17, 1996

accounting or computer system, perhaps, to help the Industrial Commission to do it's job. But I'm not here to bash the commission. I would hope we could work together to fix that problem. But what I am here to do is try and advance something that says, 'yes, we have some concerns with the way the Industrial Commission administers it's responsibilities.' But my greater concerns are the widows and orphans and those workers who are permanently and totally disabled, who are not being paid. And I think this assessment increase will address that."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Hannig."

Hannig: "Yes, thank you, Representative. I think part of the problem has been that the commission has felt that they do total authority to collect these type penalties. And so one of these things we may want to and maybe this Bill already does it, is to ensure that they do clearly have the authority to collect these penalties when indeed there is no question that penalties are due. So, that seems to be, if my recollection is correct, what the commission has said to the Audit Commission in the past when we've asked them questions as to why they do not collect these assessments. But having said that, just let me say to the Bill, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, that this is a much needed overhaul of the system. Something that really has needed to be done for a long long time. past we have tried to solve the problem by simply borrowing our way out of it. But that has never worked. There has always been or has been for a number of years a structural imbalance between the amount of revenue that comes in and the amount of revenue that goes out. frankly, Representative Black has taken a very strong stand and has attempted to change that imbalance and to correct

114th Legislative Day

April 17, 1996

that imbalance for the people of the State of Illinois who are the least likely to help and fend for themselves. And so I would applaud him for his effort. It's a very fine effort from a very fine Sponsor and I'd ask all Members on both sides of the aisle to support Representative Black. And I thank you."

Speaker Daniels: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Kankakee, Representative Novak."

Novak: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative Black, I would like to thank you for adding me on as a Sponsor of the Bill. I do have a few constituents in my district that have been ringing my phone off...in my office complaining about situation, this lack of corrections that we need to do in Rate Adjustment Fund. So, I really want to applaud you in what you are trying to do. I just wanted to ask you one question. Is there anything in the Bill and I think I spoke to you before about this Bill, Bill. Is there anything in the Bill that pertains with restructuring the Industrial Commission?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Black."

Black: "No, this Bill does not address that at all. The original Bill that I filed did have some substantive language to restructure the Industrial Commission. Quite frankly, we couldn't find the support we needed to advance that concept. This Bill only addresses the Rate Adjustment Fund. No restructuring of the Illinois Industrial Commission whatsoever."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Novak."

Novak: "And one other question, Representative Black. How much money will this generate on an annual basis?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Black."

Black: "According to the Fiscal Note prepared by the Industrial

114th Legislative Day

April 17, 1996

Commission, revenues to the fund would increase by approximately \$3.2 million in Fiscal '97."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Novak."

Novak: "Yes, and Representative Black, would that be sufficient amount of money to cover the current deficit that we owe to the recipients of the benefits through the Rate Adjustment Fund?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Black."

Black: "It's my understanding from staff and the people that I have talked to Representative, that there will still be a slight short fall in FY-97. But if we can enact this into law we should be, I can't promise you that, a lot of things could happen. It's my understanding, my desire that in '98 we are on a sound fiscal footing and the checks will be mailed on time and for the full amount."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Novak."

Novak: "Yes, thank you, Representative Black. Very good. I commend you for the great job you done on the Bill. I certainly urge all my colleagues to support this Legislation."

Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman from Jackson, Representative Bost."

Bost: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of this Bill.

One of the most frustrating things I've found, as a
Representative, is whenever I received a call from one of
my constituents, that we as a state, we're so far behind on
paying a Bill that was owed to her, because her husband had
died in an industrial accident. I got on the phone and I
tried to find an answer to the problem. And at that time,
is when I found out the problems that we had been having
with this particular fund. I talked to the Sponsor at that
time and he had explained to me how hard he was working on

114th Legislative Day

April 17, 1996

it. And I was very glad to hear that he had a plan out there. And right now I'm very glad to hear that it finally has come to the Floor and I want to compliment him on that. And I think this is a problem that we need to get cured. And, I would encourage the colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this. Thank you."

Speaker Daniels: "Further discussion? Representative Black to
 close."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'm encouraged by the bipartisan tone, on this particular piece of Legislation. I'm encouraged because certainly one could say that my remarks earlier did not lend itself to a bipartisan spirit. But that's, most of you know me by now and I have some rather strong emotions on certain topics. No more stronger emotion do'I have than on this. It isn't a Republican issue. It isn't a Democrat issue. It shouldn't even enter in to the arena of politics. The Rate Adjustment Fund was created to take care of those people, who have suffered a tragic loss as a result of a work place death or serious injury. There is work to be done on worker's compensation. We all know that. We may not agree on how we proceed, but we haven't really done much to the system since 1975. But in the meantime, I would hope, we could agree today to address a serious and I think embarrassing problem, that the State of Illinois has in the Worker's Rate Adjustment Fund and that is our inability, I pray not our own unwillingness but our inability to pay those dollars promised to widows, orphans and those people who can no longer work to support themselves. I would hope we send this out of here with an unanimous vote, and a strong message to our colleagues in the Senate, that on occasion we need to take action to fix

114th Legislative Day

April 17, 1996

a problem. This is a problem that transcends politics. This is a problem that affects human beings in every district throughout the state. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Black has moved for the passage of House Bill 2593. All in favor will signify by voting 'aye'; opposed by voting '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 113 'aye'; 1 voting 'no'. This Bill having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On page four of the Calender appears House Bill 3041. It's on now the Order of Third Reading. Right, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk McLennand: "House Bill 3041 is on the Order of Third Reading, a Bill for an Act to amend the Park District Code.

Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Churchill."

Churchill: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is a Vehicle Bill for Park Districts."

Speaker Daniels: "Any discussion? Representative Granberg."

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

Speaker Daniels: "He indicates he will."

Granberg: "Representative Churchill, do you have any idea what this will be used for after it comes out of the Senate?

Are there negotiations going on with the Park Districts?

Or what is your intent for this Bill after it passes the House?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Churchill."

Churchill: "There are no negotiations. There are no discussions.

We have no intention at this point. It's just to keep a

Bill alive. So in the event that anything comes up in the

area, we have something."

114th Legislative Day

April 17, 1996

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Granberg."

Granberg: "Thank you, no further questions."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Lang. No further discussion.

Representative Churchill to close."

Churchill: "Please vote green."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Churchill, moves for the passage of House Bill 3041. All in favor will signify by voting 'aye'; opposed by voting 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk, will take the record. On this question there are 110'aye'; 1 voting 'no'; 3 voting 'present'. This Bill having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed."

Speaker Daniels: "House Bill 2859. Read the Bill Mr. Clerk."

Clerk McLennand: "House Bill 2859, a Bill for an Act that amends the Airport Authorities Act. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Stephens."

Stephens: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, 2859 is simply a Vehicle Bill. We'd like to move it to the Senate. There are no particular plans for the Bill.

But we would like to have it in the position should it be needed later in the Session."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Granberg."

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

Speaker Daniels: "He indicates he will."

Granberg: "Representative Stephens, hypothetically, could this
 Bill be used for the proposed new third airport in
 Peotone?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Stephens."

Stephens: "I choose not to deal in hypotheticals. There is no plan and I will not be party to using this Bill in

114th Legislative Day

April 17, 1996

reference to Peotone airport."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Granberg."

Granberg: "Well, Representative Stephens, I certainly honor your commitment. But unfortunately, with the House Rules you voted for, Leadership can take that Bill away from you. Individual Members do not have control over Legislation. So with all due respect, I would urge Members or the Members on this side of the aisle to vote 'no'. And particularly, the downstate or anyone who is opposed to the third airport outside of Chicago that it has a devastating impact on downstate road programs. This would be disastrous. Absolutely disastrous. The third airport could use 1.5 billion of road funds for that airport and that would come out of the current projects in the State of Illinois. There is a balance of \$700 million in road fund currently. IDOT says that will go down by a third, which will affect all of our districts. And this project alone could cost 1.5 billion in road fund dollars. We don't have enough road fund dollars now. There will not be enough next year. And we don't need \$1.5 billion in road funds to be used for a pork barrel project outside the City of Chicago in Peotone, Illinois. So I, with due respect to the Sponsor, I rise in opposition to this Bill, because I know he's a man of his word, because of the rules, that Bill could be taken away and used for whatever purpose the Leadership might appropriate. So, I intend to vote 'no' and I ask the Members on this side of the aisle to vote 'no' and who is opposed to the third airport, to vote 'no' on this Bill because this could be used for that. And that will come back to haunt all of you in your districts and in your campaigns."

114th Legislative Day

April 17, 1996

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Black."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentleman I simply rise to support the Gentleman's of the House. Bill. Once again, I would like to remind you there's a sense of history in this place, if you've been around here long enough. It was the federal authorities that said we needed a third airport, in the Chicago area because of overcrowding at O'Hare. And the way that the buildup, suburban sprawl and people have surrounded O'Hare. And you know I find it really funny. No, I don't find it funny. I peculiar, perhaps, that when the City of Chicago thought that the third airport should be built in Lake Calumet, that was good. Because the City of Chicago, you see, would still have controlled the third airport that would have been built in Lake Calumet. That's okay, no matter what it would have taken because the City of Chicago would still control the third airport. Now, I've heard this bogus argument about \$1 billion of road fund money from the ATA and all their funny little commercials on television. Where they dressed up somebody to look like a farmer and telling us he just didn't come in off the turnip truck. Well they're right about one thing. We didn't just come in on the turnip truck. I'm going to tell you something, the only reason that Chicago is opposed to a third airport outside the City of Chicago, is that they won't control the 'cash cow'. Seventy five permanent jobs. Hundred of thousands of construction jobs. Yeah, I don't blame Chicago for opposing that. They don't want to give up any of that money and any of those jobs at O'Hare. Well, the question is, what are you going to do when the federal government says, 'O'Hare is at its capacity'? And they begin to close it down or limit

114th Legislative Day

April 17, 1996

flights? Now, if you think a downstater is going to pour a billion dollars into road construction at Peotone or anywhere else, you don't understand the appropriation process. But as a downstater I say this, keep the idea of a third airport alive and maybe, just maybe, some of us downstaters can see the thousands of jobs, the thousands of construction jobs and the payrolls so that we can hire an insider company to put plastic toilet bowl wrappers on our toilets for hundreds of millions of dollars. Yes, siree bob. That's what we got with O'Hare. We won't get that with a third airport downstate. Vote 'yes'."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Holbrook."

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

Speaker Daniels: "He indicates he will."

Holbrook: "Representative Stephens, do you plan to address anything with the Midwest airport in our St. Clair County with this Bill? Do you have any intention to address anything in St. Clair County at our, with our new Midwest joint use airport with this Bill?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Stephens."

Stephens: "If I heard you, if I heard your question correctly,
no, I have no specific intention for the use of this Bill
in the Senate. If I did I would go up for the Amendment
now."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Holbrook."

Holbrook: "Thank you. I have no other questions."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Parke."

Parke: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would like to know if the Sponsor will yield for a couple of questions?"

Speaker Daniels: "He indicates he will."

Parke: "Thank you. Representative Stephens, is there any

114th Legislative Day

April 17, 1996

opportunity, do you think that anybody would be able to take this Bill away from you as the Sponsor?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Stephens."

Stephens: "Representative Parke, let me assure you that this Bill is going to remain in my Sponsorship. It is in no way intended to be used for a third airport in the Chicago area. The Gentleman on the other side of the aisle and any other references made, between a third airport in Chicagoland area and this Bill are totally erroneous. I made that declaration in a response to a question to the other side of the aisle. I make it again. There is...and I'm not going to deal in hypotheticals and fall into his trap. But this is in no way intended and will not be used for a third airport in Chicago. I will remain the House Sponsor of this Bill and that's the way it's going to be."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Parke."

Parke: "Thank you. To the Bill. I feel confident in the words that Representative Stephens, has shared with the Body. I have confidence in his word that this Bill will not be used for anything other than the purposes that he has in his district and one other county. I would ask the Body to certainly rise up and support his agenda on this Bill, so they can finally work out the legislation. And I will let the Body also know, that the issue of a third airport is still to be defined and that there will be Members on both sides of the aisle who will oppose an extension of a third airport. So that's not just something that is a partisan issue. It's something that we all have to look at and decide what's best for in their districts."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Erwin."

Erwin: "Thank you, Speaker. I just wanted to reiterate what Representative Granberg had indicated earlier. I would

114th Legislative Day

April 17, 1996

certainly urge the Chicago area Legislators not to even provide any opportunity for legislation to move forward that would jeopardize the economic lifeline, I think, for the Chicago Metropolitan area, which is our two airports. And I would only point out that there were a couple of pieces of legislation regarding airports that did not have enough votes in the state Senate to get out. And I think that, you know, if these issues are not going to be considered over there, I don't certainly want to give them another opportunity past their deadline. So I appreciate that it's a Vehicle Bill, but I think that there are other people that have other intentions, Representative Stephens, on this. So I would urge a 'no' vote on our side."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Lang."

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

Speaker Daniels: "He indicates he will."

Lang: "Representative, this apparently, if I'm listening to the debate properly, this is a Vehicle Bill. Do I understand that correctly? Is a Vehicle, an Airport Vehicle Bill?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Stephens."

Stephens: "You understand it correctly."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Lang."

Lang: "Well, what's it for?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Stephens."

Stephens: "Future consideration."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Lang."

Lang: "Future considerations of what?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Stephens."

Stephens: "Airport related issues excepting Chicago area."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Lang."

Lang: "Can you tell me where it says that in the Bill, Sir?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Stephens."

114th Legislative Day

April 17, 1996

Stephens: "Would you care to retract your remark?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Lang."

Lang: "Would I care to what?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Stephens."

Stephens: "I asked you if you would care to retract that. You, obviously, have looked at the Bill. You know that it is only a Vehicle Bill and it, obviously, does not say anything."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Lang."

Lang: "Well, if it doesn't say anything, then you were just disingenuous with us, Sir, when you told us it was for future considerations regarding airports other than in Chicago. You said that was in the Bill. Now you're telling us there is nothing in the Bill. But let me go on. Let me go on. You'll get your turn, Sir. You'll get your turn. I'm not that long-winded. You'll get your turn. Are you aware, Sir, that there is a rule in this House that you voted for, that would allow your Speaker to take away this Bill from you and give it to another Member?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Stephens."

Stephens: "Mr. Speaker, first of all, let me set the record straight. The Gentleman asked me a question about the intentions, my intentions for the use of this Bill. And my response to that he later characterized, as me saying that that's what the Bill did. Now, I think if the word disingenuous is going to be used on this House Floor, then he has defined and tried to edit the term to use it for me. I will tell you, Representative, I am familiar with the rules. And I will also tell you, that there is a time honored tradition here, that maybe you want to live up to or maybe you don't. I will live up to it. I will maintain the Sponsorship of this Bill. I will not use it for a

114th Legislative Day

April 17, 1996

third airport in the Chicago area of this state. Now I don't know that I can make it anymore clear. I don't know what words I can use to make you understand that. you can try to empathize with me in the fact that I hold my word dear. I will stand behind my word. And you can manipulate your words anyway you want. And you can manipulate my comments anyway you want for your playing to the Press. But it will not change the character by which I present this Bill. It is simply a Vehicle Bill that I have pledged will not be used for an airport in your backyard. Now if you can live with that, fine. If you can't, I'll have to move on without you."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Lang."

