66th Legislative Day

May 21, 1997

- Speaker Brunsvold: "The House will come to order. All unauthorized personnel should retire to the balcony. Again, all unauthorized personnel should retire from the Chamber to the balcony. We'll be led in prayer today by our Doorkeeper, the Reverend Lee Crawford with the Victory Temple Church of God in Christ. Guests in the Gallery may wish to rise for the invocation. Reverend Crawford."
- Reverend Crawford: "Let us pray. Gracious Lord, we graciously come before You with a sincere desire to serve You. We pray according to Your word that says, 'Blessed are the poor in spirit, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven. Blessed are they that mourn, for they shall be comforted. Blessed are the meek, for they shall inherit the earth. Blessed are they that do hunger and thirst at their righteousness, for they shall be filled.' So we ask that You fill us with Your joy, fill us with Your strength, fill our minds with Your peace, fill us with wisdom and understanding, and above all, we pray and ask that You will fill our hearts with Your love. This we pray. Amen."
- Speaker Brunsvold: "We'll be led in the Pledge today by Representative Scott."
- Scott- 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 Brunsvold: "Mr. Clerk, Roll Call for Attendance. Mr. Clerk, take the record. Okay. Excuse me, Mr. Clerk. Mr. Cross, any excused absences on the Republican side of the aisle?"
- Cross: "None, whatsoever. We're all here today, ready to work."

 Speaker Brunsvold: "Mr. Dart, on the Democratic side of the aisle."

66th Legislative Day

May 21, 1997

Dart: "We're all here and ready to work."

Speaker Brunsvold: "Thank you, Mr. Dart. Mr. Clerk, take the record. There being 118 answering the Roll Call, we do have a quorum."

Clerk Rossi: "Committee Reports. Representative Currie, Chairman from the Committee on Rules, to which the following Amendments and Joint Action Motions were referred, taken on May 21, 1997, reported the same back with the following recommendations: 'be adopted' Floor Amendment 2 to Senate Bill 9, Motions to concur, Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 768, Senate Amendments 1, 2, and 3 to House Bill 1147, and Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 2152. Representative Saviano, Chairman from the Committee Registration and Regulation, to which the following Joint Action Motions were referred, action taken on 5-21-97 (sic-1997), reported the same back, recommend: "be May 21, adopted', to concur Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 679, and Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 1216. Representative Eugene Moore, Chairman from the Committee on Revenue, to which the following Joint Action Motions were referred, action taken on May 21, 1997, reported the same back recommend 'be adopted' to concur, Senate Amendment 2 to House Bill 847, Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 1121, Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 526, Senate Amendment 2 to House Bill526 lost, Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 528."

Speaker Brunsvold: "House Bill 108, Mr. Clerk. House Bill 108,

Mr. Clerk. Mr. Hannig. Out of the record. Mr. Clerk,

House Bill 306. Mr. Lang."

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to concur in Senate

Amendment #1 to House Bill 306. Senate Amendment 1 was

agreed upon cleanup language that was suggested by Senator

66th Legislative Day

May 21, 1997

- Burzynski. I know of no opposition in the Senate."
- Speaker Brunsvold: "The Gentleman has moved for concurrence. Is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Vermilion, Mr. Black."
- Black: "Yes. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
- Speaker Brunsvold: "He indicates he will yield."
- Black: "Yes, Representative, perhaps I missed it in the general noise and confusion, but can you outline what Senate Amendment #1 does to your underlying Bill"
- Lang: "Yes, Mr. Black, the original Bill was amended to make the statute less confusing, Instead of changing the preference order in the way it was done in the original Bill, the same provisions are added to an appropriate paragraph of the Probate Act concerning qualified administrators."
- Black: "Is there a significant portion of the Amendment that was contained in an earlier House Bill, House Bill 1619?"
- Lang: "That's correct, Sir."
- Black: "And so the Amendment allows non-residents to act as administrators of estates?"
- Lang: "I don't have the details of 1619 in front of me, Sir, but if that's what that Bill did, then that's in this Amendment."
- Black: "And this language is in agreement with... I assume the State Bar has looked at this and they have no difficulties with the Bill?"
- Lang: "Yes, I think so, and it was supported by the Chicago Bar in committee, the Administrative Office of Illinois Courts has indicated no fiscal impact, nor would it affect the need for additional judges."
- Black: "Do you know if the downstate bar is in agreement?"
- Lang: "I have not heard from them one way or the other, Sir."

66th Legislative Day

May 21, 1997

- Black: "I haven't heard from them in some time. Would this... as amended, did this Bill get out of the Senate unanimously?"
- Lang: "Again, I don't have that in front of me, but I believe it did, Sir."
- Black: "Yeah, I know I'm watching and I would ask that you watch, too. If we do get a Bill that comes over here that didn't get out of the Senate unanimously, would you call that to my attention?"
- Lang: "I will do that, but then there's always this problem. A Bill that does get out of there unanimously, is one we better take a second look at."
- Black: "Well, this Bill did get out unanimously. That's why I'm asking you these insightful questions."
- Lang: "I appreciate you taking a second look at it for us, Sir."
- Black: "Thank you. As always I appreciate the Gentleman's answers. Thank you, Mr. Speaker."
- Speaker Brunsvold: "Any further discussion? Any further discussion? Seeing none, the Gentleman from Cook to close, Representative Lang. The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 306?' This is final action. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; all opposed vote 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. clerk, take the record. And on that question, 'no', 0 voting there are 118 voting 'yes', 0 voting And the House does concur in Senate Amendment 'present'. #1 to House Bill 306. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Black, for what reason do you rise?"
- Black: "Yes, Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I rise for a point of personal privilege."

Speaker Brunsvold: "Proceed."

