146th Legislative Day

December 3, 1997

- Speaker Daniels: "The House will come to order. The Members will please be in their chairs. All those not entitled to the Floor will please retire to the gallery. Speaker Daniels, in the Chair. Ladies and Gentlemen the Chaplain for the day is Pastor Dale Wilfong of the Sherman United Methodist Church in Sherman, Illinois. Pastor Wilfong is the guest of Representative Raymond Poe. Guests in the gallery may wish to rise for the invocation. Pastor Wilfong."
- Pastor Wilfong: "Shall we pray. Lord, God in our prayers for our great state. We remember especially the men and women who powerfully influence the life of society. Those who fashion our politics. Those who frame and administer our laws. Those who mold public opinion through the press, radio, and television. Those who write what many read. May all such recognize their responsibility to You and to the State of Illinois. That people may be influenced for what is good, not evil. What is true, not false. For the glory of Your name. Amen."
- Speaker Daniels: "Thank you, Pastor. We will be led in the Pledge of Allegiance by Representative Peter Roskam."
- Roskam et al: "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."
- Speaker Daniels: "Roll Call for Attendance. Representative Currie, is recognized on the Democratic side of the aisle for excused absences."
- Currie: "Thank you, Speaker. Please, let the records show that Representative Martinez, is excused because of illness. And Representative Morrow, is excused because yesterday his wife, Sherry, gave birth to their second child. A baby boy, Michael Seay Morrow, who weighted in at 5 pounds 145

- 146th Legislative Day

  Ounces and mom, baby and big brother are all doing very

  well."
- Speaker Daniels: "Our congratulation. Representative Cross, is recognized on the Republican side of the aisle for any excused absences."
- Cross: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If the record would please reflect that Representative Wojcik, is excused today.

  Thank you."
- Speaker Daniels: "The record will so reflect. Mr. Clerk, take the record. There are 114 answering the call and a quorum is present. The House will come to order. Committee Reports."
- Clerk Rossi: "Representative Churchill, Chairman from the Committee on Rules, to which the following Joint Action Motions were referred. Action taken on December 3, 1996, reported the same back, 'do approve' for consideration. Motions to accept the Amendatory Veto. Senate Bill 1122, Senate Bill 1425, and Senate Bill 1467. A Motion to override Amendatory Veto. Senate Bill 1440. To the Order of Third Reading, Senate Bill 1263. To the Order of Concurrence, House Bill 2735. A Motion to 'nonconcur' in House Bill 2735. To the Order of Second Reading, Senate Bill 1186."

Speaker Daniels: "Supplemental Calendar."

Clerk Rossi: "Supplemental Calendar #1 is being distributed."

Speaker Daniels: "Introductions."

Clerk Rossi: "Introductions and First Readings of House Bills.

House Bill 3771, offered by Representative Dart, a Bill for an Act to amend the State Finance Act. House Bill 3772, offered by Representative Schakowsky, a Bill for an Act to amend the Medical Practice Act. First Reading of these House Bills."

146th Legislative Day

- December 3, 1997
- Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Johnson in the Chair. On page 2, of the Regular Calendar under the Order of House Bill, Third Reading, appears House Bill 546. Mr. Clerk, what is the status of that Bill?"
- Clerk Rossi: "House Bill 546, is on the Order of House Bills, Third Reading."
- Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Please, return this Bill to the Order of Second Reading. Mr. Clerk, on page 2, of the Regular Calendar under the Order of Senate Bills, Third Reading appears Senate Bill 775. Mr. Clerk, what's the status of that Bill?"
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 775, is on the Order of Third Reading."

  Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Please, return the Bill to the Order of

  Second Reading. Mr. Clerk, Committee announcements."
- Clerk Rossi: "Rules Committee will meet at 1:00 p.m. in the Speaker's Conference Room. Rules Committee 11:00 p.m. Speaker's Conference Room."
- Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Can I have your attention, please. May I have the attention of the chamber, please? On page 3, of the Calendar under the Order of Amendatory Vetoes, appears Senate Bill 1122. And on that Bill, the Lady from DuPage, Representative Cowlishaw."
- Cowlishaw: "Thank you, very much, Mr. Speaker. If you would just give me one minute, please. I'll be right with you."
- Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Please, give the Lady your attention."
- Cowlishaw: "Well, thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I would like to begin by acknowledging that although I was asked if I would present this material for the Motion to accept the Amendatory Veto, I am not the first named House Sponsor of this Senate Bill. The first name Sponsor is, Michael Weaver, but since I was asked to do this and apparently the Motion to accept was filed by Representative Weaver. I

146th Legislative Day

December 3, 1997

will be glad to present the material. This is the Bill which requires nominees for General Assembly scholarships to be identified in a notarized document, so that the general public knows to whom these scholarships have been awarded. What the Amendatory Veto does, is to require the that that document includes the home address, the attending university degree program and the amount of tuition waiver..."

Speaker Johnson Tim: "Would you give the Lady your attention.

This is an important Bill and the chamber has risen to a level where it's hard to hear the Lady. Will you please, give Representative Cowlishaw, your attention?"

Cowlishaw: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Governor's Amendatory Veto, as I was saying, requires that there be included in this notarized document, the home address of the recipient of the scholarship, the attending universities degree program program in which that student is enrolled, amount of tuition waived, and affirmation that the home address of the nominee is in the Legislative District of the Legislator making the award. Also, provides that the State Board of Education shall revoke the scholarship if it finds after a hearing that the nominee knowingly provided false or misleading information on the waiver document and that such nominee shall reimburse for the amount of any tuition waived, prior to revocation. The Governor states that to provide full disclosure and to insure that students are, as currently required by law, residents of the District of the Legislator making the award, the address of the recipient and university should be provided. addition, the Governor points out that tuition varies considerably depending upon the degree program in which the student is enrolled. And he argues therefore, that the

146th Legislative Day

December 3, 1997

taxpayers should be aware of the cost of each waiver. I think those are reasonable changes to Senate Bill 1122, and so does it major Sponsor, State Representative Michael Weaver, to whom I am grateful for this opportunity to present the acceptance Motion. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, although both Representative Weaver and I, we'll be glad to answer any questions. Our Motion is to Accept the Governor's Amendatory Veto of Senate Bill 1122."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "On the Bill, the Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Dart."

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

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

Dart: "Representative, This Bill used to do quiet a few other things. Has that all been removed, and deals just with the scholarship now?"

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Cowlishaw."

Cowlishaw: "This Bill, at the moment applies only to General Assembly scholarship. That is correct."

Speaker, Johnson, Tim: "Representative Dart."

Dart: "What is exactly is the form that you're going to have the documents put on, as far as the notarize form? What exactly are those going to be and how are they going to be physically be done by a Legislator?"

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Cowlishaw."

Cowlishaw: "Representative Dart, I really apologize to you but I could not hear your question."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "I don't want to berate this comment, but if we could give the Lady and the Gentleman, your attention on this critical Bill. The Chair and I'm sure that the Member of the General Assembly would appreciate it. So, if we could have a breakup of the caucuses and a lowering of the din, so that we can hear the questions and answers, it

146th Legislative Day

December 3, 1997

would be most appreciated. Do you want to repeat the question, Representative Cowlishaw. You can repeat the answer or at least attempt to ascertain the question. It would be appreciated by the Chair and by the other Members of the House. Representative Dart."

Dart: "Thank you. What I was trying to find out, Representative. For legislative intent and for, I guess, all our benefit. Can you explain to us what exactly would be the form of this notarized document that we're going to have to submit now for Legislative Scholarships? So that...is that form going to be provided by somebody or how is this going to be done?"

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Cowlishaw."

Cowlishaw: "Thank you, Representative Dart, for your question because that is something I had neglected to explain. This Bill provides that there is to be a standardized form that all of us will use in providing this information and the Illinois Student Assistance Commission, is given the responsibility for creating and dispersing to all of us that standardized form."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Dart."

Dart: "Then once we receive the forms it is just incumbent on us, once we designated people to have it notarize by ourselves. Is this something where the individuals who are coming before us, who are going to be the recipients of the scholarships, are they going to individually have to be there when the notarization occurs?"

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Cowlishaw."

Cowlishaw: "The Legislator and those people who are actually going to receive those scholarship awards all...it is my understanding, although of course ISAC has not yet designed the form. All would be required to sign that the

146th Legislative Day

information is accurate. And then that form would have to be notarized."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Further questions? Representative Dart."

Dart: "Okay. So, just so I'm clear then. The form itself would be notarized. It wouldn't necessitate that the individual recipients all be present when documents are being notarized because sometimes, notarization is required in front of the different parties?"

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Cowlishaw."

Cowlishaw: "Representative Dart, I'm not a notary myself and so, I'm not sure but what...either I suppose you would have to make arrangements that all of your scholarship recipients and you, met together at the designated place by the notary and you all signed at the same time that the information in there is correct, and that form would then be notarized. But I would suppose that if you have a notary who is in one location, for one whole business day, that each of these individuals could come and go during the course of the day, each could sign and then the notary could notarize that at the end of the day."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Dart."

Dart: "Has any legal council examined this and questioned whether this violates the Buckley Act, the Federal Act at all?"

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Cowlishaw."