Lang: "To the Bill. Let me first remind the Body, that on anyone's motion by 60 votes this Bill could be given to any I could make a motion by 60 votes give this other person. to Representative Moore, who I'm sure wants an airport Bill. I could give this to anybody by 60 votes. So, Sponsor's comments are really superfluous. What really is in question, here, is do we want a Bill floating around, that's a Vehicle Bill that can be used for anything at all relative to airports. It could be used to close O'Hare. It could be used to add runways at Midway. It could be used to make Meigs a park or to make Meigs a parking lot. could be used to build Peotone. It could be used to make Pate real happy and build an airport in Lake Calumet. Bill could be used for anything. This Body should not be about the business of building airports with Bill. This Body should not be not be about the business of allowing a Vehicle Bill to move through here, when we have no idea what it's going to be, we have no idea what the agenda is. When we have no idea who the Senate Sponsor

114th Legislative Day

April 17, 1996

will be. When we have no idea what the Governor plans for it. And when we have no idea what our good friends across the rotunda think of this idea. So this cries out for a resounding 'no' vote and it cries out for one from the Republican side of the aisle, as well. Don't cheat your constituents. Make sure you get your voice heard on all airport issues. Vote 'no'."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Stephens to close."

- Stephens: "Well, in a time honored tradition, I have given my word and I think this is a chance to stand up for the issue of the old way of doing business here in the House. When your handshake meant something. When your word meant something. I've given my word. I urge an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Stephens has moved for the passage of House Bill 2859. All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye'; opposed by voting 'no'. The voting is open. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 61 'ayes'; 53 voting 'no'; 1 voting 'present' and Representative Granberg requested verification. Read the Affirmative Roll Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk McLennand: "Those Members voting in the affirmative. Black. Ackerman. Balthis. Biggert. Biggins. Bost. Brady. Churchill. Ciarlo. Clayton. Cowlishaw. Deuchler. Doody. Durkin. Goslin. Hassert. Johnson, Tom. Hughes. Johnson, Tim. Jones, John. Klingler. Krause. Kubik. Lawfer. Leitch. Lindner. Lyons. McAuliffe. Meyer. Mitchell. Moffitt. Moore, Andrea. Mulligan. Murphy, Maureen. Myers. Noland. Pankau. Parke. Pedersen. Persico. Poe. Roskam. Rutherford. Ryder. Salvi. Saviano. Skinner. Spangler.

114th Legislative Day

April 17, 1996

Stephens. Tenhouse. Turner, John. Wait. Weaver.

Wennlund. Winkel. Winters. Wirsing. Wojcik, and Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Granberg."

Granberg: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative Klingler?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Klingler is in her chair."

Granberg: "I thought she was still out with AFSCME. I didn't know she was back. Representative Salvi?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Salvi? He's in his chair."

Granberg: "Representative O'Connor?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative O'Connor? He's not voting."

Granberg: "Not voting?"

Speaker Daniels: "No, he's not voting. Mr. Clerk, how is Representative O'Connor recorded?"

Clerk McLennand: "Representative O'Connor is not voting."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Granberg."

Granberg: "Representative Black?"

Granberg: "Nothing surprising there. Is he getting his Academy

Award for today's performance yet?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Poe, asked for leave to be verified. Does he have leave?"

Granberg: "Sure."

Speaker Daniels: "Leave is granted. Representative Granberg
further questions?"

Granberg: "Representative Brady?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Brady is in his chair."

Granberg: "Representative Bost?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Bost is in his chair and so is Representative Moffitt. He's here, as well. Will anybody that's not here on the Republican side of the aisle raise

114th Legislative Day

- April 17, 1996
- your hand? I was trying to make it easier on you, Representative Granberg. Representative Granberg."
- Granberg: "Well, Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to thank the Members because I know particularly the downstate Republicans are for the third airport. Take that Road Fund money away. So we appreciate your time and efforts on this issue."
- Speaker Daniels: "You're welcome. This Bill having received 61
 'aye'; 53 'no'; 1 voting 'present'. This Bill having
 received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared
 passed."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Granberg. House Bill 322. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk. Representative Granberg your request have been filed for Fiscal Note, and for Pension Impact Note, as amended. Mr. Clerk, has this Bill been amended?"
- Clerk McLennand: "This Bill 322 has not been amended and has been read a second time previously."
- Speaker Daniels: "Therefore, your requests are out of order and we're going to move this Bill then to Third Reading. If you'd call the Bill, Mr. Clerk 322."
- Clerk McLennand: "House Bill 322, a Bill for an Act that Amends the Illinois Pension Code. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Daniels: "Hold that Bill on the Order of Third Reading Mr. Clerk. Representative McAuliffe. House Bill 2206.
 Announcement, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk McLennand: "Rules Committee will meet immediately in the Speaker's Conference Room. Rules Committee immediately."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Johnson. Representative McAuliffe, okay. House Bill 2206."
- Clerk McLennand: "House Bill 2206. The Bill has been read a second time previously. Committee Amendment #1, was adopted. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative

114th Legislative Day

April 17, 1996

McAuliffe has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative McAuliffe Amendment #2."

McAuliffe: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Floor Amendment #2 becomes
the Bill. It clarifies the use of monies from the CDL
Trust Fund. Derived from the statutory set, \$6 of the
Commercial Drivers Licenses Fee, requested by the Secretary
of State's office."

Speaker Daniels: "Discussion? Representative Granberg."

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

Speaker Daniels: "He indicates he will."

Granberg: "Representative McAuliffe, I believe you said this was at the request of the Secretary of State? Is that correct?"

McAuliffe: "Yes."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Granberg."

Granberg: "Is there any Fiscal Impact, Representative?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative McAuliffe."

McAuliffe: "No, there's no Fiscal Impact."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Granberg."

Granberg: "Are there any costs attributed to the Bill? Any cause for a cost...

Speaker Daniels: "Representative McAuliffe."

McAuliffe: "There is no cost."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Granberg."

Granberg: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Thank you,
Representative McAuliffe. I certainly rise in support of
this Bill. We try to work on a bipartisan basis on this
side. We're always for George Ryan. Because George is a
very bipartisan Secretary of State. A very professional
officeholder. And we do everything we can to help George

114th Legislative Day

- April 17, 1996
- Ryan. So, I rise in support of the Amendment. I don't think we need a roll call."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative McAuliffe moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #2. All those in favor say 'aye'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Amendment #2 is adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Rossi: "No further Amendments."
- Speaker Daniels: "Any motions filed?"
- Clerk Rossi: "A Fiscal Note has been filed on the Bill as amended, by Amendment #2."
- Speaker Johnson, Tim "Okay, Third Reading. Representative Johnson. House Bill 3238. page five of the Calendar. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk. The Bill is House Bill 3238. The Chair recognizes the Lady from DuPage, Representative Cowlishaw. Representative Johnson in the Chair."
- Clerk McLennand: "House Bill 3238. The Bill has been read a second time previously. Committee Amendment #1 was adopted. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Cowlishaw has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Johnson, Tim: "The Lady from DuPage, Representative Cowlishaw."
- Cowlishaw: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would like to move the adoption of Floor Amendment #2, to this Bill which was approved for adoption on the House Floor this morning by the Aging Committee on a unanimous 100% vote. If you would first adopt the Amendment, I would certainly then be glad to tell you what this Bill does as amended."
- Speaker Johnson, Tim: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Lang."
- Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just rise in support of the Floor Amendment #2. Representative Cowlishaw worked very

114th Legislative Day

April 17, 1996

hard on this. There were some parties that had some difficulty with one segment of this Bill. They were dramatically at odds. They worked it out. This is an example of what the Legislature can do, when it sits down and gets parties together. So, I would recommend 'aye' votes."

- Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Seeing no further discussion. The Lady moves for the adoption of Amendment #2, to House Bill 3238.

 All those in favor signify by saying 'aye'; those opposed by saying 'no'. And in the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes' have it and the motion is adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk McLennand: "No further Amendments."
- Clerk McLennand: "House Bill 3449. The Bill's been read a second time previously. Committee Amendment #1 was adopted. No Floor Amendments. No outstanding note request."
- Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Third Reading. Continuing on the Order of House Bills Second Reading Mr. Clerk, read House Bill 2250."
- Clerk McLennand: "House Bill 2250. The Bill's been read a second time previously. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Kubik has been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Johnson, Tim: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Kubik. Proceed."
- Kubik: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Floor Amendment #1 represents an agreement, which has been reached between the funeral industry, the cemetery industry and the Comptroller's Office on some legislation which, the Comptroller put forth earlier this year. Let me

114th Legislative Day

April 17, 1996

just say that we had a package of Bills that had been introduced. There has been an enormous amount discussion and this particular Amendment is the result that discussion. It is an Agreed Amendment and let me go through the provision very rapidly. The first would require that any Perpetual Care Trust Fund or Pre-need Cemetery Sales Trust Fund which exceeds \$500 thousand. would have an independent trustee. Secondly. it establish a two tier audit process under the three Funeral and Burial Funds Statutes administered by the Comptroller. Thirdly, it would grant authority to prosecute fraud under the Consumer Fraud and Deceptive Practices Act...Businesses Practices Act, for violations of the three Funeral and Burial Funds Statutes. Also administered the Comptroller. And finally, it would define specific authority for the Comptroller regarding the examination of books and records pertaining to Care Trust Fund, as well as the examination under oath of any person connected to the books and records pertaining to trust funds, insurance policies, or tax deferred annuities. This legislation is in response to a number of abuses that have occurred with trust funds. Where these trust funds have been depleted and this will give the Comptroller more authority and responsibility in prosecuting and preventing these kinds of instances from occurring. I'd be happy to respond to any questions you might have and would urge your support of Floor Amendment #1."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "On the Amendment the Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Macoupin, Representative Hannig. Proceed."

Hannig: "Yes, thank you, Mr, Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "He indicates that he will yield."

Hannig: "Yes, Representative Kubik, I didn't hear everything that

114th Legislative Day

April 17, 1996

you said and I apologize for that. Did you say that all the parties that were concerned about this Bill had ultimately agreed to this language here in Amendment #1?"

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Kubik."

Kubik: "Yes, Representative. Then I might point out that all of them took part in the negotiation. So that we have, I think reached a good agreement among all of the participants."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Hanniq."

Hannig: "It's my understanding Representative, that at one time this proposal had some fee increases in the Bill or in the proposal. Are they still in this proposal?"

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Kubik."

Kubik: "Representative the fees have been removed. There are no fee increases contained in this legislation."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Hannig."

Hannig: "Now, I know that the Comptroller had been interested in this and I think she was also interested in the fee part of it. Is she comfortable with that language then that takes the fees out?"

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Kubik."

Kubik: "Representative, I think she is. In testimony, in committee the Comptroller indicated that she believes she has sufficient resources to enforce this Act, at this point in time."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Hanniq."

Hannig: "Yes, it's my understanding that the Cemetery Associations and the Funeral Directors were having some difficulties in coming to agreement on some areas, particularly the outer burial chambers. Could you tell us the status of, first of all how that is in this Bill or addressed in this Bill? And secondly, what negotiations

114th Legislative Day

April 17, 1996

may still be going on concerning that issue?"

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Kubik."

Kubik: "Representative, first of all it is no longer in the Bill. As I understand it, I participated and monitored the negotiations, as well. At one point in time, there was some discussion about that type of a provision. That provision has been removed to the satisfaction of both, the Funeral Directors and the Cemetery Association. So, that is no longer an issue."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Hannig."

Hannig: "And do you know if there are still negotiations going on to try to deal with that?"

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Kubik."

Kubik: "Representative, it is my understanding that there are still some discussions that are ongoing on this issue. But at this point, it would no way impact this legislation. So, but they are still discussing those issues."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Hannig."

Hannig: "Yes, and I suppose that if there is an agreement you could always put it either on another Bill or this Bill, at a later stage. But in any case, I know that the Comptroller had an interest in the Bill because there were a number of cemeteries that were in financial trouble, default or perhaps even operating without a license. Do you have some figures you could share with this Body, as to how many cemeteries approximately or exactly if you know, fall into that category?"

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Kubik."

Kubik: "It's my understanding Representative, that the Comptroller's Office has been looking at about five or six of them. I am personally familiar with one, which used to be in my old legislative district. It is one of the, I

114th Legislative Day

April 17, 1996

- would have to say most flagrant violators of this proposal.

 But, They are looking at least five or six of them."
- Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Hannig. Further
 questions?"
- Hannig: "This is my last question, Representative. So, even without the fees that initially we thought we would need, or at least the Comptroller thought she need to deal with this, that we'll be able to deal with these problems and hopefully correct these cemeteries that are having these problems, is that correct?"

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Kubik."

- Kubik: "Representative, yes, it's my understanding that they feel comfortable. The Comptroller's Office feels comfortable that they can address these issues. I might point out that the meat of the legislation, the real body of the legislation, is designed to try to prevent this from occurring again. We don't want to find ourselves in this sort of predicament in the future. So, although we're dealing with the present, we're also trying to look to the future with this Bill. And I want to thank, if I haven't done so already, all of the people that have talked to me. Both Representatives and people in the..."
- Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Further questions, of the Sponsor. The
 Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Bureau, Representative
 Mautino. Representative Mautino."
- Mautino: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
- Speaker Johnson, Tim: "He indicates that he will. Please give Representative Mautino, your attention."
- Mautino: "Representative Kubik, first of all I commend you on reaching the agreement on this Bill and it's...we just heard this a little earlier today in committee. I believe the Funeral Directors and the Cemetery Associations are

114th Legislative Day

April 17, 1996

both on board. And I know it's taken a long time to get them to that point. Just as an assurance and there are the fees, which were in dispute, they are all out of the Bill. And as far as the two tiered audit, there is a system that has been set in place where the Comptroller can go ahead and verify before bringing in the full second audit."

- Kubik: "Yes. You are quite correct, Representative Mautino. The two-tier audit enables the Comptroller, if the Comptroller feels that there are some discrepancies or things that they're uncomfortable with, they can initiate a second audit, with a more complete audit. But there are some protections builtin both ways. And these are agreements that have been reached by all the parties. I think it's a good proposal. So I might point out, I know you mentioned this this morning. There is a ceiling on the amount that can be charged for the audit of \$7500, so that has also built into the Bill. So, I think, it built in protections for consumers and the people who operate these facilities."
- Mautino: "And I know that, although, the fee structure did not go in, and we have a couple of the cemeteries now which, basically are in a shambles. That is currently in dispute in courts and they'll possibly get the reimbursement, cause I don't belive the Comptroller has the funds available to go in and refurbish those cemeteries, at this point."
- Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Kubik. I'll give you and Representative Mautino another minute, if you want to respond. Proceed."
- Kubik: "Representative, as you know, in those instances the

114th Legislative Day

April 17, 1996

Comptroller has joined others in legal action against the operators of those facilities, to try to recover dollars that have been misspent. So, we're hopeful that that legal action will result in some reimbursements in making some people whole. So the Comptroller feels comfortable at this point in time with the removal of the fees. And, I think we ought to move the Bill along and they're going to also work on legal approach to generate some dollars to make those people whole."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Mautino."

- Mautino: "To the Bill. I simply rise in support of this Bill.

 It's been a 10 month negotiation and I commend the
 Comptroller's Office, Kevin, the Funeral Association, and
 the Funeral Directors Association, and the folks from the
 Cemetery Association, Representative Kubik, they did a
 great job."
- Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Seeing or hearing no further discussion.

 The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Kubik, moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 2250.

 Those in favor will signify by saying 'aye'; those opposed by saying 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk McLennand: "No further Amendments. A Fiscal Note has been requested on the Bill, as amended by Amendment #1, and has been filed."
- Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk now turning to the Order of House Bills, Third Reading. Mr. Clerk read House Bill 2250."
- Clerk McLennand: "House Bill 2250, a Bill for an Act that amends the State Comptroller Act. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Johnson, Tim: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative

114th Legislative Day

April 17, 1996

Kubik on the Bill."