66th Legislative Day

- May 21, 1997
- Black: "Yes, I would like to welcome Clare Manning and some of her students from North Ridge Middle School in Danville. I believe they're up in the Gallery right over here. Welcome to Springfield."
- Speaker Brunsvold: "Welcome to Springfield. The Lady from Macon,

 Representative Curry, for what reason do you rise?"
- Curry: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I, too, rise on a point of personal privilege."
- Speaker Brunsvold: "Proceed."
- Curry: "I'd like the Members of this Assembly to help me welcome the retired teachers of Decatur and Macon County. They're here today lobbying on fair school funding."
- Speaker Brunsvold: "Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, we have a historic moment today. When this Speaker was first elected in 1983, I had the privilege of serving with the first Hispanic to ever serve in the House of Representatives in Illinois and his name was Joe Berrios, and today, we have another great honor. The Speaker going into the Chair right now, will be the first Hispanic ever to sit as Speaker of the House of Representatives in Illinois. So, with that, I would, with great privilege, like to introduce and present to you the Speaker in the Chair at this moment, Representative Miguel Santiago."
- Speaker Santiago: "Thank you very much, everyone. I really appreciate it. Thank you. Mr. Clerk... Representative Lang, for what reason do you rise?"
- Lang: "Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to add my congratulations to you ascending to the Chair today. I know you'll do a wonderful job, and I just wanted to tell you how nice I think your tie is."
- Speaker Santiago: "Thank you very much, Mr. Lang. House Bill 540. Mr. Clerk, what is the status of House Bill 540?

66th Legislative Day May 21, 1997

Representative Lang on House Bill 540."

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen, I move that we concur in Senate Amendments #1 and 2 to House Bill 540. Senate Amendment 1 requires certified organization to insure that the individuals who conduct the inspections at mental health facilities comply with all the laws regarding patient rights, confidentiality, and safety. Senate (sic-Amendment) #2 makes the Bill mandatory instead of permissive, and I would move that we concur."

Speaker Santiago: "Is there any discussion on the Motion? The Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black."

Black: "Yes, Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. It's good to see you in the Chair, but I need to put you on the spot. I have an inquiry of the Chair."

Speaker Santiago: "State your inquiry."

Black: "Thank you. Earlier in the year, we were told that these Bills would be pretty much a 50/50 basis. I would submit to you, Sir, that this is two Bills in a row sponsored by Representative Lang, two Bills in a row. I would ask that you take this Bill out of the record and call a Republican Bill, Sir."

Speaker Santiago: "We will take you comments into consideration..."

Black: "You learn in a hurry."

Speaker Santiago: "... but I think that Mr. Lang hasn't had too many Bills during this Session, so you may proceed."

Black: "What? What?"

Speaker Santiago: "You may proceed, Mr. Black."

Black: "Well, I need to ask these questions slowly because you have our request under advisement, so..."

Lang: "Mr. Speaker, did Mr. Black use up his five minutes yet?"

Speaker Santiago: "Can we have some order please? Mr. Black."

66th Legislative Day May 21, 1997

Lang: "You have some order."

Black: "Mr. Speaker, our side of the aisle has the most ... utmost respect and admiration for you. We will give you as little order as we possibly can."

Speaker Santiago: "You may proceed, Mr. Black."

Black: "Thank you. Representative Lang, I'm intrigued with Senate Amendment #2. Are you saying that Senate Amendment #2 makes this Act a mandatory? I heard you say Senate Amendment #2 makes this Bill mandatory. Did I hear correctly?"

Lang: "Mr. Black, in its original form, the Bill said that the Department of Mental Health should certify not more than three organizations, which the department interpreted to mean it could be zero, because it said not more than three. This would say at least three organizations."

Black: "I don't remember, and I know we're on concurrence, so, technically, you don't have to answer this, but there are certain requirements in the underlying Bill so that not just anybody can walk in and say, 'I'm here to inspect the premises.' You took care of that didn't you?"

Lang: "That's absolutely correct. The original Bill ended up being agreed language, which would indicate that the not-for-profit advocacy groups that would be allowed to tour the mental health facilities and inspect them, would basically be those that in the end, would be signed off on by the department. What this Amendment does is say that there will be at least three such agencies, there could be more but there could not be less. That was the intent of the original Bill."

Black: "One other question that I think came up and I don't know that the Senate Amendments address this. What assurance do we have... well, let me just cut to the chase. What... who

66th Legislative Day

May 21, 1997

is going to be... accept the responsibility and/or liability for one of these inspectors being in this facility and it creates a problem or somebody becomes agitated, and as a result, either becomes injured or causes someone to be injured. Who is the responsible party in such a case?"

Lang: "Mr. Black, the department, under the Bill, would make the rules and regulations for these inspections, and they would cover that within their rule making authority."

Black: "Okay. And so, we would see that then in JCAR at the appropriate time?"

Lang: "Presumably so."

Black: "Thank you. Thank you, Representative. Mr. Speaker, before I speak to the motion to concur, have you had a chance to look at our inquiry of the Chair? We expect nothing but absolute fairness from you, Sir. You're noted for that."

Speaker Santiago: "That's what you're going to get, fairness. As long as I'm up here, it's going to be fair."

Black: "Well, we'll withhold judgement on that until we see what the next Bill will be, but it does give me a great pleasure to rise in support of the concurrence motion, I think the Senate Amendments, surprisingly for the Senate, are very good Amendments. The Sponsor of the underlying Bill, we're not sure about, but the Senate Amendments certainly add to the Bill, and I stand in favor of the motion to concur."

Speaker Santiago: "Is there any further discussion? Any further discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 540?' This is final action. All those in favor signify by voting 'yes'; all those opposed signify by voting 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all

66th Legislative Day

May 21, 1997

- voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr, Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 118 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. The House does concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 540. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. The Gentleman from Madison, Mr. Stephens, for what purpose do you rise?"
- Stephens: "Well, Mr. Speaker, a lot of us are curious if those folks behind you are just jealous. Are they kibitzing, or is that your new advisory staff, or is that the future House Democrat minority staff behind you?"
- Speaker Santiago: "These are my bodyguards in case someone gets out of hand."
- Stephens: "Bodyguards, well, I don't want to get into a discussion about your body, so I'll just let it drop."
- Speaker Santiago: "House Bill 709. Representative Moore. This is a Republican Bill."
- Moore, A.: "Thank you. Thank you very much. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Yes, we would move to concur with Senate Amendment #1, 2, and 3. I had explained the Bill Yesterday and inadvertently, the Senate Amendment #1 had been referred to committee, and Rules took care of that change, and now it is in Order to Concur."
- Speaker Santiago: "The Lady has moved to concur on Senate

 Amendment 1, 2, and 3. Is there any discussion? Any

 discussion?"
- Moore, A.: "Just to clarify, it was inadvertently... it was mistakenly referred to the Public Utilities Committee, and I believe that Rules had made that correction and that's why it came directly back out to the floor. As listed on the Calendar, the motion for concurrence is Senate Amendment #1, 2, and 3 of the House."