Cowlishaw: "It is my understanding from information provided for me by our staff. That the Illinois Stunds Assistance Commission has looked into that issue and has assured us that there will be no difficulties with the provisions of this Bill as Amendatorily Vetoed in keeping with the federal laws."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Dart. Representative Dart, you have 35 seconds for further questions."

146th Legislative Day

December 3, 1997

Dart: "Just one other question. One other question, as far as the scholarship being removed and requiring repayment if somebody lies about their...where they reside. Who does that and how is it enforced?"

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Cowlishaw."

Cowlishaw: "The Amendatory Veto provides that the State Board of Education may revoke the scholarship if it finds after a hearing that the nominee knowingly provided false or misleading information on the document."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "There being no further discussion? No, the Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Parke."

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

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

Parke: "Thank you. I have a number of school districts who have specific requests in here and I just want to double check with you, if you might be aware of the requests by school district 15, is in there and we've accommodated their concerns?"

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Cowlishaw."

Cowlishaw: "Representative Parke, this Bill, although it had some other things in it previously, now, has absolutely nothing in it except the Illinois General Assembly scholarships."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Parke."

Parke: "Thank you, for your answer."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Seeing or hearing no further discussion.

The question is, 'Shall the House accept the Governor's specific recommendations for change with respect to Senate Bill 1122?' 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?

146th Legislative Day

December 3, 1997

Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question there are 107 voting 'yes'; 3 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill, having received the Constitutional Majority, the Motion passes and the House does accept the Governor's specific recommendations for change regarding Senate Bill 1122. Continuing on the same Order of Business. Mr. Clerk, Senate Bill 1425. The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from McLean, Representative Brady. Representative Brady on the Bill."

- Brady: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House."
- Johnson, Tim: "Again could we give the Gentleman your attention?

  Proceed."
- Bradv: "Senate Bill 1425, as you may recall last year, provided prohibited language which insurance companies discriminating against victims in domestic violence. The Governor in his Amendatory Veto pointed out, that one of the provisions allowed for...them to discriminate if the owner of the policy, of a life policy, a health policy or disability policy, was, in fact, the perpetrator. The Governor indicated that we should cleanup the language to only indicate that they could not offer authorize insurance if the perpetrator were the owner of a life policy only. I think the Governor has made a wise discussion here and I ask for your support."
- Johnson, Tim: "On the Bill, The Chair recognizes the Lady from Cook, Representative Ronen. Representative Ronen, proceed."
- Ronen: "Thank you, Speaker. I wish to rise in very strong opposition to this Bill. Let's be very clear. This Bill is not what it purports to be. This Bill is a wolf in sheep's clothing. This is not about protecting victims,

146th Legislative Day

December 3, 1997

this is taking away rights to victims. And all the women's groups, the Illinois Women's Bar, the Chicago Metropolitan Better Women's network, many other groups, I will list them when I'm finished, are opposing this Bill because of Insurance discrimination against domestic violence victims is a real issue. It's not theoretical. There are examples everywhere. In Illinois, a survey conducted by the Illinois Department of Insurance, found that nearly half the insurance companies surveyed would use underlying health conditions caused by domestic violence in their underwriting process. And more than 14% admitted they currently use an applicant history of domestic abuse in determining whether to issue a policy. So, the problem is very real. This is not a theoretical issue that we're talking about. Battered women suffer enough trauma at the hands of their abuser and it's outrageous that this law them to be further abused by insurance would permit practice. But that's exactly what this Bill does. Listen This Bill has many, many problems. very carefully. most serious concern is that it permits insurance companies to refuse to insure, limit the amount of coverage or charge a different rate based upon an abuse-related conditions. This means that they are permitted to charge more, or not to cover the cost of an injury received at the hands of an While there may be legitimate business reasons to not cover preexisting conditions, the way that this Bill is drafted, increases the potential that insurance companies exception as a basis for will use this try to discriminating against victims of abuse. Now, if the Sponsors of this Bill were serious, there are ways that they could have addressed the problem. First they could have eliminated the exception all together. Or the second

146th Legislative Day

December 3, 1997

way, was to use a way that was recommended by the National Association of Insurance Commissioners, which is made up of commissioners of all 50 states and the District of Columbia in model legislation that they developed. The National Association of Insurance Commissioners requires certain safeguards be built-in if this exception is not there. They're very specific about it. They have model This Bill does not follow any of those Legislation. safeguards. Does not include any of the safeguards. say to you, that fact makes it clear that what this Bill is all about, is not protecting victims of domestic violence. Sponsors of this Bill might believe...might have their hearts in the right place and might be wishing to do that, but every group that I reviewed this with these past weeks, my phone has been ringing off the hook. The Illinois The Illinois Women's Health Women's Bar Association. Coalition. The Chicago Advisory of Council on Women. Illinois Caucus on Adolescent Health. Illinois Now. Women's Bar Association of Illinois. Women Employed institute. The Chicago Women's Aids Project. The Alliance for Women in the Law of the Chicago Bar Association. All of these groups, look at this and say, 'this is not a This is not going to help victims. This, in fact, Bill. might be taking us in a backward mode.' So, I ask all my colleagues to think very carefully about this. And those who wish to help address a problem, a real problem, I think the only appropriate vote is to...appropriate votes is to vote 'no' or vote 'present'. This Bill is a step backward a significant step backward. Women's groups are united in that feeling and I think we ought to listen to them and be very careful. The fact that we're not even following the National Association of Insurance Commissioners model,

146th Legislative Day

December 3, 1997

tells us that we're in trouble here and we're not doing the right thing. So, I ask all my colleagues to look very carefully at what we're doing here and to please, please vote 'no', or vote 'present'."

- Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Thank you. Further discussion? The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Lang."
- Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, it's even louder in here than it usually is."
- Speaker Johnson, Tim: "It is. You're right, Representative Lang.

  Please give Representative Lang and Representative Brady,

  and everybody else the courtesy now at this point of the

  Session in listening to the questions and answers.

  Representative Lang, your request is very reasonable.

  Please direct your attention to the Gentleman from Cook,

  Representative Lang. Proceed."
- Lang: "Thank you. And might I have my time back, Sir?"
- Speaker Johnson, Tim: "You may have your time back and more, if you want."
- No, that won't be necessary. Ladies and Lanq: "Thank you. Gentlemen of the House, I rise in opposition to the Motion. Not because I disagree with what the Governor did, because this is a Bill that we should have not passed in the first place. It's a Bill that got through here as we thought it dealt with the issue of battered women and insurance companies. And we thought we were doing a good thing for battered women. We thought we were doing the right thing. But if you take a good look at the Bill, this was a Bill that never should have passed this chamber or the other chamber. And the Governor should have vetoed it all together after he realized our mistake. This Bill it attempts to resolve. creates more problems than would allow insurance companies to question applicants

146th Legislative Day

December 3, 1997

regarding their condition and would allow them to set rates based on some perceived risk. So, that if you were a battered women and you went for some coverage and you made They could ask you about that and they could ask you about the potential for you being abused again. you about the potential for you being battered again and perhaps after some investigation, if they felt that the battered might do it again, might raise you rates. Well, this creates a worse problem than we started with. If the goal of the Bill was to create a situation that would prohibit insurance companies from discriminating against battered women, we have created the exactly the opposite We have created a situation which would problem here. encourage them to encourage...to discriminate battered women because it will raise their insurance rates. It will violate their right to privacy and other sorts of issues. The Bill also provides insurance companies with blanket immunity for civil or criminal liability if they discriminate against battered women. Now, why should we be about the business in this chamber of providing blanket immunity to anyone who discriminates against any citizen in our society? That's a flaw in the Bill and very dangerous flaw. There are several other problems with this Bill but I wanted to key in on those. And I want to indicate to you that this is a good time just to kill this Bill by refusing to accept the Amendatory Veto. And if the Sponsor later chooses to just override, we can be in a position of putting this Bill to rest where it belongs. Because as I say...it does create more problems that it solves. Ιt stopping insurance companies from of would instead discriminating against battered women, would encourage them to do that. That's not what we're here for. If the intent

146th Legislative Day

December 3, 1997

of the Bill was to protect battered women, to make sure that they get insurance coverage, this Bill won't do it. And, so, I urge you to help us rectify the mistake we made when we passed this Bill the first time. The Senate passed it overwhelmingly. We passed it overwhelmingly. We were in error and we're old enough to recognize when we make a mistake. This is the time to correct that mistake and therefore, I would recommend, 'no', or 'present' votes."

- Speaker Johnson, Tim: "The Chair recognizes the Lady from Cook, Representative Schakowsky. Proceed. Representative Schakowsky, you were recognized. Do you wish to proceed? Apparently you don't. Seeing or hearing no further discussion. Representative Brady to close."
- Brady: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would remind this Body that this passed with 98 'yea' votes. It also passed unanimously in the Senate on the Amendatory Veto. The Amendatory Veto does make it a better Bill. In fact, the previous speaker voted 'yes' for it and agreed that it made a better Bill. I have a letter here from the Illinois Coalition Against Domestic Violence, in full support of this Bill as amended. Signed by Vicky Smith, Executive Director. This is, maybe not the whole step, but it's definitely a positive step to helping victims of domestic violence. I urge your continued support."
- Speaker Johnson, Tim: "The question is, 'Shall the House accept the Governor's specific recommendation for charge with respect to Senate Bill 1425?' 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 50 voting 'yes'; 61 voting 'no', 3 voting 'present'.