Kubik: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think we've had a dialogue on this Bill. Amendment #1 becomes the Bill. This Bill really is an attempt to rectify a problem, which is really hard to contemplate that people are raiding trust funds that would be used for perpetual care. It's hard to believe and I guess the term 'grave robbers' comes to mind. There are a few 'bad apples' in this industry. Our attempt with this legislation, is to attack those who have done But at the same time, I would like to commend the people in both the funeral and cemetery industry. They recognized they had a problem and they set at the table with the Comptroller and attempted to address that problem. And I think that cooperative discussion over a period of months has resulted in a very good Bill. So, I would be happy again to respond to questions. I would urge your support of House Bill 2250."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Kubik has moved for the passage of House Bill 2250. Seeing no discussion, the question is, 'Shall House Bill 2250 pass?' Those in favor will signify by voting 'aye'; those opposed by voting 'no'. The voting is open. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this Bill there are 115 voting 'yes'; none voting 'no' or 'present'. This Bill having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Proceeding on the Order of House Bills - Third Reading Mr. Clerk, Clerk, read House Bill 346."

Clerk McLennand: "House Bill 346, a Bill for an Act that amends the Juvenile Court Act of 1987. Third Reading of this House Bill."

114th Legislative Day

April 17, 1996

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Kendall, Representative Cross. Proceed."

Cross: you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 346 was amended earlier with Amendment #6, which became the Bill. 346 as amended addresses several areas of concern. First of all, and the most substantive part of this Bill addresses a concern that first came up in Kane County. Whereby they at Kane County Sheriff's Office the courthouse have been using people to act as security guards at the courthouse, they were not Sheriff's Deputies. Attorney General of the State of Illinois has issued an opinion saying, you have to be full-time Sheriff's Deputies in order to be working as security officers at the courthouse. This Bill creates another classification provides for courthouse security officers. The Illinois Sheriffs Association, is very supportive of this Bill, are the Metro Counties. So I'd be glad to answer any questions. It passed out of committee this unanimously. There's also a small provision that we talked about earlier or another provision that amends the Code of Civil Procedure that it permits Amendment of complaints to Be glad to answer any name other necessary parties. Ι think I've addressed the concerns Representative Granberg earlier, but Kurt, I will be glad to answer any other questions. This does not take account Cook County. It exempts Cook County. They have a similar provision already in place. They're Home Rule and they've addressed this problem in a different way, So. thank you."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "On the Bill, the Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Clinton, Representative Granberg. Proceed."

Granberg: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Representative Cross, first

114th Legislative Day

April 17, 1996

of all I want to thank you."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "He indicates he will yield."

Granberg: "Well, I thank you for taking the Bill out of the record so we can address this concerns and working those out in agreement with the law enforcement personnel. And I certainly, I'm not sure if I can agree with your political statement there, because I have concerns about that. But as far as the Bill is concerned, I am going to be in support of it. And I believe there is a question about the intent, Representative Cross. So if you could address that issue and I would appreciate your response and your talking about what you...the concerns we addressed in our conversation."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Cross."

Cross: "I believe, Representative, if I handle and please correct me, the concern is whether the existing individuals that are working as court security officers will be able to maintain their jobs. That is definitely the intent. There's a provision in there that they need to work on getting some training. But the goal and the intent is to keep those people in their current positions. The sheriffs understand that. I understand that and that is certainly the intent and no other different intent than what you and I talked about."

Granberg: "No. Thank you, Representative Cross. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Bill and once again I thank the Representative for working with us in the interim this afternoon to address our concerns as law enforcement personnel."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "On the Bill, the Chair recognizes the

114th Legislative Day

April 17, 1996

Gentleman from Cook, Representative Dart. Proceed."

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

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Indicates he will."

Dart: "Representative, this is for just outside of Cook County?

Is that correct?"

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Cross."

Cross: "Yes, Representative."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Dart."

Dart: "And what type of training are these individuals going to receive?"

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Cross."

Cross: "Representative, what we did is we left that up to and let me get the section of the statute or the Bill, make sure I direct to you to the right section. We left it up to the Police Training Board. And if you look at page 14 of the Amendment, and we've left that up to the Police Training Board to set out a minimum. We weren't sure what the amount of training needed to be. We thought they could do We acknowledged that there needs to be training. I it. think there should be training. They have the power to make arrests and they have the power to carry weapons. So we definitely need a minimum of training. We've been talking at least with sheriffs and the judges of having maybe 100 hours of training. They definitely would need the 40 hours of firearms training. But we felt like the Police Training Board could provide the necessary training."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Dart."

Dart: "Will they be required to receive training in the ins and outs of search and seizure laws because they'll be acting as guards and security guards at the courthouse. That's the procedure most of the police officers get. Will they

114th Legislative Day

April 17, 1996

get any of that training?"

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Cross."

Cross: "Representative, that's a good question. We left that up to them and that's a good example of something, one of the things we...by trying to delineate everything we want them to provide training for. We didn't know what we could do so we left it up to them and believe that their discretion is good and that's certainly something that I think they need to be looking at, as I said earlier, along with the use of weapons and any other things associated with making arrests at the courthouse. We have not specified what they can, what they should or shouldn't do as far as training goes though."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Dart, further questions?"

Dart: "What about as to the breadth of their jobs, how far the parameters are? I don't see any prohibition against them acting as security for others. Is there any prohibition as far as exactly the complete dynamics of their job? I mean, what exactly is their role? Is that specified?"

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Cross."

Cross: "Their role, Representative, has been, as you know, primarily to provide security at courthouses, provide a presence. Let me and generally we want them to have arrest power at or around the courthouse facility. And let me make sure we, let me direct you to the section of the statute if you can hold on one second, or the Amendment. Tom, Tom, if you look at page 17, I'm sorry, I thought I had that marked, about what they can or can't do. And we've pretty much, if you look on the bottom of page 17 starting on lines 578 and 579. We're talking about attending courts as well as having the authority to arrest shall be limited as I said earlier. So, primarily just

114th Legislative Day

April 17, 1996

arrest power at the courthouse and providing security at the courthouse."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Dart."

Dart: "And I guess, I was just looking here. It says they shall be sworn officers of the sherriff. If, in fact, something occurs where they either arrest somebody illegally or they harm somebody, will the sherriff be liable for that in a civil suit?"

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Cross."

Cross: "Well, I don't see anything that would eliminate, there's nothing in this Bill that would eliminate any liability on the sheriff's part. Many of these people are already performing these functions and apparently, maybe improperly according to the Attorney General. So we're just trying to create this class. But I think, I mean, that's why we're having the training. And so, I don't see anything that would relieve or alleviate the responsibility of the sherriff."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Dart, further questions?"
Dart: "No further questions."

- Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Seeing no further questions or discussion, the Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Kendall, Representative Cross, to close."
- Cross: "I think we've eliminated the opposition of this Bill.

 We've spent a lot of time working on it. There's a real

 need to address this problem. And I'd appreciate a 'yes'

 vote. Thank you."
- Speaker Johnson, Tim: "The question is. 'Shall House Bill 346

 pass?' Those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; those
 opposed by voting 'no'. The voting is open. This is final
 action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?

 Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On

114th Legislative Day

April 17, 1996

this question, there are 114 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no' or 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Proceeding on...Committee Report and announcements, Mr. Clerk."

- Clerk McLennand: "Committee Reports. Committee Report Representative Churchill, Chairman from the Committee on Rules, to which the following Joint Action Motions were referred, action taken on April 17th, 1996, reported the same back: 'do approve for consideration' Floor Amendment #3 to House Bill 2576, Floor Amendment #3 to House Bill 3448, and Floor Amendment #1 to House Bill 3271. Attention Members. Committee notices. The following committees will meet at 3:30, Cities and Villages will meet at 3:30 in Room C-1, Personnel and Pensions Committee will meet at 3:30 Room 118 and Higher Education Committee will meet at 3:30 in Room 114. Again, Committee notices for today at 3:30: Personnel and Pensions in Room 118, Higher Education in Room 114 and Cities and Villages in Room C-1 in Stratton."
- Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Thank you, Mr. Clerk. And proceeding on the Order of House Bills - Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read House Bill 2206."
- Clerk McLennand: "House Bill 2206, a Bill for an Act that amends the State Finance Act. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Johnson, Tim: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Representative McAuliffe. Proceed."
- McAuliffe: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 2206 we amended recently that with House Amendment #2 it becomes the Bill. And it simply clarifies the use of money from the Commercial Drivers License Trust Fund in the Secretary of State's Office. This Bill was requested by Secretary of State, Ryan."

114th Legislative Day

April 17, 1996

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Seeing no discussion, the Chair recognizes Representative McAuliffe to close. He has. The Gentleman from Cook, Representative McAuliffe, moves for the passage of House Bill 2206. Those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; those opposed by voting 'no'. The voting is open. final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, On this Bill, there are 116 voting 'yes', 0 the record. voting 'no' or 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared Proceeding on the Order of House Bills - Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read House Bill 2612."

Clerk McLennand: "House Bill 2612."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Williamson, Representative Woolard."

Woolard: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I very much appreciate the fact that we're calling this Bill again today. I think negotiations are really proceeding at a fast pace. I'm reasonably sure that Representative Black, has just about got Representative Hughes in a posture that we're going to be successful in some way making a difference on this piece of legislation. And I'd like to put it on one more, let's just take it out of the record again today."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "We will continue to afford you every courtesy, Representative."

Woolard: "Thank you."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "The Bill will be taken out of the record.

On the Order now of House Bills - Second Reading. Mr.

Clerk, read House Bill 3448."

Clerk McLennand: "House Bill 3448. The Bill has been read a Second Time previously. Committee Amendment #1 was referred to Subcommittee. Committee Amendment #2 was

114th Legislative Day

April 17, 1996

referred to Rules. Floor Amendment #3, offered by Representative Lyons has been approved for consideration and is available on the computer system."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Lyons, the Lady from Cook, on Floor Amendment #3. Representative Lyons, proceed. Give the Lady your attention. Representative Lyons, proceed."

Lyons: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House Bill 3448 creates the Illinois Street Gang House Racketeering Law within the Criminal Code. Street gang racketeering is defined as 'the commission when in a three year period of three or more specified offenses, with the intent to further the activities of a street gang'. establishes enhanced penalties, provides for forfeiture of property and authorizes a fine of three times the gross value gained or three times lost by the defendant. It. amends Currency Reporting Act to address money laundering. It expands the eavesdropping ability to the Attorney General's Office with the consultation and advice of the States Attorney's Office and extends such application from 10 days to 30 days. This Bill also redefines street gang as it is presently defined in the STOP Act, so that it is easier to prove gang activity. This legislation is an effort to focus on gang leaders and it is another tool for law enforcement to focus on I know there are ongoing task force meetings criminals. that are taking place throughout Illinois. And I welcome the input of recommendations that come out of that task But I have worked with the Attorney General's have worked with a representative from the mayor's office and I have worked with staff in an effort to establish this public policy. And I'll now answer

114th Legislative Day

April 17, 1996

questions that you might have."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Seeing no, well the Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Dart. I didn't see your light, Representative. Proceed."

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

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "She indicates she will."

Dart: "Representative, now this is, you've taken a step back from the RICCO requirements. Is that correct?"

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Lyons."

Lyons: "In what way do you mean I took a step back?"

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Dart."

Dart: "Well, originally the way this Bill had been in part of this Amendment, it sort of pretty clearly followed the Federal RICCO Statute and State RICCO Law requiring the number of people to be involved in an event in the conspiracy thing. If I'm not mistaken now, this no longer requires that?"

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Lyons."

Lyons: "No, it's the same now."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Dart."

Dart: "Well, under the RICCO statute, wasn't there a requirement of an organized hierarchy?"

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Lyons."

Lyons: "I'm sorry."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Dart."

Dart: "Under the RICCO statute, was there not a requirement for an organized hierarchy to exist?"

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Lyons."

Lyons: "This is redefining that. This is eliminating the hierarchy within that definition."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Dart."

Dart: "And what's the reason behind eliminating the hierarchy

114th Legislative Day

April 17, 1996

because my understanding is the RICCO statute, the reason they have the hierarchy is so you could target gangs and you can target organized crime. Why are we removing the hierarchy requirement?"

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Lyons."

Lyons: "Because this makes it easier to prove."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Dart."

Dart: "It makes it easier then. So I guess I just need to get, the focus of this Bill then is no longer organized crime in the hierarchy? This is more of enhanced penalties for, I mean, it could be used for organized crime I suppose. But I mean, by removing the hierarchy requirement, it no longer necessarily requires that this is gangs we're dealing with anymore."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Lyons, do you wish to respond?"

Lyons: "This is still focusing on gangs. It just makes it easier to prove. The hierarchy was too difficult to establish.

We're still focusing on gang crimes and gang activity."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Dart."

Dart: "Who said it was too difficult to prove? Was that the States Attorneys or was that O'Malley's Office? Did he have problems with this?"

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Lyons."

Lyons: "This was both the Attorney General's Office and the States Attorney's Office."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Dart."

Dart: "So then under the requirements of this law then, any three people who are organized together in whatever form or fashion could be the targets of this type of legislation? Is that correct?"

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Lyons."

114th Legislative Day

April 17, 1996

Lyons: "If they commit the three listed offenses within the three year period."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Dart."

Lyons: "And then..."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Proceed, Representative Lyons."

Lyons: "And then it would be to further the activity of that gang or organization."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Dart."

Dart: "Have you made changes in the eavesdropping section as well in this?"

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Lyons."

Lyons: "Yes. There are changes in the eavesdropping in that the Attorney General's Office would consult and advise with the States Attorney's Office before getting an application for an eavesdropping device. And it's also extended it from 10 days to 30 days."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Dart."

Dart: "Under the present statute now, they require that for eavesdropping you list the type of conversations being listened to, such as drug deals and the like. Does this Bill remove that requirement in expanding the eavesdropping statute?"

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Lyons."

Lyons: "No. It doesn't change that part of it at all."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Dart."

Dart: "Okay, now is the Attorney General cut out of the loop as far as the person who gets reports back?"

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Lyons."

Lyons: "Did you say the Attorney General would be cut out of the loop? For what reports?"

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Dart."

Dart: "For the eavesdropping portion."

114th Legislative Day

April 17, 1996

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Proceed."

Dart: "That was my question. Have they been cut out, the
Attorney General has been cut out of the eavesdropping
section as far as being reported to?"

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Lyons."

Lyons: "I still don't understand his question."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Dart, your time is drawing to a close. Do you wish to proceed?"

Dart: "Yeah, this is my final question. Right now, the States
Attorney's Office is required to report to the state police
any eavesdropping they're doing. We don't have that same
requirement for the Attorney General's Office. Is there a
reason why?"

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Lyons, you want to bring your remarks to a close?"

Lyons: "I've run this Bill through the Attorney General's Office and the Mayor's Office as far as that's concerned. And I'm not quite sure what answer you're looking for."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Washington, Representative Deering."

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

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Indicates she will."

Deering: "Representative, as far as the eavesdropping section is concerned, if a States Attorney or the Attorney General wants to go in and eavesdrop on a person they're trying to convict or build a case against, and say that person works in a factory or a plant or in an office with other, with co-workers, do those agencies, will they then be required to notify the co-workers that this eavesdropping or wire tapping will be taking place?"

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Lyons."

Lyons: "If they're overheard and identified, they would have to

114th Legislative Day

April 17, 1996

be notified."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Deering."

Deering: "So then they would have to be notified after the fact.

Or would they have to be notified before the fact if they operate? Say the operation is going to take place in an office, 15 workers and they're wanting to earmark one certain individual. They have the authority from either the States Attorney or the Attorney General, would they have to come in beforehand and notify the other 14 workers that they were then going to be monitoring all calls coming in or going out or anything taking place in order to build a case against the individual that they were building the case against?"

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Lyons."

Lyons: "No. You wouldn't have to do that under present law anyway."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Deering."

Deering: "So this could, this could, is this an expansion of current law concerning eavesdropping?"

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Lyons."

Lyons: "Not in that respect, it's not."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Deering."

Deering: "Thank you."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Further questions? The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Clinton, Representative Granberg.

Proceed."

Granberg: "Thank you. Will the Lady yield?"

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Indicates she will. Proceed."

Granberg: "Representative Lyons, I have just a couple of questions. This seems very familiar to me, this legislation. Didn't Representative McAffee have this legislation two years ago?"