66th Legislative Day

- May 21, 1997
- Speaker Santiago: "Mr. Clerk, could you please give us a status on the Amendments?"
- Moore, A.: "Mr. Speaker, I admire your calm, cool, and collected manner in the Chair."
- Speaker Santiago: "Thank you, Miss..."
- Moore, A.: "It figures you have to get a Bill that's mixed up as one of the first Bills that you have to Chair for."
- Speaker Santiago: "The Gentleman from Washington, Mr. Deering, for what purpose do you rise?"
- Deering: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Inquiry of the Chair. Can you inform me as to the whereabouts of Representative Art Turner, please? I'm kind of curious as to where he's been the last couple of days. Do you have any information?"
- Speaker Santiago: "I saw Mr. Turner this morning when I was coming in so, he's around someplace in the building."
- Deering: "Well, if you should happen to see him, Mr. Speaker, would you tell him I'm looking for him?"
- Speaker Santiago: "Representative Moore, can you please take the Bill out of the record for a minute? We'll come back to you."
- Moore, A.: "Yes, Mr. Speaker, at your request I would love to be cooperative in a bipartisan way and I would be happy to take it out of the record."
- Speaker Santiago: "Thank you. Mr. Clerk, Committee Reports."
- Clerk Rossi: "Representative Bugielski, Chairman from the Committee on Financial Institutions, to which the following Joint Action Motions were referred, action taken on May 21, 1997, reported the same back: 'concur' Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 2211. Representative Bugielski and Deuchler, Chair persons form the Committee on Banks Selling Insurance, to which the following Joint Action Motion was referred, action taken on 5-21-97, reported the same back:

66th Legislative Day

May 21, 1997

'to concur' Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 586. Representative Phelps, Chairman from the Committee on Elementary and Secondary Education, to which the following Joint Action Motions were referred, action taken on May 21, 1997. reported the same back: 'concur' Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 574. Representative Woolard, Chairman from the Committee on Agriculture and Conservation to which the following Joint Action Motion was referred, action taken on May 21, 1997, reported the same back 'to concur' Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 1050. Representative Deering, Chairman from the Committee on Transportation, to which the following Joint Action Motions were referred, action taken on May 21, 1997, reported the same back: 'to concur' Senate Amendments 1 and 3 to House Bill 844."

Speaker Santiago: "Mr. Black, for what reason do you rise?"

Black: "Yeah, thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. In all seriousness, and inquiry of the Chair. On the Bill that Representative Moore just took out of the record, if we could get that straightened out, the Amendments are very important to my district, quite frankly, and I appreciate the Representative carrying that. Ιt appears Amendment #1 was assigned to Public Utilities under some confusion, and they didn't meet today, it was canceled, and so I'm hoping that Rules will pop it back out to the floor so that we could move on that Bill. It would be very much appreciated if we could straighten that our in a timely fashion."

Speaker Santiago: "We will do the utmost to make sure that we straighten out the situation."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker Santiago: "House Bill 748, Representative Wait."

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

66th Legislative Day

- May 21, 1997
- House Bill 748, I wish to concur in Senate Amendments #1. This just helps to clarify the Bill and makes all parties... makes it a better Bill."
- Speaker Santiago: "Any discussion? Seeing none, the question is,

 'Shall... the Gentleman from Effingham, Representative

 Hartke."
- Hartke: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"
- Speaker Santiago: "The Sponsor yields."
- Hartke: "Representative Wait, you said the Amendment clarifies things. I'm still unclear. Would you explain what it clarifies?"
- Speaker Santiago: "Representative Wait."
- Wait: "Was that a question, Representative Hartke? Was that a question or...?"
- Hartke: "Yes, would you explain what the Senate Amendment clarifies?
- Wait: "Yes. Senate Amendment, basically, takes out... makes it prospective rather than being retroactive."
- Hartke: "I don't think so. That's not what my analysis says.

 Senate Amendment 1 removes the provision that requires units of local government to refund and forgive all money paid or owed to their respective entities. What does that mean?"
- Wait: "Yes. What that says... there was a court case as a split.

 One court held that it was constitutional back to '92, the other one split the other way saying that they would have to pay. So, what this says is, they would have to pay up to the time of when this law now goes into effect. So it does not make it retroactive."
- Hartke: "What was the court case all about?"
- Wait: "The court case was whether the Secretary of State of

66th Legislative Day

May 21, 1997

Illinois has the exclusive rights to license and title all IRP plates. These are the trucks, you know, that go from New York to California."

Hartke: "So, which local unit of government is involved in this
 decision?"

Wait: "This basically goes back to what it did in '92 when we passed it, except that from '92 to now, if the court case said the money was owed, then they would pay it, but from this point forward, they would not pay it. That was the intent of the Bill in 1992. This is the same Bill that we passed out of here by 90 votes, and the same Bill we passed out... The Senate Bill, by 110 votes, except it makes this clarifying language."

Hartke: "That's not the question I asked you. The question I asked was, which unit of local government does this involve?"

Wait: "It dealt only with Cook County. The City of Chicago was out of it to begin with. This only clarifies it for Cook County."

Hartke: "Okay, we accept this Amendment, what is that going to cost state revenues?"

Wait: "Nothing to the state."

Hartke: "What's it going to cost the unit of local government?"

Wait: "Well, I believe there's only like 3 thousand trucks that are in this category."

Hartke: "What is it going to cost the City of Chicago?"

Wait: "Nothing to the City of Chicago."

Hartke: "If it's not going to cost the state and it's not going to cost the City of Chicago, what about the County of Cook?"

Wait: "The County of Cook ... this is Cook County's Amendment and they are agreed to it, and I think maybe you're talking 3

66th Legislative Day

May 21, 1997

thousand trucks at a \$100, maybe \$30,000, maybe. This is Cook County's Amendment and they are satisfied with it."

Hartke: "Okay. Thank you very much for that clear and concise explanation of Senate Amendment #1."

Speaker Santiago: "The Gentleman from Washington, Representative Deering."

Deering: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I simply rise in support of the Gentleman's motion to concur with Senate Amendment 1 on House Bill 748."

Speaker Santiago: "The Lady from Lake, Representative Moore."