146th Legislative Day

- December 3, 1997
- Representative Brady, do you wish Postponed Consideration?"
  Brady: "Yes, Sir."
- Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Your request is granted. The Bill will be put on the Order of Postponed Consideration. On page 3 of the Calendar on the Order of Amendatory Veto, appears Senate Bill 1467. The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Kendall, Representative Cross."
- Cross: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is up on a Motion to accept the Governor's Amendatory Veto and I would encourage and urge a 'yes' vote. Thank you."
- Speaker Johnson, Tim: "On the Bill. The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Dart."
- Dart: "Yes. Can you explain what this Bill is?"
- Speaker Johnson, Tim: "I couldn't hear your question and I don't think the Sponsor could either. Do you want to repeat it?"
- Dart: "Yeah, because I couldn't hear. Could he explain the Bill?"
- Speaker Johnson, Tim: "If everybody in the chamber wants to not understand the questions or the answers continue the din.

  If you want to hear the questions and the answers, please listen to Representative Dart and Representative Cross.

  Representative Dart, do you want to try again?"
- Dart: "Yes. Can the Sponsor explain what the Bill does and what the Amendatory Veto does?"
- Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Cross."
- Cross: "Yes. Thank you, for the question, Representative Dart.

  Contains none of the language that Representative Brady's

  Bill had in it. And...but it does...actually the

  Amendatory Veto is very simple, Tom. We amended the curfew

  Section. If you'll look at the original Bill, the Child

  Curfew Act, and we set as minimum curfew amount to be...to

  fine someone for a petty offense at \$100. The Governor

146th Legislative Day

December 3, 1997

The Governor felt like the minimum should stay at \$10, which is where it had been. And his amendatory language was very simple. It reduced...put the minimum from 100, back to 10, and that's all it did. The other part of the Bill dealt with clouding title, which the Governor did not make any changes at all. But with the whole area of people intentionally clouding title or filing liens and some of the groups actually in the Sangamon County area, the posse comitatus, I don't know if you're familiar with them. They were filing liens against property. That part is...remains the same, and I think I've explained it as well as I can, but I will try to answer other questions if you have them."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Dart."

Dart: "Thanks Tom, that was right on target. One other thing that I was going to ask you, it deletes the home rule preemption as well? How would that effect the Bill?"

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Cross."

Cross: "Yes, thank you, and I apologize for not adding that. The Governor felt like, and I think he was right in reading his amendatory language. It deleted the home rule preemption that we had in the original Bill, which I think it did. There was a great deal of opposition after the Bill passed the General Assembly from municipalities, including the tried City of Chicago. And he to honor municipalities, and he did by deleting the home rule preemption from this...this Bill. So, that is additional thing that he did, but it's something that everyone wanted."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "From Ottawa, Representative Dart."

Dart: "Nothing further. Thanks."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative

146th Legislative Day

December 3, 1997

Lang. Representative Lang. Not seeking recognition. Hearing or seeing no further discussion. The Gentleman from Kendall, Representative Cross, to close."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I would appreciate a 'yes' vote." Speaker Johnson, Tim: "The question is, 'Shall the House accept the Governor's specific recommendations for change with respect to Senate Bill 1467?' 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 111 voting 'yes'; 0 voting 'no', or 'present'. This Bill, having received the requisite Constitutional Majority, Motion passes and the House accepts the Governor's specific recommendation for change with respect to Senate Bill 1467. On page 3, of the Calendar, under the Order of Concurrence, appears House Bill 2702. And on that Bill the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Kubik, is recognized. Representative Kubik."

Kubik: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would move to nonconcur in the Senate Amendments to House Bill 2702."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Dart."

Dart: "Yes. This is a nonconcurrence? Can you explain why you're moving to nonconcur?"

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "...Kubik."

Kubik: "I think that there are some items in there that we'd like to discussed further, before we put it in its final form."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Dart, is that all?"

Dart: "The United Mine Workers, do they have a position on this, one way or the other?"

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Kubik."

146th Legislative Day

December 3, 1997

Kubik: "They haven't spoken to me."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "No further questions. The question is...Representative Dart, do you have further questions?

I'm sorry."

Dart: "Just one. The Coal Association have they said anything about this Bill either?"

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Kubik."

Kubik: "They haven't spoken to me."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Dart. No further questions. Representative Kubik, has moved to nonconcur in Senate Amendments to House Bill 2702. Those in favor will signify by saying 'aye', those opposed by saying 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the House does nonconcur in Senate Amendments to House Bill 2702. Under the Order of Supplemental Calendar #1, House Calendar Supplemental #1, under the Order of Concurrence appears House Bill 2735. And on that Bill, the Chair recognizes the Lady from McHenry, Representative Hughes."

Hughes: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to nonconcur with Senate Amendment #1, to House Bill 2735."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Any discussion? Representative Dart."

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

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

Dart: "Representative, can you explain to us what the Amendment is that you are nonconcurring to?"

Hughes: "The Amendment that we're moving to nonconcur with has to do with agenda items, and how they get placed on township...for the township annual meetings. There's some technical concerns here that we wish to address in Conference Committee Report and would also anticipate...there is one other technical cleanup relative to a township matter as well, that we wanted to place on

146th Legislative Day

December 3, 1997

this Bill."

- Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Dart."
- Dart: "So, is it fair to say then that the reason you're putting this in conference is purely for technical cleanup of the original Bill and not dump new things in to it?"
- Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Hughes."
- Hughes: "The reason is for technical matters. There's one...there is one item that we will be adding to this Bill, which is a technical cleanup of statutes as they exist. It is not a substantive change and it is something to which there is no opposition, but it is a new issue on this Bill. And I can't...I'm caught here without my folder as to what that is."
- Speaker Johnson, Tim: "No further questions. Oh, the Lady from Cook, Representative Fantin."
- Fantin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
- Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Indicates she will. Please, give Representative Fantin and Representative Hughes your attention. Representative Fantin, proceed."
- Fantin: "Representative...how does this affect pay deadline. Was this the Bill that, said that they had to specify the pay before...?"
- Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Hughes, has indicated that she can't hear your question. I can't either and neither can most of the Members of the House. Please, Ladies and Gentlemen, give Representative Fantin and Representative Hughes the courtesy of your attention. Representative Fantin."
- Fantin: "Representative, was this the Bill that specified that pay must be, the pay deadline was before elections of all officers, including the assessors?

146th Legislative Day

December 3, 1997

And what is the change?"

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Hughes."

Hughes: "This is the Bill that addressed that issue and that portion of the Bill would not be changed from the form it was in when we voted on it, here in the House. It would stipulate that township assessors salaries would be set no later than 150 days, prior to the election. That would place them in conformity with all other local officials."

Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Fantin."

- Fantin: "Due to a conflict, I will refrain from voting on this.

  Thank you."
- Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Seeing no further discussion.

  Representative Hughes, has moved to nonconcur in Senate

  Amendments to House Bill 2735. Those in favor signify by
  saying 'aye', those opposed by saying 'no'. In the opinion
  of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it and the House does
  nonconcur in Senate Amendments to House Bill 2735. In the
  gallery, as guests of Representative Gwenn Klingler, are
  the 3rd and 4th grade students of Carl Sandburg School,
  Springfield."
- Clerk McLennand: "Rules Committee will meet immediately in the Speaker's Conference Room. Rules Committee will meet immediately in the Speaker's Conference Room."
- Speaker Johnson, Tim: "Representative Biggert, in the Chair."
- Clerk McLennand: "The Rules Committee will meet immediately in the Speaker's Conference Room. Rules Committee meeting immediately in the Speaker's Conference Room."
- Speaker Daniels: "Committee announcements. Members of the House will you please, give your attention to the Clerk's well here so, you can listen to the committee announcements."
- Clerk Rossi: "The following Committees will meet this afternoon.

  At 3:00 p.m. in D-1, Counties and Townships. At 3:30 p.m.

#### 146th Legislative Day

December 3, 1997

- in 114, Executive. Also at 3:30 p.m. in C-1, Registration and Regulation. At 4:30 p.m. in D-1, Judiciary Criminal. At 5:00 p.m. in 114, Transportation and Motor Vehicles. For Wednesday, December 4, the following Committees will meet in the morning. At 8:30 a.m. the Appropriation Public Safety Committee will meet in Room 118. And at 9:00 a.m. the Health Care Committee will meet in 118. Also, at 9:00 a.m. Elementary Education Committee will meet in C-1. And the Civil Law Judiciary Committee will meet in D-1. We're going to be passing out a sheet that will show today's Committees, momentarily."
- Speaker Daniels: "Speaker Daniels, in the Chair. Ladies and Gentlemen, we're pleased to have with us from the Grayslake School and with their teacher, Mike Demodeo here in the gallery. So welcome them to Springfield to join us. Representative Brunsvold."
- Brunsvold: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Democrats have requested a conference."
- Speaker Daniels: "And I understand that you've asked for 45 minutes."
- Brunsvold: "That...that would be fine."
- Speaker Daniels: "Okay. The Democrats will go caucus in Room 118, for 45 minutes. We'll then kick in the Committee schedule which starts at 3:00 p.m. The House will stand in recess until 6:00 p.m. We will return in Session at 6:00 p.m. We have some very important legislation yet to accomplish today. So, we will return here to the chambers at 6:00 p.m. this evening. The House is now in recess until 6:00 p.m."
- Clerk McLennand: "Attention Members of the House of Representatives, due to the delay in Committee meetings, the House will delay convening until 6:30 p.m."