- 114th Legislative Day
- April 17, 1996
- Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Lyons."
- Lyons: "It was similar legislation but this is a refined legislation."
- Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Granberg."
- Granberg: "So you have refined Representative McAffee's idea in his legislation? Is that what you just said?"
- Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Lyons, do you wish to respond?"
- Lyons: "If you want to put it that way. This is a refined legislation of an original street gang racketeering Bill."
- Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Granberg, further questions?"
- Granberg: "And weren't you opposed to Representative McAffee's legislation two years ago when he introduced this?"
- Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Lyons."
- Lyons: "No. I was not here when Representative McAffee presented this legislation."
- Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Granberg."
- Granberg: "I seem to remember some press releases and things in that district, that I thought you were actually opposed to it, Representative."
- Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Lyons."
- Granberg: "And I just wanted to clarify that. I don't remember."
- Lyons: "No, your're mistaken."
- Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Granberg."
- Granberg: "Okay, I thank the Representative, and I'm glad she's picked up Representative McAffee's legislation and moving it forward."
- Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Thank you. The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Rock Island, Representative Boland. Representative Boland, proceed."
- Boland: "Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would just like to

114th Legislative Day

April 17, 1996

compliment the Sponsor on this legislation. I think that it provides us with some important new tools in dealing with a very tough problem, the problem of street gangs and the fact that they are getting bigger, more wealthy, stronger in their apparatus and organizations and this gives us a great opportunity to strike a blow for the victims of crime and for the protection of the ordinary citizens against some of these vicious characters, and the organizations that they head. I would strongly urge a 'yes' vote on this Bill. Thank you."

- Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Seeing no further discussion, the Lady from Cook, Representative Lyons, moves for the adoption of Floor Amendment #3, to House Bill 3448. Those in favor signify by saying 'aye'; those opposed by saying 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. And the Amendment is adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk McLennand: "No further Amendments. And a Fiscal Note and Correctional Budget Impact Note have been filed on the Bill as amended by Amendment #3."
- Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Third Reading. Proceeding to the Order of House Bills Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read House Bill 3448."
- Clerk McLennand: "House Bill 3448, a Bill for an Act concerning Criminal Law. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Johnson, Tim: "The Chair recognizes the Lady from Cook, Representative Lyons. Proceed."
- Lyons: "Again, House Bill 3448 creates the Illinois Street Gang Racketeering Law within the Criminal Code as was just discussed. It expands the eavesdropping ability of the Attorney General's Office. It redefines the street gang as it is presently defined in the STOP Act. I'm concerned about the public policy that we're establishing as far as

114th Legislative Day

April 17, 1996

focusing in on career criminals, and would be happy to answer any questions you might have."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Any discussion on the Bill? The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Morrow."

Morrow: "Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Would the Lady yield?"

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Indicates she will. Proceed."

Morrow: "Representative Lyons, what is the fiscal cost if House Bill..."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "If you could give Representative Morrow your attention, please. Give Representative Morrow your attention. Proceed. Representative Lyons"

Lyons: "The fiscal impact is unknown."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Morrow."

Morrow: "Our charts show that this Bill which is supposed to be language in kind to House Bill 403, which Representative Scott has introduced. The fiscal impact would be \$71 million over the next 10 years. Are you aware of that?"

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Lyons."

Lyons: "I am not."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Morrow."

Morrow: "Wouldn't rather than locking up criminals at a cost of \$71 million, wouldn't it behoove us to use that \$71 million to educate our children so that they don't become criminals?"

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Lyons."

Lyons: "We're talking about career criminals here. We're talking about focusing in on a career criminals. And the money is well spent when we're talking about criminals who are in the business of criminal activity."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Morrow."

114th Legislative Day

April 17, 1996

Morrow: "Could you define to me what a career criminal is?"

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Lyons."

Lyons: "As it's stated in this Bill, this is three felony offenses that are listed in this Bill and within a three year period."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Morrow."

Morrow: "Well, I understand that this Bill also includes minors, so if a minor has committed three felonies in their short period of time on this earth that they would come under this law also?"

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Lyons."

Lyons: "That doesn't change present law. This Bill does not change present law."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Morrow."

Morrow: "Well, where do you propose that we get the money to enact House Bill 3448? I mean, you know, we're on a tight fiscal budget. Do you propose raising taxes or do you propose cutting money out of some other agency to pay for this Bill?"

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Lyons."

Lyons: "No, I do not. But I do think we have to set priorities and if we are dealing with career criminals, and you don't feel that that money is well spent, then vote 'no' for this legislation."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Morrow."

Morrow: "Do you have an accompanying appropriation Bill in order to fund this or would this just be another unfunded mandate?"

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Lyons."

Lyons: "As I said before, the Fiscal Note on this was unknown. I don't know what the cost is at this point. So I can't answer your question."

114th Legislative Day

April 17, 1996

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Morrow."

Morrow: "Well, if it's unknown, why are we voting for it? We are going to pass a Bill that could possibly sign into law that we don't know what the cost is? So how are we going to balance our budget?"

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Lyons."

Lyons: "There's also forfeiture aspects of this legislation that's going to provide for seizing the assets of those career criminals who have gained, ill-gotten gains that we're going to be able to now seize. It's money that we will be getting."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Morrow."

Morrow: "Well, I understand that they make a lot of money or produce a lot of revenue out here, but wouldn't it behoove us to raise the gaming tax? That we can create revenues of probably \$65 million and maybe we can pay for a program like this. I'd be glad to vote for an increase in the gaming tax to pay for a program like this, if your side of the aisle was to present that Bill."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Lyons."

Lyons: "If you would like to support that increase, that's fine.

What we're talking about is this legislation right now."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Morrow, your time is drawing to a close. Please continue."

Morrow: "Well, my colleagues on this side of the aisle and on that side of the aisle, you know, Session is almost coming to a close. We're eventually going to have to deal with the budget. We're going to have to come up with a balanced budget. And I don't see how we can pass House Bill 3448 when first of all, we don't know how much it's going to cost. We don't know where the revenue for House Bill 3448 is going to come from, so here's another Bill we're voting

114th Legislative Day

April 17, 1996

on just to make someone look good at election time, to get re-elected. More power to you. But I advise you to vote 'no'."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Dart. Proceed."

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

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Indicates she will."

Dart: "Representative, I want to touch on the fiscal impact of this as well. I think, we might as well dispense with it right away. We're all tough on crime in this Assembly here, so we don't have to posture about that. We all want to lock up 'bad guys'. Yesterday, yourself, Members of your side of the aisle voted for an education Bill in which it's projected it's going to cut costs and require the Department of Corrections to take a hit. How many people are you going to need, extra jail guards to cover the people that will be coming into the prison system as a result of this?"

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Lyons."

Lyons: "How many people, I'm sorry. How many people what?"

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Give Representative Dart your attention so the Sponsor can hear the question. Representative Dart."

Dart: "Well, I find it strange Representative, that the fiscal impact here, what is the fiscal impact, the Fiscal Note?"

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Lyons."

Lyons: "I'm reading the fiscal impact. It's unknown."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Dart."

Dart: "Now, this Bill is virtually identical, take my word for it, to Representative Scott's Bill, which was introduced earlier this Session in which there was a Fiscal Note of \$71 million attached to that. And this as I said, is virtually identical to it. So, why is it that yours is

114th Legislative Day

April 17, 1996

undetermined and Representative Scott's was \$71 million?"

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Lyons, if you wish to respond."

Lyons: "How many years are you talking about on that Note?"

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Dart."

Dart: "That was last year."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Lyons."

Lyons: "Over how many years, though?"

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Dart."

Dart: "It's 10 years like always are."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Lyons."

Lyons: "On this Bill, it's unknown."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Dart."

Dart: "Nothing surprises place anymore. me around this Absolutely amazing. Well. for your information Representative, and maybe you and your number crunchers over there can figure this one out. It's a \$71 million price tag on this and 385 new inmates are projected from this. Representative Morrow mentioned earlier, is there any type of appropriation Bill that you have out there or your side has out there that's going to put these quards out there?"

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Lyons."

Lyons: "As you know, this is not an appropriation Bill. This is a public policy Bill. This establishes the street gang racketeering offense."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Dart."

Dart: "Representative, that seems to be the problem that your side of the aisle preaches a great deal about is that we set public policy around here but we never pay for it. And you guys are very fond of using the word 'unfunded mandate', okay? Now, when you're requiring the prison to

114th Legislative Day

April 17, 1996

take on an extraordinary number of new prisoners without attaching new prison guards with money attached to it, that is called an 'unfunded mandate'. I am asking you if you are going to act responsibly and identify a revenue source. Are you going to raise taxes? Are you going to come up with money from, take more money from the lottery or something to pay for this? We got to do something. We cannot just let these people loose. I mean, we probably could put an Amendment on this so we could make it like one of your other Bills over there which will send these people to another country. Our gangsters, we'll put them on a plane and send them off to the Bahamas, too. But if you have a revenue source here? Do you have any idea where you can get money to pay for this?"

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Lyons."

Lyons: "Representative Dart, this Bill is about protecting our streets. This Bill is about focusing in on career criminals. This Bill is about setting priorities in the State of Illinois about the way we spend money."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Dart, further questions?"

Dart: "So, you're saying it gives a priority of how we're going to spend money. I'm asking you to tell me where we're going to get the money to pay for this. We're all agree we are all tough on crime. Where is the money coming from?

Tell me. Where do you envision the money coming from here?

Do you have another part of the budget that you're going to find where there's some more 'fat' in Governor Edgar's Budget? Are you proposing a tax increase? Where's the money? We're for the public policy part. Now, where's the money?"

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Lyons."

Lyons: "Representative Dart, we are funding our prisons now and

114th Legislative Day

April 17, 1996

we'll continue to fund our prisons."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Dart."

Dart: "Representative, yesterday you voted to get rid of 640 prison guards. You now put a Bill before us which has at the bare minimum, a price tag of \$71 million attached to it and you stand before us without a clue about how we're going to pay for it. Representative, we are all tough on crime here. You can get your press release out as soon as this Bill gets passed, which it will. But it is the height of irresponsibility to come forward with a Bill withno money attached to it and not a clue on how you're going to pay for it, Representative. I suggest maybe you ought to go back to a civics class and figure out public policy should have a dollar sign attached to it, Representative. We can go on here all day without you answering the question. The reality of the situation is there's a price tag..."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Your time has expired. Seeing no further discussion, the Chair recognizes the Lady from Cook, Representative Lyons, to close."

Lyons: "Thank you. I urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Lyons, has moved for the passage of House Bill 3448. Those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; those opposed by voting 'no'. The voting is open. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 110 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no' and 4 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Committee announcements. Mr. Clerk."

Clerk McLennand: "Rules Committee will meet at 3:30 in the

114th Legislative Day

- April 17, 1996
- Speaker's Conference Room. Rules Committee 3:30, Speaker's Conference Room."
- Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Proceeding on the Order of House Bills Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, read House Bill 3283."
- Clerk McLennand: "House Bill 3283, a Bill for an Act that amends the Illinois Public Aid Code. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Johnson, Tim: "On the Bill, the Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Giles. Proceed."
- Giles: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House Bill 3283 is a Bill that amends the Illinois Public Aid Code to provide that the Department of Public Aid may provide, may provide grants to not-for-profit organizations for the purpose of providing assistance to homeless persons from any funds appropriated within that Department. Now, what this Bill actually does is, one, first, it expands the Department authorization with regard to the type of services provided to the homeless. Second, what this Bill does is to expand the universe of funding options to the homeless assistance. This is a very good Bill. It's a dire Bill that we need in the State of I would hope that the Speaker and the Governor would allow me to have a trailer Bill that I had introduced that appropriated \$2.1 million to help with this Bill. will hope that Bill will get out of Rules so that we can truly address the issue of homelessness throughout State of Illinois. And I ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Seeing or hearing no discussion, the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Giles, has moved for the passage of House Bill 3283. Those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; those opposed by voting 'no'. The voting is open. This is final action. Have all voted who wish?

114th Legislative Day

April 17, 1996

Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 115 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no' or 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On Supplemental Calendar #1, on the Order of Concurrence, appears House Bill 682. And on that, the Chair recognizes the Lady from Cook, Representative Krause. Representative Krause, proceed."

Krause: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 682 that was originally passed out of the House some months ago, adopted by the Senate which has now also adopted Senate Amendment And I ask for Concurrence. #1. Very briefly, the Bill has two provisions. underlying The first provides that where a territory lies within a protection district in Cook County, wholly surrounded by a Home Rule municipality, and there are no legal voters residing in the territory, then a majority of the owners may seek to be disconnected and transferred to municipality. The Amendment #1 provides that municipality shall have a population between 50,000 55,000 inhabitants. The second part of the Bill amends the Park District Code to provide that a district can enter into an agreement with a not-for-profit corporation to operate park district facilities if the corporation agrees to use the facilities for a public park or recreational programs for the youth. The Amendment limits the territory а municipality to one of more than 40,000 inhabitants within a county of more than 260,000 inhabitants bordering the Mississippi River. And I ask for Concurrence on Senate Amendment #1."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "On the Motion, the Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Clinton, Representative Granberg. Proceed."

114th Legislative Day

April 17, 1996

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

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "She indicates she will. Proceed."

Granberg: "Representative, if I remember correctly, two areas, one is East St. Louis at Representative Holbrook's request and where is the other parcel that we're dealing with?"

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Krause."

Krause: "The first provision relates to Mt. Prospect in suburban

Cook County. The second one relates to an area near East

St. Louis."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Granberg."

Granberg: "And Representative Krause, was that Senate Amendment #1 that Senator Butler put on the Bill? Does that deal with Mt. Prospect or was that the East St. Louis language?"

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Krause."

Krause: "Senate Amendment #1 deals with both Mt. Prospect and the East St. Louis area."

Granberg: "Thank you. So in the language, Representative Krause, they limit the application to municipalities of 50 to 55,000 inhabitants, and that applies only to Mt. Prospect. Is that correct?"

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Krause."

Krause: "That is correct."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Granberg."

Granberg: "And Representative Holbrook, Representative Stephens and others are in agreement on the language dealing with the Metro-East area. Is that also correct?"

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Krause."

Krause: "That is correct."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Granberg, further
 questions?"

114th Legislative Day

April 17, 1996

Granberg: "For the record, Representative, it's my understanding that there was some concern about fire protection districts, about this language?"

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Krause."

Krause: "That issue was raised and I addressed it by stating that in this particular situation, that applies to the first part of this Bill, that Mt. Prospect has provided an agreement if the fire district is interested in it, whereby the Village of Mt. Prospect would cover the unincorporated areas that would still remain."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Granberg, anything
further?"

Granberg: "Thank you. And Representative Krause, I believe there was no other opposition to the Bill. Is that correct?"

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Krause."

Krause: "There was at the hearing an opposition put in by, as I recall, the Alliance of Firefighters. They were the ones. I would like to point out for the record that this particular rural fire district is in suburban Cook County, that there are no employees in that district that they contract privately. I would also point out that Mt. Prospect which has offered to cover that area has a Class II rating and the rural fire district has a Class X. So that if they did accept the offer of Mt. Prospect, it very clearly would be very good fire service."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Granberg."

Granberg: "Thank you. So the opponents to the Bill, they had concerns with the fire protection district and the group that you just cited. But those were the only opponents to the Bill? I just want to make sure that's correct, for the record."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Krause, for the record."

114th Legislative Day

April 17, 1996

Krause: "That is correct."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Granberg."