Moore, A.: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A point of Parliamentary inquiry. Could the Chair please rule on how many votes will be necessary and if this, in fact, preempts Home Rule units of government?"

Speaker Santiago: "We'll look into it and we'll get back to you."

Moore, A.: "Before the vote?"

Speaker Santiago: "Before the vote."

Moore, A.: "Thank you."

Speaker Santiago: "Representative Moore, I have been advised by the Parliamentarian that it takes 71 votes. The Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black."

Black: "Yes. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Inquiry of the Chair. If that last ruling could be explained, I know many of us would be very grateful. I don't know how this preempts Home Rule, in that, I don't believe any community has the right to tax interstate commerce in the first place, and this ruling was not made on the original House Bill. And I'm extremely upset about this ruling because it may preclude passage of this Bill, and I do not believe the cities have any right to tax interstate commerce in the form of interstate trucking. I just don't believe that they have any authority to do so, and I would hope the Chair

66th Legislative Day

May 21, 1997

would reconsider that rule."

Speaker Santiago: "Mr. Black, I will have the Parliamentarian explain to you his reasons."

Parliamentarian Kasper: "Representative Black, this Bill prohibits counties from imposing a tax on vehicles, including Home Rule counties. Because it's a preemption of their ability to impose a tax, it requires a super majority vote pursuant to Subsection (g) of the Local Government Article of the Constitution, and I do believe that this ruling was made on the Bill on the Order of Third..."

Speaker Santiago: "Is there any discussion? Any more discussion?

There being none, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate... Representative Wait."

Wait: "To close?"

Speaker Santiago: "To close."

Wait: "Yes, could I just close on this? Could I just close on this?"

Speaker Santiago: "Yes, you may close."

Wait: "Yeah, okay. Yes. I would just like to say, this Bill got over 95 votes when it was a House Bill, when it was a Senate Bill, it was even a better Bill, I think 115 votes and now it's even a better Bill, yet. There's nobody against it, and I'd appreciate your support on this Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Santiago: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 748?' This is final action. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye; all those opposed signify by voting 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there's 94 'yes', 22 'no', 0 'present', and 2 not voting. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional

66th Legislative Day

- May 21, 1997
- Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1171.

 Representative Rutherford. Representative Granberg, for what reason do you rise?"
- Granberg: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A point of personal privilege. I am pleased to announce that I have friends from the Brownstown Grade School in my district observing the Illinois Legislature today. They're in the Gallery. The Brownstown School District. They probably left."
- Speaker Santiago: "Welcome. Welcome to Springfield. The Gentleman from Livingston, Representative Rutherford."
- Rutherford: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. House Bill 171 (sic-1171),

 I'm moving to nonconcur with Senate Amendment 1. This

 would in effect, put it into a shell Bill. This is going

 to be agreed upon language when we get to the time for the

 general obligation bond authorization."
- Speaker Santiago: "The Gentleman has moved to nonconcur to Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1171. Is there any discussion? The Gentleman has moved to nonconcur on Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1171. Is there any opposition? Any objection? Hearing none, the Gentleman moves ... it does not concur in Senate Amendment #1. All in favor say 'yes'; all opposed say 'no' The 'ayes' have it. The Gentleman (sic-House) does not concur on Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1171. Thank you. House Bill 1327. House Bill 1327.
- Clayton: "Out of the record, please."
- Speaker Santiago: "Out of the record. House Bill 1375.

 Representative Capparelli on House Bill 1375. Out of the record. On House Bill 1450, Representative Rutherford."
- Rutherford: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd move to nonconcur with Senate Amendment 1 to House Bill 1450."
- Speaker Santiago: "The Gentleman has moved to nonconcur on Senate

66th Legislative Day

May 21, 1997

Amendment #1 to House Bill 1450. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye'; all those against signify by saying 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. House Bill 1513. Representative Holbrook. Out of the record. House Bill 1641. Representative Stroger. Representative Stroger on House Bill 1641."

Stroger: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to nonconcur with Senate Amendment #3."

Speaker Santiago: "The Gentleman has moved to nonconcur in Senate Amendment #3 to House Bill 1641. Is there any discussion? Any discussion? Hearing none, the Gentleman has moved to nonconcur to Senate Amendment #3. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye'; all those opposed signify by saying 'no'. The 'ayes' have it. The House does not concur in Senate Amendment #3 to House Bill 1641. House Bill 847. Representative Roskam."

Roskam: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Amendment 2 to House Bill 847 cleans this up. It's an initiative of the City of Warrenville. The City of Warrenville took on the responsibility of a special recreation district for children with developmental disabilities before the Warrenville Park District existed. What we're trying to do now is transfer the authority from the city to the Warrenville Park District. I know of no opponents, and I'll do my best to answer any questions."

Speaker Santiago: "Representative Dart."

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

Speaker Santiago: "Will the Sponsor yield?"

Roskam: "Yes."

Speaker Santiago: "He indicates he will."

Dart: "Representative, is this an exemption to the tax cap at all?"

66th Legislative Day

May 21, 1997

Roskam: "Well, you could argue that. What it would do,
Representative, is it says that if there is existing taxing
authority, let me move so I can see you, if there is
existing taxing authority, in this case for the City of
Warrenville in my district, if they want to transfer
that... that same taxing authority over to the Park
District, they would be able to do that, but it's a revenue
neutral proposal, as I understand it. But you could, I
mean, you can characterize it however you want."

Dart: "You know... exactly. That's what I mean. People around here twist these things so often and so well. I was just wondering, because the way I looked at it, it was neutral, it was revenue neutral the way you were shifting it, correct?"

Roskam: "That's correct."

Dart: "So the intent was not to create a loophole..."

Roskam: "Absolutely not."

Dart: "Okay. Thank you, Representative."

Roskam: "Thank you."

Speaker Santiago: "Are there any further questions? Any further questions, discussion? Hearing none, the Gentleman from Roskam (sic-DuPage), do you wish to close?"

Roskam: "Yes. I would move that we concur with Senate Amendment #2, and I am the Gentleman from Roskam."

Speaker Santiago: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 847?' This is final action. All those in favor, signify by voting 'yes'; all those opposed, signify by voting 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 74 votes voting 'yes', 42 voting 'no', and 2 voting 'present'. The House does concur in Senate

66th Legislative Day

May 21, 1997

Amendment #2 to House Bill 847. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1121. Representative Curry. Out of the record. House Bill 528. House Bill 528, Representative Wood."