146th Legislative Day

December 3, 1997

- Speaker Churchill: "The House will come to order. The House will come to order. Will all unauthorized people please, leave the Floor? Committee Reports."
- Clerk Rossi: "Committee Representative Stephens, Reports. Chairman from the Committee on Executive, to which the following Joint Action Motions were referred, action taken on December 3, 1996, reported the same back, 'do approve' for consideration. Floor Amendment #2, to Senate Bill 1186. Conference Committee Report #1, to Senate Bill 1766, and Floor Amendment #2, to Senate Bill 503. Representative Saviano, Chairman from the Committee from Registration and Regulations, to which the following Joint Action Motion were referred, action taken on December 3, 1996, reported the same back 'do approve' for consideration. Conference Committee Report #1, to House Bill 632. Representative Wait, Chairman from the Committee on Transportation, to which the following Amendment was referred, action taken on December 3, 1996, reported the same back with the following recommendations; 'Do approve' for consideration, Floor Amendment #4, to Senate Bill 775. Representative Hughes, Chairman from the Committee on Counties and Townships, which the following Bill was referred, action taken on December 3, 1996, reported the same back with the following recommendations: 'Do pass as amended, Short Debate' House Bill 3734."
- Speaker Churchill: "Representative Churchill in the Chair. On the Order...on Supplemental Calendar #1, Senate Bills, Second Reading. Mr. Clerk, please read Senate Senate Bill 1186."
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 1186, a Bill for an Act amending the Illinois Aeronautics Act. Second Reading of this House (sic-Senate) Bill. Amendment #1, was adopted in committee.

146th Legislative Day

December 3, 1997

No Motions have been filed. Floor Amendment #2, offered by Speaker Daniels, has been approved for consideration."

Speaker Churchill: "On Floor Amendment #2, the Speaker of the House, Speaker Daniels."

Daniels: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, authorizes the Illinois Department Transportation to acquire and operate Meigs Field on its current site on Northerly Island in Lake Michigan. Despite its small size, Meigs Field is an important economic asset for the entire State of Illinois. Located just five minutes from downtown Chicago, Meigs services thousands of business travelers each year. In fact, as recently as 1991, Chicago Park District, itself, estimated that Meigs annually creates \$72 million in economic development for the State of Illinois. Meigs is also the only viable downtown heliport for emergency medical services, organ donor flights and emergency coast guard operations. result, preserving Meigs advances not only the economy of Illinois but the safety of our citizens. Some will say that this legislation tramples upon local control. While, I, along with some of the other Members on this side of the aisle, am proud to be at the forefront of a fight for local control over many important issues, Meigs Field is simply not a matter of local autonomy. The land on which Meigs is located was given to the City of Chicago by the State of Illinois and was expanded with the state's approval the expressed condition that the land be used as an airport development. In the years since, the State of Illinois has provided millions of dollars for improvement at Meigs Field. Meigs is truly a state-local partnership, which the City of Chicago has now decided, unilaterally, to dissolve. We as Legislators for the entire State of Illinois, cannot

146th Legislative Day

December 3, 1997

permit one municipality to disrupt air travel for the entire state, anymore than we could allow a single county or city to disrupt ground transportation by attempting to designate a portion of a highway within their boundaries for some other purpose. For all the citizens of Illinois, I urge a favorable vote on Senate Bill 1186. Mr. Speaker, I move for the adoption of Amendment #2. I'd be pleased to answer any questions."

Speaker Churchill: "Is there any discussion? The Chair recognizes the Lady from Cook, Representative Erwin."

Erwin: "Thank you, Speaker. With all due respect, Speaker, I'm a little surprised actually, that this is coming up tonight. It just seems to me that as one who has used Meigs Field since 1978, I am not sure we're talking about the same airport. For many of us who have used that airport, it has been a virtual ghost town. To in any way indicate that this little airport, which we used to say was really sort of a pretend airport, to in any way indicate that this is tied to the economic livelihood of Chicago or our seems ridiculous to me. The City of Chicago has a good, viable, and I must say improving in-city airport, Midway Airport. Ιt is critical that Midway be improved, as the city has planned. We have mass transit to Midway Airport. And the truth of the matter is, as most of the people in this room know tonight, many, many times, sometimes 50% of the year, we are going to Midway Airport instead of Meigs. The long and short of it is, we care about the economic livelihood of our city. It is why there are many of us who are so concerned about preserving our lakefront and too, in fact, enhancing and improving our lakefront so that not only Chicagoans but all of you can come and use our lakefront. The plan for Northerly Island is an exciting

146th Legislative Day

December 3, 1997

one which will enhance education and learning for children throughout the state and indeed, the country, since many of the visitors that come to our city are from not only other states but also other countries. I urge a strong 'no' vote on this, with all due respect to the disagreements that the Governor may have with the Mayor. It seems to me in this chamber ought to be figuring out how we can work together to meet the needs of all the regions of state. We care about the transportation needs of downstate Illinois. It's why we spend billions of dollars on roads. It is why we bailed out AMTRAK. It is why we are enhancing Metro and the RTA. The transportation needs of every region of this state are critical. But let us not, for petty and political reasons divert our energies to only will have no impact on the transportation needs of this state and have no impact the economic needs of this state, but divert our attentions to silly things that really only heighten the volume of petty and personal disagreements. Let us be above this. Let's vote 'no' on this and move on to more constructive, positive ways to meet the needs of every region of this state."

Speaker Churchill: "Further discussion? The Lady from Cook, Representative Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. I'm put my cards on the table. I've been a Meigs Field frequent flyer, but when it comes to the sense of this Amendment to Senate Bill 1186, I have to tell you, I'm strongly for a park. I'm strongly for local control. Meigs Field has lost 40% of its passengers over the last 15 years. A tiny handful of people with activities at McCormick Place, a tiny percentage of our downtown business people use Meigs

146th Legislative Day

December 3, 1997

Field. They're a tiny elite, that's who we're talking about, using Meigs Field today. in fact, we have And another airport in the City of Chicago, Midway Airport, not much farther away from downtown than Meigs Field. it that the only commercial carrier out of Meigs Field flies only to Springfield? The answer is, the frequent flyers at Meigs Field are not the corporate executives, they're not the McCormick Place users, they're state government employees and Springfield lobbyists. For this, we should turn our backs on the principle of local control and the opportunity to finish with the last in the crown that is the lakefront park system of the City of Chicago. We're lucky in Chicago, because unlike other Great Lake Cities, Cleveland, Toronto, we didn't turn our downtown lakefront over to commercial and industrial use. We have a beautiful park system and the 90 acres that today is Meigs, if that were turned into the kind of park the City of Chicago envisions, we would extend and finish the vision of Daniel Burnhan. Is there a trade off? Of course there's a trade off, but the vast number of people of Chicago and of Illinois will get more value from park land than they do from Meigs Field. Finally, Speaker and Members of this House, there is a very important issue of local control. If we, the state, can take these 90 acres, 90 acres that were not ceded to the City of Chicago by the State of Illinois. These were Chicago acres to begin with. If we can take these 90 acres, which 90 acres of yours can't we take as well? There is a strong precedent set by this legislation and I would have thought every Member of this House who values local control, who talks about the people governing best, where the people governed closest, every Member of this House should be turning down

146th Legislative Day

December 3, 1997

this Amendment, should be turning down this Bill. This is a silly issue. It's a waste of our time and if we care about not only local control, but the opportunity for a major parkland in the City of Chicago, without major disservice to air traffic and air control, the right vote is a 'no' vote."

Speaker Churchill: "For further discussion, the Gentleman from Clinton, Representative Granberg."

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

Speaker Churchill: "He indicates he will. Please proceed."

Granberg: "Mr. Daniels, we're going to debate this Bill on Third Reading, so I will forgo some of that discussion but, one question on the Amendment itself. You said this will give the state the ability to take that property by eminent domain. Will the state then have to pay reasonable compensation to the park district for the taking of that property?"

Speaker Churchill: "Speaker Daniels."

Daniels: "Representative Granberg, we're not taking this by eminent domain."

Speaker Churchill: "Representative Granberg."

Granberg: "So, on the context of the Amendment, Mr. Daniels, the state would just forcibly operate Meigs Field? They would not actually, there is no taking of the property?"

Speaker Churchill: "Speaker Daniels."

Daniels: "We are taking the property through a transfer. It is not through eminent domain procedures; therefore, no compensation need to be paid because the State of Illinois and this Authority has the sovereign power and has the authority of property within its jurisdiction to exercise that sovereignty. As you know from a student of government yourself, you realize that all local units of government

146th Legislative Day

December 3, 1997

are subject to the will of the General Assembly. Now where we desire to be very careful in the exercise of that power, it has only been used on very rare occasions, such as the Toll Highway Authority, such as certain instances of state highways, in which in some cases, like in the City of Chicago, we may have a highway, but the property under that highway is still owned by the City of Chicago. Now if Chicago were to try to exercise its right over the closure of that highway, we would step in and then take the transfer of power over that highway. It's the same factor here in the airport. We do not need to exercise eminent domain in accordance with case law and rulings by the Illinois Supreme Court. We are doing this through a transfer of power based upon a sovereignty as it exercises power over a unit under its control."