- Granberg: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And thank you, Representative, for the answers to the questions."
- Speaker Johnson, Tim: "On the Motion, the Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Madison, Representative Stephens. Proceed."
- Stephens: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Simply to rise in support of the Bill, to mention that about an \$8 million private investment will result in the City of East St. Louis in St. Clair County and not-for-profit corporations being formed in the honor of Jackie Joyner-Kersee, one of the fine citizens of the City of East St. Louis that has gone on to fame and fortune and has returned to help revive the life of her city. I hope that all the Members on our side of the aisle will join in support of this Bill."
- Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Seeing or hearing no further discussion, the Chair recognizes the Lady from Cook, Representative Krause, to close."
- Krause: "I would merely ask again for support to concur in Senate
 Amendment #1 to House Bill 682."
- Speaker Johnson, Tim: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur with Senate Amendment #1, to House Bill 682?' Those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; those opposed by voting 'no'. The voting is open. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 115 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #1, to House Bill 682. And this Bill, having received the required Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Announcements, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk McLennand: "Rules Committee will meet in the Majority

114th Legislative Day

April 17, 1996

Leader's Office immediately. Rules Committee - Majority Leader's Office will meet immediately. For Thursday, Members should take note. Appropriation in Human Services Committee will meet at 9:30, not at 8 a.m. Appropriation for Human Services will meet at 9:30 in Room 122-B on Thursday."

- Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Further announcements, Mr. Clerk?"
- Clerk McLennand: "The following Committees will meet at 3:30:

 Cities and Villages Committee will meet at 3:30 in Room

 C-1, Higher Education will meet in Room 114 at 3:30,

 previously announced, Personnel and Pensions is cancelled.

 Personnel and Pensions Committee, scheduled for 3:30 is cancelled."
- Speaker Johnson, Tim: "The Gentleman from Will, Representative Wennlund, for what purpose do you seek recognition?"
- Wennlund: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In Representative Biggert's absence, I request a Republican conference at 4 p.m. in Room 114."
- Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Approximately one hour, Representative?"
 Wennlund: "Correct."
- Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Brunsvold, do the Democrats
 wish a conference?"
- Brunsvold: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. An inquiry of the Chair.

 Are we going to recess for committees and then return to
 the Floor?"
- Speaker Johnson, Tim: "That is the intention of the Chair, yes.

 We will return to the Floor, just for clarification and the committees will meet at 3:30. We will recess for a conference at 4:00, Republican Conference, and if you so wish likewise, then we will return to the Floor at 5 p.m. That is our intention."
- Brunsvold: "And continue legislation or continue work until

114th Legislative Day

April 17, 1996

- what?"
- Speaker Johnson, Tim: "We will continue to work until the business of the House is concluded. I can't give you an exact hour at this point."
- Brunsvold: "At this time, Mr. Speaker, the Democrats do not request a conference."
- Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Committees as scheduled will meet at 3:30.

 Republican Conference at 4:00 and we will all return to the
 House Floor to reconvene at the hour of 5 p.m. The House
 is in recess. Just a moment, Representative Moore, the
 Gentleman from Cook."
- Moore: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. I rise on account of personal privilege. I would like to announce that District 89 School District is in the upper gallery. For members in school, let's give them a General Assembly welcome. Please stand. Thank you very much."
- Speaker Johnson, Tim: "You're welcome. Representative Cross, the Gentleman from Kendall."
- Cross: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to take a moment to introduce former State Senator from my area for 16 years and a good friend of mine, Bob Mitchler. Bob, if you would stand up?"
- Speaker Johnson, Tim: "The House stands in recess until the hour of 5:00 p.m."
- Unknown: "Attention Members of the General Assembly, the House
 Rules Committee will meet at 5:00 in the Speaker's
 Conference Room."
- Clerk McLennand: "Rules Committee notice. Rules Committee will meet in the Speaker's Conference Room at 5:00 and Rules Committee will meet at 5:05 in the Speaker's Conference Room. Committee notice. Rules Committee will meet at 5:05 in the Speaker's Conference Room, Rules Committee at 5:05

114th Legislative Day

April 17, 1996

in the Speaker's Conference Room."

- Speaker Daniels: "The House will come to order. The Members will please be in their seats. Those not entitled to the Floor will please retire to the gallery. Mr. Clerk, Committee Reports."
- McLennand: "Committee Reports. Clerk Committee Report from Representative Wirsing, Chairman from the Committee on Higher Education, to which the following Joint Action Motions were referred, action taken on April 17, reported the same back: 'do approve for consideration' Floor Amendments #1 and Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 1286. Committee Report from Representative Balthis. Chairman from the Committee on Cities and Villages, to which the following Joint Action Motions were referred, action taken on April 17, 1996, reported the same back: 'do approve for consideration' Floor Amendments #5 and Floor Amendment #6 to House Bill 3414. Committee Report from Representative Churchill, Chairman from the Committee on Rules, to which the following Joint Action Motions were referred, action taken on April 17, 1996, reported the same back: 'do approve for consideration' to the House Floor, House Resolution #86. Members are encouraged to run an update on their computer systems. These Amendments are available on the computer."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Brunsvold."

- Brunsvold: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just want to let everybody know I got this hat from Greg Norman, but also I'd like to introduce a former Member, Terry Stezco. Terry. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."
- Clerk McLennand: "Committee Report. Committee Report from Representative Churchill, Chairman from the Committee on Rules, to which the following Joint Action Motions were

114th Legislative Day

April 17, 1996

referred, action taken on April 17, 1996, reported the same back: 'do approve for consideration' to the House Floor, Floor Amendment #4 to House Bill 2900 and Floor Amendment #2 to House Bill 3309."

Speaker Daniels: "Mr. Clerk, House Bill 17. Read the Bill."

Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 17. This Bill has been read a Second
Time previously. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment
#2, offered by Representative Winters, has been approved
for consideration."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Winters."

Winters: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Amendment #2 becomes the Bill.

It puts the question of downstate tax caps before the voter
for all 96 counties at county board discretion. I'd be
happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Daniels: "Is there any discussion? Representative Granberg. Or do you want Representative Currie, pass to Representative Currie. Representative Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. I'm sorry that I didn't hear all of the Gentleman's explanation. Is it that you are limiting the tax cap advisory referendum option to a smaller number of counties than were in the Bill when we heard it in Revenue Committee this morning?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Winters."

Winters: "No. This Amendment was heard in committee and it allows it for all 96 counties."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Currie."

Currie: "So this is the Amendment that would not say tax caps for all counties, not say a referendum for all counties, but say that if a county board wants to offer that opportunity to the voters, that will happen. And can I ask you this, Representative? Is this the last Amendment we're going to see on this Bill?"

114th Legislative Day

April 17, 1996

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Winters."

Winters: "It's the last that I'm Sponsoring."

Speaker Daniels: "Mr. Clerk, are there any other Amendments filed on this Bill?"

Clerk Rossi: "No further Amendments have been filed to this Bill."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Currie."

Currie: "So does that mean, to your knowledge, no other

Amendments will be filed or will be considered with respect
to the Bill?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Winters."

Winters: "Yes, as far as I know."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Currie."

"Thank you. Currie: Just to the Amendment, where the Revenue Committee did recommend it's approval, but the Members should know that it's kind of a funny approach. It says on the one hand, maybe there will be property tax caps in your county, because what the Bill would do would be to say that, county boards have the option of offering a referendum on property tax caps which would go into effect should the voters approve. At the same time, this measure includes a major loophole in tax cap legislation that we've already passed. Now, the particular project, the airport and United Parcel Service, Rockford area, a contract may be indeed quite a legitimate one. But all the Members know that this Amendment does provide an exemption, a loophole in the tax cap. And those of you who have touted your support for tax caps to your voters, might want to think twice about how you vote."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Winters moves for the adoption of Amendment #2. All in favor say 'aye'; opposed 'no'.

The 'ayes' have it. Amendment #2 is adopted. Further

114th Legislative Day

April 17, 1996

- Amendments?"
- Clerk Rossi: "No further Amendments. A Fiscal Note and a State

 Mandates Note as amended by Amendment 2, has been requested

 on the Bill. and the Notes have not been filed."
- Speaker Daniels: "Okay. We'll hold that Bill on Second Reading.

 House Bill 2900. Read the Bill. Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 2900. This Bill has been read a Second Time previously. Amendments 1 and 2 were adopted in Committee. No Motions have been filed. Floor Amendment #4 has been approved for consideration and is offered by Representative Skinner."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Skinner."
- Skinner: "I'm trying to make peace with the Cook County
 Assessor's Office. This is the language it suggests. I
 move the adoption of the Amendment."
- Speaker Daniels: "Is there any discussion? Being none, the Gentleman moves the adoption of Amendment #4. All in favor say 'aye'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. And Amendment #4 is adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk Rossi: "No further Amendments have been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Daniels: "Third Reading. House Bill 3238. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk McLennand: "House Bill 3238, a Bill for an Act concerning congregate living arrangements. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Cowlishaw."
- Cowlishaw: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. House Bill 3238 is a very simple Bill. It is a matter of accommodating the proposal that has been put forth by the Council of Jewish Elderly who would like to do a pilot project having to do with the

114th Legislative Day

April 17, 1996

housing and the treatment of level 1 Alzheimer's patients. Representative Lang, and other Members of the Aging Committee are very familiar with this Bill. All of interested parties have agreed and are now all in support of this legislation as of the Amendment that was this morning. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be the Sponsor of this Bill, because there is so much that we do not know about how to properly go about helping people, who have Alzheimer's disease, particularly in it's earliest stages. This is a very good proposal. It is endorsed by the Department on Aging, the Department of Public Health, the Health Care Association, and of course the Council of Jewish Elderly. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I would be glad to answer any questions. There is absolutely no opposition to The Amendment came out of the Aging Committee this Bill. this morning by a unanimous bipartisan vote. So, although I would be glad to answer any questions Mr. Speaker, I don't think probably there really ought to be very questions. And I would appreciate an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Daniels: "The Lady from Cook, Representative Schakowsky."

Schakowsky: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in strong support of this legislation. As the population in our state ages, we need to look at alternative ways of dealing with the various problems that come along with aging and the various possible living arrangements. This one allows for a demonstration project that is under way through the Council for the Jewish Elderly and on their behalf and my behalf, I would appreciate very much an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Lang."

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of House Bill 3238. It's a Bill that addresses a serious problem in our

114th Legislative Day

April 17, 1996

society. It talks about putting together a program for Alzheimer's patients and it's something we need to do to protect these folks. The Sponsor of the Bill worked hard in bipartisan way to move this along, and I think we should help her out. Vote for it."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Lawfer."

Lawfer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The Sponsor has worked very hard on this, put a lot of people together, worked out a very good Bill, and I would urge a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Cowlishaw to close."

Cowlishaw: "I am grateful to the Council of Jewish Elderly for being willing to undertake this very important pilot project in relation to the treatment of Alzheimer's disease, and I would very much appreciate your 'yes' vote.

Thank you."

Speaker Daniels: "The Lady from DuPage, Representative Cowlishaw, moves the passage of House Bill 3238. All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye'; opposed by voting 'no'. The voting is open. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk, will take the record. On this question, there are 115 'ayes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. On the Order of Second Reading, page 4 of the Calendar, House Bill 2632. Representative Churchill. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk McLennand: "House Bill 2632. The Bill has been read a
Second Time previously. Committee Amendment #1 was
adopted. Floor Amendment #2 was referred to rules. A
Fiscal Note has been filed on the Bill as amended by House
Amendment #1."

114th Legislative Day

April 17, 1996

Speaker Daniels: "Third Reading. Ladies and Gentlemen, would you join me in welcoming the Comptroller of the State of Illinois and former House Member, Loleta Didrickson? On the Order of Third Reading, appears House Bill 2632. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk McLennand: "House Bill 2632, a Bill for an Act concerning temporary support services. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Churchill."

Churchill: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is another Vehicle Bill that we need to send over to the Senate."

Speaker Daniels: "Is there any discussion? Representative Granberg."

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

Speaker Daniels: "Indicates he will."

Granberg: "Representative, I just wanted to make sure I heard you correctly. This is a Vehicle Bill? Is that correct?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Churchill."

Churchill: "That is correct."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Granberg."

Granberg: "Bob, is there any...do we know what we're going to be using this for or what we might be using this for?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Churchill."

Churchill: "I'm sorry. I did not hear what he said."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Granberg."

Granberg: "Do we have any idea what we might be using the Bill for, Bob?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Churchill."

Churchill: "We're looking at things happening with different departments in the state of government, and this might be used for that purpose."

114th Legislative Day

April 17, 1996

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Granberg."

Granberg: "So this might be the vehicle for the proposed consolidation or reorganization of those human service agencies?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Churchill."

Churchill: "It's one Bill that could be used for that purpose.

Yes."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Granberg."

Granberg: "Well, is it your intent to have this vehicle available for that subject, Bob? Or do you anticipate using it for anything else?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Churchill."

Churchill: "At this point I have no intention to use it for anything else. And again, we may not even use this Bill.

It's just something to keep alive in the system so that if we have an opportunity to discuss that subject matter, we can have a vehicle out there to use it."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Granberg. Nothing further.

Representative Churchill now moves for the passage of House
Bill 2632. All in favor will signify by voting 'aye';
opposed by voting 'no'. The voting is open. This is final
action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish?
Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On
this question, there are 65 'aye', 46 'no', 2 voting
'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional
Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2595. On
the Order of Third Reading. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk McLennand: "House Bill 2595, a Bill for an Act that amends the Unemployment Insurance Act. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Churchill."

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

114th Legislative Day

April 17, 1996

House. This is a vehicle for unemployment insurance, again just in the event that we ever had anything that came up where we needed a Bill to put anything that we might be able to come up with in the process onto it. We want to send this over to the Senate and keep it alive."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Granberg."

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

Speaker Daniels: "Indicates he will."

Granberg: "Representative Churchill, in the past we passed out Shell Bills while negotiations continued between labor and management. But so far in this last Session, the last year and a half, labor has really not been included in these negotiations. Is labor involved with any changes, any proposed changes in the unemployment insurance area?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Churchill."

Churchill: "I'm meeting with a small group of people. We're meeting on Friday, so."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Granberg."

Granberg: "Will you agree not to move the Bill until labor agrees?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Churchill."

Churchill: "No."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Granberg."

Granberg: "Well, at least you're honest about it, Bob. So another good thing for labor today. I rise in opposition to the Gentleman. If labor is not going to be consulted, if they're not going to agree on whatever might be the subject matter of this Bill, that's not good for working men and women in this state. And I rise in opposition."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Lang."

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in opposition to this Bill. I mean, what else do they want to do to the

114th Legislative Day

April 17, 1996

unemployment insurance of the State of Illinois. already been a rape of the trust fund. We've already benefitted big employers and big money in Illinois, at the possible expense of working men and women in our state. What more do we want to do? Whatever more Mr. Churchill and Mr. Parke, who have sponsored this Bill wanted to do. they should have done before. They certainly ought to it in the light of day, not in the process of a Vehicle Bill. So I don't think we ought to be about the business in this House of providing opportunities to do more damage to the lives of working men and women. This General Assembly in the last year and a half has done quite a bit negatively to the lives of working men and women in Illinois. And one more Shell Bill out of here that could be anything when it finishes, is not the way we want to go. This is a 'no' vote."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Churchill, now moves the passage of House Bill 2595. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; opposed by voting 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk, will take the record. On this question, there are 63 'aye', 51 'no', 1 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 22. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk McLennand: "House Bill 22. The Bill has been read a Second

Time earlier today and moved to Third. A Bill for an Act

to amend the Illinois Public Aid Code. Third Reading of
this House Bill."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Leitch."

Leitch: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill is necessary in preparation for our end of Session negotiations. It's a

114th Legislative Day

April 17, 1996

vehicle in the event we need it for our Medicaid decisions.

And I'd appreciate it's approval."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Granberg."

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

Speaker Daniels: "He indicates he will."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Leitch."

Leitch: "Frankly, Representative, we've had such other major issues occupying us to date that we really haven't gotten started. And the other thing has been the uncertainty at the Federal level. But aside from some informal negotiations or discussions, I really should say, we'll be moving very soon to try and sort out in connection with a budget process, what will be needed in that regard."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Granberg."