Wood: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to concur with Senate Amendment #1 and 2. Senate Amendment #1, essentially, guts the Bill. Senate Amendments #2 puts in, basically, all the provisions of House Bill 528 that was passed unanimously by this House, but it eliminates a disconnection provision. It's agreed to by all parties. I respectfully ask for your support."

Speaker Santiago: "The Lady has moved to concur on Senate

Amendment 1 and 2 to House Bill 528. Is there any
discussion? The Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative
Black."

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

Wood: "Yes."

Speaker Santiago: "He (sic-she) indicates she will."

Black: "Representative, I'm not familiar with mosquito abatement districts down my way, and it appears what you're trying to do is to clear up some overlapping of mosquito abatement districts in the Bill?"

Wood: "That's true, Sir. This Bill addresses overlapping taxing districts, mosquito abatement districts, which has occurred. We're really trying to avoid the double taxation. The Amendments merely eliminate the disconnection provision, because there were some questions raised by that. So, it still eliminates the double taxation."

Black: "Okay. Would it apply to any other overlapping taxing district or is it specifically limited to a mosquito

66th Legislative Day May 21, 1997 abatement district."

Wood: "It's specifically limited to mosquito abatement districts."

Black: "Okay. I appreciate ...this concurrence motion makes me itch for some reason, so I'd just as soon get the Bill out of here alright? Okay."

Wood: "Thank you."

Speaker Santiago: "Any further discussion? Any further discussion? Hearing none, Representative Wood to close."

Wood: "Thank you very much. I'd ask for your favorable support in concurring in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 528."

Speaker Santiago: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment 1 and 2 to House Bill 528?' This is final action. All those in favor, signify by voting 'aye'; all those opposed, signify by voting 'no'. The voting is open. 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 117 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', and 1 not voting. The House does concur in Senate Amendment 1 and 2 to House Bill 528. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 679. Representative Mautino."

Mautino: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move to concur in Senate Amendment #1. This is the language that we spoke about early on. It takes care of some concerns the City of Chicago had with the sting operations, and it puts everyone into agreement with the Bill. The underlying Bill, itself, got 115 votes. I commend Representative Saviano for his work on negotiating it and simply ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Santiago: "The Gentleman has moved to concur on Senate

66th Legislative Day

May 21, 1997

Amendment #1 to House Bill 679. Is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black."

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

Mautino: "Yes."

Speaker Santiago: "He indicates he will."

Black: "Thank you. Representative, on Senate Amendment #1, it's my understanding that we're really putting some revolutionary language in the Act. You mean, we're actually going to prosecute the person who falsely passes himself or herself off as being 21, buying liquor illegally, we're actually going to be able to prosecute the person who really and truly perpetuates this crime, is that what we're doing in Senate Amendment #1?"

Mautino: "The reason we've got Senate Amendment #1 is the original Bill was unconstitutional in its drafting, and it required that a state's attorney in those operations 'shall prosecute'. This is going to allow them ... it just says 'may prosecute', and that is the correction that was necessary and was brought forward by the City of Chicago. We're all in agreement."

Black: "I think this is long overdue. It's a good piece of legislation."

Mautino: "I agree. Thank you, Sir."

Black: "Thank you."

Speaker Santiago: "Is there any further discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 679?' This is final action. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; all those opposed signify by voting 'no'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this

66th Legislative Day

May 21, 1997

question, there are 118 voting 'yes'; 0 voting 'no'; 0 voting 'present'. The House does concur on Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 679. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1216. Representative Saviano."

- Saviano: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I would move to concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1216.

 Senate Amendment #1 represents ...we combined House Bill 1215, the contents of that Bill, into House Bill 1216 with Senate Amendment #1. House Bill 1215 passed out of the House unanimously, and I would ask that the House concur. Thank you."
- Speaker Santiago: "The Gentleman has moved to concur on Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1216. Is there any discussion? Any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill This is final action. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; all those opposed signify by voting 'nay'. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the who wish? record. On this question, there are 94 'yes', 'no', o voting 'present'. The House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1216. On this Bill... and this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby 768. declared passed. House Bill Representative Capparelli, the Dean of the House."
- Capparelli: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to concur with Amendment 1 and 2 to House Bill... Senate (sic-House) Bill 768. This is a ... (sic-Amendment) #1 excludes residential structures under the Act, and Amendment #2 scratches line 90, 'Preparing to respond and responding to fires.' Just a cleanup Amendment. I ask that I concur on both of these

66th Legislative Day

May 21, 1997

Amendments."

Speaker Santiago: "The Gentleman has moved to concur on Senate Amendment #1 and 2 to House Bill 768. Is there any discussion? Any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments #1 and #2 to House Bill 768?' This is final action. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; all those opposed signify by voting 'no'. 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 118 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', and 0 voting 'present'. The House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 and #2 to House Bill 768. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 844. The Gentleman from Washington, Representative Deering, on House Bill 844."

Deering: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I move to concur with Senate Amendments 1 and 3 to House Bill 844. (sic-House Bill) 844 was the Car Rental Bill that passed out of this Chamber earlier this year, went to the Senate and while it was in the Senate, there was some ongoing negotiations between the the car rental agencies and the insurance companies, the consumer groups, that try to make this a better Bill. There has been an agreement by almost all parties to the language contained the Amendments, which makes this a Bill that is palatable to the automobile rental industry throughout the State of Illinois. Senate Amendment #1 sets some parameters for the fee that can be charged for a collision damage waiver, a CDW, which is a permissive and optional insurance policy that you can purchase if and when you go to a car rental agency and want to rent a vehicle and drive within the boundaries of the state. It also sets caps onto