Speaker Churchill: "Representative Granberg."

Granberg: "So this would not be a public taking. Your argument is that a exercise of that sovereign power, even though the property does belong to the City of Chicago. So there...in that case, no compensation must be paid to the city for the actual use and taking of the property, since in your words, it is a transfer."

Speaker Churchill: "Speaker Daniels."

Daniels: "Well let me emphasize. The history of this property started with the State of Illinois granting the property to the City of Chicago. It was approximately a half or a third of its current property. We then expanded that with the wishes and grants from the City of Chicago was expanded and landfill was added, and they then in 1947 asked for permission to build piling and then to expand the runway for the creation of the airport, which the State of Illinois allowed. So from the very start, this has been a

146th Legislative Day

December 3, 1997

state-owned property that they have granted to the City of Chicago, and we treated this as a partnership for the operation of an airport. It was when the city has unilaterally attempted to close this airport that has now been determined, and this General Assembly will decide whether or not it's an asset to the people of the State of Illinois to keep it open. If they decide that, then the transfer would go to the people...all of the people of the State of Illinois."

Speaker Churchill: "Representative Granberg."

Granberg: "Well, my concern is...are two, Representative, just on Second Reading. First of all, the city owns the property and whether we do it in Chicago, we can do it in Centralia or Carbondale or any place else. And secondly, if there is no compensation to be paid, to me that would cause to be some concern as a terrible precedent to set against our municipalities downstate or anywhere...or located anywhere else in the State of Illinois. Because everyone is entitled to compensation, except for use of that sovereign To arbitrarily go in and tell a municipality that they are going to take over that property, and they will not be reimbursed for the reasonable cost of that property, I think is a gross exercise, a gross abuse, of state power. So I appreciate the Gentleman's comments, and I would like to debate the Bill on Third Reading, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Churchill: "Further discussion? The Lady from Cook, Representative Davis."

Davis, M.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to ask this question. If the state..."

Speaker Churchill: "The Gentleman will yield."

Davis, M.: "All right, has the state taken control of any other airports in the State of Illinois?"

146th Legislative Day

December 3, 1997

Speaker Churchill: "Speaker Daniels."

Daniels: "Well first of all, we know of no instance in which a city has unilaterally attempted to close an airport without the permission or granted authority. Secondly, we know of no other instance in which this has happened before. So the answer to your question would be, 'no', they have not attempted to do this."

Speaker Churchill: "Representative Davis."

Davis, M.: "Well, to the issue. I personally feel great offense on behalf of the taxpayers in Chicago, as well as in the State of Illinois. If there is land at an airport in the city that was used for the convenience of those in the city or in the state, and at some point, because of the change in need, the city should have the right to decide how that property will be used. This Bill would set an extremely dangerous precedent for all of your districts, because if at any time there is something in your area that the Governor feels should remain or should change, if he has the votes in Springfield, he would merely come and try and change the law, irregardless to the feelings of the taxpayer. Now, one of the major issues here is, this will be a court battle. Taxpayers are going to pay the lawyers. We don't need need this battle. You know I could understand it better if Meigs were the only airport in Chicago. Meigs is one of two major airports. We have Midway Airport; we have O'Hare Field, and I see absolutely no reason for the will of the few to be imposed upon the will of the many. Now because you have the many or the most in Springfield does not mean that you actually have the most when we talk of taxpayers. Because the majority of those who use that airport and taxpayers in Chicago, they outnumber all of us here in Springfield. There are...It's a large number, a

146th Legislative Day

December 3, 1997

large pool of taxpayers in Chicago who have a right, constitutionally, by the Illinois State Constitution to decide how that land will be used. It's home rule. I'm really surprised at this kind of aggressive, aggressive move to have one's will supersede the will of those who pay the bills. I am appalled, and I speak for the taxpayers in I am truly appalled that this play really my district. has come to the fore. I would be ashamed to say to all of those in Chicago that your will is not as important as mine. Your home rule rights no longer will exist, because for the moment, for the moment, at this point in time, I have the majority in Springfield. It is only for the moment and shortly that moment will pass. I feel that a grasp for control of local entities should be a wake-up call and a warning to all of those who reside in the State of Illinois that at any point, your powers, your home rule powers, could be - what shall we say, overtaken. There could be a quick take action by the Governor. I'm truly ashamed. I really thought that the people who would be elected to an executive office would have much more regard for the large group of taxpayers in the State of Illinois. The taxpayers in Chicago are outraged; they're appalled that their will is no longer important, but the will of 60 people here in Springfield will supersede that majority that resides in Chicago. That super majority in Chicago that has to be concerned with traffic, with crime, schools, I really wish that each of us would consider the taxpayer. Even when we have to pay those big lawyer bills, it's coming out of the taxpayer's pocket. Woe be unto you."

Speaker Churchill: "Further discussion? The Lady from Sangamon, Representative Klingler."

146th Legislative Day

December 3, 1997

Klingler: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in strong support of this Bill, not only for the reasons that are stated, but...but because of the tremendous impact that this...the closing of Meigs would have in the City of Springfield. The Capital Airport has 23% of its total employment just going to Meigs Field. And at this point from October, compared to October a year ago, we've seen a 30% reduction in traffic. It's estimated that Springfield Airport will lose over \$200 thousand a year from the loss of revenue from the closing of Meigs Field alone. also take strong issue with the statements that have been made on the other side of the aisle that this is only used for state workers and lobbyists. And I'd like to read a brief paragraph from an infectious disease specialist that works very closely with Public Aid, the Department of Public Aid, on infectious disease issues and including the AIDS Task Force, who travels frequently to Chicago without any compensation to work on these very important issues. And this letter states, 'With the recent closing of Meigs, I have found it impossible to participate in the Drug and Therapeutic Joint Committee of the Illinois State Medical Society and the Illinois Department of Public Health. case in point concerns the upcoming meeting at noon on October 16, 1996.' And he mentioned how originally he was only able to miss a half a day of his infectious disease patients. With the closing, it would have meant a whole And then he goes on to continue, 'The net result of the closure of the airport is that the statewide work that is scheduled for Chicago will have necessity preclude participation by consultants from Springfield. Not only is this true for my committee, but it surely must be true of all work in state government and in the other business that

146th Legislative Day

December 3, 1997

is transacted in Chicago.' I think it's very important to keep this important and vital transportation link open, and I urge all Members to support this Bill."

- Speaker Churchill: "Ladies and Gentlemen, if we could pay attention to those who are engaged in the debate. Further discussion? The Lady from Cook, Representative Flowers."
- Flowers: "Mr. Speaker, will the Gentleman yield?"
- Speaker Churchill: "He indicates that he will yield. Please proceed."
- Flowers: "How many votes will this take to pass, Sir?"
- Speaker Churchill: "Are you asking a parliamentary question or are you asking the Speaker of the House about the Bill?"
- Flowers: "I'm asking a parliamentary question. How many votes will it take for this to pass?"
- Speaker Churchill: "This is an Amendment. This is an Amendment, so the majority of those voting on the Amendment will pass the Amendment."
- The Northerly Island proposal Flowers: "Mr. ... To the Bill. places children and families first in Chicago's priority. It provides a natural setting for children to learn about the wildlife and enjoy the benefit of some of the major museums in the United States. Studies have clearly shown that children learn to be more peaceful and respectful of nature and all its creatures when they are exposed to natural settings like the one proposed in Northerly Island. as the children of DuPage County enjoy Morton Auditorium, the children of Chicago deserve such rich experience as well. Instead, we are faced with placing concrete ahead of children's needs. This is ironic in light of the fact that this Governor began his first term with the promise of placing children ahead of concrete. After all, what is it? Another 30 minutes out of an

146th Legislative Day

- December 3, 1997
- adult's way to go to Midway as opposed to Meigs. And I would urge for the defeat of this Amendment. Thank you."
- Speaker Churchill: "There being no further discussion, Speaker Daniels has moved for the adoption of Floor Amendment #2.

  All those in favor say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'nay'.

  In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it and the Amendment is adopted. Are there any further Amendments?"
- Clerk Rossi: "No further Amendments have been approved for consideration."
- Speaker Churchill: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, please read Senate Bill 1186 on Third Reading."
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 1186, a Bill for an Act amending the Illinois Aeronautics Act. Third Reading of this Senate Bill."
- Speaker Churchill: "The Gentleman from DuPage, Speaker Daniels."
- Daniels: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is Third Reading on Senate Bill 1186, which transfers ownership of Meigs Field and the land on which is located to the State of Illinois - That is all the people, in every part, in every section in the State of Illinois on June 1, 1997. This Bill will require 60 votes in which to pass, since the effective date is June 1, 1997. conveyance from a local government to the state will require state compensation. Property held by a no political subdivision in this state is deemed to be held in the name of the people of the State of Illinois, per People versus Deathridge in the Illinois Supreme Court ruling. authorizes the Illinois Department of Transportation, who will be the operator of the airport, to contract with a private firm to operate the Meigs Field Airport. Funding necessary for the airport operations will be paid from airport user fees. All funds received from

146th Legislative Day

December 3, 1997

operations will be deposited and in turn paid from the General Revenue Fund. No Road Funds, and I emphasize, Road Funds will be utilized to operate Meigs Field. The Act finds that Meigs Field Airport is a critical component of Chicagoland's air transportation system. The Act also finds that air travelers cannot be adequately serviced by other existing Chicagoland airports; and therefore, it is an important policy to the State of Illinois to keep Meigs Field open and operating. Meigs Field is used 90% of the time for business purposes, creating an estimated \$80 million in economic benefits to the people of the State of Illinois and the Chicagoland area. Meigs is also heavily utilized by hospital emergency room facilities because of its heliport and access to Chicagoland hospitals. the Chicago Park District itself prepared a report in 1991 to the Federal Government saying that closure of Meigs Field would create an economic loss to the Chicagoland area of approximately \$72 million. The Illinois Department of Transportation may also regulate Meigs Field land usage, including building codes, zoning regulations and safety issues. Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, move for the adoption of Senate Bill 1186 and in so doing, recognize that its usage, its facility, its benefits of economic development to all the people of the State of Illinois requires this action of the General Assembly."