Granberg: "Thank you, Representative Leitch. I understand you're well-intentioned. But, once again I rise in opposition. This might give up the Medicaid Bill cycle. Since the reductions that took place yesterday might extend the bill payment for our nursing homes, we don't know what may happen, what could come about by the end of Session. And I would respectfully ask our Members on this side of the aisle, if they are concerned with Medicaid and Medicaid payments to vote 'no'."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Lang."

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in opposition to this Bill and just simply echo Mr. Granberg's comments and would ask for a verification should this reach the requisite amount."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Leitch has moved for the passage of House Bill 22. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; opposed by voting 'no'. The voting is open. This

114th Legislative Day

April 17, 1996

is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 64 'aye', 51 'no', 0 voting 'present'. The Gentleman has asked for a verification. Poll of the Affirmative Roll."

Clerk McLennand: "Those Representatives voting in the Affirmative. Ackerman. Balthis. Biggert. Biggins. Black. Bost. Brady. Churchill. Ciarlo. Clayton. Cowlishaw. Cross. Deuchler. Doody. Durkin. Goslin. Hassert. Hoeft. Hughes. Johnson, Tim. 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. Salvi. Saviano. Skinner. Spangler. Stephens. Tenhouse. Turner, Wait. Weaver. Wennlund. Winkel. Winters. Wirsing. Wojcik. Zickus. Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Daniels: "Questions of the Affirmative Roll.

Representative Lang."

Lang: "Thank you. Representative Klingler? Oh, Representative Klingler is in her chair. Representative Salvi?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Salvi? Is the Gentleman in the chamber? Representative Salvi. Remove him from the roll. Further questions?"

Lang: "Representative Tom Johnson?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Tom Johnson in the center aisle. Further questions? Further questions, Sir?"

Lang: "Bear with me, Sir. Representative Biggert?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Biggert is up front."

Lang: "Representative Lyons?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Eileen Lyons is in her chair."

114th Legislative Day

April 17, 1996

Lang: "Representative Ackerman?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Jay Ackerman is in his chair as always. Representative Salvi has returned, so return him to the Roll Call."

Lang: "No further, Sir."

Speaker Daniels: "This Bill, having received 64 'aye', 51 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3271. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk McLennand: "House Bill 3271. The Bill has been read a
Second Time previously. Floor Amendment #1 offered, by
Representative Meyers, has been approved for
consideration."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Meyers."

Meyer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the The Bill that you see before you today is for consideration as a Bill that has in the past done two things. The purpose of the Bill is to ban the so-called sport of ultimate fighting for the event from being held in the state. The Bill, as it was drafted and on Third Reading, has now been moved to Second. Also banned the purveyance of that sport event over the pay-per-view venue that the cable industry uses. I had hoped to have a discussion on the value of actual combative type of sports that do more than depict injury but actually inflict it. The votes were not there for it and so at this point, I would like to amend this Bill to take out the cablevision or the cable industry portion of the Bill and leave it in terms of banning the event from being held within the state."

Speaker Daniels: "Any questions? The Lady from Cook,

Representative Erwin."

114th Legislative Day

April 17, 1996

Erwin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield for a question?"

Speaker Daniels: "Indicates he will."

Erwin: "Thank you. Representative, am I to understand that this deals mainly with the pay-per-view type of cable television access?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Meyer."

Meyer: "Representative, as I explained in my opening remarks, the original Bill did, but the Amendment that we're dealing with here, Floor Amendment #1 deletes the pay-per-view portion of that Bill, and in effect, leaves the Bill dealing only with the actual event being held within the state."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Erwin."

Erwin: "Just so that I'm clear about this, the Amendment now will only ban the sport in the state, has nothing to do with the conveyance over any type of airway or broadcast system? Is that correct?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Meyer."

Meyer: "Representative, that is correct."

Speaker Daniels: "Further discussion? Representative Schoenberg."

Schoenberg: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the Amendment. I'd like to commend Representative Meyer, who has been very persistently working on this subject. It's one of great personal conviction to him. And it's one I'm sure of great personal conviction to many of us. I think we all recognize that in this particular case that government regulation has indeed provided the threat of government intervention, has indeed provided a Damoclean sword for an industry to govern itself and just as in Washington, we were able to see that the television industry responded to

114th Legislative Day

April 17, 1996

the excessive amounts of violence on television by changing their own ways prior to Congress changing them. Here too, Mr. Meyer, has taken yet another responsible step forward to making sure that this unsavory activity is not going to be on the airwaves. So I would urge the adoption of the Amendment and of the Bill in it's entirety. Thank you."

Speaker Daniels: "Further discussion? Representative Novak."

Novak: "Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Gentleman yield?" Speaker Daniels: "Indicates he will."

Novak: "Representative Meyer, who came to you for this Bill? I mean, did you decide to do this, introduce this Bill yourself? Or did a special interest group or an advocacy group come and see you? Did the humane society come and see you about this Bill?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Meyer."

Meyer: "Well, Representative, I'm glad you asked the question. Actually, I was made aware of the event type of sport that we're talking about about 7:30 one Sunday morning when a very concerned constituent called me and asked me if I was aware of such a sport being developed. I responded to them 'no, I wasn't and I would look into it'. During the next couple weeks I was able to view excerpts of the sport on 20/20 as well as on the local news programs and have since supplied, I think, probably virtually every Member here in the House with a copy of an article that was written in People magazine. I've done extensive research on the subject matter, and based on that, I brought the Bill to the House."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Novak."

Novak: "Yes, Representative, so the Amendment would delete the pay-per-view events. Correct? Is that it?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Meyer."

114th Legislative Day

April 17, 1996

Meyer: "Well, Representative, pay-per-view is only the venue by which that event is distributed. What the Amendment does is to ban the actual event from being staged within the state boundaries of Illinois."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Novak."

Novak: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Let me ask this rhetorical question. You know I've read a few articles about this ultimate fighting thing and do you think it's any different than hockey, the National Hockey League where you have two players beating the hell out of each other in front of the referee and the referee just stands there and watches them, blood all over the ice. What is the difference? Will you give me the difference?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Meyer."

Meyer: "Well, Representative, as you're then aware, this event is one that's held basically by putting two people into a chain link fence ring. The only rules are that you can't bite and you can't gouge eyes, but everything goes. And of course the thrust of the whole..."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Novak."

Novak: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. Thank you. Well, Representative Meyer, I kind of agree with you. I certainly wouldn't turn this thing on and watch it for any type of enjoyment. I don't know what type of people would derive any type of enjoyment. I'm a hockey fan. I sort of pay attention to it a little bit, but I certainly don't like to see all of the blood all over the ice and when the referees just stand by and let them whale away at each other until someone has a broken jaw or until someone looks like Bobby Hull used to look with about 50 stitches down his face. So you know, to me it seems like it's an infringement upon our rights to see what we want to see on TV. As much as it may be

114th Legislative Day

April 17, 1996

distasteful to some people, it may be for whatever the merits may be, tasteful to other people. You know, they talk in Washington about putting this V chip, and I know President Clinton signed that Bill, that doesn't take effect until I think the later part of this decade. But a V chip will be going into televisions manufactured after a certain date and that will allow parents and guardians to regulate..."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative, can you bring your remarks to a close? Are you done, completed? Representative Novak."

Novak: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate your indulgence.

That would allow the parents and guardians to regulate programming for children. I think the simple thing is Ladies and Gentlemen, is to pick up your remote control and just switch the station off. I think that's the simple thing to do and I would urge my colleagues to defeat this Bill."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Winkel."

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

Speaker Daniels: "The question is, 'Shall the main question be put?' All in favor say 'aye'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. Representative Meyer moves for the adoption of Amendment #1. All in favor say 'aye'; opposed 'no'. Amendment adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk McLennand: "No further Amendments."

Clerk McLennand: "House Bill 17. The Bill had been held pending the filing of a Fiscal and State Mandates Note. Both of those notes have been filed."

Speaker Daniels: "Third Reading. House Bill 3309 on the Order of Second Reading. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

114th Legislative Day

April 17, 1996

Clerk McLennand: "House Bill 3309. The Bill has been read a
Second Time previously. Committee Amendment #1 was
adopted. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative
Meyer, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Meyer."

Meyer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, 3309 has been heard in committee. committee discussion on that Bill, there were opponents to the original language of the Bill, which quite frankly, I had anticipated when I introduced the legislation. And over the last several weeks, we have been working on language that all sides of this issue could agree with. And we've now come to a complete understanding. All of the opposition to the Bill itself has been, or to the Amendment has now been removed. And the Amendment before you allows for emergency medical service to be restored to an area that had been utilizing a medical center that had been a certificate under the State Law to have a medical emergency treatment center there. And this Bill just allows that activity to take place again."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Schakowsky."

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

Speaker Daniels: "She indicates she will. He indicates he will."

Schakowsky: "Got it. Now, Amendment 1 also limited the Bill in some way as well. Right? And this, and Amendment #2 now further reduces...could you explain again how this Amendment changes the original Bill?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Meyer."

Meyer: "Representative, thank you. First of all, Amendment #2 becomes the Bill. And this is under the EMS Act as opposed to the First Amendment was under the Alternative Health Care Bill Act."

114th Legislative Day

April 17, 1996

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Schakowsky."

Schakowsky: "Can I just ask you Representative, why it is that we didn't go back to committee with this, why we didn't go back to committee with this Amendment and take a closer look at it?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Meyer."

Meyer: "Representative, the subject matter of the issue is still the same. As a part of the committee hearing, there was definitely a sense there and I believe that probably the Committee Chairman could speak to that. There was a sense within the Committee that the Committee Members wanted to try and work with the concept that was what we were trying to accomplish through the legislation. It was just that there was opposition to certain parts of the language. And therefore, I agreed to work with both sides in good faith, which we did with the Department of Public Health, the Hospital Association, Med Society and emergency medical physicians. And we have now worked out all that language and in addition to that have communicated with hospitals that are involved. And the thrust of this is to allow for emergency medical service to be given, to restore that to our community."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Schakowsky."

Schakowsky: "Is this...would you still call this a demonstration project?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Meyer."

Meyer: "Representative, it's a demonstration project under the EMS Act and I believe it runs on an annual basis."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Schakowsky."

Schakowsky: "I didn't hear what basis it runs on but my understanding is that there is no time limit on this. So that's not my understanding of a demonstration project."

114th Legislative Day

April 17, 1996

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Meyer."

Meyer: "Representative, in the legislation, it's on page 4 of the Amendment, the facility has to be annually inspected and the license has to be renewed on an annual basis. And I do think that would address some of your concerns you've expressed here."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Schakowsky."

Schakowsky: "Yes, but that's standard with licensing. This is a perpetual process, however. There's nothing that says that we need to evaluate the demonstration that it would sunset at a certain point. And I also don't see in here anything that would absolutely limit it to one, I mean, it leaves a lot of flexibility in determining how many might be used as demonstrations."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Meyer."

Meyer: "Representative, there is a limit. It's an annual limit and as far as, I've forgotten your second part of the question, quite honestly."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Schakowsky."

Schakowsky: "The other part was that there, it seems to us in reading this Bill, this Amendment, that another project could also be set up, that it's not just the one."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Meyer."

Meyer: "Well, there is, the way that the Bill is drafted, I would assume theoretically Representative, if somebody else fit into that same criteria they possibly could. In this case, the criteria is extremely tight and it's dealing with trying to restore something that was already there and something that we operated under from 1981 to 1992. And where we're now faced with having our ambulances being out of the village for one to two hours while they transport a patient for even a sprained wrist or a sprained ankle up to

114th Legislative Day

April 17, 1996

a hospital emergency room. Now they can again through the use of this Bill, can be serviced through the medical center that is right there in Bolingbrook. In fact Representative, it's a full-blown emergency room. The certificate originally was written to put a 120 bed hospital there. And basically they started out by constructing..."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Schakowsky, your time has expired. Representative Lang."

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

Speaker Daniels: "Indicates he will."

Lang: "Representative, as I read this Amendment, it's apparent it's for one area, one facility, one idea. Tell me what that is."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Meyer."

Meyer: "Well, Representative, the facility is the Bolingbrook Medical Center that I am speaking of. That happens to be my hometown also. It's a facility that was...as I was explaining, was originally going to be developed as a fullblown hospital. The facility is owned and operated by Hinsdale Hospital. It's just not a medical center stand alone. And the hospital that actually would determine whether a patient was picked up by the EMS service in Bolingbrook and would be transported to the facility or medical center or to the hospital is Edward Hospital in Naperville. They are the controlling hospital every call would individually be triaged in determination that would be made by the hospital, not by the EMS people as to which facility would be the service. We're not trying to take away from the care of a needy patient. What we're trying to do is provide a more reasonable type of care by allowing those that are not life

114th Legislative Day

April 17, 1996

threatening to be transported to this medical center as opposed to the emergency room in the hospital which is again taking those ambulances out of service for one to two hours. We're currently answering about one-third of our calls with ambulance services from other communities through the assistance program."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Lang."

Lang: "Well, that was a very long answer but the bottom line is that this is for a specific hospital in your district. It's almost special interest legislation but I'll take it beyond that and go to something else. Aren't you setting precedent here that would allow ambulances to stop perhaps, at a facility that cannot help a patient and then require them to later transport that patient to a full service hospital?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Meyer."

Meyer: "Again, Representative, perhaps you missed the response to this question. I was trying to lay out that groundwork in the answer I gave you previously. The resource hospital actually makes the decision as to where that ambulance is going to stop, whether it be the Bolingbrook Medical Center Emergency Room or if the patient has to be transported all the way to the Edwards Emergency Hospital Room. The emergency rooms are the same. It's just that one of them is better able to service non-life-threatening types of problems and therefore, allow the rest of the citizens of the community to have ambulance services right there and not an hour or two hours away because they are out of town."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Lang."

Lang: "Well, even though the resource hospital would have to make the recommendation, aren't you leaving open the possibility

114th Legislative Day

April 17, 1996

that the call will come to the resource hospital, they'll have an overloaded trauma center and they'll just say, 'Look, dump the person there, we'll take them later."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Meyer."

Meyer: "Well, Representative, as your're aware, I'm sure, every hospital does have a bypass procedure. But over and above that to infer that there would be a possibility of the Edward Hospital not making the proper call on that just because they happen to have patients in the emergency room, I disagree with. Currently, if you're looking at caseload in Edwards Hospital, every type of service that is given whether it's a sprained ankle, sprained wrist or major trauma it all goes to Edward Hospital right now and as a matter of fact, I think this Bill would alleviate maybe some of the congestion that that facility would have, so they can deal with more serious concerns."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Lang."

Lang: "Mr. Speaker, before I continue, I do want to request a Roll Call Vote on this. Isn't the...Is the Illinois Hospital Association for this Bill?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Meyer."

Meyer: "They drafted the language, Representative."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Lang."

Lang: "They drafted the language or the Amendment to make what they thought was a Bill that they were opposed a little bit of a better Bill. But do they support the Bill? Would they file a witness slip in favor of this Bill if this went to committee right now?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Meyer."

Meyer: "The Hospital Association is certainly neutral on it.

Again, we have worked very close together with all of the organizations and at this point..."

114th Legislative Day

April 17, 1996

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Lang, you're out of time but...Representative Meyer, would you answer the question and finish the answer to the question?"

Meyer: "Yes, Representative, again, the Hospital Association has drafted the language. They've met with their individual hospitals. They've taken it before their boards and they have, in fact, worked with us to develop this and are not in opposition to it."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Winkel. Representative Winkel." Winkel: "Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question."

Speaker Daniels: "Question is, 'Shall the main question be put?'

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

Representative Meyer to close."