66th Legislative Day

May 21, 1997

the amount of damages that will be awarded from the insurance companies if there is an accident with the rental car, sets those caps and parameters as to the amount of money the insurance companies will pay. It is a graduated It increases in the out years. The fee right now, up front, for collision damage waiver would be \$9. is permissive. It can be cheaper than \$9. It does not say ... It's not set in stone, the \$9 is just a ceiling. Likewise, in the out years as the fee increases, that's the maximum it can increase. It goes up to \$9.50 January 1, 2000, and to \$10 on January 1, 2001. It's just an increasing fee. It covers more, the caps continue to Now, that's what Amendment #1 does. Amendment #3 sets the parameters and the reasons under which a rental car company may void a collision damage waiver. that the collision damage waiver for one or more of the following reasons, can be voided: If loss to the vehicle is intentional, if it is an organized or agreed high-speed racing type situation, if the vehicle is used in a commission of a crime, any business operation while you're renting the automobile, you can have that collision damage waiver voided, or any fraud or misrepresentation of the facts on the application when you sign the application, can void the collision damage waiver, it's optional to the car rental agency. Again, these provisions in these Amendments and in this Bill are permissive. I, as consumer, or you, as a consumer can go to a car rental agency, rent a car, it's your choice if you want to purchase the collision damage waiver, or it's your choice if you want to rent that car totally on the own merits. And if you have an accident with that car, then you pay for it totally out of your pocket. You cannot go to your

- 66th Legislative Day

 insurance company. So, it is a permissive Bill. It's a good Bill. It's a consumer Bill. And I would be happy to try and answer any questions."
- Speaker Santiago: "The Gentleman has moved to concur on Senate

 Amendment 1 and 3 to House Bill 844. Is there any
 discussion? Any discussion? Hearing none... the
 Representative from Bureau, Representative Mautino."
- Mautino: "Representative Deering, this Bill just is the culmination of the agreement that was worked out between the rental car industries and the insurance industry, and I believe that there's no longer any opposition to this. Correct?"
- Deering: "I believe there is one agency, or one company that is opposed to it. I believe that's State Farm and they've not been... to my knowledge and information, they haven't been working the Bill. Otherwise, everyone else... there's a long list of supporters that had testified in the committees, who are in support of this negotiated agreement."
- Mautino: "I commend you on the work, and all the groups that have spent a long time putting this together. It puts an issue to the rest that's been around here for about the last seven, eight years. And I just urge an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Santiago: "Any further questions? Seeing none, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment 1 and 3 to House Bill 844?' This is final action. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; all those opposed signify by voting 'nay', The voting is open. The voting is open. 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 99 'yes', 17 'no', 0 'present', 2 not... non-voting. The House does concur in Senate

66th Legislative Day

May 21, 1997

Amendments 1 and 3 to House Bill 844. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 1050. Representative Brunsvold. Representative Brunsvold.

- Brunsvold: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1050 added some language dealing with hunting of geese, snow geese, particularly, and liberalizing the requirements for snow geese after the regular goose season is over. This was added in the Senate. I know of no opposition. I ask for the concurrence in Senate Amendment #1."
- Speaker Santiago: "The Gentleman moves to concur on Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1050. Is there any discussion? Any discussion? Seeing none, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1050?' This is final action. This is final action. The voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the record. On this question, there are 118 voting 'yes', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present'. The House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1050. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. House Bill 2211. Representative Hassert."
- Hassert: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to concur with Senate Amendment #1 and Amendment #2. Senate Amendment #1 adds some language dealing with automatic loan machines, so they cannot be located within a 1000 feet of a gambling facility. That also clarifies some law in relation to the department issuing legal interpretation under CILA, and also strikes language from the Interest Act that could have been interpreted to mean that sales financial agency could make direct loans when they cannot. And Amendment #2,

66th Legislative Day

May 21, 1997

basically, strikes some language in the original Bill that provided for arbitrations. Some consumer groups were against this proportion of the Bill, so it was deleted, and also allows for attorney fees to be awarded in a civil action suits against lenders. I'll be happy to answer any questions."

Speaker Santiago: "The Gentleman has moved to concur in Senate

Amendment 1 and 2 to House Bill 2211. Is there any
discussion? Representative Black."

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

Speaker Santiago: "He indicates he will."

Black: "Yes, Representative, this Bill could be portrayed as a Department of Financial Institutions Administration Bill, would that be accurate?"

Hassert: "Yes, it would."

Black: "Just a couple of little points on the Bill. It does raise the consumer loan ceiling, is that correct?"

Hassert: "If I'm not mistaken, in the original Bill it raised it from ... up to 25 thousand from..."

Black: "Right. Okay. And the insurance item allowing the consumer loan companies to sell insurance, is that in agreement with the ongoing negotiation about banks and insurance companies and all of that?"

Hassert: "My understanding, Representative, that was in the original stature to begin with, that was not changed."

Black: "It was in the original Bill. Okay. Alright. Thank you,

Representative."

Speaker Santiago: "Any discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Dart."

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

Speaker Santiago: "He indicates he will."

66th Legislative Day

May 21, 1997

Dart: "Representative, what was the need for these Amendments?"

Hassert: "There were some questions regarding the automatic loan machines basically being located close to any type of gambling facilities. There's a concern, so there's some language put in there that they couldn't be located within a certain thousand feet, and there's just some clarifications when it moved over to the Senate. And the second Amendment dealt with some consumers' groups concerning that instead of going ... the financial institutions would prefer that they had an arbitration clause in there. Consumer groups felt that, that was unfair, and they felt that they should have the right to sue before going to arbitration, and so..."

Dart: "So, it was at their request that the mandatory arbitration provisions were removed?"

Hassert: "Yes."

Dart: "Okay. And, Brent, how does the location... the ban on the location around gambling sights, how did you change that, the provisions that dealt with the ... within a 1000 feet of a wagering facility, how did that change in this Amendment to what was the original Bill?"

Hassert: "Are you referring to the automatic loan machines? In the original Bill, there was no... they could have located one, for example, in a riverboat facility. You know, it could have been located on the boat, itself, but this would allow that it can't be within a 1000 feet. So they just put a distance in the Amendment that it couldn't be located in close proximity to any kind of gaming facility."

Dart: "Okay. Thank you."

Speaker Santiago: "Any further questions? Representative Hassert to close."

Hassert: "I just ask for a favorable vote."