Speaker Churchill: "Representative Lang, did you have a parliamentary question before we begin debate?"

Lang: "Yes, I do. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As I understand the Illinois Constitution, the Illinois Constitution requires that every passage of a Bill on Third Reading, first requires that a Bill be read on this floor in final form on three separate days. Would you please tell me if I'm

- 146th Legislative Day

  understanding the Constitution correctly, and if I am, has that been done, Sir?"
- Speaker Churchill: "Representative Lang, the Constitution requires that the Bill be read by title on three separate days. It was read on the 1st day on May 8th, 1995, the second on May 16, 1995, and a third time on December 3, 1996. Do you have a further question? Representative Lang."
- Lang: "So, it's the Chair's ruling that it must be read by title only on three separate occasions and so long as the title does not change, the Bill may be moved and passed on Third Reading?"
- Speaker Churchill: "That is the ruling of the Chair. Do you have another parliamentary question on a different issue? Representative Lang."
- Lang: "And, can the Chair confirm for me or can the Clerk confirm for me, the title of this Bill has been the same on all three readings of the Bill?"
- Speaker Churchill: "Representative Lang, are you referring to Article 4, Section 8, subsection (d) of the Constitution?"
- Lang: "Mr. Speaker, let me make this easy for you. When this Bill was first introduced, the title of the Bill was, 'An Act to amend the Illinois Aeronautics Act'. As of today, the title of the Bill has been changed to 'An Act relating to acquisition and operation of Meigs Field by the Department of Transportation for and on behalf of the State of Illinois'. By your own words, Sir, the Bill's title must stay the same and must be read in that form three times on this floor."
- Speaker Churchill: "The Chair is right. Representative."
- Lang: "This title became the title today, Sir. If the Constitution requires that the Bill be read by title three

146th Legislative Day

December 3, 1997

times in the same form, that has not been accomplished."

Speaker Churchill: "No, that is not what the Constitution says.

That's why I asked if you were referring to that Section.

The Section says, 'The Bill shall be read by title on three different days in each House', and that has been satisfied.

It is the ruling of the Chair. Do you have another parliamentary inquiry on another subject? Representative Lang."

Lang: "Well, your original comments, Sir, were that so long as the Bill's title did not change on all three of those times, then the Constitution would be satisfied."

Speaker Churchill: "Representative Lang,..."

Lang: "You know, excuse..."

Speaker Churchill: "Representative Lang, I've just read to you the provision from the Constitution. The Constitution prevails. It is the ruling of the Chair that this Bill has satisfied the requirements of the Constitution.

Representative Lang."

Lang: "So, it is now the Chair's decision that you have basically overruled yourself because the transcript will clearly show your original ruling, Sir, was, 'So long as the Bill was read in the same title three times in this chamber, it could be passed'. You are now changing that point of view which you are...it's fine if you do that, Sir. Earlier today we...on this floor, many of us changed our mind on a vote, and we stopped a bad Bill from becoming law. If you are now saying that you've changed your mind, that's fine, but let's make the record clear that within the last five minutes, you've given me two different rulings."

Speaker Churchill: "Representative Lang, the ruling of the Chair is in conformance with the Constitution of the state, and that is the ruling of the Chair. Do you have another

- 146th Legislative Day

  December 3, 1997

  subject matter for parliamentary inquiry, or we will go to

  debate? Representative Lang."
- Lang: "I would move to overrule the Chair."
- Speaker Churchill: "All those in favor say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have...the 'nays' have it, and the Motion is...fails, and the Chair is sustained. Representative Lang, do you now have another parliamentary inquiry?"
- Lang: "Mr. Speaker, I'll renew my Motion to overrule the Chair and ask for a Roll Call Vote and Verification."
- Speaker Churchill: "Representative Lang, that's out of order because we've already done the Motion. Representative Lang, do you...I know you have another parliamentary inquiry. Perhaps if we go to that, we can settle that one, too. Representative Lang."
- Lang: "I have no other parliamentary points of view, Sir. I'm going to return my light to the flashing position so I might debate the Bill."
- Speaker Churchill: "Okay, so, is there any discussion on this Bill? The Chair recognizes the Gentleman from Cook, Representative Lang."
- Lang: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. By the way, if this Bill should receive the requisite number, we would request a verification. Do you acknowledge Sir?"
- Speaker Churchill: "I've heard your request."
- Lang: "Thank you. Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I rise in strong opposition to Senate Bill 1186. I find it quite amusing really that the Republican Party on this floor, the Party that talks about local control, the Party that insisted that there be local control in the City of Chicago for their schools, now insists on taking local control away from the Chicago Park District from land that

146th Legislative Day

December 3, 1997

they own. Not only the land, but property they own. Books and records that they own. All of a sudden, the issue of local control isn't such a big deal. There's some concern this side of the aisle about the Majority Party's interest in having a coherent philosophy of government. that says, 'We're for local control today, and not for local control tomorrow, when it suits our whims'. find it very interesting that the Majority Party, who continues to try to convince the people of the State of Illinois that they're the Party of working men and women, want to privatize the police and fire services at Meigs Field if they're able to keep it in place. And I find it very interesting that the Majority Party, the Republican Party, the Party that talks about, 'Well, we're just not for rich, corporate executives, we're for the common man and the common woman', want to keep an airport open that the common man and the common woman don't use, that rich corporate executives use. I find that incredibly curious, and I also find curious, the fact that the Majority Party, the Republican Party, the Party that's so much against taxes, so much against going back to the people who take money out of their pockets, is about to impose a \$3.00 head tax on every flight in, on every person, every flight out on every person. So those of you on that side of the aisle who insist and continue to insist, election upon election, that you're for the common man and the common woman and working men and women people who live in the State of Illinois, and that you're opposed to taxes and you're for local control, why you get off it? Why don't you understand what you're really all about here, which is just a raw power grab because for the next few days you're in a position to do

146th Legislative Day

December 3, 1997

it? Maybe you're in a position to do it, I hope not. the fact is, that you've decided that you don't care if you the people that use the airport. The fact is, you don't care if it is local control or not local control. The fact is, you don't care if you're going to put people out of work as you privatize those services, police and fire, et cetera. All you care about is taking this airport for your own purposes. And let me remind you that if you take this airport today, a different majority in this House and in the Senate and a different majority...a different Governor that might be sitting in the Governor's chair someday, may decide to take the DuPage County Airport, may decide to take a block in your district and give it to the State of Illinois for whatever purpose they have. don't we realize what this is really about? And those of you who are prepared to vote for this are making a serious mistake politically because all the things that you argued about in your elections in November, were all in opposition to the kinds of things you'll be voting for today. those things are not what you said you were for when you ran for election to this Body. Things such as, not only the local control taking away the property from the park district, but you want IDOT to be able to have zoning power over this land. The State of Illinois is going to determine the zoning on this strip of land in the City of Chicago that today is owned and controlled by the Chicago Park District. What an outrageous use of power. outrageous and egregious use of the majority in your last few minutes here. I'm frankly surprised you didn't wait to do this the morning of January 8th, to send a real present to the people of the State of Illinois on your way out. think we all know on this side of the aisle, and you all

146th Legislative Day

December 3, 1997

know on that side of the aisle, if you were being honest with yourselves, that you're not being true to your word. You're not being true to your constituents. There's only one reason for this, and that reason is, that there's a Gentleman on the second floor that wants you to do this. And the Governor of this state will pay a price for this raw taking of power and you will pay a price for your agreement to help him take away land that does not belong to you, that belongs to somebody else. Rethink your position on this, because there's going to be a political price paid in this chamber and on the second floor of this building. Vote 'no'."

Speaker Churchill: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Dart."