Meyer: "Thank you, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The Bill that you see before you today is not a new concept. It's a concept that we and that medical treatment facility were operating under from 1981 through 1992. It's a that makes a lot of good common sense. It improves, I believe, the services of the emergency room at Edwards Hospital which is a resource hospital. It improves the medical service to the community of Bolingbrook by allowing the MS Service on selected cases that are authorized by the resource hospital to be treated at the Bolingbrook Medical It is a Bill that I feel that will help the Facility. people of that community, some 50 thousand strong. Ladies and Gentlemen, anyone here in the House that would be visiting that community that would need treatment, I'm sure you would want to have those EMS facilities available to you. I ask for your favorable vote on this."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Meyer, has moved for the adoption of Amendment #2. All those in favors signify by

114th Legislative Day

April 17, 1996

voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. There are 99 'aye', 10 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And this Amendment having received the requisite Majority vote is hereby declared adopted. Further Amendments?"

- Clerk McLennand: "No further Amendments. A Fiscal Note has been requested on the Bill as amended and has been filed."
- Speaker Daniels: "Third Reading. On page 9 on the Calendar,
 Order of Concurrence appears House Bill 2251. The
 Gentleman from Livingston, Representative Rutherford, is
 recognized."

Rutherford: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of House. appreciate your timing in the fact that Comptroller Didrickson is here with us on the Floor. legislation that I have worked very closely with her on for the past year in cooperation with our colleagues on the Democratic side of the aisle as well. Senate Amendment which I am asking for concurrence, would do five things: One of them, it would create a separate fund within the State Treasury to be named the Comptroller's Administrative Fund and this will be utilized by that office as is this case with several other state agencies to hold costs, fees and service and governmental grants recoveries, received by the Comptroller's Office. It eliminates the Comptroller's Merit Advisory Board which is something that hasn't met and been in existence actually for almost six to eight years. Establishes the statutory definition for reappropriation. Ιt also changes and this is the significant part of the Bill changes the lapsed period spending time from a six...from the three month period down to a two month period and it also provides for the debt

114th Legislative Day

April 17, 1996

collection board to establish a time tables and procedures. I would be delighted to answer any question you might have."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Lang."

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen. I rise on opposition to the Concurrence Motion. I do so for various reasons and I'd like you all to listen, because this is a very critical matter affecting the State of Illinois.

A good deal of this Amendment deals with the collection of owed to the State of Illinois. And as you know Jay Hoffman and I chaired a task force to study debt owed to our state. Comptroller last year reported that there were \$6 billion owed to our state by our own taxpayers, we started to study that. And of course, it didn't hurt that we had a state treasurer who decided to give away \$30 million of taxpayer money to wealthy nevertheless, we studied this issue of debt. Six billion dollars would dwarf what we owe. Why don't we go collect And so we brought experts to the table to tell us about thought. the collection of debt. When we did that we came up with a report. That report is embodied in a package of Bills that we have sponsored that of course, have not left the Rules Committee. But that package of Bills will start the ball rolling to collect This plan will not. We discovered that every single state debt. agency from Revenue down to Veterans Affairs collects their own debt except, only one or two departments out of thirty odd departments have any expertise in the collection of debt. There is no one on the staff of the Veterans Affairs Department knows how to collect debt. But this proposal will continue that tradition of having each department collect their own debt. I don't think we should be having civil servants who aren't expert in debt collection or some intern or some summer help determine

114th Legislative Day

April 17, 1996

what debt should be collected. They don't have the expertise. In addition, this plan will continue to allow the State Debt Collection Board to do the collections for the State of Illinois. Since 1990, the State Debt Collection Board has collected a whopping two percent of the debt owed to the State of And every single expert that testified before our task force said we should be getting 25, 30, and for some departments 50%. plan and this Bill will continue the procedure where we only collect two percent, rather than 30 or 40 or 50% of the \$6 billion owed to us. So it creates a continuation of the plan. It's nonprofessional. There's no expertise. In addition, this plan is political, it's partisan. It gives the Comptroller the ability to give away \$6 billion in contracts to collect debt for the State of Illinois. Six billion dollars. That power will be given to Comptroller to determine who will make those collections. Clearly, those assignments are political. You know who will those contracts. Despite the fact, that I have great trust and confidence in our Comptroller. The proposal we put on the table would centralize debt collection in a special unit created in the Auditor General's Department. It would require professional debt collectors to be hired and the payment for this department would come out of their collections. It would be non-political because Auditor General is not a political office. The Auditor General is a Constitutional office that is not political It is a bipartisan office. A nonpartisan office. And so if you believe that the debt collection experts are right, and you should, because they are the experts. We can collect between a billion and a half and maybe \$3 billion, that's owed to the State of Illinois. This is all the time we're talking about a half a billion dollars for education. Let's put \$3 billion on the table for education and collect the money. This plan will not it. Ιt looks good but it doesn't do anything. It doesn't put

114th Legislative Day

April 17, 1996

expertise into it, it put politics into it. It doesn't put a nonpartisan person involved, it keeps a partisan person involved.

And it won't collect the money. Consider this strongly, consider \$6 billion of our constituents' money. I would suggest a 'no' vote."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Rutherford to close."

Rutherford: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate the speaker's comments. Actually, there are excellent reasons to be voting for this piece of legislation. This piece of legislation would require that the agency would have six months to attempt to collect it. Once they have not been able to do that, they'll turn it over to the Collection Board in cooperation with the Comptroller, to be able to put this out for bid, to be able to bring in the private firms to collect the state debt. Everyone of there to go after it, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House of Representatives. What we're also being able to do here is tighten up the lapsed period spending time so we can close the books on the State of Illinois, have a better handle on the fiscal condition of our state. I appreciate the cooperation from both sides of the aisle. The cooperation from the Comptroller and I would ask for a 'yes' vote."

Speaker Daniels: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur with Senate Amendment #4 to House Bill 2251?' All those in favor, signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. The voting is open. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk, will take the record. On this question there are 100 'ayes', 11 'nays', 3 voting 'present'. And the House does concur with Senate Amendment #4 to House Bill 2251. House Bill 17. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

114th Legislative Day

April 17, 1996

Clerk McLennand: "House Bill 17. The Bill is on the Order of
Third Reading. A Bill for an Act to relation of property
tax. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman from Winnebago, Representative Winters."

Winters: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 17 amends the Property Tax Code and the Election 'Toll' Code to grant the county board of all 96 counties not yet subject to the property tax extension limitation law. A question of whether to make all Non-Home Rule taxing districts where the majority of the are the EAV within that district subject to the tax extension limitation law. I'd be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Daniels: "Any discussion? Representative Dart."

Dart: "Thank you, will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Daniels: "He indicates he will."

Dart: "Representative, how is it that the referendum will be determined?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Winters."

Winters: "If I understood your question, is how will the referendum be decided? The county board can by ordinance or resolution place this on the ballot for the next general election. At that point, if it passes by majority of the voters, it takes effect the January 1st following the election."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Dart."

Dart: "How many counties is this going to affect?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Winters."

Winters: "This is permissive language allowing all 96 downstate counties other than Cook or the collar counties, to put this on the ballot but it is permissive language giving this power to the county boards."

114th Legislative Day

April 17, 1996

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Dart."

Dart: "Yeah, I guess my question is why don't we just impose them like we did on Cook County last year? It's not good enough for them, what's the reason?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Winters."

Winters: "The reason we're not imposing is that there is a much greater disparity between the different counties. Some of them are still suffering from the fall of real estate values after 1983. Their taxing districts have not been excessive in their demands for tax money. We're simply allowing, however, all counties to call them whether it's next year or five years down the road, 10 years down the road, whenever they see the significant property tax pressure, at that point the county board would still be empowered to call the question. There is a great disparity between the counties is the reason for not imposing them."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Dart."

Dart: "So then what you're saying then is that there are some counties where tax caps won't be appropriate and some counties where it will be appropriate? Is that correct?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Winters."

Winters: "I cannot speak for all the counties. It will be up to the county boards to decide whether it is appropriate for them or not."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Dart."

Dart: "Well, maybe you can explain this logic to me then, Representative, what you're saying is that there is some disparity between the counties so, they will make up the decision themselves but when it came to Cook County, you said all municipalities in Cook County are the same, so we are imposing them on them. We're not giving them the opportunity to do this. Is that correct?"

114th Legislative Day

April 17, 1996

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Winters."

Winters: "One, we're dealing only with Non Home Rule communities.

The other aspect that is different is that there had been a countywide referendum in Cook County expressing the public's wish to have tax caps. That has not been done downstate. But there is significant demand in a number of counties. They have brought that concern to us and this Bill is the result."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Dart."

Dart: "But don't you think, though, that in reality is if the tax cap referendum was put on in every county in the state it would pass?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Winters."

Winters: "I certainly can't speak for all counties. I think there are a number of counties where it might not pass.

And those county boards will respond to the public pressure. I can't speak for all counties. I think that there very well could be counties where it would be turned down."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Dart."

Dart: "Could you explain the provision dealing with the special loophole you're putting in here for your district?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Winters."

Winters: "This provision concerns the Greater Rockford Airport Authority, which entered into a number of years ago a long-term contract dependent on being able to float General Obligation Non-referendum Bonds. It's a long-term contract involving millions of dollars which will not be able to be honored if the tax caps do not exempt them. When the obligations are paid off in approximately 10 years, the tax cap will then lower to where they cannot use those non-referendum bonds."

114th Legislative Day

April 17, 1996

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Dart."

Dart: "Thank you. То the Bill. This is an interesting Bill because it's tax caps, but it's not tax caps. For those of you folks who are for tax caps, this does not supply them. It basically says that if you want to do this we'll put a referendum together, then you can decide it so it's not And in addition to that, it imposes a imposing them. loophole so for you ardent tax caps people, this doesn't supply it. It says it does but we aren't doing it. Unlike in Cook County, unlike Chicago, in the collar counties and we put another loophole into the tax cap. So, this a unique Bill in that regard. It's got the name of tax caps so, it really doesn't do that."

Speaker Daniels: "Okay, further discussion? Representative Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. I rise in opposition to House Bill 17. The one substantive thing that it does, the one real thing that it does, is create a loophole in property tax caps. It may be quite legitimate loophole, but those of you, who have run your campaigns and your careers on your devotion to property tax caps might want to think twice before you support a glaring loophole in tax cap legislation. The second thing measure does is very little indeed. We ourselves, imposed tax caps on Cook County and the collar counties. it's a good idea to take away from the folks back home, their authority to hire people to work for government and determine what kind of tax base is needed and what kinds of services are appropriate, if we thought we should do that for the people who live in Cook and the collar counties, why are we messing around with House Bill 17? Either it's a good idea for the folks in Springfield

114th Legislative Day

April 17, 1996

to impose property tax caps or it isn't. This Bill doesn't even say, 'We'll first ask the voters what they think,' as happened in Cook County. This Bill says maybe some of the voters will be offered the opportunity to say 'yea' 'nay'. And look at the question they'll be asked. This is called the free lunch question, 'Would you like a free lunch?' Anybody asked his question, which is how would you like property tax caps without any definition of what you might lose in terms of services if you have them. Anybody who asks this question, is playing a game with the voters. So think about your own districts, your own campaign rhetoric, your own commitments to the taxpayers at home. you're for property tax caps, this Bill doesn't do it. What it does do, is create a exemption in current One more loophole because the Bill didn't get drafted right in the first place."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Wait."

Wait: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I stand in strong support of House Bill 17 here. T was down here when we imposed tax caps on the collar county and unfortunately I was one of those that was in the ring around the collar where McHenry was in the district and the other ones weren't. And, I swore, I would fight for caps for the rest of the state. This is really a step in the right direction. It's to limit the spiraling growth of tax especially in our area. Collar counties and Cook County, as we know, have them, so now it is time to let us have them. Boone County, my home county, assessments went up 43% in the last three years. I repeat, 43%. That's the largest, fastest growing county in the whole State of Illinois as far as the assessments go. Winnebago and DeKalb Counties, also in my area, are in the top 10

114th Legislative Day

April 17, 1996

counties in the State of Illinois. People are crying out for help. This is an opportunity that we can do something to help them. Literally, right now, people are being forced out of their homes and they are saying this is wrong and I'm here to try and help them. We know this is not a long term solution. The long-term solution is to take property taxes off, especially for schools and I'm strongly in favor of that. What we have here today, basically it allows government to live within its means. It just if you want to capture extraordinary growth, you have to go to the voters. What we have found out in other areas where they have tax caps, around 50% of them are passing because people feel that they have empowerment. I'm convinced that our local county board, by giving them the power, will feel the pulse of the community and will put this on the ballot the November election. So I ask for your support on this Bill to empower the taxpayers to have some say and some control over their local taxes. Thank you very much."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Balthis."

Balthis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
Speaker Daniels: "He indicates he will."

Balthis: "Representative Winters, I've heard some comment about an exception in this Bill for a...for the airport in Rockford and the park district and something that's happened there. It's my understanding that several jobs were created as a result of that. Could you explain to us what that was about and how that is affected by this legislation?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Winters."

Winters: "Yes, part of the reason for this exemption is that the Greater Rockford Airport expanded to a 10 thousand foot runway, added an extensive cargo unloading and sorting

114th Legislative Day

April 17, 1996

facilities. The United Parcel Service has added 700 full time jobs and peak out at over 900 during the Christmas rush. They have also allowed numerous local industries to expand further because of the second day air service that they provide. Motorola has moved 300 additional jobs into the Rockford area, specifically, so they could remanufacture repair radios overnight, ship them back out the next day. That would not have happened without the airport authority going out for these additional bonds. We are trying to protect that contract."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Balthis."

Balthis: "So on this Labor Day in Springfield a vote for this

Bill would appear to be a vote to protect jobs in your area

and in the Rockford area especially as a result of this

legislation?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Winters."

Winters: "Absolutely, there were hundreds upon hundreds of construction jobs that were used for years during the construction phase of this facility and we're talking well over a thousand good paying high quality jobs in the Rockford area. We're trying to defend those jobs by protecting the contract the Airport Authority entered into."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Balthis."

Balthis: "The exceptions in this Bill are similar. understand it, to the ones that we granted for Metropolitan Water Reclamation District and the Chicago Museum to allow them to do similar things to protect the citizens of the City of Chicago. Ιs that your understanding?"

Speaker Daniels: "That is perfect a parallel. We were in those cases attempting to protect their bonding authority that

114th Legislative Day

April 17, 1996

they had already entered into. And we are doing exactly the same thing. An excellent example."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Balthis."

Balthis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just rise in support of the Gentleman's Bill. I think it's giving the people there an opportunity that I would have liked to have had in Cook County, quite frankly, to have let the people decide what they wanted to do and I congratulate Representative Winters for working to save jobs in his area. Thank you."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Brunsvold.'

Brunsvold: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Gentleman yield?" Speaker Daniels: "He indicates he will."

Brunsvold: "Representative Winters, have you been...have you ever been in local government?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Winters."

Winters: "I'm sorry, I couldn't understand the question."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Brunsvold."

Brunsvold: "Have you served in local government?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Winters."

Winters: "Yes, I served both on a town board and on a county board"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Brunsvold."

Brunsvold: "Okay, then let me pose this question. If you're a

Home Rule community and you're increasing taxes

approximately one percent a year to catch inflation and

that, and we were to impose tax caps on you, what would you

do?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Winters."

Winters: "If I was a responsible local official, which I was, I would look at the needs of the township and raise taxes according to the needs."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Brunsvold."

114th Legislative Day

April 17, 1996

Brunsvold: "Well, even today, Representative, we have groups that have gone to five percent just because they are afraid of the tax caps. So, in fact, what's happening, is that towns that are very comfortable with slight increases with one or two percent will now, automatically go to five percent to protect themselves. And you have, in fact, a tax increase caused by tax caps. That's what is resulting in a lot the communities around the state now that are afraid of tax caps. To the Bill, Mr. Speaker. Yesterday, we passed a educational plan which you sponsored and I believe that tax caps in the collar counties directly resulted in a per capita grant to school kids. They can't raise taxes fast enough to build schools and take care of the school system, so we now go to another way of getting sources...resources from the state and that's down here. And someone's going to suffer. And because of tax caps, Ladies and Gentlemen the House, we're going to divert funds from one part of this state to another and let some kids not have an equal opportunity to education. So I'm opposed and have been opposed as a mayor that served in this state, opposed to tax caps and I've always said that if you don't like the councilman and mayor in your community or you don't like your county board people and what they're doing, then get somebody else."