66th Legislative Day

May 21, 1997

- Speaker Santiago: "The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 and 2 to House Bill 2211?' All those in favor, signify by voting 'aye'; all opposed, signify by voting 'nay'. The voting is open. 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 95 voting 'yes', 21 voting 'no', 1 voting 'present'. The House does concur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 2211. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority, is hereby declared passed. Mr. Clerk, for an announcement."
- Clerk Bolin: "A dessert tray has been set up for the Members in the hallway on the Democratic side. A dessert tray has been set up for the Members in the hallway on the Democratic side."
- Speaker Santiago: "House Bill 1375. Representative Capparelli."
- Capparelli: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to concur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1375. This Amendment continues the district of water reclamation present non-referendum bonding authority from December 2001 to December 30, 2006. It does not increase the district's tax rate. These projects that they do require a long term planning and implementation in order to let contracts which extend over several years. We have to have this bonding authority for the Bill that Skippy Saviano passed last week. I would ask for an 'aye' vote."
- Speaker Santiago: "The Gentleman has moved to concur on Senate

 Amendment #1 to House Bill 1375. Any discussion? The

 Gentleman from Cook, Representative Saviano."
- Saviano: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. Senate

 Amendment #1 represents ... this is the Amendment which

 will allow us to perform under the Bill that we passed out

66th Legislative Day

May 21, 1997

of here last week, which was Senate Bill 435, and I would ask for your approval. Thank you."

Speaker Santiago: "Is there any discussion? The Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black."

Black: "Yes, Mr. Speaker. I have an inquiry of the Chair."

Speaker Santiago: "State your inquiry."

Black: "I thought we had already concurred with this Amendment.

Was it on another Bill, or am I just confused?"

Speaker Santiago: "We had the Bill earlier today, but he took it out of the record."

Black: "Oh, okay. Thank you."

Speaker Santiago: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative McAuliffe."

McAuliffe: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I'd just like to remind everyone and the Members that these bonds are out to build the flood control improvement, that these bonds have paid for the Deep Tunnel Project which keeps sewage out of Lake Michigan and protects the drinking water of Cook, Lake, and DuPage County. I'd also remind you that this project is 75% federally grant funded, and these bonds are needed to pay the 25% local share. And I would encourage a 'yes' vote on this Bill. Thank you."

Speaker Santiago: "Representative Capparelli to close."

Capparelli: "I would ask for an affirmative vote. Thank you."

Speaker Santiago: "The Gentleman has moved to concur on Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1375. The question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1375?' This is final action. All those in favor, signify by voting 'aye'; all those opposed, signify by saying 'no'. Voting is open. Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Clerk, take the

66th Legislative Day

May 21, 1997

record. On this question, there are 47 voting 'aye', 69 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', and 2 non-voting. The House does not concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1375, and having not received the Constitutional Majority, the Amendment... the Gentleman moves to... the Motion fails. House Bill 526. Representative Leitch."

Leitch: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Senate Amendment #1 is a contents of House Bill 1425, which Representative Kubik passed out of this House 116 to 0. What it does is make the Uniform Penalty and Interest Act consistent with the bonding requirements in the Retail Occupation Tax Act and the Income Tax Act. I know of no opposition to this measure. It simply didn't get out of Rules in the Senate, and I would ask for your concurrence."

Speaker Santiago: "The Gentleman has moved to concur in Senate

Amendment 1 to House Bill 526. Is there any discussion?

Representative Black."

Black: "Yes, thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Staff has some confusion with this Bill. Would the Sponsor be kind enough to take it out of the record for a second?"

Leitch: "Yes."

Speaker Santiago: "He indicates he will."

Black: "Thank you."

Speaker Santiago: "House Bill 1230. Representative Phelps.

Representative Phelps. Out of the record. House Bill

1121. Representative Curry."

Curry: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would make a motion that we nonconcur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1121. We need to make some additional changes in this Amendment and would like to send it back over to the Senate."

Speaker Santiago: "The Lady from Macon, Representative Curry, moves to nonconcur with Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill

66th Legislative Day

May 21, 1997

- 1121. All those in favor say 'aye'; all those against say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the House does not concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1121. House Bill 23. Representative Lindner. Representative Lindner on House Bill 23."
- Lindner: "Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I did file this morning a motion to nonconcur."
- Speaker Santiago: "The Lady from Kane, Representative Lindner, wishes to nonconcur in Senate Amendment 1 and 2 to House Bill 23. All those in favor say 'aye'; those opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the House does not concur in Senate Amendment #1 and 2 to House Bill 23. House Bill 526."
- Leitch: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Again, my intent here is to concur in #1 and to nonconcur in #2, which I believe was a question that was on the Floor. I've just, a moment ago, described Senate Amendment #2... or #1, and I would ask for its concurrence."
- Speaker Santiago: "The Gentleman has moved to concur on Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 526. Is there any discussion? Any discussion? Hearing none, the question is, 'Shall the House concur in Senate Amendments #1 to House Bill 526?' This is final action. All those in favor signify by voting 'aye'; all those opposed, please signify by voting 'nay'. The voting is open. 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 'aye', 0 voting 'no', 0 voting 'present', and 1 non voting. The House does concur in Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 526. And this Bill, having received a Constitutional Majority... Representative Leitch on Senate Amendment #2."

Leitch: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to nonconcur in Senate

66th Legislative Day

May 21, 1997

Amendment #2."

Speaker Santiago: "The Gentleman has moved to nonconcur on Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 526. All those in favor say 'aye'; those opposed say 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the House does not concur in Senate Amendment #2 to House Bill 526."

Leitch: "Thank you."

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

Black: "Yes, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker Santiago: "Your light is on."

Black: "My light was on?"

Speaker Santiago: "Yes, Sir."

Black: "It must have been an inadvertent light. Oh, I know what it was. I thought it was raining outside and I remember that law, I had to have my light on."

Speaker Santiago: "House (sic-Senate) Bill 469. Yes, House (sic-Senate) Bill 469. Senate Bill 469. Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "My State Senator apparently made a mistake and didn't realize this was the final deal. So, I have to move to recede so we can go in a Conference Committee and get the same language and bring it back out. So, I move to recede. I mean, I move to refuse to recede."

Speaker Santiago: "Is there any discussion? Is there any discussion? The Gentleman has moved to refuse to recede to House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 469. All those in favor say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'no'. The House refuses to recede to House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 469, and a Conference Committee has been requested. Senate Bill 680. Representative Bugielski."

Bugielski: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I

66th Legislative Day

May 21, 1997

refuse to recede on House Amendment #1, I refuse to recede on House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 680, and I ask that a Conference Committee be appointed."