Dart: "Thank you. We have now hit an all time low around here. This is absolutely incredible. It's disgusting. Let's call this what it is. This is a steal. You know the criminal laws we pass around here every day, this is another one. This is a crime. You are stealing the property from the State of Illinois. And where is Governor Edgar going to stop? He is stealing it from Chicago, where is it going to stop? If he wants a golf course out in your district, he is going to wander in and steal that? If he wants a race track so he can watch all his horses, is he going to wander in and steal that, too? This is absolutely insane. This is a small airport for the instead of the people who would go to a park to observe the park, a nature park. The elite are going to have this now. So you have turned your back on all of This is something, as I say, that hits a new low. But let's look at this steal that you are taking here. What exactly you are getting for your buck? Meigs Airport

146th Legislative Day

December 3, 1997

has been a loser for the City of Chicago for every year. And you are now taking on this loser that the State of Illinois is going to be paying for now. Year after year, after year. And what is this going to cost you? been throwing around some phoney baloney numbers. But figures on this, folks. I hate to burst your bottom line bubble, folks, here is going to be \$3 million 697 thousand And where did these numbers come from? Seven a year. hundred and eighty six thousand dollars is the budget One million eight hundred and forty thousand for the fire department, 445 thousand for the police department and it goes on from there. And that is the annual cost. is not counting the capital cost it is going to take to take care of all the problems they are having there with the water and the sea wall. That is about another 15 So you have added about another \$33 million price tag on here, folks. So thank God you don't have problems with your schools that you need money and you don't need new roads in your district, cause you are going to be giving it to Chicago. I am just so happy to hear that you are just so enthusiastic about helping Chicago out. And I would be real interested to find out who it was drafted this Bill. It must have been some retired bureaucrat from the Soviet Union who in was charge of taking their private property because this is interesting. I would really like for you to take just one second to take a look at your own Bill, which is something which would be novel and unique around here. If you take a look at Section 25 part 5. It says that the Department of Transportation is allowed to take any obstruction to error. Now I have a sneaking suspicious that you haven't looked this one up, cause that is probably about par for the

146th Legislative Day

December 3, 1997

course around here, folks. But if you look under the federal statutes, which are the ones that cover this, they will tell you a federal obstruction error is an object of greater heights, than other heights of surfaces of the airport. Okay, now let me run down a list of the things that you are going to allow the state to take now, okay? You are going to let them take the parking lot from Adler Planetarium, Solidarity Drive, Lake Michigan water rights, the Adler Planetarium itself, the Adler Planetarium parking lot, the beach house, the Humana Hospital, Michael Reese, Mercy Hospital, McCormick Place North, buildings between Wacker, Randolph, Michigan and Columbus, folks. That is half the 'Loop'. That is what your Bill is doing here. This is the greatest heist we have had down here in years. You should be so proud of yourselves. This is absolutely insane. This is an airport that handles a very number of passengers who are the elite, the absolute elite. Instead of giving this a park, a public park for everybody to enjoy, you are going to turn your back on the public once again and steal land that has no end in sight. You can take every single parcel of land within a hundred, within thousands of yards of this airport. Where will it stop? It won't stop anywhere. This is a half-baked idea that Governor Edgar has had in the back of his head cause he wants to steal this. He wants to show Mayor Daley, who is boss here. Well, it is the most irresponsible act that we have had in this Legislature in years. And let me set the record straight also, in regards as to who was, in fact, the owners of this land. The reality of this is Northerly Island was conceived of, paid and built to be a park by the Chicago taxpayers in 1920. So the previous speaker was absolutely incorrect. When he talked about how

#### 146th Legislative Day

December 3, 1997

this was state property that they gave to Chicago. That is not true. That is a falsehood. The state has never had any involvement with the Island Safe Port Grant of \$30 thousand to the Meigs Airport for equipment. That's been the extent of it. There has been no state property where they gave out of the bottom of their hearts to the City of Chicago. This was City of Chicago property and is City fo Chicago property and you ought to keep your hands off of it."

- Speaker Churchill: "Further discussion? The Gentleman from Effingham, Representative Hartke."
- Hartke: "Representative Granberg...I would like to yield my time to."
- Speaker Churchill: "Representative Granberg hasn't spoken, yet, but we can go to him. The Gentleman from Clinton, Representative Granberg."
- Granberg: "Thank you, Representative Hartke. Thank you, Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House let's put this in terms of reality. We have an airport, a small airport, whose passenger use has decrease by 42%. Whose overall use has decreased by 62% since 1980, and now the state wants to take it over. This airport currently operates at a deficit. The state wants to assume that deficit. Where's that money going to come from? Last week a spokesman for the administration said there would be no cost to the state. Today we find out there a cost of \$850 thousand for the interim operation of Meigs Field. What about next week? They're asking you to give a blank check to the state to operate this facility. What about the \$3.7 million in the indirect budget costs that the state will have to assume to operate Meigs Field in addition to the current deficit -3.7 million. What about the \$81.5 million in capital costs

146th Legislative Day

December 3, 1997

that will be need to bring Meigs Fields up to speed for current use? Where is that money going to come from? We've heard people say this will not going to come from the Road Fund. This will not come from transportation dollars. IDOT has projected a decrease in our road program up to a third in the upcoming years. If that is going to come from the road fund, that is going to impact every one of downstate Legislator's districts. Every project that you need to be completed, will not be done. Every one in the suburbs and in the city. Those dollars have to come from somewhere. In addition if it does come from the Road Fund that's GRF. Are you going to give the state the authority to spend millions of dollars for a small airport in Chicago, that could be uses for educating our children, that could be used for infrastructure for our schools? Are those your priorities? And I speak mostly to my downstate colleges, because you will be asked, why you are supporting an airport in Chicago instead of your local road program, instead of your local schools? We're talking about a great deal of money. And we are doing it in the waning days of a Republican dominated Legislature. My friends downstate as well particularly for those who are on the AMTRAK lines. administration asked us to take reductions Springfield, Macomb, Carbondale, Centralia, Bloomington. We saw trip reductions. We saw a decreased use for our citizens. And then we were asked to 'ante up' thousand, to subsidize AMTRAK - our local communities. at the same time we're being asked to raise \$400 thousand we're seeing millions and millions of dollars diverted to Chicago. If you are a downstater, what are you thinking about? Go back and tell your friends that ride AMTRAK, your priority is to keep Meigs Field open. You want to

#### 146th Legislative Day

December 3, 1997

decrease the subsidy for AMTRAK, you want to decrease the subsidy for downstate transportation, and you would rather have that money go to Meigs Field. Makes sense to me, guess. But you are the ones that are going to have explain it, not me. Because I have no intention of shifting money to Meigs Field instead of downstate. Mt. Vernon, is going to have to explain it, Carbondale is going to have to explain it, Champaign with the ridership will have to explain it. Tell your people why you are not for AMTRAK, but you're for Meigs Field. We've heard how it is the matter local control and it is. A terrible precedent to set, to have a state government stick their hand into the operations of a municipality, whether it's Centralia, or Carbondale, or any place else, that is the precedent we are setting. But, lastly let me address one, I think that every important, point. I have never seen a concerted effort like this in the last two years. I have seen more energy given to Meigs Field than any other issue. If we would use this energy to resolve school funding problems, if we would resolve the problems in corrections, or get rid of the gangs, if we would resolve campaign finance reform, if we would spend that amount of energy on the serious issues impacting every person in this state we could resolve those issues, in a bipartisan basis. We're using this effort for a small Chicago airport. It doesn't make any sense to me. Why don't we work together? And back up the campaign rhetoric. Let's deal with inequity in funding education, whether it is the suburbs, or downstate, or central Illinois. Let's deal with getting the gangs out of correction. Let's deal with campaign finance reform. Let's do the people of state...lets do them some justice, let's deal with reality not some political power grab by

146th Legislative Day

December 3, 1997

one certain official in the State of Illinois.

Churchill: "There being no further discussion, Speaker Daniels to close."

Daniels: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. prior speaker talked about more energy being expended on this issue than any other issue. With all due respect the prior speaker, I understand why he feels that way. He wasn't apart of any other issues that went forward. He wasn't there for school reform, he wasn't there to deal with the children of Chicago to improve their school We were there, we did it. He wasn't there to system. improve our whole structure and welfare reform and the justice system in this state. He doesn't know criminal what it took to put those together. And with all due respect to the previous speaker, if he had been part of that maybe we could have done a better job. would be true. But, he should be part of that effort to make sure that we improve all that. Now the previous speaker will have the opportunity to bring school reform to all of Illinois. Let's see what his performance is for the suburbs, for the City of Chicago, and for the downstate Illinois on school reform, and bringing more money in without increasing tax of this state. Wе met OUT obligations, I don't know if you can do the same. The previous speaker talks about a history of this state. He talks about the effort as it relates to Meigs Field. let me tell you what the true history is, with dates. Nineteen hundred and three the state, the sovlereign people of the state of Illinois gives the land to the City of Chicago, by state legislation, 1935 the state approves use of the land for airport in 1935. In 1947, the state grants a request from the City of Chicago and the Chicago Park

146th Legislative Day

December 3, 1997

District, for a permit to add more land from the state for the express purpose of airport development. In 1947 1990, the state funnels \$4.4 million into Meigs Field based upon the assurances that the airport will stay open. talked about a partnership earlier which we wanted to have. that's why I commend Governor Edgar for his efforts in this regard. Time and time again he has tried to talk Mayor of City of Chicago to keep this very important airport open for all the people of Illinois. Not just the basis that they say the City of Chicago owns this and therefore we will unilaterally determine what this asset to all of Illinois will do. We'll forget about the history of this airport. The Governor has said, 'Mr. Mayor, talk, let's compromise, let's address your issues of a park, even though you want to spend \$29 million of the City of Chicago taxpayers' funds for this park, when the whole City of Chicago fronts Lake Michigan as a park itself. could spend that money better in other parts of the City of Chicago to improve its park system.' The Mayor instead said, 'No I am closing this airport.' Who talks about job That's real job loss. Shuts down the jobs to the people that work there. Shuts down the jobs for the people that service the airport, and shuts down the important economic development to all of the area without the consideration of anyone elses views. So yes, the Governor has gone that extra mile to try to keep this open. commend him for his efforts in that regard. Now when we look at this overall project and what we are talking about today. This effort in costing jobs to all of Illinois and closing the airport, is an economic drain to the state as well. A loss of \$72 million as estimated by your own Chicago Park District. But, what overall then are we