Speaker Daniels: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from McHenry, Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Would the Gentleman yield for a question?"

Speaker Daniels: "He indicates he will."

Skinner: "One of the Democrats made the illusion that there was some new loophole in the tax cap that this Bill is driving in the six county area. There is no new loophole for the six county area. Is that correct?"

114th Legislative Day

April 17, 1996

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Winters."

Winters: "That is correct. There is no loophole for the collar counties."

Speaker Daniels: 'Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Thank you."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Black."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. To the Bill. I spent 10 years as a member of the county board and, in fact, was a county board chairman. I've always had some very mixed if not strong emotions on the issue of property tax caps. When I served on the county board, the property tax is a local tax. is collected, levied, and spent by local It has never been in the purview of the State government. of Illinois. We don't spend property tax money from the Assembly. But a few years ago people came to many of us in this Floor who represented areas of the state that had tremendous growth, population growth, business, commercial, and whose assessed valuations were going through the ceiling. A part of me thought that that should have been left up to local governments and locally elected officials to handle. But as I recall that discussion, the people in those collar counties decided that that's what Then Cook had a referendum and last they wanted to do. year when the idea came up to extend it downstate, I wasn't excited about that. I don't need to rehash that but I So it's incumbent, I think, on those of us who wasn't. have said for many years on this Floor one size does fit all, and I believe that to still be the case. This is in my opinion, speaking for my district, the compromise that I can agree to. One thing that I cannot escape nor any of you in this chamber can escape, is the

114th Legislative Day

April 17, 1996

way the demographics have changed in the State of Illinois. I believe if the figures are correct in my mind that 56% of the people now live in six counties of the State of Illinois. And I believe you know where those six counties What I then am faced with, what can I do to empower local governments who rely on the property tax to make a decision based on their needs, their views, their study of their EAV. This is what we came up with. The question really is not whether you like this Bill or this issue, the question is, do you want to leave this issue to those counties that are left, up to the responsibility of that local county or do you want it imposed by the State of Illinois? I've told my local units of government for the last six months, there is no doubt in my mind that the votes are here to impose property tax caps. This Bill at least empowers the counties to determine whether or not the issue of property tax caps is important enough to put before their citizenry and at least it retains a measure of control where I think it should be and that's at the local government level. And that's the reason I'll vote 'Yes' for this Bill."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Tenhouse. Sorry.

Representative Winkel."

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

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

Winters: "Thank you. In recent years we have seen in Northern Illinois and in various other areas of this state, tax bills on property rise as much as 45% in three years. This Bill will extend the rights that citizens in the six Chicagoland counties have to the 96 downstate counties,

114th Legislative Day

April 17, 1996

will hold property tax inflation to either the rate of inflation or five percent. It will be empowerment of the local county board to put them on the referendum. The citizens will have the power to cap their own taxes. This is good for the taxpayer and I urge a positive vote. Thank you."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Winters moves for the passage of House Bill 17. All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. The voting is open. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Clerk will take the record. On this question there are 80 'ayes', 25 'noes', 7 voting 'present'. This Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2900. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk McLennand: "House Bill 2900, the Bill is on the Order of Third Reading. A Bill for an Act in relation to local open space and recreational land acquisition. Third Reading of this House Bill."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is a widow's Bill primarily. Ιt comes from a suggestion from one of my constituents. It has to do with the Senior Citizen Assessment Freeze. The constituent was over 65 years old. His wife was under 65 years old. He says, 'What happens if I die before my wife gets to be 65 years old? The tax bill may leap immediately and because the leap in the tax bill, my wife may have to sell the house before she has time to get finished mourning. He asked for a short period of time in which the wife might be able to settle the estate and to figure out whether she could afford to live in the house given the higher taxes that would come after the freeze

114th Legislative Day

April 17, 1996

disappeared. So the result of that is House Bill 2900. The language which in it was suggested very kindly by the Cook County Assessor's Office. It would allow a... I don't want to use the word 'stay of execution' but nothing else comes to mind. It would allow a...well a short period during which the tax bill would not go up. The freeze would still remain in effect. That's all this Bill does and I ask for your approval."

Speaker Daniels: "Is there any discussion? The Lady from Cook, Representative Fantin."

Fantin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield to questions?"

Speaker Daniels: "He indicates he will."

of Fantin: "How long а freeze are you speaking of. Representative?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Two years."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Fantin."

Fantin: "Right now the State of Illinois we're paying our taxes a year late. So this already gives the person a year to make up for this. You do not think that's sufficient? It seems to be working at the present time."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "The way I understand it, when the spouse over 65 years old dies, the exemption disappears immediately."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Fantin."

Fantin: "The exemption would disappear if they lived in the home in January of that year, my understanding, is the exemption is for that whole year. It would be the following year. So that is the one year. Correct?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "You may perhaps be right."

114th Legislative Day

April 17, 1996

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Fantin."

Fantin: "So, if someone is married to a 21 or 22 year old, should still be allowed under this Bill, you're saying that they should still be allowed the Senior Citizen exemption."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "I love it. The Representative Currie argument. Representative Currie made this argument in the Revenue Committee. And my answer then was, that someone in their twenties probably would not be induced to marry someone over 65, because of this exemption."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Fantin."

Fantin: "So if they are 40 years old. If they're 40 years old you're still saying they should qualify for the 65 year old exemption?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Yes."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Fantin."

Fantin: "To the Bill. I do not believe it's a good idea, I think that they already have a years time, which seems it should be sufficient for people to get everything in order. It has worked. I see no reason for this Bill for this exemption to take more money away from the taxpayers. I urge a 'no' vote. Thank you."

Speaker Daniels: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Representative Persico."

Persico: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On the last vote my button malfunctioned, so I'd like the record to reflect that I would have voted 'aye' on House Bill 17."

Speaker Daniels: "The record will so reflect. Representative Skinner to close."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, I think the Bill has been adequately debated. If you think widows ought to be able to have a

114th Legislative Day

April 17, 1996

period of time to settle the estate, to figure out whether they can afford to live in the house in which a senior citizen assessment freeze has been in existence, you ought to vote 'yes' if you want to give widows a...more consternation during their period of mourning, you ought to vote 'no'."

- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Skinner moves for the adoption of House Bill 2900. All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. The voting is open. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this question, there are 112 'aye', 1 'no', 1 voting 'present'. This Bill having received a Constitutional Majority is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3151. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk McLennand: "House Bill 3151, a Bill for an Act that amends a Watershed Improvement Act. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker DAniels: "Return that Bill to Second Reading. House Bill 3271. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk McLennand: "House Bill 3271, a Bill for an Act that amends Professional Boxing and Wrestling Act. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Meyer."
- Meyer: "Thank you, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. We've had a pretty good conversation on this Bill, a debate this afternoon and I would just ask that you vote 'yes'."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Deering."
- Deering: "First off, Mr. Speaker. Inquiry of the Chair. Since this Bill, I understand, preempts home rule, does it require 71 votes?"
- Speaker Daniels: "Mr. Clerk, will you give us the Bill so we can

114th Legislative Day

April 17, 1996

answer the Gentleman's inquiry? Representative Deering, in response to your inquiry, this Bill will take 60 votes. It's a concurrent exercise authority and pursuant to the Illinois Constitution requires 60 votes. Further Discussion, Representative Deering."

Deering: "Yes, will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Daniels: "He indicates he will."

Deering: "Representative, I believe we still live in a democracy where people have a right to pick and choose what they want to do. While we may not all agree with every avenue or aspect or vice that's out there, I think that we still have the right to make our choice of what we may want to participate in, Sponsor, help promote or even watch in our home. Why do you think you should have the ultimate authority or you should spearhead the ultimate authority of what folks in my district...why do you want to take away their ability to or their options to watch this or to participate or promote this if they want to this in my area or any other area of the state?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Meyer."

Meyer: "Thank you, Representative, and I agree we do live in a democracy. We also have limits to what we can do within that democracy. Certainly, the Supreme Court of the United States has already held that you can't cry 'fire' in a crowded theater. So we do have limits. And if you look at this new so called sport that, basically, it's a no holds barred, it's a barroom brawl, it's a human cock fight. It's a sport that does not have rules except that you cannot gauge eyes or you cannot bite but you can basically do anything else. You can break fingers, you can break arms, anything that you could want to do to incapacitate the opposition. At some point where it is actual violence,

114th Legislative Day

April 17, 1996

I believe that it does cross that line of what is morally good for a society. And certainly there are court tests that can be made on this or any other law. That's why we have a third part of our government, the judicial system. And those that feel it does not cross over that, into that very vulgar type of violence. Again, we're not dealing with depiction, we're dealing with an actual event. They certainly have a remedy."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Deering."

Deering:: "Yes, Representative, are there any penalties? Say I choose to promote one of these operations or someone in the state, not necessarily down in my specific district, but say someone chooses to violate the law and promote or hold one of these ultimate fighting spectacles. What's the penalties in that aspect?"

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Meyer."

Meyer: "Yes, Representative, on page 4 of the original Bill, line 19 thru 25, it outlines the disciplines and the sanctions. The department may refuse to issue a permit or license. Refuse to renew, suspend, revoke, reprimand, place on probation or take such other disciplinary action as the department may deem proper, including that imposition of fines not to exceed \$1 thousand for each violation with regard to any license or permit holder for any one of the combination or following reasons."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Deering, your time is expired,
Sir. Representative Winkel."

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

Speaker Daniels: "Question is, 'Shall the main question be put?'

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

Representative Meyer, to close."

Meyer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would just ask for an 'aye'

114th Legislative Day

April 17, 1996

vote."

- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Meyer moves for the passage of House Bill 3271. All in favor signify by voting 'aye', opposed 'no'. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 98 'ayes', 8 voting 'no', 6 voting 'present'. This Bill having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 3309. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk McLennand: "House Bill 3309. The Bill is on the Order of
 Third Reading, a Bill for an Act in relation to health
 care. Third Reading of this House Bill."
- Speaker Daniels: "Representative Meyer."
- Meyer: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Again this Bill, we've discussed fully what the Amendment that became the Bill accomplishes and I would ask for a favorable vote."
- Speaker Daniels: "Any discussion? Being none, Representative Meyer moves for the passage of House Bill 3309. All those in favor will signify by voting 'aye', opposed by voting 'no'. The voting is open. This is final action. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Take the record, Mr. Clerk. On this question there are 115 'ayes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. This Bill having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Committee Announcements."
- Clerk McLennand: "Committee Announcements for Thursday, April 18th. The following Committees will meet: Executive Committee will meet at 9:00 a.m. at Room 114. Personnel and Pensions Committee will meet at 9:30 in Room D-1. Elections in State Government will meet at 10:30 in Room 114. Cities and Villages will meet at 11:00 a.m. in Room

114th Legislative Day

April 17, 1996

C-1. Registration and Regulation will meet at 11:00 a.m. in Room D-1. Appropriations Education Committee will meet at 8:00 a.m. Appropriations and Human Services will meet at 9:30. Again, Committees for Thursday. Executive Committee at 9:00 a.m. Personnel and Pensions at 9:30 in D-1. Elections in State Government at 10:30 in Room 114. Cities and Villages at 11:00 a.m. in Room C-1. Registration and Regulation at 11:00 in Room D-1. Appropriations Education at 8:00 in Room 118 and Appropriations Human Services at 9:30."

Speaker Daniels: "Representative Churchill now moves that the House stand adjourned until Thursday, April 18, 1996, at the hour of 12:00 noon. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it and allowing for Perfunctory Time for the Clerk, the House now stands adjourned until Thursday, April 18, 1996, at the hour of 12:00 noon."

Clerk McLennand: "House Perfunctory Session will be in order and being no further business, the House Perfunctory Session stands adjourned. Being no further business, the House Perfunctory Session stands adjourned until Thursday, April 18th at the hour of 12:00 noon."

REPORT: TIFLDAY PAGE: 001

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

97/04/16 09:26:41

APRIL 17, 1996

	11, 1330		
HB-0017	SECOND READING	PAGE	93
HB-0017	HELD ON SECOND	PAGE	78
HB-0017	THIRD READING	PAGE	105
	SECOND READING	PAGE	4
	THIRD READING	PAGE	86
	HELD ON SECOND	PAGE	4
	RECALLED	PAGE	37
	SECOND READING	PAGE	4
	THIRD READING	PAGE	47
	CONCURRENCE '	PAGE	71
HB-1476	SECOND READING	PAGE	6
	THIRD READING	PAGE	8
	POSTPONED CONSIDERATION	PAGE	13
	SECOND READING	PAGE	7
	SECOND READING	PAGE	37
	THIRD READING	PAGE	53
	SECOND READING	PAGE	40
	THIRD READING	PAGE	46
	CONCURRENCE	PAGE	100
	THIRD READING		18
	SECOND READING	PAGE	
ND 2505	THIRD READING	PAGE	7
ND-2090	OUT OF BECORD	PAGE	84
UB 2622	OUT OF RECORD SECOND READING	PAGE	54
		PAGE	82
ND-2032	THIRD READING RECALLED	PAGE	83
		PAGE	7
	SECOND READING	PAGE	7
HB-2009	THIRD READING SECOND READING	PAGE	27
HB-2900	THIRD READING	PAGE	80
HB-2900	THIRD READING	PAGE	116
	SECOND READING	PAGE	7
HB-304 I	THIRD READING	PAGE	26
	HELD ON SECOND	PAGE	119
	SECOND READING	PAGE	39
	THIRD READING	PAGE	80
	SECOND READING	PAGE	89
	RECALLED	PAGE	7
	THIRD READING	PAGE	119
	THIRD READING	PAGE	70
	SECOND READING	PAGE	93
	THIRD READING	PAGE	122
	SECOND READING	PAGE	54
	THIRD READING	PAGE	62
	SECOND READING	PAGE	40
	FIRST READING	PAGE	12
	FIRST READING	PAGE	12
	FIRST READING	PAGE	12
	FIRST READING	PAGE	11
	FIRST READING	PAGE	11
	FIRST READING	PAGE	12
	FIRST READING	PAGE	12
	FIRST READING	PAGE	12
	FIRST READING	PAGE	12
	FIRST READING	PAGE	12
SJR-0089	FILED	PAGE	13

SUBJECT MATTER

HOUSE TO ORDER	PAGE	1
SPEAKER DANIELS IN THE CHAIR	PAGE	1
PRAYER - PASTOR MIKE DRAKE	PAGE	1
PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE - REPRESENTATIVE JOHN TURNER	PAGE	1
ROLL CALL FOR ATTENDANCE	PAGE	2
SUPPLEMENTAL CALENDAR #1	PAGE	11

REPORT: TIFLDAY PAGE: 002

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

97/04/16 09:26:41

APRIL 17, 1996

SUBJECT MATTER

REPRESENTATIVE TIM JOHNSON IN THE CHAIR	PAGE	39
SPEAKER DANIELS IN THE CHAIR	PAGE	76
HOUSE ADJOURNED	PAGE	123
HOUSE PERFUNCTORY SESSION	PAGE	123
HOUSE PERFUNCTORY SESSION ADJOURNED	PAGE	123
GUEST - JIM DONAWALD, FORMER STATE SEN. & TREAS.	PAGE	11
GUEST - CONCERNED PARENTS GROUP FROM CENTRALIA	PAGE	13
GUEST - FORMER STATE SENATOR BOB MITCHLER	PAGE	76
GUEST - DISTRICT 89 SCHOOL	PAGE	76
GUEST - FORMER HOUSE MEMBER, TERRY STEZCO	PAGE	77