- Speaker Santiago: "Is there any discussion? Hearing none, the Gentleman has moved to refuse to recede from House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 680. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye'; all those opposed signify by saying 'no'. And the Gentleman has requested a Conference Committee. Senate Bill 596. Senate Bill 596, Representative Scott."
- Scott: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move that we refuse to recede from House Amendment 1, ,2, and 3 to Senate Bill 596, and ask that a Conference Committee be appointed."
- Speaker Santiago: "The Gentleman has moved to refuse to recede to House Amendment 1, 2, and 3 to Senate Bill 596. All in favor say 'aye'; all opposed say 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the House does refuse to recede to House Amendment 1, 2, and 3 to Senate Bill 596. And the Gentleman requests a Conference Committee to be appointed. Senate Bill 240, Representative Lindner. Representative Lindner. Take it out of the record. Senate Bill 713. Senate Bill 713. Representative McGuire."
- McGuire: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I refuse to recede on House Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 713 and I would request a Conference Committee. Thank you." Speaker Santiago: "The Gentleman has refused to recede from House Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 713. All those in favor say 'aye'; all those opposed say 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the House does does refuse to recede from Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 713. And a Conference Committee will be appointed. Senate Bill 379. Representative Roskam."

66th Legislative Day

May 21, 1997

- Roskam: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move that we nonconcur in Senate Amendments 1 and 2."
- Speaker Santiago: "The Gentleman has moved to nonconcur on Senate Amendment 1 and 2 to House Bill 379. All those in favor, signify by saying 'aye'; all those opposed... in the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the House does not concur on Senate Amendment 1 and 2 to House Bill 379. On the Order of Second Reading, Senate Bill 1105. Representative Scott. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."
- Clerk Bolin: "Senate Bill 1105. The Bill has been read a second time, previously. No Committee Amendments. No Floor Amendments. No Motions filed."
- Speaker Santiago: "Any discussion? Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, announcements."
- Clerk Bolin: "Immediately after adjournment, the following committees will meet: Insurance Committee in Room 114, Judiciary I Committee in Room C-1, Stratton. Personnel Committee, Room 118. State Government Committee, Room D-1, and Agriculture Committee on the House Floor. Again, the following committees will meet immediately upon adjournment: Insurance Committee in Room 114, Judiciary I Committee in Room C-1, Personnel and Pensions Committee in Room 118, State Government Committee in Room D-1, Stratton, and Agriculture Committee on the House Floor."
- Speaker Santiago: "Allowing Perfunctory time for the Clerk, Representative Capparelli now moves that the House stands adjourned until May 22... Thursday, May 22, at the hour of 11:00 a.m. Mr. Black."
- Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I rise for a point of personal privilege."

Speaker Santiago: "Proceed."

Black: "Thank you. It's my pleasure to introduce to you an

66th Legislative Day

May 21, 1997

outstanding Gentleman from my hometown of Danville, serving his second term as president of the Illinois Board of Education, Mr. Lou Mervis."

- Speaker Santiago: "Welcome, Mr. Mervis. Mr. Biggins."
- Woolard: "Representative Biggins was gone so Representative Woolard is in his chair. I'd like to make an announcement. The House Ag Committee will meet at 3:00 on the House Floor, 3:00 on the House Floor."
- Speaker Santiago: "The Motion is, 'Shall the House adjourn until Thursday, May 22, at the hour of 11:00 a.m.?' Those in favor, signify by saying 'aye'; those opposed, signify by saying 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the House does stand adjourned until 11:00 a.m. ... May 22 at 11:00 a.m. Thank you, everyone."
- Clerk Bolin: "The House Perfunctory Session will come to order.

 Introduction of Resolutions. House Resolution #175,

 offered by Representative Novak. Senate Joint Resolution
 #27, offered by Representative Phelps."
- Clerk Bolin: "Messages from the Senate. A Message from the Senate by Mr. Harry, Secretary. 'Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has concurred with the House and they adopted their Amendments to Senate Bill 106, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Municipal Code by changing Section 7-1-47, together with House Amendment #1 and House Amendment #3. I am further directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has refused to concur with the House in the adoption of the following Amendments: House Amendment #2 to Senate Bill 106, House Amendment #4 to Senate Bill 106, and House Amendment #7 to Senate Bill 106.'"
- Clerk Bolin: "A Message from the Senate by Mr. Harry, Secretary.

 'Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of

66th Legislative Day

May 21, 1997

Representatives that the Senate has refused to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendments to the following Bills: House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill #218, House Amendment #3 to Senate Bill #348, House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 681, House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 521, and House Amendment #3 to Senate Bill 789, House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 232, House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 551, House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 1109, and House Amendment #1 to Senate Bill 569.'"

Clerk Rossi: "The House Perfunctory Session will come to order. Committee Reports. Representative Mautino, Chairman from the Committee on Insurance, to which the following Joint Action Motions was referred, action taken on May 21, reported the same back, recommend: 'be adopted' to concur Senate Amendments 1, 2, and 4 to House Bill Representative Dart, Chairman from the Committee on Judiciary I, Civil Law to which the following Joint Action Motions were referred, action taken on May 21, 1997, reported the same back, recommend: 'be adopted' to concur Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 66, Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 165, Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 613, Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1211, Senate Amendment #1 to House Bill 1619. Representative Murphy, Chairman from the Committee on Personnel and Pensions, to which the following Joint Action Motions were referred, action taken on May 21, 1997, reported the same back, recommended: adopted' to concur Senate Amendments 1 and 2 to House Bill 593, and Senate Amendment 1 and 2 to House Bill Representative Giles, Chairman from the Committee on State Government Administration, to which the following Joint Action Motions were referred, action taken on May 21, 1997, reported the same back, recommend: 'be adopted' to concur

66th Legislative Day

May 21, 1997

Senate Amendments 1, 2, and 3 to House Bill 274, and Senate Amendment 3 to House Bill 1757."

- Clerk Rossi: "A Message from the Senate by Mr. Harry, Secretary.

 'Mr. Speaker, I am directed to inform the House of Representatives that the Senate has refused to concur with the House in the adoption of their Amendment to a Bill of the following title: Senate Bill 408, a Bill for an Act to amend the Entry on Adjoining Land to Accomplish Repairs Act, together with House Amendment #1.'"
- Clerk Rossi: "There being no further business, the House Perfunctory Session will stand adjourned."