#### 146th Legislative Day

December 3, 1997

talking about? What does an airport mean to all of us? When you visualize an airport and you think about it's importance. You think about transportation. You think about convenience. You think about safety. You think the ability to move, the ability to transact businesses. And 52,000 flights a year mean a great deal to the State of Illinois and its economic developments. Fifty-two thousand flights a year that bring people into the City of Chicago. Some there to conduct state business, most there to conduct to conduct city business. and almost every person there willing to spend money in the City of Chicago for economic development, creating jobs and its necessary function. But, what strikes me the most is some speakers can stand up here and talk about this horrible thing that happened, how their memory is so short. Maybe I should give them the benefit of the doubt on younger people on the other side of the aisle, that they might have forgotten the land grab of the City of Chicago when it created O'Hare Field. When it took property out of a joining counties and joining municipalities. When it created its own airport without regard to them when didn't want this to occur. This was a true land grab. you don't acknowledge that. Why? Because it was a state law, that gave that authority to the City of Chicago to do State legislation passed by the Illinois General Assembly that determined it was in the best interests of the people of Illinois to create O'Hare Airport. And now you talk about today, about safety, and about creating better transportation networks, and AMTRAK. The prior speaker talk to that. But, he didn't tell you, did he, that between our General Assembly, the last two years we have created and an additional funding of AMTRAK from \$2 million

146th Legislative Day

December 3, 1997

So, once again another argument falls by to \$7 million. the wayside. Time and time again you try to bring these articles up, you try to bring these arguments up and they fall by the wasyside. Because what you are doing is defending a unilateral grab, an unilateral decision without consideration for all the people of Illinois. suggest to you that this Bill will pass. And I hope it will. It will pass because the Governor has gone the extra mile on behalf of all of us. Not just Chicago residents who want to keep this open, not just a resident of Will County or resident of Sangamon County, but on behalf of all the people of Illinois that feel this is a viable operating airport, that helps creates a safety network that helps eliminate some of the congestion in our skies as a result of overcrowded situation at O'Hare and Midway and that And yes, helps reduce the noise pollution. helps keeps jobs open. In your heart there is not a person on that side of the aisle that doesn't believe in their own heart that this airport ought to stay open. Now I understand why you sit there and why you want to talk about spending \$29 million for a park that is not needed in the City of Chicago. Spend your tax money if you must in improving the current park situation south of Meigs, to help the people in the south part of the City of Chicago and improve the current park situation. So Ladies and Gentlemen of the House I strongly urge, I strongly urge, keeping this very important viable airport open. Keeping the jobs available to it, keeping the economic development apparent to the State of Illinois and making sure that this General Assembly speaks clearly on behalf of all of Illinois and all of its citizens. Mr, Speaker, I move for the adoption of Senate Bill 1186."

146th Legislative Day

December 3, 1997

Speaker Churchill: "Ladies and Gentlemen a verification has been requested on this. So, will the Members please be in their chairs? The question is, 'Shall Senate Bill 1186 pass?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'nay'. 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 63 voting 'ayes'; 51 voting 'no' and there has been a request for a verification. Representative Lang do you persist in that request? He persists in his request. So the Clerk will verify the affirmative vote. Mr. Clerk, call the Affirmative Roll."

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

Churchill: "Representative Lang, questions of the affirmative vote?"

Lang: "Thank you. Representative Klingler?"

Churchill: "Representative Klingler is in her chair."

Lang: "I'm sorry her chair was at my back."

Churchill: "Representative Lang. Representative Black would like leave to be verified. Is there a leave? Leave is granted.

146th Legislative Day

December 3, 1997

Representative Lang"

Lang: "Representative Jones?"

Churchill: "Representative Jones. John Jones is in his chair."

Lang: "Representative Bost?"

Speaker Churchill: "Representative Mike Bost is in his chair."

Lang: "Representative Tim Johnson?"

Speaker Churchill: "Representative Tim Johnson is standing by the side his chair."

Lang: "Representative Myers?"

Speaker Churchill: "Representative Myers is in his chair."

Lang: "Representative Lyons?"

Speaker Churchill: "Representative Lyons is in her chair."

Lang: "So many people in the aisle Mr. Speaker, I just can't see them all."

Speaker Churchill: "Representative Ryder would you please move out of the aisle Representative Lang can not see beyond you?"

Lang: "Representative Winkle?"

Speaker Churchill: "Representative Winkle is in his chair."

Lang: "Oh."

Speaker Churchill: "So far you batting zero. Do you have anymore?"

Lang: "I have batted zero before on the floor of this House, Sir, but not for too many more weeks. Representative Weaver?"

Speaker Churchill: "Representative Weaver is in his chair."

Lang: "No further, Sir."

Speaker Churchill: "On this question there are 63 voting 'aye';
51 voting 'no'. and 0 voting 'present'. And this Bill,
having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby
declared passed. Committee Reports. Mr. Clerk,
Supplemental Calendar announcement. I'm sorry, Committee
Reports, Mr. Clerk."

146th Legislative Day

December 3, 1997

- Clerk Rossi: "Committee Reports. Representative Tom Johnson, Chairman from the Committee on Judicatory Criminal, to which the following Bills were referred, action taken on December 3, 1996, reported the same back with the following recommendations: 'Do pass' Senate Bill 1036. 'Do approve' for consideration Floor Amendment #7, to Senate Bill 1643."
- Speaker Churchill: "Supplemental Calendar announcement."
- Clerk Rossi: "Supplemental Calendar #2, is being distributed."
- Speaker Churchill: "Mr. Clerk, on Supplemental Calendar #2,
  appears Senate Bill 1263. What is the status of Senate
  Bill 1263?"
- Clerk Rossi: "Senate Bill 1263, is on the Order of Third Reading."
- Speaker Churchill: "Return the Bill to Second Reading. Mr. Clerk, are there any other announcements?"
- Clerk Rossi: "Attention Members. The Rules Committee will meet immediate upon adjournment. The Rules Committee will meet immediately upon adjournment. In addition the following Committees will meet tomorrow morning. At 8:30 a.m. the Appropriation Public Safety Committee will meet in Room 118. At 9:00 a.m. the Health Care Committee will meet in Room 118. Also at 9:00 a.m. the Elementary Education Committee will meet in C-1, and also at 9:00 the Judiciary Civil Law Committee will meet in D-1."
- Speaker Churchill: "Representative Ryder now moves that the House stand adjourned until Wednesday, December 4, 1996, at the hour of 11:00 a.m. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair the 'ayes have it and allowing for perfunctory time for the Clerk, the House now stands adjourned until December 4, 1996, at the hour of 11:00 a.m."
- Clerk Rossi: "The House Perfunctory Session will come to order.

# 146th Legislative Day

December 3, 1997

Introduction and First Reading of Resolutions. House Resolution 159, offered by Representative Younge. House Resolution 160, offered by Representative Monique Davis. These Resolutions are assigned to the Rules Committee."

Clerk McLennand: "Being no further business, the House Perfunctory Session stands adjourned and the House will reconvene in full Session on Wednesday, December 4, at the house of 11:00 a.m."

REPORT: TIFLDAY PAGE: 001

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

97/03/24 09:16:23

# DECEMBER 03, 1996

HB-0546	RECALLED	PAGE	3
HB-2702	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	17
HB-2735	NON-CONCURRENCE	PAGE	18
HB-3771	FIRST READING	PAGE	2
HB-3771	FILED	PAGE	2
HB-3772	FIRST READING	PAGE	2
HB-3772	FILED	PAGE	2
SB-0775	RECALLED	PAGE	3
SB-1122	VETO ACTION	PAGE	3
SB-1186	SECOND READING	PAGE	22
SB-1186	THIRD READING	PAGE	34
SB-1263	THIRD READING	PAGE	53
SB-1425	VETO ACTION	PAGE	9
SB-1467	VETO ACTION	PAGE	15
HR-0159		PAGE	54
HR-0160		PAGE	54
	- <del> </del>		٠,

#### SUBJECT MATTER

HOUSE TO ORDER	PAGE	1
SPEAKER DANIELS IN THE CHAIR	PAGE	1
PRAYER - PASTOR WILFONG	PAGE	1
PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE - REPRESENTATIVE ROSKAM	PAGE	1
ROLL CALL FOR ATTENDANCE	PAGE	1
SUPPLEMENTAL CALENDAR #1	PAGE	2
CONGRATS TO REPRESENTATIVE MORROW & BABY BOY	PAGE	1
REPRESENTATIVE CHURCHILL IN THE CHAIR	PAGE	22
HOUSE ADJOURNED	PAGE	53
HOUSE PERFUNCTORY SESSION	PAGE	53
HOUSE PERFUNCTORY SESSION ADJOURNED	PAGE	54
SPEAKER DANIELS IN THE CHAIR	PAGE	20